

Report of Proceedings 2020

General Synod November Group of Sessions

**Monday 23 November 2020 –
Wednesday 25 November 2020**

Remote Meeting

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

Full Synod: First Day

Monday 23 November 2020

WORSHIP

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

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 1.12 pm

ITEM 1

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOMES

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. In a moment I am going to read out the names of the new members of the Synod.

The new members are: the Rt Revd Guli Francis-Dehqani, Bishop of Loughborough, replacing the Rt Revd Alistair Magowan; Dr Brendan Biggs, Diocese of Bristol, replacing Mr Ian Yemm; the Ven. Robert Cooper, Diocese of Durham, replacing the Ven. Ian Jagger; the Revd Jo Pestell, Diocese of Gloucester, replacing the Revd Tudor Griffiths; Canon Karen Czapiewski, Diocese of Gloucester, replacing Mrs Corinne Aldis; Mr Jonathan Walker, Diocese of Leicester, replacing Mr Jonathan Cryer; the Revd Christopher Trundle, Diocese of London, replacing the Revd Dr Sean Doherty; the Revd Elisabeth Goddard, Diocese of London, replacing the Revd Dr Andy Emerton; the Revd Dr Amatu Christian-Iwuagwu, Diocese of London, replacing the Revd Preb. Alan Moses; Mrs Abigail Ogier, Diocese of Manchester, replacing Mr Michael Heppleston; the Revd David Penny, Diocese of Manchester, replacing the Revd Sharon Jones; the Revd Michael Read, Diocese of Manchester, replacing the Ven. Cherry Vann; the Revd Claire Robson, Diocese of Newcastle, replacing the Revd Catherine Pickford; Miss Emily Hobbs, Diocese of Sheffield, replacing Mr Mark Russell; the Revd Christopher Lee, Diocese of Southwell & Nottingham, replacing the Ven. David Picken; the Revd Dr Christian Selvaratnam, Diocese of York, replacing the Revd Peter Moger; the Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC, Dean of the Arches, replacing the Rt Worshipful Charles George.

Please may we greet them all? You are invited to wave or put up a hand, press a “thumbs up”. That looks wonderful. You do have a “raised thumb” or “clap” icon in Zoom under “options”. You also have, on some of them, a thumbs down. If you do that after a speaker has spoken they will be executed!

I am invited and I would like to welcome the ecumenical representatives attending for the first time: Fr Jan Nowotnik, Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales,

replacing Fr Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard, O. Carm, the Revd Tim Meadows, representing the United Reformed Church, and the Revd Dr Paul Goodliff, General Secretary of Churches Together in England. May we greet them all.

This concludes our Introductions and Welcomes, and, accordingly, I now hand over to the Chair of our next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 1.14 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod. We are missing you terribly here in Church House. I certainly am. Greetings from here. I hope we will be able to proceed with the forthcoming business in the spirit of being at the forefront of the technological advance that this represents on this occasion. Before we start the first formal item of business for this remote group of sessions, I have been asked to reassure members that we are all here in Church House appropriately socially distanced and are following the guidance related to Covid-19.

May I remind members that if you wish to speak on this, or indeed any other item, that you will need to raise the blue hand icon. May I encourage members to use the icon promptly but not prematurely? That will help those who are monitoring these things and keep the business flowing. It will be helpful if you could remember to take the icon down when it is no longer needed. If you wish to raise a point of order at any time, then please send a message to “point of order” in the chat box. This will alert whoever is in the chair at that point that there is a request to make a point of order.

Please do bear with us with any technical challenges we may face over the course of this group of sessions. Can I encourage you to see the possible pauses that may occur from time to time not as a delay but as an opportunity to fill the Synod business over the next few days with moments of prayer.

ITEM 500

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

STANDING ORDERS MADE UNDER SECTION 1 OF THE GENERAL SYNOD (REMOTE MEETINGS) (TEMPORARY STANDING ORDERS) MEASURE 2020 (GS 2177)

The Chair: We come now to Item 500. In accordance with section 3 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020, the first item of business at this group of sessions is the question of whether to approve the Special Standing Orders made under that Measure by the officers of the General Synod. The Special Standing Orders in the form made by the officers are set out in GS 2177.

Under the Measure the Synod may approve the Special Standing Orders with or without amendment. Due notice has been given of one amendment, which is Item 508 on the Order Paper. As a result, the Special Standing Orders must be dealt with under the Preliminary Motion Procedure provided for in Standing Order 73 of the Standing Orders of the Synod.

That procedure involves the following stages. First, the Chair of the House of Laity on behalf of the officers of the Synod will move the preliminary motion: "That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be considered." If, following any debate, that motion is carried, I shall invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment. After Mr Lamming has spoken, I shall invite Dr Harrison to speak in reply. If he indicates support for the amendment, the debate on the amendment can continue and a vote can be taken on it. If he indicates that he does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members indicate by means of a Zoom poll at that time that they wish the debate to continue and a vote to be taken on the amendment. Once the amendment has been dealt with, Dr Harrison will then move the final motion: "That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be approved."

ITEM 500A

The Chair: I now call the Chair of the House of Laity Dr Jamie Harrison to move Item 500A: "That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be considered". He has up to ten minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Chair, you will be aware, as will members of Synod, that this item, Item 500, is both the first item on our agenda in this group of sessions and the first item ever to be debated remotely, in this case through Zoom, and voted upon via an external voting platform. It is, of course, a great sadness that this is in the context of a Covid epidemic and that we meet during an ongoing worldwide pandemic, with its huge cost in illness and, sadly, significant loss of life.

When we met as a Synod in September, some physically in the chamber at Church House Westminster and others supporting and praying online, we passed the Remote Meetings Measure. The Measure was reported on favourably by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and, following resolutions in both Houses of Parliament, received Royal Assent on 4 November 2020.

In a speech back in September I noted that should we not take this route of using such Special Standing Orders that Synod would go into a form of a hibernation, and, of course, with the ongoing concerns with us still of coronavirus infection rates, a physical meeting of the Synod in February remains uncertain. We can only hope and pray that

we will be able to meet together in York next July for the final group of sessions of this extended quinquennium.

The Measure before us provides for the six officers of the Synod to make Special Standing Orders to enable the Synod to meet and to transact business remotely. As required by the Measure, the officers consulted the Business Committee and the Standing Orders Committee on the draft Standing Orders. Positives were received from both groups and the officers made the Special Standing Orders in the form set out in GS 2177. These Special Standing Orders are now subject to approval by the Synod, with or without amendment. That is the purpose of this debate. Once agreed, the Measure comes into force with immediate effect.

The text of GS 2177 is, I believe, quite straightforward and does not require line-by-line exposition. In summary, the approach taken in the Special Standing Orders is to enable Synod to follow, as closely as the technology will permit, the procedures that we normally would use at physical meetings. The procedures adopted for remote meetings should therefore remain reasonably familiar to members even if some of the details are necessarily different.

At this point I would like to make reference to David Lammings' amendment, which is Item 508 and appears on Order Paper IV. He proposes that the results of simple votes, that is those taken using a Zoom poll rather than using the external platform, should not lead to the names of those voting for or against or stating an abstention being published. This concern arises from Standing Order 38(9) which requires that the results of all electronic votes of whatever type must be made public, something I suspect we made up and agreed to when we had never ever heard of Zoom.

I am sympathetic to Mr Lammings' motivation in wanting to stay as close as possible to how we normally do things. A simple vote taken by a Zoom poll is intended to stand in for a show of hands and votes taken by shows of hands in the Synod, such as for motions for the closure, are not recorded and the names of those voting are not published. Nevertheless, votes by a show of hands are public votes and members and visitors in the gallery, as well as members in the hall, are able to see who votes by a show of hands, so votes by a show of hands are therefore not secret but, equally, they are not recorded.

I have no strong view either way on the matter, but so that it can be decided by Synod I am happy to indicate at this point that I will support the amendment being debated so that the 40-member rule does not need to be used and a vote can be taken. The inevitable added complexity of meeting in this way will prove stressful and tiring as well as artificial, and lacking the huge benefits of direct human interaction. But we are where we are. I am immensely grateful to the Synod staff and the Business Committee for guiding us through the process and equipping us for engaging with our business; and for introducing a system for voting remotely using the online platform as well as enabling the Zoom polls for other simpler matters.

Like all of you, I very much hope we can get this technology to work well, but also that we can be patient with one another and kind and that these temporary Standing Orders whether amended or not, will prove helpful in facilitating our business together. Therefore I beg to move Item 500: "That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be considered."

The Chair: Thank you, Dr Harrison. Item 500A is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): I think if we have an opportunity to record votes we should do so. I think it is a good innovation to be able to know, even on matters of a relatively straightforward kind, who voted in which way.

The Chair: May I remind members that at the moment we are speaking on Item 500A. We have not yet come to the amendment. Thank you.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Sorry, Chair, I thought we were speaking to the amendment. I will lower my hand.

The Chair: I take it you do not want to speak further? You wish to speak on the amendment, not on this item. Thank you. We will go to Bill Braviner.

Revd Bill Braviner (Durham): I just wanted to ask if the wording in Item 4 could be amended slightly to take account of the fact that deaf members of Synod cannot hear and be heard, and we need to recognise that.

The Chair: I am afraid the only amendment before the Synod is the one at 508, which we will come to next.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I took part in the debate in September and one of the things I asked, and I look at this and support electronic voting, was about a blend in time. I am asking Dr Jamie Harrison particularly when it might be possible for us to meet in person and some of us, rather like the parliamentary process, be in the distance and not able to be there. By doing all of this, are we excluding that opportunity, which seems a very good one, that there could be the blend that people could physically be at Synod voting in person and online voting would still be available for those unable to be there?

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Scowen.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Simply I am seeking to find out where we are to find the

Order Papers. I cannot seem to find them on the website nor have they, so far as I can see, been emailed to us.

The Chair: I am afraid that is not in my hands, Mr Scowen, but I am sure that the Administrator and Clerk to the Synod have heard that request and will do their best to make them available as soon as possible.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): May I add a bit to Clive Scowen's point of order? I have already brought this to the attention of the controlling group and apparently the website is down but you can get access to the Notice Papers via the General Synod app, as I have just discovered.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Stallybrass. With the joys of blue hands going on and off, I had called Mr Lamming, but it may be that he was slightly premature for his amendment. If he could indicate whether that is the case or not, I would be grateful.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Just in response to the point that Clive was making a moment ago, I accessed the Order Paper on the website. I cannot say whether it is down at the moment, but I had also sent an email to Synod Support asking whether Notice Papers and Order Papers could be emailed to members because not everybody will necessarily have access either to the website or the Synod app.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lamming. Could I remind members that we are at the moment in the middle of a formal debate? It is unfortunate when there are practical issues, but if those could be taken up through the app or using email rather than through the formal debate of the Synod. May we return to the debate on Item 500A, please?

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I just want to take the opportunity of thanking everybody who has worked so hard to put these amendments and new regulations together. We had an excellent time in General Synod earlier on this year which through speedy efforts we got it all done. It was properly considered. Many of the points we were concerned about were addressed. It is a pity that we cannot do anything at the moment about deaf people, but if somehow we could have the technology of bringing in some sort of subtitling system that would do more than address the problem, but I do not know how the vagaries of Zoom work. I do know that this has been a well thought out, well-executed piece of work and I think it really does need to go ahead without amendment.

Without straying too far from the main point, which is a debate on this issue, Mr Lamming knows that he does not have the support of anybody in General Synod from the St Edmundsbury & Ipswich team on his point. I hope he will have the grace at some point to withdraw it. Nonetheless, we look forward to his deliberations with interest.

The Chair: I see no one else indicating a wish to speak, so I now invite Dr Harrison to respond to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thank you, Chair. Obviously at this stage we are having complexities. We are struggling to get our heads around all different types of technology. I have got three or four different things open at the moment on different machines. Thank you for your patience and for those who are attempting to help us forward. There is a chat function where you can send messages to the team, which may be helpful but thank you. Debbie McIsaac has raised an issue which I think we are going to come to in the amendment. It is around recording what we can record and what we should record. Thank you, Bill Braviner, because I think we do need to keep reviewing the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders Committee would be very interested to hear from you, and if you would like to write in that would be very helpful.

Thank you to Peter Bruinvels, as ever picking up helpful directions of travel for us. GS 2177X at para 8 does reflect on the possibility of a hybrid-type arrangement. This will be determined by the Business Committee, but again I am sure they would be pleased to hear from you in relation to how that might work, particularly with your experience in other contexts.

To Jonathan Alderton-Ford, thank you for that warm encouragement, and making the point that much that has been done has been extremely well thought out at quite a good pace. Thank you to those who have contributed. I am happy to pass back to the Chair in relation to considering Item 500.

The Chair: I now put Item 500A to the vote. For this purpose I order a simple vote. This is a simple vote on Item 500A and voting will take place using a Zoom poll. Members of Synod, I am sorry to say that there is a technical hitch with the simple vote, so we are going to proceed by a formal vote, and this will be by a count of the whole Synod. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 500A. Voting will take place using the Crystal voting platform. I am sorry for the delay, members of Synod, but bear with us, we are almost there.

Those voted on Item 500A: in favour 263, against 39, with 16 recorded abstentions.¹
The motion was carried.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Wilson?

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): It really was a point of clarification. I was probably a bit too premature in moving to the voting platform. I noticed that at the top it said Item 508 but

¹ The voting figures announced by the Chair (but not the result) differ from those recorded here, as it was subsequently discovered that a number of duplicate votes were recorded by the remote voting platform. The figures shown in the Report of Proceedings (here) are the corrected figures.

when the actual vote came up it was 500. Could you clarify that my vote for 508 has not been recorded?

The Chair: The vote which was announced, Mr Wilson, and the vote that was taken was on Item 500A. We have not yet come to Item 508, but we will in just a moment.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): I know. Sorry, what I was saying is I was a bit premature in moving to the voting platform, and when it came up it was with Item 508, which I voted for, and then I realised later that the actual vote for 500 had not been announced.

The Chair: We will clarify that, but the position is, as I have said, that we have not yet come to Item 508, so there can have been no vote recorded on it.

Members of Synod, I am sorry that we are experiencing some inevitable technical issues, but I am very grateful to you for your patience and your forbearance. I can assure you that colleagues here are working very hard to make things as smooth as they possibly can. Could I remind members first that the papers for the Synod are available on the Church of England website, and that includes, I am told, the Order Papers. If you can get on to the website, the information that you need is there.

Could I also remind members of Synod that the way to respond to a Zoom poll is to wait for the pop-up box and respond to that, not to use the blue hand function which is only used here at the moment to indicate a wish to speak. Thank you. Bearing that in mind, and the number of blue hands that are currently showing, it would be helpful if you do not wish to speak if you could lower your blue hand.

ITEM 508

The Chair: We now move to Item 508 and I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment. He may speak for up to five minutes.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Chair, members of Synod, might I start first by acknowledging the work done by the Steering Committee and the Church House lawyers and the Synod staff in getting us to where we are this morning on the Measure and the Standing Orders.

I expressed concern at the consultation stage of the Measure, and again before the Special Standing Orders were made, about whether special provision needed to be included in the Standing Orders for remote voting. I was assured it was not necessary and was covered by the existing Standing Orders. Paper GS 2177X sets that out. I do not need to read it. It was only last Tuesday during the remote voting demonstration, which about 100 members of Synod participated in, that it became apparent that the remote voting system that we are using means that there will be a permanent record of how members voted on an informal poll, something which, as Jamie Harrison has already said, is equivalent to a show of hands at a physical meeting. It is that learning

last Tuesday that has prompted my amendment to address what I suggest is clearly an unintended consequence of the combination of remote voting by electronic means in Standing Order 38(9).

Some people may think that this is a good thing. Andrew Dotchin in my diocese is one of those and, at this point, I have to disagree with what Jonathan said a moment or two ago: it is not the expressed view of all other members of the St Edmundsbury & Ipswich team to oppose this amendment. We did not discuss it. The only person to actually express a view has been Jonathan.

Of course, the Chair can at any time direct a counted vote either of the whole Synod or a vote by Houses, or indeed a member of Synod can request such a vote, and, if a sufficient number of members stand, a counted vote of the whole Synod or by Houses can be directed. But I think that what we ought to be doing is replicating, as far as possible, in a remote meeting what would actually happen if we were meeting physically. Indeed, Jamie said as much in his introductory speech. If we do that we do not record how people voted on a show of hands.

Of course, the advantage of a poll, when it works properly, is that the Chair would not need to have to look around the chamber to assess whether the motion has been passed or defeated, something which can be difficult if there appears to be a close vote, because the poll will actually give the Chair of the debate the voting figures, and he or she will be able to declare those, or to display a percentage vote or how people have voted, much in the way that those who are familiar with “Who Wants to be a Millionaire?” will see how “ask the audience” polls are displayed.

Members of Synod, this is a matter of principle. It should not be slipped through, as it were, as an unintended consequence of the Standing Orders. My own personal view, and why I put forward the amendment, is that we ought to replicate what happens at a physical meeting. This should not be a recorded vote and a permanent record of how people vote on a show of hands. Others may feel differently, but, at least on the basis of the amendment I put forward, Synod has the opportunity to express its view on that particular issue and it will not simply go unremarked as an unintended consequence of Standing Order 38(9).

The Chair: I invite Dr Harrison to respond.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (London): I will not repeat what I have already said. I think it just highlights one issue with Zoom. We have already had a Zoom poll in relation to Item 500A. I do not know what the Chair will be suggesting for the amendment, but I am assuming when we come to the final vote on this piece of business there will be an external poll. It will give us a flavour as to what the differences would be between a Zoom poll and an external poll, and, of course, things like motions for closure would come under this. I am accepting the amendment on the basis that it will be good to hear some views and a vote.

The Chair: Dr Harrison has indicated that he supports the amendment for the purposes of the 40-member rule, so Item 508 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds): I would like to oppose this amendment. Members of the General Synod are holders of a public elected office and, as such, they are accountable to those who elect them and to the public for everything they do in exercise of that office. Before there were such things as electronic votes, members would vote by going through appropriate doors and would be counted, or they would vote by a show of hands in the chamber. Both of these forms of voting were public, as any other members could see how they were voting and members of the public in the gallery and the press could also see that.

When we moved to electronic votes for division of the Synod those had to be recorded, otherwise people would not have been able to see how members had voted. However, when we are in the chamber together votes by a show of hands are not recorded because it can be seen who has voted in what way and any member of the public, if they wish to look, and any member of the press can see how a Synod member is voting.

If we do not record these votes, we are changing the way we normally do things, because with an electronic vote it is not possible, if you do not record it, to see how people have voted, either for other members of Synod or for the public in general. Sometimes shows of hands can be quite significant votes, as in the amendment to the climate change motion in February, and members of Synod should always be accountable to those who elect them for their votes. I therefore argue that to not record these votes would be to change the way we normally do things and also make something invisible which should be transparent and accountable.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): I too would like to oppose this amendment. I think Canon Jones is quite right that it would actually alter something. I welcome this unintended consequence because I think we should always be able to justify why we have voted. When we have had a show of hands in Synod, I have always reported back to the deaneries which way I voted. I think it is important we are transparent in our voting. This is an unintended consequence that I welcome.

The Chair: Do you wish to speak, Mr Wilson?

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): I think I am being confused with the other Mr Wilson.

The Chair: We will move to Professor Joyce Hill.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I have put in to speak. I seem to have been unmuted. Do you wish me to make my brief point, Chair?

The Chair: I had just indicated we would move to Professor Hill. Thank you, Mr Bruinvels.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): I am glad the amendment has been brought forward. I am in the same position as Jamie Harrison in thinking that it is right for it to be debated. I am less concerned personally about which way the vote goes, but I do think it is right that we should not let this go through simply as an unintended consequence of the technology default. If we are going to let it go through, which is fine – I do not mind one way or the other – it is right that we should do so knowingly, and not as an accidental consequence. I think it is right that we debate it in Synod.

There is a distinction to be made, however. It is perfectly true that show of hands votes made in the chamber are publicly visible, but they are not permanently recorded. There is a distinction here which we are in danger of overlooking. If we follow what seems to be the consequence of the new Standing Orders, they would be recorded in the same way as counted votes are recorded. I think we have got to be careful about the distinctions that we are actually dealing with here.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): Let us ask ourselves a question, if we could, as to what the outcome is that we want from this. When we do our practice normally in a physical form, there are a number of votes that we are invited to perform which are of no consequence, genuinely, to the rest of the world, particularly closure motions and so on, of which there may be many. What I think we need to do is to find a solution that will enable us to have the things that we really need to know recorded and those things that we do not really need to know for a long period not recorded. I think it would be better to go with this amendment for the moment and find a way in which we can make sure that those amendments which are crucial or seemingly substantive can be recorded in an appropriate way.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I am not dramatically concerned one way or the other, but it does seem to me that it is worth supporting this amendment, particularly as the overall voting figures are often quoted extensively outside of the meeting. Many of the informal polls or show of hands polls are called at relatively short notice and members are not necessarily able to ensure that they are present in the chamber for those votes. In those circumstances, quoting the numbers of people who voted could have their own unintended consequences.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I am in a dilemma here, Chair. I think votes are public and absolutely therefore they should be recorded. However, what I have seen in recent years in the chamber when we have a show of hands, and it is sometimes so close that we go on to have a full vote, is people change their vote between the original one and the three minutes going up to having a full vote. Sometimes these shows of hands are reflecting exactly what is going on at the moment. As Mike Todd said a few minutes ago, not everyone is in the chamber at that time. I am thinking of the length of time in calling all these particular votes. I genuinely believe that for final votes, most

certainly, if it is that close we should have it. This is an unintended consequence and, whilst I welcome a good discussion, at the moment I am minded to support David Lamming on the grounds that a formal vote, when it really appears to be close, will still be a proper vote that will be recorded.

I would mention one other thing. I mentioned earlier on what a shame it is we are not all meeting or partly meeting in groups, with some in the chamber and some at home. One thing I have felt over the years, and I have been on Synod a long time, is people can be influenced in a debate when they are around each other and watching how the votes are going and how people are supporting them. There is no doubt in my mind that votes change between an initial show of hands and, if it is too close, having a formal vote. I am minded to support David Lamming.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I am afraid I cannot support Mr Lamming on this occasion. Although it is right that we should not be doing anything with unintended consequences, having thought about the consequences, I really do not understand what the anxiety is. Frankly, the only reason we do not record how people vote in the chamber on a show of hands is that it is not practical to do so. As Joyce Jones pointed out, everybody present can see, as indeed can those millions who watch the live stream, how we have voted, which is simply invisible on this occasion.

You cannot replicate what happens in the chamber in a number of ways but, as others have said, if we are publicly accountable for the public office we hold, why would any of us worry about our vote being recorded? If we find we voted the wrong way and people say, "Why did you do that?" You can say, "I made a mistake". It is not a massive problem, it seems to me. If there is a choice between secret voting on this sort of issue, where there is no accountability as a result, or having our voting recorded for all time, I think the latter is preferable. I will not be supporting Mr Lamming's amendment.

Can I also ask something relating to the point of order I raised earlier? Those of us who cannot access the app still do not know what the words are that we are voting on. I was told that an email had been sent to all members with the Order Papers attached, but nothing has arrived.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Scowen. Your point has been heard, but we are now debating Item 508. I am grateful, thank you. We will move to the next speaker, Canon Andrew Dotchin, following whom I shall be testing the mind of Synod on a motion for closure.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you very much, David, for your diligence in checking our working. Unintended consequences sometimes are unfortunate, but I think this is a case where we are fortunate to have this unintended consequence. Those who have raised comments about how we normally record our votes, please remember this is only amending these Standing Orders, not our permanent Standing Orders when we do meet as a physical Synod.

If we are looking forward, as someone has mentioned, to a mixed mode Synod, this way of voting, where every vote is recorded, would be essential because you cannot do half in the chamber and half online without recording everyone. It is an unintended consequence. I think it is a good one. It will allow us to weigh our minds carefully and, bless them, it will make the job of the Synod staff much easier. Please let us think about the backroom girls and boys who are working very hard and not make their life more challenging. I oppose the amendment.

The Chair: As there are members indicating that they wish to speak, I need to put the motion for closure. Point of order, Mr Archer.

Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans): Chair, we are on the same page about closure.

The Chair: It is very kind of you to help me but I was going to do it myself, Mr Archer, which I can do these days.

Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans): I put in one speaker back and then you said you were going to do it, so let us get on with it.

The Chair: I put the motion for closure on Item 508 to Synod. For that purpose I order a simple vote. This is a simple vote on the motion for closure on Item 508.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: I now put Item 508 to the vote. For this purpose I order a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 508. Voting will take place using the Crystal voting platform.

There were voted on Item 508: in favour 125, against 248, with 26 recorded abstentions. The motion was lost.

ITEM 500B

The Chair: We move now to Item 500B and I call on Dr Harrison to move Item 500B: "That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be approved." Dr Harrison, the Standing Orders allow you up to ten minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (London): You are very kind, Chair, but I will not delay the Synod. You have a lot of important business this afternoon. I would like to thank Synod particularly for the thoughtful and helpful debate on the amendment. We had eight speakers and I am sorry there was not time for more, but it highlighted some of the questions we face as a Synod in terms of our accountability, what is important business, and what is perhaps more procedural business, and how we might do that. The size of the vote in favour of the amendment suggested that it touched the hearts and minds of quite a few people, but in the end the amendment was defeated. As we get more

experienced with this technology, and we have had a go at a Zoom or two and had a couple of external platform votes, that has given us a sense of the flavour of how we might work together.

I am grateful to all those who contributed, particularly to David Lamming for stimulating that conversation, but I will now move the following. I beg to move Item 500B: “That the Standing Orders made under section 1 of the General Synod (Remote Meetings) (Temporary Standing Orders) Measure 2020 be approved.”.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr Harrison, for your admirable brevity. Item 500B is now open for debate. I see no one indicating to speak, so I am putting now Item 500B to the vote. For that purpose I order a formal counted vote of the whole Synod using the Crystal voting platform.

There were voted on Item 500B: in favour 331, against 15, with 6 recorded abstentions.² The motion was carried.

The Chair: The Special Standing Orders have accordingly been approved by the Synod and continue in operation for a period of 12 months subject to the power of the Synod to extend that period or to revive them. That completes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 2.23 pm.

ITEM 501

AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103D)

AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2105)

The Chair: Amending Canon No. 40 and Amending Canon No. 41 received Final Approval from the Synod at the July 2019 group of sessions. I have to report to the Synod that Royal Assent and Licence has been given in respect of both Amending Canons. Under Standing Order 68, once the Instrument of Enactment for the Canons has been read to the Synod, the motion appearing on the Order Paper must be put to Synod and voted on without debate. I call upon the Registrar to read the Instrument of Enactment.

The Registrar: “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, maturely treated upon by the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the 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

² The voting figures announced by the Chair (but not the result) differ from those recorded here, as it was subsequently discovered that a number of duplicate votes were recorded by the remote voting platform. The figures shown in the Report of Proceedings (here) are the corrected figures.

Britain and Northern Ireland and of her other realms and territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith, being Canons entitled respectively Amending Canon No. 40 and Amending Canon No. 41, both of which received Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence on the 16th day of November 2020.

"We, being the Presidents, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of York, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity of the said Synod, do hereby declare and testify our consent to the said Canons entitled Amending Canon No. 40 and Amending Canon No. 41. And in testimony of such our consent, we have hereunto subscribed our names, or authorised our names to be subscribed, as hereafter follows, dated this 23rd day of November, in the year of our Lord 2020 and in the 69th year of the reign of our sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II."

The Chair: I therefore move Item 501: "That the Canons entitled 'Amending Canon No. 40' and 'Amending Canon No. 41' be made, promulgated and executed".

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote using Zoom.

The Chair: I now therefore sign the Instrument of Enactment. It will subsequently be signed by the Archbishop of York, the Prolocutors, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity. It will travel many miles. The Canons will be sent for proclamation in the diocesan synods in the usual way. That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 2.27 pm.

ITEM 2 PRESENTATION BY THE PRESIDENTS

The Chair: Members of Synod, we now come to Item 2, which is the presentation by the Presidents. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York will together present the Presidential Address. This will be followed by an opportunity for questions and will refer to *Living in Love and Faith*. There will then be a time in breakout rooms and after that we will return for questions. Chaplains are available for members during this item and details are available on Notice Paper III. I now call on the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to speak. They have 25 minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): We meet, dear sisters and brothers of the General Synod, in the shadow of the pandemic. Across our country somewhere around 70,000 extra people will not be with us at Christmas who might very well otherwise have shared in our celebrations. Millions more have been ill, and a significant minority have long Covid, a syndrome whose outcomes and impacts are unclear. The impacts of this virus have been especially serious for specific groups and it has stripped away every attempt to cover weakness. If you have learning

difficulties, if you have other disabilities, if you have chronic illnesses, if you are of UK minority ethnic heritage, if you are poor, if you are old or in a care home, then if you contract Covid you are more likely to die. If you are poor and in a frontline occupation you are more likely to get Covid. If you risk yourself for others you are more likely to get Covid.

Add to that the vast rise in domestic abuse, in mental illness, in unemployment and financial hardship, especially amongst small businesses, the low paid and the entrepreneurial, and we see that the virus makes its way directly or indirectly into every crack in society.

And this country is richer than most, for even those where the pandemic has been minimal are suffering from the struggling global economy. A day labourer in so many parts of the world works or starves. A child soldier is trapped in violence. Women are ever more vulnerable. Our fellow human beings in the poorest parts of the world, our brothers and sisters in Christ, have the virus on top of already intolerable hardship and persecution.

We come to the end of 2020 with bereavement, illness, suffering and fear marking much of the year for many of the people in much of the world. Whatever else we are called to do, whatever actions we decide on, we are called to weep with those who weep, to serve those in need, to be courageous in faith and to put our hands in the hand of the creator, saviour and judge of all things, praying with lament, protest, petition and thanksgiving.

Like 2001 with the destruction of the Twin Towers, 2020 will be a year that registers in memory and in history. It can be compared also with 1929, with 1914, with 1989. We are aware that this is a year in which huge changes are happening in our society, in the world and consequently in the Church.

For let us be clear, there is no possibility of changes in society failing to have a profound effect on the shape, calling and experience of mission in the Church. Institutions that do not adapt to new circumstances are condemned to extinction, as are institutions that adapt wrongly, in a way that does not reflect their history, their traditions and their values.

As I have said, 2020 has brought not one but at least seven obvious crises and too many to list if one looks harder. It began with Covid-19 and the immense impact that has had on our sense of security, in those parts of the world, like here, where disease and natural disaster that threaten to change our lives for many years are unfamiliar parts of our history, not normal companions to our journey.

Second, the pandemic triggered an economic recession on a scale that is extraordinary. Despite its happily v-shaped nature, for which gratitude is owed not least to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for his decisive action and to the Government for its

willingness to take great risks, we will still end the year with the economy at least 5% smaller than it began the year.

Third, we are facing in society and in the Church the Black Lives Matter crisis, racism, come to the fore afresh this year but deeply embedded in our history and foundations. Here, I am using crisis not only in the sense of an alarming event but also something that rightly forces decisions on us. In reviewing 25 CMEAC reports we see that there have been numerous recommendations – more than 170 – most of which have not been put into practice. We cannot blame anyone but ourselves for that.

Fourth, we have the IICSA report and the dreadful shame that rightly accompanies it. We have discussed this at great length in the past and changes are happening, but there is far yet to go and, as on every occasion when we mention safeguarding, we must say clearly how sorry we are and we must recognise that an apology only makes sense – as with racism – when it is accompanied by genuine action, repentance and reparation.

Fifth, as a nation we are facing huge change in the way we relate to Europe and the rest of the world. That it will change is not a question. It has been settled in two popular votes. The uncertainty is what it will be like and what we will do. The debate over international development funding is only one, albeit an extraordinarily important one, part of this question.

Sixth, although it is easily forgotten except on the south coast that there is the ongoing human crisis of immigration, with small boats coming in ever greater numbers across the Channel and the picking up of those sinking a routine matter for RNLI and Border Force, as well as for fishing boats. We need to remember that there will be those contemplating that enormously dangerous voyage at this very moment, as we sit in our homes or here.

Seventh, the underlying challenges to our understanding of democracy and populism, of international law and of what makes for a good society continue to be chronic and destructive weaknesses in the capacity of our societies to respond to change. Underlying all these – overshadowing might be a better word – bigger than any, is the crisis of climate change and the environment.

It would be easy for the Church to be fearful, fearful of these changes, to concentrate only on ourselves, and there have been moments this year where we have done precisely that. Perhaps we will look back and conclude we acted wrongly, or perhaps we can only conclude that we acted over-prudently in the light of our ignorance about the nature of the virus. Whatever we see over time we also know that at the grassroots level the Church has acted magnificently, with lay people and clergy giving every ounce of their energy and commitment to the service of the poor and the needy in our society. They are also heroes of these crises.

However, we cannot remain in crisis mode forever. Therefore, this shared Presidential Address continues with Archbishop Stephen showing us what actions we have taken and how we are looking forward in order to make space for the empowering and envisioning work of the Holy Spirit.

For as it says in Isaiah 7:9, in Isaiah's words to King Ahaz panicked by invasion and threats, "if you do not stand in faith you will not stand at all".

These crises are not signs of the absence of God but calls to recognise the presence of the Kingdom of God, and to act in faith and courage, simplifying our common life, focusing on Jesus Christ, looking outwards to the needy and renewing the call to wash feet, to serve our society and to be the Church *for* England.

We do not lose heart. Indeed, we rejoice in Christ. The title of our Christmas campaign, whether physical or virtual, is "Comfort and Joy". It will be lived out, spoken out, proclaimed and celebrated. For it is in pointing not to us, but to the God who came to the poorest of the poor in order to be amongst them and with them as Immanuel, God with us, that we fulfil our mission and our calling. That is our call today and now we turn to Archbishop Stephen to show how we are trying to make space for that call to be realised amidst the human, financial and missional challenges we face.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Psalm 20:7, "Some put their trust in chariots and some in horses, but we will call only on the name of the Lord our God."

Synod, it is good to be with you this afternoon. It was good to hear in our prayers mention made of Carol Wolstenholme, member of this Synod, lay chair in the Newcastle Diocese, who died a couple of weeks ago. Our prayers are with her family, those she loved, and with the Newcastle Diocese.

Tomorrow morning when we come to explore Vision and Strategy for the Church of England over the next ten years, you are going to find right at the heart of the vision that I believe God is laying upon us precisely this: those words from Psalm 20 about a greater dependence on God. Hearing the challenges that confront us, particularly the things that have either emerged this year or whose urgency has been heightened by the events of this year, it would be tempting to say, "Oh we don't need to worry too much; everything will be okay. We'll soon be back to normal and here is the five-point plan for fixing it all."

But that is not where we are. And even if we did find a way of overcoming those seven woes that Archbishop Justin has just identified, as he said there is an eighth coming over the horizon which dwarfs them all, and that is the environmental crisis which, if unaddressed, will consume everything and render all these other things very small beer indeed.

What is the Christian response? Well first of all, soberingly, it is to heed the prophet Jeremiah who warned against treating people carelessly saying, “Woe to you who say peace where there is no peace”. We are facing huge challenges and there is no point in pretending otherwise. But also, as Jesus said, “The truth” – and I want to add and nothing but the truth – “will set you free”.

This year has revealed to us some truths about ourselves. Our finances are more than stretched. The IICSA report has confronted us with some terrible failings, and on Wednesday we will have an opportunity to discuss this. Our culture needs to change. We all have a responsibility for this, but the culture of any organisation is most shaped by those in leadership. Therefore, we Bishops and Archbishops must take a lead. Loving one another and being honest and transparent about our failings is essential. And there are other challenges that relate to this. Therefore, alongside our response to IICSA and all that follows from it, we have this year set up a number of other groups.

The Bishop of London has been leading a recovery group which has been dealing with the day-to-day challenges of Covid-19 and liaising with government. Bishop Sarah has just come from a meeting with them. The Bishop of Leeds is leading a group to review our governance structures with an aim to simplify the way we do things. The Bishop of Ely is leading a group that is asking questions about our diocesan structures. The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich chairs a group that is looking at how we can improve our effectiveness, exploring a great range of issues about how we can share and simplify various functions, find better ways of doing things. After all, we have all learned this year that not every meeting, even General Synod, has to happen in person – and, where necessary, stop doing some things altogether. The Bishop of Sheffield chairs a group that is exploring greater financial mutuality between dioceses. I have been leading a large consultative process to discern what God might be saying to the Church of England and how we might become a church which is more centred on Christ.

All these groups have been collaborating with each other under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Manchester, and many, many other people, lay and ordained, are involved in these processes, lending their energy, time and expertise. Justin and I wish to express our gratitude to them all. It is a huge undertaking. But I believe that through it God is going to lead us to a better place, and, in due course, quite a number of things will come to Synod for deliberation and decision.

But the most important thing is that we put our trust in God. I have always been very moved by Othello’s words to Desdemona. I think of it as English literature’s greatest chat-up line. If you cannot quite remember it, he says to her at one point, “I do love thee; and when I love thee not, chaos has come again”. Oh, wouldn’t it be lovely if somebody said those words to you? And, of course, it is what God says to us in Christ. We rest secure in the knowledge of the love of God that has been shown us and poured out to us in Jesus Christ. He is our security. He is our peace. He is our hope.

When we abandon this love or depart from this love there is chaos. Now is the time that we in this Synod and in this Church of England must love one another more than ever. There are going to be difficult changes ahead and hard decisions to make. But it is not the survival of the institution of the Church of England that matters so much as the love that God has for us in Jesus Christ which has been entrusted to the Church, which is itself the bride of Christ and God's most precious beloved. Whatever happens, and whatever form and shape the Church of England takes, God's love for the Church is not in doubt, but because we have been shamed this year by the terrible failings of the past; and because we know in our bones that we cannot maintain this way of doing church for much longer; and because we know this will mean difficult, difficult decisions; and because we know that Jesus loves the poor, and we have a special vocation to be a church of the poor; and because we have been charged with responsibility to be good stewards of the earth and to bear the Gospel of God's love to everyone, we are going to have to change. As Hans Küng observed, "To stay the same when everything else around you changes, is not to stay the same".

If we do this without love, there will be chaos. If we decide to put our trust in the chariots and horses of the world, we will fail. But if we put our trust in God, and if we learn to love one another, then I believe we can become a simpler, humbler, bolder Church, better able to live and share the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Synod, there is going to be great change and great challenge ahead of us in the coming year or so. Ah, but it is joy and it is adventure because Christ is leading us, and with this in mind we turn to one of the challenges immediately before us as we move forward in the process of *Living in Love and Faith*.

The Chair: Thank you to both Archbishops for their words to us. I will now call upon the Bishop of Coventry and Eeva John to address us.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you, Archbishops, for your strengthening words to us all today. Thank you, if I may, for your generosity and support through the LLF process.

Dear friends, dear members of General Synod, you have patiently accompanied us on this project over the last three years. You have taken part in workshops, prayer spaces, fringe meetings and discussions in various formats. You have listened to presentations and watched films. You have questioned, critiqued, encouraged, and you have waited. I am deeply thankful for your company on this journey. You have made us think. You have spotted weaknesses we had not seen. You have warned us of pitfalls we might have fallen into. You have provided regular reality checks about the difficulty of our task, not that there were many moments when we might have forgotten that difficulty.

Just last week the very group that has worked together for three years to oversee the project met to begin to repair damaged relationships; a task that required honesty and vulnerability in equal measure; a readiness to attend to everyone's emotions, to clarify

misunderstandings, to understand intentions. Throughout our years together that remarkable group of people has shown an extraordinary commitment to each other and to a common vision, never more so than last week. I pay tribute to each one of them and I thank them deeply. They have taught me how we can hold on to each other, by holding on to Christ, who stills the storm.

Dr Eeva John: So what exactly is this common vision? A big book, podcasts, story films, a video course and an online library are all freely available to anyone who might be curious enough to explore them. What work do we hope this collection of learning resources will do among us?

In between each of the book's five parts is a section called "Encounters". They are real-life stories, in the same way the course videos are punctuated with story films. These are real-life encounters with people who have courageously agreed to share their stories, their lives with us. They are people who deserve our respect, love and care. They impress upon us that *Living in Love and Faith* is about people, people made in the image of God. It is not just about some people. It is about all of us. Though we know that, for some, their lives will be invested in what is seen and said more than it will be for others.

So, this idea of encounter is a good way to describe the *Living in Love and Faith* vision. As we study the materials together, we are invited perhaps first and foremost to encounter reality. To encounter the reality of the world around us and the reality of the diversity in our churches; the reality of our divisions and the reality of the pain and fear that too often accompany the manifestations of these divisions. And all of this within the underlying reality of God.

The LLF resources also invite us to encounter one another, through the films and stories and through our learning together in groups. Such encounters call us to truly attend to one another in our joy, in our pain and in our differences; to attend to the experiences that we share and to those we do not. They ask of us to respect each other's point of view and to look for where it may include legitimate convictions and concerns. They ask of us to be open to learning from one another. They ask that we speak not about each other but with each other. They demand that we curate spaces that are truly safe, so safe that each of us is able to speak freely in the love of God. They ask of us to open our hearts to one another and to look for Christ in each other. These kinds of encounters invite, maybe even compel us to encounter ourselves afresh in God's loving presence, to heed the Spirit's movement among us, in drawing our attention to the roadblocks that we so often put in the way of our learning together, the roadblocks of fear, ignorance, oppressive silence, prejudice, hypocrisy and power.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): And of course, above all, the LLF vision and resources invite us to encounter God together; to listen out for the true and living word of God through Scripture; to listen and respond to the work of God in each other's lives; to encounter the One who shared our humanity with all its

frailties; to encounter the One through whom we are created with our differences and our commonalties, to be centred on Christ and shaped by him and whose body is our common life.

Living in Love and Faith is an invitation to create what Pope Francis in his latest Encyclical calls “a culture of encounter”. But it is only an invitation; it is not a summons. Many have already signalled that they do not feel safe enough to accept an invitation to learn together across difference. There is past and present pain and the work of repentance, forgiveness and healing still to be done among us. There is a work of understanding how each one of us needs to learn to become a place of safety for others. So the invitation for some may be to gather with trusted friends for now in a space that is safe; safe enough in which to open ourselves up to learning together, with the hope that these places of safety will expand in time so that strangers can become friends.

Dr Eeva John: But what might this culture of encounter mean for you as members together of the General Synod of the Church of England, for you with your national responsibilities? I discovered the other day that the General Synod was established in its present form in 1970, exactly 50 years ago. There may just be some among us here who have had the joy and privilege of celebrating our 50th birthdays. I do not know about you, but there is something liberating about growing older that for me at least began at around 50. It is something about being freer to let the important things take their priority and place in life: friendships, family and a clearer sense of vocation.

I wonder what that might look like for Synod in your 50th birthday. What might it look like for Synod to approach its responsibilities more relationally, more like a family? What might it look like for Synod to rediscover its vocation of bridging the local and the national and even the international? What might it look like for Synod to show a different way of relating to disagreement, to not be so concerned about winning and losing, but about exploring and hearing together what God is saying to the Church today?

Make no mistake, the LLF engagement, to which the whole Church is invited from now until the end of next year, represents a new way of doing things. As churches across the country sit down to learn together about some of the complexities that questions about identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage raise, as we seek to understand better the different conclusions we draw, we – the whole people of God – will be participating in the Bishops’ task of discerning what it is that God is saying to the Church.

It is then during 2022 that the next General Synod will bear a heavy responsibility for reflecting on what has emerged from this engagement as it considers and carefully weighs whatever decisions the Bishops see as needful for the life, health and mission of the Church.

What would it look like to seek to do this together, relating to one another in love and faith?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Dear friends, you will know that Coventry has many connections with German cities, so it could not escape my notice that 9 November was chosen for the launch of LLF, the day history surprised the world and a great wall that had torn a city in half, divided members of one human family from another and turned one people into two, that wall was breached, broken down piece by piece.

My greatest hope and fervent prayer is that by the grace of God, who heals what is hurt and mends what is torn, LLF will play its part into drawing us into the heritage of the children of God made one by the rendered flesh and spilt blood of God's own son, in whom one new humanity has been created. A divided nation in a divided world needs the Church to witness to the way of Christ who goes on breaking down the walls that divide, healing the hostility that hurts and calling humanity to live in faith and love, and with hope.

Thank you, Synod. Thank you, Archbishops, for the privilege of being able to join you in your address.

The Chair: Thank you Bishop Christopher and Eeva, and my apologies to the Archbishop of Canterbury who had expected an opportunity to have a further short word to us. Archbishop, please do not make me your commissary to South Georgia. We look forward to hearing from you again.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): South Georgia never, but you may be concerned to know I also have some responsibilities in the deep Indian Ocean.

Members of Synod, in February 2017 the General Synod decided not to take note of a report from the Bishops around questions of human sexuality. *Living in Love and Faith* is the response of the House of Bishops to that decision by the Synod to which we paid close attention. Immediately after the vote, Archbishop Sentamu, the then Archbishop of York, and I set out the broad shape of the process and wrote a joint letter a few weeks later saying this, and please note the words carefully: "... we need a radical new Christian inclusion in the Church. This must be founded in Scripture, in reason, in tradition, in theology and the Christian faith as the Church of England has received it; it must be based on good, healthy, flourishing relationships, and in a proper twenty-first century understanding of being human and of being sexual".

Each word in those sentences counts. We cannot fillet it for the bits we like. The result has been almost four years of intense work by well over 40 people, producing the most clearly thought through and remarkable document, itself a forerunner ahead of almost

everything else in the global Church. It has been backed up by literally hundreds of thousands of words of scholarly research and interaction.

At the same time LLF has not been an ivory tower exercise. As the book and videos have shown and, as Eeva has just said, it has constantly gone back to the lived experience of a wide range of people.

Now we come to this next stage: the invitation. The Bishops invite the whole Church to spend time in reflection and prayer, as Bishop Christopher just told us, using the course and the materials provided and any other sources, seeking to discern what the Holy Spirit is saying to the Church.

The material has had a surprisingly good welcome, not unanimously of course – I will come back to that – but to read the *Church Times* review of it, and the review by Professor Oliver O'Donovan in *Living Church* is to feel that the intricacies of theological navigation have been well handled by the captain and crew of the good ship LLF. They have navigated with a constellation of stars. First, brightest and foremost, is Scripture. With Scripture has been theology and ethics and philosophy, history and patristics and the human and biological sciences. This has been an attempt to do theology on the fundamental issue of human identity in a way that is truly of our time in the 21st century, but also equally truly of our history and traditions, and, above all, under the authority of the God whom we serve, worship and love, who has in Jesus revealed God's nature, and in the inspired Scriptures has shown us the way to live.

During the course of the journey to date one of the most important outcomes has been the principles for self-examination for how we listen and discuss, developed by the Pastoral Advisory Group under the remarkable leadership of Bishop Christine. Thank you, Christine, and all those who have worked with you. Eeva has already referred to them. They are set out on pages 4 and 5 of the book. Let me remind you. They are "To address ignorance, to acknowledge prejudice, to admit hypocrisy, to cast out fear, to speak into silence, to pay attention to power".

These six principles set the basis for disagreeing in a way, both inside and outside the Church, that opens space for the loving and healing truth of the Holy Spirit to infuse all that we say and do with each other. For that to happen is indispensable.

I want to conclude with two comments. First, please let us not simplify the complicated. This work shows the complexity of the issues. There are few or no binaries. Many people, some people will seek to say, "The answer is this," or, "The answer is that." The LLF resources taken together demonstrate that the questions we are facing are not as simple as some on all sides of the discussion like to pretend. Where we introduce simplistic binaries, we will do so only by ignoring the six principles, by dismissing our sisters and brothers in Christ, by ignoring the breadth and mercy of the love of God in Jesus.

I doubt the nation is watching us today, but what we do in the next period as we look at this, will be seen by the global Church, not just the Anglican Communion as a sign of hope or a sign of failure. It will be seen in the land in its effects as to whether all decisions are binary, as is so often the truth in our politics and our common life, or whether we can love and live across profound and passionately held differences.

In other words, in how we act now we will witness or fail to witness to the Lord of the Church. This work has continued through the crisis because to lose it would be to ignore deep issues that were there before and will be there after. It is offered in the love of Christ and to the glory of God.

Second, may I above all thank you, Bishop Christopher, Eeva John, the Co-ordinating Group, those who have led streams of thought, those who have worked hard and behind the scenes, contributing knowledge and thoughtfulness and wisdom. To all of you, and to many others who have risked so much in personal pain and suffering, you have indeed borne the cross because you have carried us through this journey and given us the means to travel on. Whatever happens next, the debt we owe you is immeasurable.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop. Members of Synod, because time is getting on and to allow ourselves time for both some questions now and then a decent screen break, we are going to forego the working groups and we are going to move on to questions, which will be responded to by Bishop Christopher and by Eeva. I am going to ask you please, using the blue hand facility, to raise the blue hand if you wish to ask a question and I will take them, if we have such numbers, in groups of three.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford): The *Living in Love and Faith* process was said to be safe on the basis of various assurances that were given to participants that their trust and openness would not be abused. Christian Concern (promoted by Anglican Mainstream) has just posted a video which uses LLF material and then takes personal stories that were given in trust and criticises them publicly on general media. It would seem that it has ended up not being safe despite all the assurances. How can we overcome those sorts of problems?

The Chair: If I could remind those asking a question to give their name and Synod number.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Thank you very much for those presentations earlier on, which were a great help. I cannot pretend to have read through the book yet, but I looked quickly at the glossary at the end to see if I could find conscience. I cannot find anything about conscience. I was rather hoping that we would have some teaching on individual conscience and how it applied to all this. Could you tell us a little bit about what has happened to that?

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): There is an awful lot of material to engage with this. We have already seen from some of the reactions that the temperature seems to be as high as ever. Given that we are not going to be able to meet consistently face-to-face, which seems to me important, on a regular basis probably until next summer, what are the realistic timescales for churches, congregations, small groups meeting face-to-face to discuss this material in time to provide input for the Next Steps Group?

The Chair: Thank you. Bishop Christopher or Eeva to respond.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much for those questions. Thank you, Rosie Harper, for your question. The Christian Concern video was brought to my attention this morning. I managed to look through it, I have to admit, during an earlier session. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to comment significantly on it because there are legal questions concerning copyright which need to be pursued. I do not want to say much about it except to underline the words that Eeva spoke paying tribute to the extraordinary courage of those who took part, who shared their stories, and her call for us all to have a combined sense of care.

I would say to everybody – and this reinforces what Ian has just said – look at all the resources, please, and read the book. If I may say, if you want to have a go at someone, do not ridicule those who have offered themselves in this way, take a shot at me. I would much prefer that.

We are committed to doing all we can, and this will be a subject of the answers this evening, to make this a safe process for people. Perhaps I should not say any more at this point, except to note that it was a trailer that was used rather than the other resources. Please, everybody, engage with the resources in all their breadth.

Gavin, thank you very much for your question. May I answer that? That is a failing of the index. I am really sorry about that. If you look at chapter 17 there is a nuanced, careful analysis of experience and conscience. I remember all the discussions we had about that. You will find that there, Gavin. Sorry about the absence from the index. I hope there are not too many of those.

Chair, with your permission, may I pass the third question from Ian on to Eeva?

Dr Eeva John: Thank you, Ian, for your question. First, I am going to pick you up on a phrase that you used at the beginning. You talked about reacting to the resources. I think we are really looking for people to engage with the resources in learning. We have seen some reactions and that is not particularly helpful. We are looking for really deep, respectful engagement. Your question about timeframes is a really important one and in some sense there is an imponderability about that given that we do not know how life is going to work out in the next twelve months.

Nevertheless, having said that, it is really interesting that some people feel that beginning this kind of learning together is easier online. Others, of course, feel that there is no way they can do this online on Zoom and they need to do it together physically. That is why we have really stressed that it is important for local churches to decide when is a good time for them, and it may not be until later in the year. But I think that a year is a good, long time for churches to engage in different ways.

I should say that a number of dioceses have already begun that process. A number of dioceses have had whole clergy days with large numbers of participants already getting a feel for what it will be like for their churches and groups to engage with the resources. I think we have enough time, but it is really important to say that no one is imposing a timeframe within the next 14 months or so.

The Chair: There is time for one more group of questions.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I would like to congratulate all the authors of *Living in Love and Faith*. One thing that does concern me is I am in the over-50s group, Eeva, and while we have got to concentrate on the young generation, we are losing too many of my generation for no good reason at all. We have to make sure that we reach out to them as well. Some may be set in their ways but some are not.

Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs): I have been a member of LLF since pretty much its beginning. In the early stages we talked about joined-up thinking between IICSA and LLF, and there were hopeful signs of that, but in the end on page 87 of LLF it talks about the specific theological reflection on IICSA should be carried out separately from *the Living in Love and Faith* project. I guess my question is, is that another working party, and how and when is that going to happen?

Miss Debbie Buggs (London): In Anglican circles we seem to have difficulty distinguishing between love and niceness. Love has the eternal salvation of people at heart, and is prepared to have difficult conversations to secure people's long-term eternal salvation. It is much easier to be just nice. We just need to make people feel happy about themselves, with no view to their long-term future. How do we make sure that we are loving (and pleasant) rather than just nice but in the long-term unloving?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the questioners. Eeva, is there anything you would like to say on John Freeman's helpfully made point?

Dr Eeva John: It is just such an excellent point. Thank you very much for raising that. You are absolutely right that the younger generation is really important and we very much hope to engage the younger generation as part of the participatory learning process. I guess I would just say as an aside we are really pleased that for the video version of the course we have some very young presenters, and hopefully that will make the video course more accessible to the younger generation.

I would also say that we are in discussion with the Education Department about how resources like this can help the Church of England's work in schools, and it may well be that that will be another avenue. We also want to encourage churches not just to have their church groups but to get their youth groups involved in discussions like this. I think a lot of the resources are quite accessible for the younger generation as well. Thank you very much for that question.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you too, to Judith Maltby for her question. Thank you for your participation in the process, in the whole project. In paying tribute to you, I pay tribute to the other more than 40 people who have taken part. Your question now is very closely related to a question that will be considered this evening at Question Time. Members of Synod might like to look at pages 39 to 40 and you will see Judith Maltby's original question and my answer to that.

In terms of when that next piece of work will take place, that is not a decision not for me in terms of my responsibilities in delivering the resources. It is for the National Safeguarding Team to assess, and to decide. I imagine that the Faith and Order Commission will also be involved in that, and so that would concern me personally. However, it is not for me at this point to anticipate the particular decisions of the NST. It is though, as you quite rightly say, an important piece of work to do, and I think what we have done in LLF will enable that next stage to be taken in relation to safeguarding.

Chair, may I say thank you to Debbie Buggs for her question? This has not felt like an experience of being nice to each other to me. It has been an experience in the work we have done, and I know this will be the case, of an exercise of love in the ways you describe. LLF was called on Radio 4 a "triumph of civility". I hope it will be a triumph of civility. My hope is that we will find ways to be kind to each other. You will find discussions about the nature of love in the book and discussions about the important areas you raise in relation to eternal salvation. This is the nature of love: to be concerned deeply and truly for each person in the fullness of their humanity, a humanity called into life with God for ever.

The Chair: Thank you to all those who asked questions. Apologies to those who had been hoping to ask a question but we ran out of time. Thank you to Bishop Christopher and to Eeva for their answers. Members of Synod, that concludes this item. We will now adjourn for a short screen break and the meeting will resume at 3.40. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 3.40 pm.

ITEM 3 RESPONSE TO COVID-19 PANDEMIC (GS 2192)

The Chair: Welcome back, everybody, to our next session. I hope you had a good break. We now come to Item 3, the response to Covid-19, and for this you will need GS 2192. This is a debate that has been requested by the Archbishops in the light of our national situation.

We have 60 minutes allotted for this debate and we have four amendments. Synod, I must warn you at the outset that I am going to try to keep everything moving quickly and we will have shortened speech limits from the beginning.

One of the amendments has been submitted out of time from the Presidents, but I have given my permission for it to be moved, and that is Item 22. You can find that on your Order Paper I. It would be really helpful, members of Synod, if you put a blue hand up to speak on the main motion, and then I call someone to speak on an amendment, that you lower your blue hand so it is easy to discover whether you are wishing to speak on the amendment. It will enable you to listen so you will speak on the amendment rather than the main motion.

Therefore, I call on the Archbishop of York to speak to and move Item 3. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Synod, in this debate we reflect on the horrors and challenges of Covid-19, our response and the response of our nation. I hope we will speak with humility, recognising that we have got some things wrong, and mindful that, as we speak, thousands and thousands of people across our world continue to suffer. Our health service and the health services of the world are stretched almost to breaking point and, if we do nothing else in this debate, let us take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude for the skill, dedication and selfless service of those who work in the NHS and in other essential and emergency services.

If we were meeting in person, at this point I think I would invite us all to rise and do what we did on those Thursday evenings in the summer and clap the NHS. But the fact that we are meeting on Zoom and still in lockdown means that we will have to make do with showing our yellow hands and thumbs up, as we continue to pray for an end to this pandemic. Thank you.

Let me identify some of the things that have been revealed to us this year and then we will get on with the debate itself. First of all, what have we learned about ourselves as a nation? We begin with the NHS. We have relearned its value and importance for our

national life and wellbeing. The NHS is deeply loved. But we have also learned that it is the ideas behind the health service that are also important and precious. These ideas are not self-evidently true. They are always under threat and they arise directly from the Christian faith, a faith that has shaped the life and values of our nation in the past and needs to do so again. It was during the Second World War, not after it, that the architects of the welfare state dreamt of the reimagining and reordering of society around notions of common welfare and common good. Christian leaders such as William Temple were at the heart of these discussions. They did not wait until the crisis was over to imagine what the future could be. And we need to learn from them and do the same.

Secondly, this pandemic has revealed terrible inequalities. The poorest communities in our land, those living with disability, black and global majority people are suffering the most. Many young people feel left behind. Many children are hungry. The mortality rates from Covid-19 in the most deprived areas of the country are more than double the least deprived. After adjusting for underreporting, the estimated rate for people with learning disabilities is 3.6 times the rate of the general population. This is scandalous and,, therefore you will not be surprised to hear that I will be welcoming and supporting Tim Goode's amendments.

For the poor there is also a terrible double whammy. The poorer you are, the more likely you are to get coronavirus, and the poorer you are, the more likely you are to suffer disproportionately from the restrictions that are imposed to control the virus. And even if you have a job, you are unlikely to be able to work from home. If you have somewhere to live, it will probably be small and cramped. Inequalities of wealth and opportunity, poor housing, poor nutrition, prejudice and xenophobia, they are a scourge and a disgrace, and we, the church of Jesus Christ, must be in the forefront of not just pointing out these inequalities, but providing a narrative of hope, the very narrative of a new humanity and a new way of belonging to each other that is given us in Christ that can help build a better world.

Thirdly, and in order to do this we need a more joined-up government. Yes, between political parties but also joined up between the different devolved Governments that make up our United Kingdom and between the different regions within them, especially here in the north.

Fourthly, a crisis like this when everyone in a nation has been forced to confront their frailty and mortality in ways we are usually quite good at avoiding, reveals, and is revealing, a spiritual, religious and biblical illiteracy, a lack of coherent faith but also a spiritual longing. We need to speak into this with simplicity, humility and boldness.

Let me then turn to the things we have learned as a Church. First, we have learned again the importance of parish and place and local ministry and pastoral care. Local churches and local clergy and local lay leaders have responded to this crisis in remarkably profound, imaginative and moving ways. There are so many stories I could

share. I hope we will hear some in the debate, but let me offer just one. The church in east London that set up its own makeshift food bank on trestle tables on the pavement in front of the church. They knew there were people in need. They just got on and responded.

Secondly, the incredible way we have developed our online presence and created all sorts of new communities of faith and found new people engaging in the life of faith. Whatever our future holds, we must continue to express our life in this digital landscape. Further theological reflection is needed on what this means for our liturgy, our sacramental life and our belonging to each other. But, Synod, these are nice problems to have. For once they are problems of growth. Churches that used to have congregations of 30 or 40 on a Sunday morning now sometimes report 130 or 140 online. Of course, those who are gathering online will not automatically start coming on Sundays when all this is over, so we must find new ways of being a mixed ecology church, expanding our vision of what it means to belong.

Thirdly, we have rediscovered the vital link between worship, spirituality, pastoral care and evangelism. We should never have separated these things out, but this year, because we have been forced back to basics, even during the first lockdown having to worship and pray largely on our own and without the nourishment of the sacraments and with church buildings closed, we have had to learn a new dependence on Christ. And because it has been denied to us, we are able to appreciate more clearly the central importance of the sacramental life to our belonging in Christ. Hence, in this second lockdown we are better able not only to worship safely when we are allowed to, but have found greater confidence to push back to government. We are not asking to be made an exception but demonstrating that we too are an essential service; that the sacraments of the Church and our meeting together for worship is not some optional add-on to the Christian life but the iron rations for the Christian journey and the service we offer.

That is where I conclude: prayer and service. These are the two defining characteristics of the Christian life. They cannot exist apart. Amazingly, in every parish church, in every community in our land, we continue to offer amazing prayer and amazing service. But without the controlling narrative of the Gospel, and without the amazing grace that only Christ can bring, not only is this service and the prayer that shapes it in jeopardy, but we could also end up being a nation that only serves itself. This is the hope and the vision we must share with the world.

Therefore, in the words of this motion, we do indeed call upon the Church to pray, especially in this Month of Prayer. We give thanks for our NHS and for all key workers, including clergy and church workers. We ask the Government to look at the way Covid-19 disproportionately impacts disabled people, black and global majority people and those in poverty, how it threatens the health of the old and the wealth of the young. We celebrate the part the Church plays in serving the nation, particularly asking the Government to review its decision to curtail public worship.

We are able to do what we do because we are people who know and worship God. That worship has changed us. We are full of hope today that a vaccine is on its way. But the deeper ailments in our society that Covid has revealed needs an injection of hope and that, sisters and brothers, is our department. I move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Archbishop. In a moment Item 3 will be open for debate. Just before that, if you are worrying about when to make a point of order about a vote of the whole Synod at the end of this debate, I am going to order that anyway. The matter is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Julian Hollywell (Derby): I want to endorse this report with a massive thanks to those in the central church structures, whose webinars and online guidelines have enabled us to learn new skills rapidly, and, for all the hoo-ha, respond swiftly with confidence in local circumstances. Lament is powerful at the moment, but I would like to look ahead with three good examples. The Archbishop has already referred to one of them.

For some of those who are disabled the move to online worship has been empowering. Unseen barriers that many of us were unaware of were removed almost overnight, and in different ways we must now not lose that. We are engaging meaningfully with a wider and more diverse population.

Secondly, I have responsibility for four city churches in Derby where mainstream church sits alongside Fresh Expressions and church plants. Covid has been a levelling experience where that which was experimental has proven to be adaptable and outward facing. A church which was on the very verge of redundancy is now a central cog in the city food hub. It is vibrant. It is busy. It is not just a parish church any more. Livestream worship and physical prayer have brought new life. I hope we can take an opportunity in the months and years ahead to lay down as close an adherence to a parish system as we have known it so we can engage in the work God is calling us to do.

Lastly, I would like to tell you about a young man who has come to faith during lockdown. Living on his own and isolated, he joins online communion via his phone with a biscuit and a cup of tea. A young woman who is also new to faith, who joins on her tea break when she is working at the Amazon warehouse, keeping some of her sandwich so she can take part. And a nurse practitioner who joins from the nursing station with her colleagues in ICU, sharing cake and a moment's grace as exhausted they tend to the sick.

I am sad I have not heard more of how the sacramental life of the Church is being broken open for the good by what has happened rather than just what we have been

starved of. I believe that the very act of closing our doors for the love of others was a sacramental act in itself. I hope we can recognise the potential for mission that a more generous sacramental theology will bring, and I see it in the spirit of what the Archbishop said today but not yet articulated in the Church.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Like all of you, I am missing my church community and I am missing the regular worship I have enjoyed for all my life. It is with a very heavy heart that I want to urge caution on our response to Covid and our request that a special case be made for worship continuing. Some of you may have seen a letter I wrote to *The Times* back in March. At that time there were a number of voices very upset that worship in church, or even access to church buildings, was not allowed. I found this rather disappointing and I wrote to make the point that although the church buildings were closed the Church is not closed. And the Church is still not closed, because the Church is you and me, and our brothers and sisters in Christ, working for the common good, as Archbishop Stephen has so well described.

The problem with making a special case for worship in church buildings to continue is that it could be argued then that we are not standing in solidarity with all the other people affected by Covid restrictions, particularly businesses and those shielding and those with special needs. I believe that we all need to play our part to reduce the R number and the incidence and prevalence of Covid-19. I understand that there is little evidence of risk from attending gathered worship, and I accept that the Church has done an excellent job of putting infection control measures in place, but the same could be said for many other businesses and settings. For me the question is how can we be in solidarity with others?

Archbishop Justin spoke eloquently of those who are at greater risk from Covid, those who are often already the most vulnerable in society. We need to ask whether we should be the first to do everything to make sure they are protected, even if that means foregoing the most precious things to us, including meeting for our own worship. I think the persecuted Church has much to teach us. In some places Christians can rarely, if ever, meet as we meet, and even here today we should remember those who are in prison and cannot meet with other Christians. We can worship freely in our own homes and we are learning how to pray and worship on Zoom, as we did today, how to livestream services on Facebook, how to care for each other and share and pray on a walk with one friend, as we are allowed to at the moment. It is an opportunity to practise worshipping differently.

This time will pass, Synod. I simply want to urge caution and wonder whether we should play our part and wonder whether we would be better known as those who put the needs of others before our own preferences – the Church for England, as Archbishop Justin said.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Malcolm Chamberlain.

Ven. Malcolm Chamberlain (Sheffield): I do not know if this is a point of order and the point of order place did not know whether it was a point of order, but said they would put me through anyway. According to my news feed, the Prime Minister has just announced that public worship will be allowed from 2 December. I wondered whether that renders the second half of clause (d) irrelevant and whether the debate should move on to the other clauses of the motion. Sorry if that is not a point of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Malcolm. That is not a point of order, you are absolutely right, but that was helpful. Could we have Archdeacon Luke Miller and then I am going to ask April Alexander to speak to and move her amendment, Item 19.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): 3 December is my confirmation anniversary, so it is a great day for the Prime Minister to have announced worship to be able to begin. I am a member of the Strategic Co-ordination Group which manages the Covid outbreak in London, and one of the co-chairs of a sub-group which co-ordinates faith community voluntary service and funding for London civil society, and so have a part to play in grappling with issues of disproportionality and service to those most in need. I have also been appointed as a voice from the faith and belief communities to the London Recovery Board, which is giving governance to the Mayor of London's plans for a greener and fairer London to emerge from the pandemic.

In that context, the faith voice has been strong in ensuring that there is a specific focus or mission looking at communities, so there can be more scope to address the issues of disproportionality, which we look at in our motion and which, Synod, I hope we will support.

The Church of England through its unrivalled engagement in every local area has a massive contribution to make to all of this. It is a fruit of our parish system which enables us to be able to engage with things at a level of granularity which even the local authority finds difficult; to hear and articulate those voices from the street and to bring them into regional, sub-regional and even into national fora. Leaner and poorer we may indeed need to become, but this we must not lose. The contribution of the faith and belief communities has come to be welcomed in London, as elsewhere. We have moved from being asked, as I was once, "Why is there a vicar in the room in this meeting about things which seem to have nothing to do with you?" to a position in which they come to us and say, "We can't do this without the faith sector. Can you not find more people to engage in the various spaces in which we need to have these serious conversations?"

We have no automatic right to that voice, but we find it when we are genuinely working with local communities, serving our neighbour in the name of God, working with those of other Christian denominations and of other faiths and beliefs, and taking the responsibility of speaking up where we can, not just for ourselves but for others. This has been recognised in London and in some other places elsewhere in the country, and it has a beneficial effect on us all. I would call for local resilience fora around the

country to include a faith and belief sector representative, and would ask the Church around the country to get engaged in this work.

This motion is right to remind us that the impetus for all this comes from us, from the wellspring of our worship. It is not an add-on, as the Archbishop of York says, but the source of our activity. This also has been understood and we owe much thanks to hard working officials and to Ministers who have grasped this alongside serious issues of freedom to worship. We welcome the announcement the Prime Minister has just made and we commit ourselves to this work and hope that we will, all of us, commit ourselves to it in service of our neighbour. I commend the motion to you.

The Chair: April Alexander to speak to and to move the amendment, Item 19. April, I am sorry we are under the cosh with time so the speech limit is two minutes.

ITEM 19

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I had prepared a speech that is a bit longer so it is going to be quite difficult. We were all going to be in it together, if you remember. That was what George Osborne promised in 2010. And were we? We would not be having this debate if everybody here was confident that we had in fact all been in it together. The motion as it stands recognises the appalling inequalities which exist.

The point of my amendment is that those who do have contact with the Government are able to remind them of the mistakes that were made last time. Huge amounts of money were piled into the economy by the Bank of England, through quantitative easing, and it says on its website that this is creating digital money and being used to buy government debt, et cetera. Vastly increased amounts of money chasing a fixed quantity of assets meant those people who owned assets benefited hugely as the value of those assets increased and those who had no assets had no such benefit. Eventually the value of houses went up, to the huge benefit of people who had them, especially those who had two or more, but it has been a disaster for those people who do not. It has been dreadful for the people who rent because the value of their houses has gone up and their rents have increased enormously too. There was an increase in money for incomes, but it was hugely disproportionately arranged. Those who had comfortable incomes had more comfortable incomes and those who had very little continued to have very little. We now know that very many of those workers at the bottom of the income scale are key workers who, as the Archbishop reminded us earlier today, are the ones who put their lives on the line.

The Chair: April, please forgive me for interrupting. Could you move the amendment standing in your name, please?

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I move the amendment.

The Chair: As I say, I am sorry but we are pressed for time. Archbishop Stephen, you have got two minutes to respond to April Alexander's amendment, please.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you for your amendment. I am sorry you have not had time to put it more fully. I am not at all unsympathetic to what it is that you are saying. Far from it. However, I am going to encourage Synod to resist this amendment because I think it is dealing with our readiness, if I have understood it, to deal with the pandemic when it arrived rather than what I think is the substance of our motion, which is how we respond to it now. For largely pragmatic reasons about wanting to get us back in limited time to the main focus of the debate, despite my sympathies with what is being said, I do not think this amendment really will help us right now, so I ask Synod to resist it, if they wish.

The Chair: Members of Synod, the Archbishop is resisting the amendment. This amendment will lapse unless 25 members indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue. This is a simple vote to indicate if members wish the debate on the amendment, Item 19, to continue and voting will take place using a Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Member of Synod, we do have 25 people who wish to continue the debate on this amendment, so the debate is open. Again, the speech limit is two minutes. Remember we are debating Item 19. I call Martin Kingston and then Chris Pye. Then I will be testing your mind on a motion for closure.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): I assume, Chair, this is the main motion that we are now debating?

The Chair: No, Mr Kingston, it is not. It is Item 19. If you wish to speak on Item 19, this is the moment to do it.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): I do not wish to speak on the amendment, but, if I may say so, in the voting on that item, the poll was not clear as to which way you were supposed to vote if you wanted to curtail the debate on the amendment.

The Chair: We were only looking for 25 people for the debate to continue, in which case I will call Chris Pye followed by Shayne Ardron.

Mr Christopher Pye (Liverpool): As you would expect, you are going to get a history lesson. In 2006 we paid off as the British people our debt from the Second World War. In 2015 we paid off the debt from the First World War. What the public purse owes because of Covid has been likened to a war situation. Surely the debt should be treated like that, whereas we should as a civilised society be able to look after and raise the standards of the poorest in society.

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester): I would really want to include this because I think the thing we keep missing out on is appreciating what businesses are doing. This begins to bring in the challenges that businesses have and how businesses have responded during Covid and how they have responded to Marcus Rashford's campaign to feed school children. Businesses have come out and said yes, they will do this. We need to appreciate the challenges that businesses have been under. It is brilliant what the Church has done, but we need to be aware and thankful for what others do, and encourage that, and we need to be aware of the pressures that they are under and how businesses can respond. For me, this is part of our everyday faith. I would be keen to include this so we can acknowledge the challenges that others are facing as well.

The Chair: Members of Synod, we have 27 minutes left of this debate and we are still on the first amendment, so I would like to test your mind on a motion for the closure on Item 19. This is a simple vote and voting will take place using a Zoom poll. If you are in favour of closure of debate on Item 19 you will go for and if you want it continue debate you will say against.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: The motion of the closure has been carried so now we move to a vote on Item 19. This again will be done by Zoom. If you are in favour you will vote for and if you are against you will vote against or if you abstain vote abstain.

The motion was put and lost on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 20

The Chair: Item 19 has not been carried, so now we move on to Item 20, an amendment in the name of Timothy Goode. I will ask Timothy to speak to and move your amendment under Item 20. You have up to two minutes.

Revd Timothy Goode (Southwark): I know that both our Archbishops are passionate about drawing attention to and ensuring the flourishing of all who are disabled, elderly or living with chronic health conditions. His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury's profoundly affirming answer to the question I sent into this group of sessions is testament to that, as has been his public statements and his hosting of a disability conference in Lambeth in July 2018, and I thank him so much for his lead on this. It means so much.

My concern though is when a motion explicitly specifies two particular demographics, BAME and young children in this case, people may infer that all those other demographics who are also being disproportionately affected by Covid-19 either do not matter as much or, more worrying still, have been forgotten. I know that this is not the case, so this amendment purely makes explicit what I know is implicit; that it will now

say to BAME, young children, the disabled, the elderly, and to those living with chronic health conditions: “We see you, we hear you, we value you and we love you”.

The Chair: Archbishop Stephen to respond. You have up to two minutes, but if you could do it in a minute that would be fantastic.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, Tim, so much. I am sure Synod has already realised that the new Archbishop of York does not always have an eye for detail because my speech made several references to disabled people, because when I wrote it a few days ago I just rather assumed that was in the motion. I apologise that that has not been spotted. That was an oversight and I entirely welcome what Tim has said. It strengthens the motion hugely and gives out precisely the signal that we want to give, and so I hope Synod will gladly accept this.

The Chair: Item 20 is open for debate. I am going to call Sam Margrave and after that I am going to test Synod with a closure motion on this item given that Archbishop Stephen is in support. The speech limit is still two minutes.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I want to thank his Grace for what he has just said, as I was going to drag him over the hot coals slightly. All I want to say is that recently comedian Rosie Jones said disabled people are not just overlooked but deliberately ignored. And the fact this was left out is a disgrace and we should accept that. Far too often the Church leaves disabled people to an afterthought. This week we saw leading members of Disability Jesus, such as Dave Lucas and guide dog Jarvis, write an open letter to the Church raising concerns. In public discourse disabled people are rarely mentioned in Parliament or public debate. It is time national leaders take action to help disabled people. I hope this motion will be strengthened by the amendment.

Disabled people are a group that has been impacted far beyond any other. Indeed, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has reported that more disabled people are likely to lose jobs or not be able to get jobs. Those on legacy benefits – disabled people – were not able to get the extra £20 a week, and 3 million people who were excluded – employed directors – are often disabled people. Disabled people face daily discrimination and there has been a rise in hate crime and eugenics. We need to make sure that we stand up for disabled people.

Finally, I would say in relation to part 2 of the amendment I have concerns about seeing disabled people as only through the prism of health. We need to adopt a social model of disability and not a medical one. I will be supporting this amendment, but it is really important to see disabled people beyond health.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Could I test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 20?

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: That has been carried, and so now we move to a vote on Item 20.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 21

The Chair: Item 20 has been carried so now we move on to Item 21, a second amendment in Tim Goode's name. Tim, you have up to two minutes, please, to speak to and move the amendment in your name.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): Friends, in Genesis we read that we are "all made in the image and likeness of God". In Psalm 139 we are "fearfully and wonderfully made". In his letters, St Paul shares with us his extraordinary theology of the body. When the profound and theological truth of our shared God-given image and dignity is diluted or ignored, the implications for disabled people are immense and potentially life threatening.

Disabled people have experienced problems getting their medical equipment and medication, difficulty accessing PPE, problems accessing information, concerns about rationing of treatment using frailty scales that might leave disabled people without care, together with reports of "do not resuscitate" orders placed on disabled people against their will, leaving disabled people feeling that their lives are less valued than those of others, and highlighting a worry slide into eugenics.

Disabled people have died in disproportionate numbers as a result of the pandemic. The statistics are truly shocking. Two-thirds of people who have died of coronavirus are disabled. People with learning disabilities are six times as likely to die of coronavirus as others and 30 times more likely if they are in the 18 to 24 age group. Such inequality should horrify all of us who care about social justice.

So, Synod, I graciously request that we accept this amendment which theologically underpins the motion, reminding us all that our community engagement flows out of our shared God-given image and dignity rather than our economic viability.

The Chair: Archbishop Stephen to respond please, up to two minutes, but quicker if possible.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): This is something about which I would love to say a good deal in fulsome support of what Timothy is suggesting, but for the time being I will just say I very happily accept this amendment which I believe will further strengthen what we wish to say.

The Chair: I am going to take one speech on this amendment and then again I am going to test the mind of Synod on a closure. Rebecca Chapman, please.

Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark): Synod, in proposing this amendment Tim has reminded us that we are all made in the image of God. Rules rushed through by the Government under the Coronavirus Act took away local councils' duty of care for disabled people and suspended the Care Act of 2014, with vital therapies and respite care withdrawn overnight, leaving families without support and putting the health and progress of those with disabilities at risk. Many of these therapies have still not resumed, therapies that parents of children with disabilities particularly have spent years fighting for to ensure their disabled children could thrive and not just survive.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence told doctors that those highly dependent on others in their daily lives would be the first to be denied intensive care if hospitals were overwhelmed regardless of whether or not they were clinically less likely to survive. Distressingly, my husband and I found ourselves having conversations about whether we would seek to hide our six-year-old's son disability if he needed emergency health care. How had we come to this?

Synod, the confidence of disabled people and those who love and care for them has been badly knocked during this pandemic through suspension of support, through rationing of healthcare and through increased isolation. I urge you to support this amendment as we try to rebuild this lost confidence by showing our belief as the Church in the God-given image, dignity and value of all disabled and elderly people.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Synod, and I am really sorry about this, we have 12 minutes left before the end of our debate and we have another amendment to come and if we have got time to return to debate on the main motion as amended. I would like to test your mind on a motion for the closure on Item 21.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Now we vote on Item 21, the amendment standing in Tim Goode's name.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 22

The Chair: We move on to Item 22. This is the amendment from the Presidents and I call upon the Archbishop of York to move. You have up to two minutes.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you for allowing this amendment after the deadline. Thank you to David Lamming and to others who have encouraged this amendment to be made. I will keep this speech very short. The amendment is calling upon the Government to preserve the United Kingdom's foreign aid budget at 0.7% of GDP. The reason I think this will strengthen this discussion about Covid-19 is simply this: we will not eradicate Covid-19 anywhere

unless we eradicate it everywhere. Therefore our sustained commitment to foreign aid is at this point more important than ever. I move the amendment.

The Chair: This matter is now open for debate.

Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio): Chair, the United Kingdom legal commitment to the 0.7% aid budget is a badge of honour. Supporting it says, “We are all made in God’s image no matter our nation or our postcode”. It says, “I am because you are, whoever you are, wherever you are”. It says, “We will not build our recovery on the back of the world’s poorest people”. It is the right thing to do. It is also the smart thing to do, for the reasons the Archbishop alluded to.

Having been for seven years the CEO of Christian Aid, I have seen all over the world the difference that aid makes, how it strengthens communities, so that when disasters strike they are better able to sustain themselves. It creates a virtuous circle, a circle of justice and righteousness. It is not just that there is a moral or practical case for aid. There is also the question of trust. Many of us here worked hard with the aid agencies like Christian Aid and Tearfund to secure cross-party commitment to the legislation, and it was a manifesto commitment from the current Government. Surely we should keep our word as a nation. That is the kind of nation I thought we were and that is the kind of nation we need to be.

The Chair: After John Wilson, I am going to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 22.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield) It is with a very heavy heart that, sadly, I will not be able to support this amendment. It is not that I do not support the worthwhile and important thrust of the amendment that sets out the pressure to preserve the foreign aid budget. We have a burgeoning national debt as a result of the support provided through this pandemic. If we do not get this reduced and under control, our children and grandchildren are going to be living with this for generations. We need to sort out our own house so that in the future we can provide foreign aid support when we are in a more financially able position.

The Chair: Synod, I am going to test your mind on a motion for closure on Item 22.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Point of order, Simon Cawdell.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): The motion that we now have in front of us could allow for a division of text given that we have heard that the Government has now allowed worship to resume in all four of the tiers. Therefore, when we come to the final vote on the motion, I would ask under Standing Order 24(1) we may divide the text so that we can have a separate vote on paragraph (d) after the comma “...call upon Her

Majesty's Government to ..." et cetera, et cetera, which would enable us to quietly drop that clause so we do not produce and vote on something that is irrelevant.

The Chair: Thank you, Simon. I will consult. Thank you for your point of order. I think it is the wrong time, but I will not forget what you have said. We are still on Item 22. The motion for the closure has been carried, so now I want to take a vote on Item 22.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Item 22 has been carried, so we now turn back to a debate on the main motion. I see no blue hands. Sorry, Martin Kingston, you tried to speak earlier in the debate. After you I will propose a motion for closure on the main motion.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): I simply want to thank the Archbishop for the inspiring message, which is really what we have needed to hear throughout this epidemic: a message of hope and encouragement, and to indicate that often the Church is criticised for having lots of words to say and not so much good news to share, but here we have good news, do we not? We have church communities around the country moving into action to support everybody in their communities: the poor, the disadvantaged and the lonely. In Gloucestershire, urged on by our forthright and ever vigorous Bishop, we are working towards providing people who need it with support with Christmas meals. We are moving out to our communities in ways that we have never done before. As a result of this epidemic we have become a church without walls, able to move out in ways that allow us to represent ourselves fairly. Instead of being the more or less respectfully dressed people who gather together in a funny-shaped building every Sunday, we can be out there in the community in an effective way. We need to do it repeatedly and to back up therefore the words that the Archbishop has urged on us, back them up with these good news stories of a Church which is in action.

I simply want to say that in thanking all those involved in care, we need to remember that those involved in care include the cleaners, the cooks, the drivers, as well as the more obvious people and not to forget those, as we have sometimes been guilty of forgetting others. Thank you, Archbishop, for the message. Keep it going and keep the good news stories flowing.

The Chair: Synod, we have reached our scheduled finish to this debate, but I still need to test your mind on a motion for the closure or Item 3 as amended. We will vote on the closure first and then I will come back to the point of order by Simon Cawdell.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Synod, I was going to do this in a few moments. We had a point of order from Simon Cawdell about dividing the text and he spoke to that. I was going to explain that it is in my discretion to accept the point of order from Simon Cawdell to divide the

text and I do not intend to do that. We will be voting on Item 3, as amended by Items 20, 21 and 22. But I do have a point of order from Sam Margrave.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Unfortunately, I do not have my Standing Orders, they are upstairs on the bedside cabinet. I wonder whether there is a way to move the motion by part, to divide the motion, because I am concerned that in widening the motion with that last amendment being added that it could be lost, and I would not like to see that happen. Could we take the motion by part?

The Chair: I am sorry, Sam, that is not a point of order. We have already amended Item 3 by Items 20, 21 and 22. Therefore, I call on Archbishop Stephen to respond to the debate. You have up to three minutes.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): This debate was sponsored by both Archbishops and I think it was agreed that Archbishop Justin would respond for both of us, if that is okay.

The Chair: Of course, that is fine with me.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Gosh, this is getting to be quite a habit. Thank you to all. I will not use up my three minutes. I cannot comment on all the excellent contributions.

I particularly want to pick out what Julian said. We need to reach out to others breaking open our sacramental life in different ways. I thought that was very powerful. What Alison said we need to remember about solidarity and we need to be rightly cautious. What Luke said about the importance of the local and the national. We are a Church that reaches the local and the national. I want to thank April for her comments. I want to thank Tim for his brilliant and excellent amendments. I am so glad that they carried. I want to apologise again, as Stephen did, to Sam's rebuke.

Let us note what Loretta said, speaking with the authority of eight years' experience as CEO of Christian Aid. She has forgotten more about this than most of us will ever know. I was very pleased to hear from John Wilson, an important voice to hear, although I disagree, and I suppose I would say my fear is that virtue tomorrow is always virtue tomorrow and never virtue today.

Martin, thank you. We are indeed moving more and more, and a number of people hinted at this, including Julian, so it was beginning and end, topped and tailed: a church without walls. Praise God for that. We are a church with a vaccine of hope for a society in despair, a church without walls for a society divided by polarisation. Let us emphasise in the way we vote what we are saying in this motion.

The Chair: I now order a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 3, as amended by Items 20, 21 and 22. Voting will take place using the Crystal voting platform.

There were voted on Item 3 as amended: 352 in favour, 4 against, with 5 recorded abstentions.³ The motion was carried.

The Chair: That concludes this item. I am really sorry to those who wanted to speak for the shortened speech limits, but please stay by your screen ready for the Business Committee and the next item.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 4.53 pm.

ITEM 4

REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2179)

The Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. It is nice to see a sea of familiar phases smiling at me even though it is via a screen. We now come to debate Item 4 on the Agenda, the Report by the Business Committee. For this item members may like to have GS 2179 to hand. If you are hoping to speak in the debate please note that the speech limit will be three minutes from the outset. I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee, Revd Canon Sue Booy, to speak to and move Item 4. You have up to ten minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): My friends, thank you for inviting the Synod into your home, your study, for all I know maybe even your shed. In common with much that is happening at the moment, this Synod is unusual, even historic, as being the first time we have met remotely. It is vital for synodical government to continue during the crisis and we are enormously grateful for all the work that you have put in to allow this meeting to take place.

In these topsy turvy times I am going to begin at what is normally my end, by saying an enormous thank you to the staff who have worked unceasingly to get us to this point. They have taken into account feedback they received about July and they have done everything they can to ensure that our business over these next few days will be efficient and effective. They had me rehearsing at least three times last week, and that is in addition to the rehearsals I would like to thank you for attending.

I want to apologise for the slightly bumpy start with both polling and paperwork. The Order Paper, in case you have not found it, is now on both the website and on the app, and Order Papers will be emailed to members daily from tomorrow. I am sure we are all going to get much more adept as virtual Synod. Indeed, the last debate showed that that was beginning to happen already. But we may well face other challenges. Please could I encourage you, if challenges arise, do not put up your hand to speak but go to the chat and find Synod Support and send them a message. That will help us to do our business much more quickly.

³ The voting figures announced by the Chair (but not the result) differ from those recorded here, as it was subsequently discovered that a number of duplicate votes were recorded by the remote voting platform. The figures shown in the Report of Proceedings (here) are the corrected figures.

When we met in July we were not able to conduct formal business and there is much urgent and important work to be done. Our first principle in planning for this group of sessions was to schedule necessary and urgent business. For that reason, Safeguarding, the Archbishops' Council budget and a number of items of business that complete or continue important legislative business, including cathedrals and education, will take up much of our time.

We are extremely grateful that we will be able to welcome and hear from survivors for the Safeguarding item. They will be logging on anonymously to ensure that they feel as safe as possible in our company.

We have already debated an important motion on the Covid response brought by the Presidents. Tomorrow there will be time to hear about and talk about Vision and Strategy. In order to create space for this, we chose not to schedule any Diocesan or Private Member's Motions. We did not take this decision lightly; however, we are convinced that this agenda is long enough and includes what it must without adding additional layers of complexity for us all to cope with.

In preparing for the Synod, we have scheduled breaks between most major items of business. I would like to encourage you to be kind to yourselves by taking time out when you need it and to be respectful of others by sharing your face as often as you are able to.

At the moment we know ourselves are more than ever dependent on prayer and on the prayers of others. We have found new and moving ways of prayer in these strange times. I am looking forward to meeting with you, praying for you, worshipping alongside you and joining you in the daily six o'clock prayers for the nation. May God bless us in shed or study or kitchen, alone or with the hubbub of family behind us, as we work and pray together.

The Chair: Thank you, Sue. When making a speech in this debate please remember to address your comments to the shape and content of the agenda rather than mini debates on substantive items. Item 4 is now open for debate. Please note the speech limit is three minutes.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): With the Archbishop of York's words ringing in our ears from earlier, I am grateful we are looking at ways in which we can change the structures of the Church of England. I am grateful we are deeming the Church Conservation Trust financing this time around. Sadly, I will not be in Synod when it comes into view next time around. However, there is an irony associated with a church that is spending so much time with useful churches ensuring they are not compromised architecturally when at the end of their useful lives they are then having to be financed by the Commissioners and charitable bodies to be maintained for their architectural magnificence. We need to remember that they are doubly redundant by the time they come to the CCT catalogue.

Could we at some stage in the future have on the agenda at least a consultation in due course about the whole area of DAC, CCT, et cetera, to ensure that architectural insignificance can be used as a missional virtue?

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Chair, I reluctantly speak against this item as I have a significant concern about our agenda and what I believe is the glaring omission of a much-needed debate over the long-awaited *Living in Love and Faith* document and resources. I appreciate that we have earlier this afternoon had an opportunity for six people to ask questions, but I would suggest that this is unquestionably not enough and definitely not the same.

As we are all more than aware, this whole process has been carefully controlled throughout to ensure there has never been a chance for open honest debate since February 2017. Many members stood for election in this quinquennium because they wished to engage with the questions around sexuality and have felt increasingly frustrated at the close leash on which we have all been so tightly held. We have heard repeated calls from the floor of Synod from all sides of the House for this to be reviewed, but these have been constantly ignored. The result? As we have all now seen, those frustrations have been channelled into nationally public videos, from both the Church of England's Evangelical Council and from Christian Concern, setting out their views, which are both offensive and highly damaging to members of the LGBT community.

The Bishops' desire to control has caused far more damage than a debate in Synod ever could do, especially as we have seen brave LGBT couples come forward to share their stories, only to be publicly pulled apart and vilified on a website produced by one of our own Synod members. This should cause anyone with even a basic level of safeguarding training to be horrified and to want to do something to stop this assault. Our only recourse, however, is to appeal to the six Pastoral Principles, which were put together by a group that includes two of those involved in CEEC and the video, an irony not lost on many. Both videos abysmally fail against every single one of these principles, but sadly, there is very little we can actually do, as no safeguarding measures with clear consequences for those who break them have been put in place.

That is why I am today calling on the Government for a public inquiry into the way religious organisations like our own treat and protect LGBT people from harmful religious teaching. I hope that we can find proper time before the end of this quinquennium, and ideally this week, to enable us to have a proper debate where we can all, not just the Bishops, discern how we manage our differences in such a way that protects those of us who are the subject and object of this process. For to do otherwise will be to condemn us all to a never-ending merry-go-round, with those of us who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex providing a revolving platform on which you all stand, stamp and spin.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Chair, thank you to you and all the staff at Church House for all the work you have done to allow us to meet together. Parishes up and down the country are closing their doors for the last time. Clergy numbers are being cut and clergy posts are being made part time, House for Duty or fixed contract. Despite working as one, the Church over the Covid period had to tell priests that they could not go to their churches and the House of Bishops refused to agree not to cut any clergy posts or close parishes until the Archbishop of York's work is complete. I have raised questions under question number 73 that we are unlikely to meet that. Tomorrow we will discuss the future of the Church in our breakout groups, although whether they will happen, as we saw today, is another thing.

The Business Committee has only allocated 30 minutes to the Church's parliament to discuss our future compared to the three days the Archbishop's group had to discuss it. That is not meaningful input by this Synod. I feel that we have been side-lined. I would ask the Business Committee to give more time to Questions because we need to hear the views from across our nation, and to hear the questions of members. We have saved time travelling. We should have more time for Questions. I would also ask that we are given more time on the Vision and Strategy of the Church of England. Finally, I would ask that we have a special Synod for three days to discuss fully the future of the Church of England and to save our parishes, because a lot of people out there are scared and worried about the future, and we need to have an honest and frank discussion to protect this church as the established Church of our nation.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I want to thank the Business Committee for its work. I regret that I shall not be voting to take note of this Report. No doubt the Business Committee had pressure put on it from various sources, but what we have in this agenda is a normal agenda for a physical meeting. This is not a normal meeting and we should not pretend it is. We were told it was necessary to meet to deal with essential business – the budget, the legal fees orders and the payments to the Churches Conservation Trust. These could have been dealt with in a morning. We have a full agenda punctuated by a few screen breaks, which look as though they will be shorter than those that were promised. Nothing else is essential. I would suggest that cathedrals have more important things to worry about at the moment than drafting new constitutions. Similarly with diocesan boards of education. We have a presentation on Vision and Strategy which could have been recorded and made available for members to watch when convenient.

We need to be realistic. Do we really think that anyone inside or outside the Church was listening to our debate on Covid-19? This was an opportunity to look afresh at Synod and do only what has to be done by Synod: essential legislative business. It is time to stop it being an irrelevant talking shop which wastes a lot of time and money.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): A few short things. First, at the September meeting we were fortunate enough to have an indication very early on in the debate from the person who was moving the motion about whether they were prepared to move amendments or

not accept them. That was really helpful. I hope we can repeat that experience in the future when we are online like this because there are some amendments where clearly there is a very strong feeling for them. I think it would shorten some of the debates that we have.

Secondly, on the LLF documents, I regret we have not had more time to look at them. To give us a week is not enough time to come to a reasonable or sensible conclusion about them. Even if with the volume of reading I normally do, I could not do it, and as a retired person I would not expect anyone who works to have got through this material at all.

Thirdly, I would like to echo what Sam was saying about having a long debate about the future of the Church. There seems to be a lot of anxiety among the clergy, necessarily so, among us and finance people. I am a member of the Finance Committee. A number of dioceses I know are extremely pressed financially. We need to have space and time to look at the Church Commissioners' budget adequately, and the funding that is available, and to step up our commitment to the technology that is required for everyone to be able to participate and include all their congregations. Some of them are growing congregations in people with disabilities. I would really like to see some time devoted to discussion about how we can do that.

Thank you to everybody who has struggled manfully. I am extremely grateful to all of the clergy and lay leaders who have struggled to get the technology advice they need. I am very well aware that some people for broadband reasons are isolated at the moment and cannot serve their congregations in the way they need to. That is another matter that also needs fleshing out.

The Chair: After Peter Adams, I am going to reduce the speech limit to two minutes so that, hopefully, we will be able to hear a couple more speakers.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Thank you, Chair, and thank you so much to the Business Committee for putting together an agenda for us to meet at Synod in this new world. I know we will all be missing the unofficial Synod: the fringes, the meals, the coffees, the lunches, the corridors, the travel together.

Has the Committee considered use of the relatively simple technology of apps that allow a three-dimensional gathering? You might, for example, want to consult with Adrian Harris and Amaris Cole and their very excellent digital team, who a few weeks ago ran a superb conference using the Hoover app, which added that three-dimensional aspect to a gathering, and allowed those fringes and those chats and that banter. My own diocesan group have been making full use of a WhatsApp group throughout this afternoon so far, and I think it really has added something. We might well consider further adding to this, recognising of course that a few will be disempowered by this technology, but at the same time we want to enable our maximisation of this new world.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): The most significant piece of legislation that this Synod passed in the last five years was in 2014, the Women Bishops settlement. Three years ago the settlement with the Five Guiding Principles and the commitment to mutual flourishing was seriously challenged, with the fallout on the appointment to the See of Sheffield. That triggered the Archbishops at the time to send it to the independent reviewer and that triggered the formation of the Implementation and Dialogue Group, the IDG, whose report on first schedule was due to come to the House of Bishops and then to this Synod.

I am delighted to see that the IDG report is coming in the February Synod, but I want to make an appeal that not only enough time and space is left for it in February, when we will still be meeting on Zoom, but for such an incredible and important piece of legislation, and seeing that the settlement is working, that we leave time for it in July as well, because we need to look at background and history. Many people on this Synod will not remember it because they were not on the Synod at the time. The Women Bishops settlement is not simply in the past, past business, because it is still revealing considerable issues of fear, ignorance and prejudice against the minority groups that were created by that legislation.

There are two integrities to be respected and honoured in this settlement. It is not past. It is not settled if the settlement is not honoured and there is no harmony and peace in appointment processes, in debates about ordinations, whether they are first, second or third Ordinations, even consecrations. It is not small. Despite the sensitivities around safeguarding and around LLF they will need to have time in February and July.

The Chair: Sorry, we are going to have to wrap it up now, please. We are tight on time now.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): First, may I add my thanks to others who have been expressed to Sue Booy and the Business Committee. I just want to highlight the importance of legislative business at this and every Synod, and to quote paragraph 9 from Business Committee Report that says, “The General Synod’s main role as set out in its constitution is to consider and pass legislation by Measure, Canon and Act of Synod”.

At the last Synod, I proposed quite a lot of amendments, people may recall, to rules relating to appeals. In response to that, Canon Paver was kind enough to comment favourably and to say that she felt there were “many who feel that legislation is a time either to go and have a cup of tea or leave it to those who understand it”. She added, “We were actually founded as a Synod as a legislative body of the Church of England. I do hope that we and those who go after us will take legislation seriously. It is serious.” You will find that in the report of proceedings of the February Synod at page 341.

At this Synod we have two Measures for Final Approval: the Cathedrals Measure and the Diocesan Boards of Education Measure. Both were considered in Revision stage in February, but the DBE Measure was very poorly attended in the debate on that Revision stage. There were only 120 people present out of 450-odd when a quorum count was called. Frankly, Synod was not doing its job in February. What I want to say to all members of Synod is do not leave it to lawyers, this is important business, and, to the Business Committee, perhaps they need to consider again where in the agenda such items are placed. In February the Revision stage of the DBE Measure was at 5 pm after a long day of debates.

The Chair: We are going to have to wrap it up there. I am very conscious that we have a scheduled break coming up and we will need to take a break; however I am aware that Paul Benfield wishes to raise a point of order. Could you tell us what that is, please, as swiftly as possible?

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I would like to ask for a count of the whole Synod on this matter so that the Business Committee has some idea of the unease which there may or may not be throughout the chamber, otherwise we will just get a result of the vote.

The Chair: Thank you, Paul. Can you bear with us everyone for a moment, please. First of all, I am going to do what we were about to do anyway, which is under Standing Order 31, I wish to move to a motion for closure on this debate, Item 4.

The motion was put and carried by a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: As it was clearly carried, I ask Sue Booy to respond to the debate, please. You have up to five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you very much, Chair. I am not going to take any time because we have timed business in just ten minutes and we all need a break. Like it or not, I am going to thank all contributors for their speeches and I will write what I have made notes to say and ask the Synod staff to circulate it to you tomorrow, because I am very concerned that we are not going to get our break. Thank you very much indeed.

Response to the Business Committee Debate

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Colleagues, I trust you will forgive this unusual step as I send my response to the debate on the Business Committee report in written form which will enable me to engage more clearly with the points so carefully raised. With an early and slow start and no lunch break we had not allowed enough “Zoom - break time” and I hoped by giving answers in this way and asking the Chair to move a variation we would get a ‘breather’. It is important to note that the Business Committee has no role

in determining the nature of the Business that comes to the Synod but the ordering of it and these responses should all rest on this understanding.

Mr Hind – you will need to find a way to bring his proposal either through one of the Boards or Councils or by means of a Diocesan or Private Member's Motion.

Ms Ozanne – thank you for using this debate as it is intended to highlight concerns about the deficiencies of the agenda and to challenge its formation. This is the place where those concerned can hear concerns and respond.

Mr Margrave and Fr Benfield – in a sense your points cancel one another out! Have we allowed too little time for matters of concern to us all? Should we have contented ourselves with only essential business? Your questions sum up our dilemma and we will need to keep learning! Both the issues around the future of the Church (raised also by Mrs Allen) and LLF are ongoing matters of concern and debate and will come to the Synod again in future I am sure.

Mr Adams – we are very aware of the various possibilities available to enable the more 3D approach you suggest however for the moment this would be likely to stretch both synod resources and the technical expertise of many members. We are delighted that various groups (including members of the Business Committee) are using WhatsApp and the usual Twitter and Facebook feeds are being used. Mr Banting will have read my previous comments about our choices related to the content of the agenda. We will be doing our best to schedule mounting business as sensibly as we are able.

Mr Lamming – the Business Committee echoes your concerns about the treatment of legislative business by the Synod and I have replied to a number of people that the scheduling of the debate that he mentioned was unfortunate - as was the unexpected prolonging of the item of business that was taken before it. We are aware of and will do our best to avoid a repetition of this problem. Thank you all for reading and for staying with this Virtual Synod. I would repeat the plea in my speech to treat yourselves and others gently! God Bless.

The Chair: Thank you, Sue. In response to the point of order which Paul Benfield raised, I shall order a vote by the whole of Synod. We move to vote on Item 4: "That the Synod do take note of this Report".

*There were voted for Item 4: in favour 231, against 70, with 30 recorded abstentions.⁴
The motion was carried.*

⁴ The voting figures announced by the Chair (but not the result) differ from those recorded here, as it was subsequently discovered that a number of duplicate votes were recorded by the remote voting platform. The figures shown in the Report of Proceedings (here) are the corrected figures.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your contributions. That concludes this item of business. There will now be a scheduled break. I hope everybody can quickly make themselves a cup of tea. Question time will start at 5.30 pm. I have just noticed that Sue Booy's has a point of order. Sue, back to you then, please, for your point of order.

Revd Canon Sue Booy's (Oxford): Thank you, Chair. I was wondering if you would care to test the mind of Synod on a variation to the order of business giving us a break that is the length it is supposed to be so we do not start until quarter to six, please.

The Chair: Thank you, Sue. I would like to test the mind of Synod on this. Therefore, I put the motion to extend the break to have the scheduled break as was originally scheduled. That would mean probably starting at 5.40.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: That was carried and therefore everyone will have a scheduled break until 5.45 and that is when Question Time will start. Enjoy your break and have a nice rest of the evening after that.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 5.40 pm.

ITEM 5 QUESTIONS

The Chair: Welcome back, Synod. I hope you have enjoyed your break. The timing for today means that we now have 15 minutes less for questions and we will be having a short break to join the national call to prayer and the Chaplain to the Synod will lead us in prayer at six o'clock. There is a House of Bishops' meeting at 7.15 that you have been sent Zoom details for because the first part of that meeting is open for you to attend, so please do avail yourself of that after our worship at 7.00.

The last time I was chairing Questions, we had a record 200 or more, I believe. That is not the case today and so we are going to, just through logistics, take it a little bit slower. Normally, there are supplementary questions and we can see if they are going to be required as there is extra time as people make their way to podiums. Via Zoom, that is not practical and so we are going to take our time to allow for those wishing to ask supplementary questions to raise their blue hands.

I would ask that you be ready to do that as we approach your question but not before we get to that number, otherwise we are trying to work out who is asking the questions. Of course, the original person who posed the original question is given priority in asking up to two supplementary questions. A little reminder too, because there is going to be a lot of muting and unmuting, because we have a very wide range of questions and respondents, that you can either unmute yourself by pressing the microphone button or,

because you are only asking questions rather than making speeches in this item, you can just press and hold the space bar for the duration of your supplementary question. I am sure none of you will get repetitive strain injury through that because it is questions and not speeches during this item. So, we begin.

NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL

1. *Ms Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Since the decision was made by the Education Office and the National Society Council to disband the Church of England Youth Council in November 2019, how does General Synod intend to gain the input and representation of those under the age of 18, which the CEYC reps had previously represented?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The decision about CEYC was made following discussion with its chair and core group, recognising its engagement with young people in recent years has been very limited. The National Society has now developed opportunities for the Church to hear the voice of children and young people in its thinking and decision making and is delighted that the new National Younger Leadership Groups (launched this month) have engaged 200 young people in the church's vision and strategy work. This programme for primary, secondary and FE students will continue with other themes and we will seek to find ways to ensure they feed into Synod and other leadership and governance structures. Representation by under 18s at Synod is less straightforward for safeguarding reasons (CEYC reps were over 18) and so we are developing a 4th stream for those aged 18-21 in Spring 2021 and will draw Synod representatives from this group.

Ms Sophie Mitchell: Can you please clarify whether the representation from the 18 to 21 National Younger Leadership Group will include full membership rights to General Synod, including the ability to vote on motions and amendments, to avoid the appearance of tokenism?

The Bishop of Durham: No, I cannot guarantee that because that would require a change in rules in General Synod, but I agree with you that it would be good if that could be moved. We also want the representation not just to be from that group but also to consult with diocesan youth officers and advisers about representation from around the dioceses as well as from that specific group, so that we draw from a wider range. But we need to work on speaking and voting rights, you are quite right.

2. *Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Will the National Society ask each Church of England School Governing Body with support from their Diocese to warmly commend in the school community the Church's teaching that sexual intercourse properly belongs within marriage exclusively, and marriage is of a man and a woman?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: All Church of England schools have a denominational inspection which considers how the school's Christian vision enables the whole school community to flourish. Our inspection schedule includes the requirement to ensure the school "offers age appropriate and coherent relationships and sex education that reflects the school's Christian vision" and the Church's teaching on marriage and place of sexual intercourse within it is already a fundamental part of that.

Mr Richard Denno: Thank you, Bishop Paul, for your helpful answers and for pointing us to the invaluable work of the denominational inspectors and their schedule. I have two supplementary questions. The first is, do we know how many schools are, in fact, faithfully communicating the traditional teaching of the Church? The second supplementary question is, what is the National Society Council doing to defend the rights of employees in Church schools to express traditional beliefs about sex and marriage?

The Bishop of Durham: In answer to your first question, Richard, the answer is no. I need to remind everybody that each school governing body is legally there in its own right. We do not have any control, in that sense, over it. I will take your second question and ask further, but my understanding is that we are constantly working at this issue and seeking to offer advice and guidance, but the National Society does not control Church schools.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): Does reflecting the school's Christian vision mean commending the Church's teaching that sexual intercourse properly belongs within marriage exclusively and marriage is of a man and a woman?

The Bishop of Durham: I simply refer you to the answer that was given in writing because you have repeated the question and the answer is there in writing.

3. *Mrs Kathy Playle (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Given that each school has autonomy over its syllabus including RSE in schools, will the Church of England Education Office ensure that any resources it will commend for RSE include those which promote a traditional Christian understanding of marriage as well as other views of family?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Yes, of course.

Mrs Kathy Playle: Following Richard's question, I was going to ask what safeguards for their jobs, for example, are now to be put in place for staff who express the view of

marriage that is given in the Christian system, particularly when that is outside of the school arena?

The Bishop of Durham: Each school is a legal authority in its own right and has to deal with those matters and it can seek advice from the National Society and guidance. Likewise, it can seek advice from its own diocesan board. But, at the end of the day, each governing body has to deal with it in their own place.

MINISTRY COUNCIL

4. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What are the figures for the cohorts of ordinands who began training in September 2019, and September 2020, by gender and in 5-year age bands, when separated into the three different modes of ordination training: full time residential, mixed mode and part time?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The data requested have been supplied in a table provided separately.

Ordinands starting training September 2020																															
	Under 25			25-29			30-34			35-39			40-44			45-49			50-54			55-59			60-64			65 and over			Grand
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	
Residential	12	15	27	12	30	42	11	34	45	11	13	24	11	6	17	6	5	11	2	1	3	2		2		1				172	
Context Based (Mixed Mode)	3	1	4	7	17	24	9	15	24	11	11	22	20	12	32	19	11	30	12	8	20	2		2					158		
Part time				2	2	4	4	1	5	8	1	9	15	18	33	29	25	54	41	17	58	33	17	50	23	5	28	4	2	6	247
Grand Total	15	16	31	21	49	70	24	50	74	30	25	55	46	36	82	54	41	95	55	26	81	37	17	54	24	5	29	4	2	6	577

Ordinands starting training September 2019																															
	Under 25			25-29			30-34			35-39			40-44			45-49			50-54			55-59			60-64			65 and over			Grand
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total				
Residential	14	18	32	10	29	39	12	36	48	9	12	21	5	6	11	9	4	13	2	1	3	3						1	171		
Context Based (Mixed Mode)	3	5	8	7	10	17	11	20	31	21	8	29	12	10	22	18	6	24	12	2	14	3	2	5	4		4	155			
Part time	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	4	5	3	9	12	17	11	28	31	14	45	29	19	48	36	15	51	16	5	21	6	222		
Grand Total	17	24	41	18	41	59	24	60	84	33	29	62	34	27	61	58	24	82	43	22	65	42	17	59	20	5	25	6	4	548	

	Under 25		25-29		30-34		35-39		40-44		45-49		50-54		55-59		60-64		65 and over		Grand										
	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total											
Residential Context Based (Mixed Model)	14	18	32	10	29	39	12	36	48	9	12	21	5	6	11	9	4	13	2	1	3	3	3	171							
	3	5	8	7	10	17	11	20	31	21	8	29	12	10	22	18	6	24	12	2	14	3	2	5	155						
	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	4	5	3	9	12	17	11	28	31	14	45	29	19	48	36	15	51	222						
Part time																															
Grand Total	17	24	41	18	41	59	24	60	84	33	29	62	34	27	61	58	24	82	43	22	65	42	17	59	20	5	25	6	4	10	548

Canon Jenny Humphreys: Thank you very much, Bishop, for the very helpful table that you have provided. Could I just point out, and ask, that the proportion of young ordinands under 35 who are women is 30% and 34%, so what is the Ministry Division doing to discover the reasons for this significant gender imbalance and the consequential imbalance in what is spent on training men and training women each year?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: There has been work going on for some time encouraging young women to offer for ordained ministry. There is work by the young vocations officer, particularly working with women. I would need to refer to them to ask them for any specific reasons that they have encountered why this figure is out of balance. What we can see from these figures is that women tend to offer when they are older, but I will ask them for specific reasons and we will write back to you, Jenny.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I just wonder whether we could have those same figures for BAME people and disabled people and all of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act because we have said it is a priority for our Church to have more BAME ordinands and more disabled ordinands. Do we know how many ordinands with disabilities or from the BAME community we have?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Can I take that and refer back to you with an answer?

Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester): I think Sam has asked my question because my question was going to be how many of those cohorts are of BAME heritage. I think Sam has sort of asked the question I was going to ask.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: We will come back with the answer.

5. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Following the adoption by Synod in February 2020 of the Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing, what financial resources are being made available to dioceses to enable them to undertake the Big Conversation, and to put any learning points into practice? Specifically, is there funding for wide-scale distribution (down to a parish level) of the report from the Living Ministry research programme *How Clergy Thrive*, which the Archbishops commend on its cover as “a valuable resource especially as part of the Big Conversation”?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The recommendations accompanying the Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing are being overseen by a newly formed Facilitation Group. No specific financial resources are provided to dioceses for this work; however, the issue of clergy wellbeing continues to be supported by staff in both the Ministry and Clergy HR teams, including the ongoing Living Ministry research. A range of materials to support the Big Conversation is available online at no cost, including *How Clergy Thrive* and its

accompanying resources. 6,000 free printed copies of *How Clergy Thrive*, funded by Clergy Support Trust, have been made available to curates, training incumbents and those in roles directly influencing clergy wellbeing.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): It invites information that the excellent publication *How Clergy Thrive* is going to get this sort of facilitation in terms of implementing what it recommends and what needs to be done in order to ensure that the message about, for example, the loneliness of clergy and the isolation that they feel, that that message is going to be communicated effectively by a resource facilitation group.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Sorry, was that a question?

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): Yes. Are the resources going to be there, Bishop? I see what you say in the written answer that you gave about the facilitation group, but it is the resourcing of it and the maintaining of the profile of it. If action follows resourcing, then some resourcing will be necessary in order to ensure that some of the really important messages about clergy care are effectively communicated?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I completely understand the question now. The group that is working on this is looking at how that should be resourced. I cannot give you specifics at the moment, but it is obviously on their agenda.

6. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Will the Chair of the Ministry Council confirm that the diagnosis and healing pathways proposed by the recently published FAOC Report '*Kingdom Calling*' (GS Misc 1254) will be fully incorporated into both the Ministry Council's vision for theological education, and the policies, procedures and budgets for Discernment, Initial and Continuing training of Ministers that underscore this vision, so that the '*Vision for Lay Ministries*' (GS Misc 1265), which the Ministry Council has strongly endorsed, can be fully realised and implemented?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: We warmly welcome the publication of *Kingdom Calling* and its challenge to us to ensure that ministries, lay and ordained, are set in right relationship with one another. The Ministry Council is fully committed to supporting the implementation of *A Vision for Lay Ministries*, across the breadth of our work, including within the vision for theological education.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Thank you, Bishop Martin, for your encouraging reply and for all you have done, following Bishop's Stephen, to lead Ministry Council towards a full understanding of the importance of equipping the whole people of God for ministry in the Church and in the world. So that lay ministries do not continue to be valued as second best, may I ask you to ensure that the needs for and funding of lay ministries in all their variety is placed firmly on the table of the current review of ministerial formation (RMF)?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Adrian, thank you for that. I can completely assure you that it is not only on the agenda, but there is a member of the Lay Ministry Advisory Group on that group to ensure that we look at this very seriously, and I am expecting us to come back with a constructive response.

The Chair: We will now pause to join prayers for and with the nation and hand over to the Chaplain to the Synod for prayer.

Revd Canon Michael Gisbourne (Chaplain to the General Synod) led the Synod in prayer.

The Chair: Amen. So we resume our questions with Question 7.

7. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What steps does the Council intend to take, to count, celebrate and support those Anglican lay people who between them have more than 1,300 role titles within 40 distinct groupings, as identified nationally by the Lay Ministry Data Project, according to the recently-published *Kingdom Calling* by the Faith and Order Commission?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The Lay Ministry Data Project highlights both the scale and diversity of lay ministry roles within the Church of England. It would not be possible for us to sustain our mission and ministry without the dedication of so many lay people.

A Vision for Lay Ministries (GS Misc 1265) points forward to a Church where all lay ministries are recognised, valued and celebrated and the Lay Ministries Advisory Group are developing an implementation plan to enable us to work towards achieving this vision both nationally and more locally.

MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

8. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What is the Church of England doing to promote a green recovery in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Environment Working Group made a full submission to the parliamentary inquiry into a green post-Covid recovery in August.

The EWG has joined the Climate Coalition, which is calling for a green recovery that leaves no one behind, unleashes a green energy revolution and protects and expands our green and wild spaces.

The Church of England is supporting Climate Sunday, asking churches to hold a climate focused service, commit to long-term action to cut emissions and to speak up by signing the Climate Coalition declaration.

Repair works funded by the Culture Recovery Fund will help our buildings remain sustainable, and include roof repairs, installation of new energy efficient heating and lighting systems, and climate change mitigation measures such as improved guttering. Therapeutic gardening and access to green spaces in churchyards may also promote individual recovery.

Our net zero target (see the definition in GS Misc 1262) gives integrity to our intervention.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard: Thank you for your reply, Mark. I am concerned that the Government's recently announced measures would not go far enough in reducing national carbon emissions to the necessary levels. Will MPA, strengthened by Synod's recent decision, also seek to hold the Government to account in this crucial coming year?

Mr Mark Sheard: Yes, I can give you a categoric assurance that we will, yes.

9. *Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What progress has been made by the Church of England in its engagement with the Government since the debate on legal aid reform in February this year?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In October 2020 MPAC submitted a response to an inquiry into the future of legal aid by the parliamentary Justice Committee. This response focused on how The Legal Aid Sentencing & Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 has impacted access to justice. It raised concerns over the treatment of society's most vulnerable and the importance of access to justice in underpinning the rule of law. It drew closely on the February 2020 synod debate.

The MPA Home Affairs Adviser has focused on building up briefing materials and relationships within the legal world so that we can respond quickly to future parliamentary debates and to the Ministry of Justice in the future as and when opportunities arise.

10. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What has been the progress on Valuing People with Down's Syndrome in 2020?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The working group tasked with designing a toolkit for use in parishes and schools completed its work in January 2020 and launched the toolkit at a fringe event during the

February General Synod. The toolkit is now on the Church of England website. Further plans were made to produce a digital booklet and an 'easy-read' version of the toolkit, with promotion of all three versions of the toolkit to be piloted in parishes and schools in the Autumn. The coronavirus pandemic has meant that these plans have been put on hold with the intention of picking them up again in 2021.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I just wanted to ask if the Mission and Public Affairs Council were aware of the "Bin Emmerdale's Prejudiced Storyline about Down's Syndrome" petition that has reached 25,000 signatures, calling for the awful storyline in Emmerdale to be binned in respect of thinking about valuing people with Down's Syndrome's lives and the work we have previously done to combat this prejudice?

Mr Mark Sheard: Yes, Sam, thank you for that. We are indeed aware of it and we have been engaged with that whole storyline with Brendan McCarthy. I share your concern and, indeed, I am sure when Synod voted unanimously on the motion in relation to valuing Down's Syndrome people two years ago that Synod as a whole would share a real concern about some of the developments in this area at the moment. I would encourage Synod members and, indeed, all those they are engaged with to add their voice to whatever petitions or, indeed, make representations to those who have influence in that area to demonstrate that we meant what we said as a Synod when we said we value people with Down's Syndrome.

Mr Robin Whitehouse (Lichfield): Just one point on what was just raised. Thank you very much for saying that the toolkit is on the Church of England website. Looking on the website, it actually says that you have to download a PDF document but when you click on that it says that it is restricted. Do you know anything about this or is this part of the toolkit that is still in progress?

Mr Mark Sheard: Robin, thank you for bringing that to my attention. I was not aware of that and I will follow that through.

CLERGY DISCIPLINE COMMISSION

11. *Miss Michelle Tackie (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: How many clergy suspensions have there been in the last 5 years (or latest data available)?

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: The latest available data is up to 31 December 2019. In the preceding 5 years there have been 97 suspensions.

Revd Stephen Corbett (Blackburn): Could that information which is not collected be collected?

The Bishop of Leeds: Thank you for the question. It could be collected but I think the issue is one of capacity to do so. The problem we have here is that not all suspensions relate to discipline. There are a number of reasons why clergy might be suspended. I will take the question back to the Clergy Discipline Commission.

12. *Miss Michelle Tackie (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: How many of the cases where the suspension is now finished were the allegations upheld or dismissed?

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: The Clergy Discipline Commission does not collect this data nor is it readily obtainable without disproportionate cost.

The Commission makes an Annual Report to the General Synod, the statistics for which are provided via an annual questionnaire sent to diocesan registrars. The questionnaire does not seek the information sought by the question.

Miss Michelle Tackie: Thank you for the written answer as well. What efforts are made to assess the impact of suspension both in terms of the mental and physical health of those suspended, their families and also the impact on relationships within the ministry teams, the parish and the wider community?

The Bishop of Leeds: As I know from experience, if a bishop has to suspend a clergy person for whatever of the reasons under the Measure, then you have to put in pastoral care. What the bishop cannot do is insist that that pastoral care is taken up. Pastoral care is offered particularly where complaints have been made both to the complainant and to the person complained about. Where suspension happens, there has to be regular pastoral care offered. There also ought to be clear communication with parishes and I imagine most bishops attempt to do that.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): I would like to ask what proportion of cases take more than 12 months from the initial complaint being received to the resolution of the complaint?

The Bishop of Leeds: Can I clarify, is that complaints under the Clergy Discipline Measure, that is formal complaints?

Revd Stephen Trott: Yes, I thought we were dealing with the Clergy Discipline Measure.

The Bishop of Leeds: Well, I think the question was to do with suspensions. I think I would have to get back to you on that, Stephen, because I do not know the proportion off-hand. All cases ought to be dealt with expeditiously, but there are sometimes factors

beyond the control of those who, for good pastoral reasons, wish to conclude matters quickly. I would have to come back to you with the numbers.

Revd Stephen Trott: Thank you.

LEGAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

13. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Legal Advisory Commission: Has the Legal Advisory Commission considered the opinion prepared by Stephen Hofmeyr QC and others with regard to the use of individual cups for the distribution of the wine in Holy Communion, and does it intend to revise its advice in the light of that Opinion?

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Legal Advisory Commission: The Legal Advisory Commission has considered the opinion from Mr Hofmeyr and others. The Commission has provided the House of Bishops with further legal advice on the use of individual cups. The conclusions reached in the Commission's two previous opinions on this question (January 1991, revised September 2003; September 2011) remain unchanged. The Commission took account of the Hofmeyr opinion when considering its further advice, but has not sought to respond to it directly.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Morag, thank you for your answer. Will the LAC now publish the further advice that it has given to the House of Bishops, particularly in the light of the fact that the legal opinion written by Stephen Hofmeyr and others has been very widely circulated?

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC: Thank you, David, for that supplementary. As you know, I am not the Chairman of the LAC. He is not a member of General Synod and so I am responding on his behalf today. It will be for the LAC to decide whether or not to publish in the normal way.

Mrs Mary Durlacher: You always have published your previous advice, so what is the reason for not providing us with the further advice? If there is a coherent one, it should be provided. My second supplementary is, given that there are now in existence legal opinions which reach different conclusions and given that the issue is *adiaphora*, can you give Synod an assurance that disciplinary proceedings will not be brought against clergy who introduce individual cups at Holy Communion?

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC: I have effectively answered the first supplementary from you already in answering David Lamming's supplementary. It will be a matter for the LAC to decide about that.

The Chair: I am sorry to interrupt. The second question, I am advised, is not in order.

LITURGICAL COMMISSION

14. *Mr Jack Shelley (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: GS Misc 1265 envisages “Lay ministries are growing and proliferating within the Church of England as more people respond to God’s call in their lives and share their God-given gifts in a wide range of ministries.” One such role is the leading of services in the absence of a Priest. ‘Communion by Extension’ is one of the authorized services, in Common Worship, to be led by the un-ordained laity. Its use is valued in many Parishes in the absence of priestly ministry. The Bishop told us in answering Question 126 in the Spring “Making a Spiritual Communion is particularly fitting for those who cannot receive the sacrament at the great feasts of the Church, and it fulfils the duty of receiving Holy Communion”. Many Anglicans do not find a ‘Spiritual Communion’ as uplifting as a service of ‘Communion by Extension’.

Would the Liturgical Commission encourage wider use of this service by Readers and churchwardens, and consider if the service could be enhanced by revising the liturgy and explaining the theology as was promised to Synod more than ten years ago?

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: The Liturgical Commission undertakes its work at the invitation of the House of Bishops, from which any request to revise liturgical material would need to come.

As the Guidelines to Communion by Extension indicate, use of this service ‘must always be regarded as exceptional and provisional’, taking place in specific pastoral circumstances. It may be led only by those who have been authorized by the diocesan bishop and have been appropriately trained. Its use is determined locally by the diocesan bishop, not by the Liturgical Commission.

The Commission is happy to draw this matter, including a request for further theological study, to the attention of the House in the course of planning the work of the next quinquennium.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Can the House of Bishops also ask the Liturgical Commission to consider extending the service of Communion by Extension to licensed lay workers as already happens in many parishes across the country?

The Bishop of Exeter: Yes, John, we would be happy to consider that in due course. It really is up to a diocesan bishop to decide how things are enacted in his or her own diocese, so it is a question of authorized ministers being appropriately trained and then it is up to the bishop’s discretion.

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

15. *Revd Canon Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Church Commissioners: In the light of Appendix 2 of GS Misc 1262, which indicates what is known of the carbon footprint of parishes and dioceses, what work are the Church Commissioners doing in order to measure the carbon footprint of the housing and ministry of Bishops?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: The Church Commissioners' Bishoprics & Cathedrals Committee initiated a pilot project into See House Sustainability at the end of 2019. This project will assess the current position and then possible solutions to reduce the carbon footprint, aiming for net zero by 2030. So far, eight houses have been assessed and the Committee will consider in 2021 a report on potential solutions, the cost of this intervention, and their replicability in other properties.

The Committee also recently reviewed its approach to providing cars for bishops to encourage a greater use of electric and hybrid vehicles and considered a new policy for installing charging points at See Houses.

16. *Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich)* asked the Church Commissioners: With reference to GS 2188: In 2012-13, the Churches Conservation Trust employed 52 full time equivalent staff at a cost of £2.1M to look after the 342 buildings. In 2020 the headcount at the Churches Conservation Trust had risen to 71 staff at a cost of £3.3M to care for 356 buildings. Given that this represents an increase of just 14 buildings, have the Church Commissioners questioned the CCT on why their staffing overheads have risen so dramatically and, if so, can the answers be shared with Synod?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: The CCT has a statutory role as part of the Church/State ecclesiastical exemption system. It is jointly funded by the Commissioners and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, so oversight is shared.

In September the Mission, Pastoral and Church Property Committee discussed the 2019-20 annual report with the Chief Executive as part of our regular review of its work. The CCT made a conscious decision in its strategy to invest in staff capacity to increase impact and sustainability. It has appointed additional staff to work with communities to build partnerships to look after CCT churches, and to grow commercial revenue so it can diversify income. Commercial income has risen 43% since 2016 and grant funding for posts now covers 17% of costs (from 3%). More staff has meant more income and therefore more spend on churches and a greater impact. Spend on churches increased from £3.4m (2013) to £5.2m (2020).

Mr Andrew Gray: I have two supplementary questions relating to question 16. The first is that, Dr Poole, you mentioned that the DCMS and the Church Commissioners share

oversight of the Churches Conversation Trust. I was wondering, when was the last occasion that either party ordered a full external audit? My second supplementary question is that you quote that the Churches Conversation Trust's commercial income has risen by 43% since 2016, I wonder if you could supply what those numbers are in real terms?

Dr Eve Poole: Thank you, Andrew, and thank you for these questions. I cannot answer either of them and so what I will do is write to you about them. But, just to say, DCMS and the Church Commissioners do actively look at the strategy and performance of the CCT, and DCMS supplies a member to our committee to provide additional oversight in that way. I will find out if there has been an external audit – that would have been before my time – and I will write to you about that. In terms of the 43% uplift in commercial income, I will need to write to you with the specifics on that and I will make sure that we do that straight after.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Dr Poole, can you ascertain, please, what efforts are made to find out the local views on the efficacy of CCT maintenance of the churches in parishes, as you may well find that there are some quite strong and pertinent views that come out from that?

Dr Eve Poole: Simon, thank you. I am not quite sure whether you mean the maintenance of the CCT's own churches or the maintenance that they carry out under their trading arm for other churches. Could you clarify?

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell: I mean for the churches that they look after themselves but often have local friends' groups which actually try to work with them, sometimes effectively, sometimes not.

Dr Eve Poole: I am hearing a sort of implication that there is a problem here that I was not aware of. I understand that there has been a request to debate the CCT funding order on Wednesday and so, if I may, I will confer with the CCT staff to get an up-to-date view on that for you and I will weave that somehow into our conversation on Wednesday.

17. *Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich)* asked the Church Commissioners: With reference to GS 2188: Given that the Friends of Friendless Churches undertakes identical activity to the CCT, managing 56 buildings with a staff cost of £49K, and The Norfolk Churches Trust manages 13 buildings with a staff expenditure of £52K, have the Church Commissioners questioned the Churches Conservation Trust as to the reason for this difference and, if so, can the answers be shared with Synod?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: These two trusts are important partners whose efforts complement the work of the Commissioners and CCT. We have recently supported two transfers to the FoFC to avoid demolition where vesting in the CCT was not appropriate. The work is similar, but the CCT has a

statutory function as the last resort vesting vehicle for churches which the Commissioners agree are no longer needed for regular worship, and for which no suitable alternative use can be found.

The CCT currently looks after 356 churches and welcomes 1.7m visitors a year, so the scale of its activity and staffing needs are correspondingly greater. It is able to do larger transformational projects and contribute to community regeneration - for example a £4.3m Heritage Fund project in Sunderland to develop Holy Trinity as an arts venue (<https://www.visitchurches.org.uk/what-we-do/blog/canny-space.html>).

Any significant rise in church closures post-Covid will present a challenge to all working in this area.

Mr Andrew Gray: Just to pick up on question 17, Dr Poole, you quote in your answer a church called Holy Trinity, Sunderland, which is to be converted I think into an arts venue. This really follows on from Mr Cawdell's question. Are you aware that this has attracted 650 complaints from the local community?

Dr Eve Poole: No, I was not aware of that. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. I will raise that with the CCT directly.

18. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Church Commissioners: Two years on from the Synod motion calling on the NIBs to start to disinvest from companies that are not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition to a low carbon economy and proactively to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and low carbon technology, what actions have been taken by the NIBs, and in particular the Church Commissioners, in this regard and what actions will follow in the coming year?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The NIBs have used Transition Pathway Initiative data to develop climate change standards that carbon intensive companies must meet to remain investible. The NIBs are working together to reflect on progress and co-ordinate decisions and announcements relating to divestment. We currently expect 6 companies held by the Commissioners will be among those restricted this year having failed to implement sufficient measures to assist the transition to a low carbon economy. More details will be published in December.

Recent significant engagement saw 12 large emitters improve performance, encouraging us in our engagement-led approach. Further standards have been set for 2021, 2022 and 2023, methodically increasing the level of ambition required, in line with the latest science. These will push companies in sectors from energy and mining to aviation and steel to align with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

In 2020 the Commissioners have invested c.£60 million into low carbon technology. This includes biofuels and recycling facilities, wind farms on our land, and £30m into an Electric Vehicle charging fund.

Revd Catherine Grylls: Thank you for your very encouraging answer, Loretta. Two supplementary questions. Is your engagement with Shell and Total challenging them on their reported plans to drill in the Arctic? And then, on the second half, what plans are there in 2021 for further investment in low-carbon technologies?

Loretta Minghella: Catherine, thank you very much for your questions. The Church Commissioners are not the leads on the two companies that you have mentioned, so I will make sure that we write to you as NIBs with answers to your specific questions about Shell. On the questions about actions in the coming year for further investment in low-carbon technology, we are always on the lookout for more and more investment in renewables, not just because they do the right thing in terms of tackling climate change but because we are increasingly finding that they make very good sense as very strong investments. We have recently ascertained that we have nearly half a billion pounds now in what we would call carbon positive investments and that takes into account the £60 million that I referred to in my answer to your question.

PENSIONS BOARD

19. *Revd Richard Mitchell (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Why is it that the Pensions Board would appear to be making increases in CHARM mortgages which now outstrip the increase in clergy pensions? In view of current interest rates at banks and building societies, how can this be justified?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board: Thank you for both of these questions. The increases in CHARM mortgage rates have not outstripped the increase in clergy pensions - they are equal, and both based on the September increase in the retail prices index (RPI).

The CHARM mortgage scheme, which closed in 2008, gave retired clergy the opportunity to own all or part of their retirement home. During the period when most loans were taken out, it was not easy for people in their 60s and 70s to obtain mortgages from banks and building societies whose interest rates were peaking at 14%. Mortgage loans therefore with an initial rate of 3% or 4% of loan, pegged to inflation-only thereafter, represented good value to the clergy.

Revd John Dunnett (Chelmsford): Can I simply ask, please, when was the last time any significant review of the CHARM scheme was taken, and by way of review I mean in terms of assessing the feeling of the current beneficiaries towards the provision it makes?

Mr Clive Mather: Thank you for that. The honest answer to your question is I do not know. Since I have been in post, the mortgage scheme has not been subject to review. Of course, the CHARM housing scheme is a different proposition and that has been regularly reviewed. In terms of the mortgage scheme, it is a fixed scheme. It is backed by external finance and subject to contract and, therefore, one has to regard it as something of a set piece and it is not a matter that we can simply review ourselves. I hope that helps.

ETHICAL INVESTMENT ADVISORY GROUP

20. *Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group: The search for vaccines and treatments for COVID19 have brought significant focus on the activity and policies of the pharmaceutical industry. At the same time much opposition to so-called “big pharma” has arisen among conspiracy theorists. What ethical and responsible investment policies guide Church of England national investment bodies in pharmaceuticals, especially in regard to research and the availability of drugs in the developing world?

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker) replied as Vice Chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group: The EIAG recognises the significant role all businesses can play in enabling human flourishing and improving the society we live in. We recognise that investments in Pharmaceuticals have the potential to bring enormous benefits to humanity throughout the world, from protecting the sick and vulnerable to enabling societies to be ‘unlocked’ from the economic shutdown and social isolation associated with COVID19. The EIAG has not offered specific advice to the national investing bodies (NIBs) with regard to Pharmaceuticals, but in line with the ‘Statement of Ethical Investment Policy’, the NIBs expect all investee companies to manifest responsible employment practices and they engage where necessary to improve upon ethical standards. Additionally, the ‘Business and Engagement Policy’ advises NIBs to serve as ‘salt and light’ to encourage investee companies to have business objectives that serve the common good in which we include research and the availability of drugs to the developing world.

Canon Peter Adams: Thank you very much, Bishop, for your answer and to the EIAG for all its work alongside the NIBs in adding enormous value to the Church’s investments. In light of Synod’s clear commitment earlier this afternoon of concern for the whole world during this pandemic, could the NIBs use their voice at this time to ensure that all will benefit from the vaccines that are bringing so much hope to us in this current crisis?

The Bishop of Manchester: Thank you very much for your questions, Peter, the original question and that supplementary. Yes, that is a matter of considerable interest to us. We note that a number of the vaccines that are in stage 3 and reporting results are now part of the COVAX arrangement which, in particular, enables vaccines to be made available to developing and poorer nations at a significant discount on the normal

market prices. We know that, I think AstraZeneca – which is the one that has most interest in the UK in some ways – have made some commitments again. Although working out in detail what the particular commitments of specific companies mean is not always as transparent as one might wish but, yes, that is obviously a matter of concern and interest to us. All of the kind of 13 top runners at the moment that are in those phase 3 trials have signed purchase agreements with governments and even Pfizer is certainly interested in looking at how this applies to some of the developing countries. That is a matter of constant monitoring, though the actual work is done by the NIBs, the National Investment Bodies, rather than the EIAG itself. We simply encourage them to look at these things.

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

21. *Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What action has been taken and what progress has been made following the Synod's approval of the Leeds Diocesan Motion in February 2020 entitled '*Through His Poverty*'?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Mission and Public Affairs Council continues to address issues of poverty and disadvantage in our communities through campaigning, lobbying and resourcing local action. Recent work has focussed especially on the impact of the two-child limit in welfare policy. Most importantly, the Estates Evangelism Task Group is exploring how the Church communicates the Gospel in especially hard-pressed communities.

As made clear to Synod in February, the specific research question in the motion is difficult to translate into a viable project and such a study would require additional resources which have not been forthcoming.

The concerns of the motion remain in our forward plan. Our main focus is on the Estates Evangelism programme and its multi-stranded strategy for strengthening the Church's capacity in those areas. The challenge of designing a study that would turn the precise terms of the Synod motion into an achievable and worthwhile project remains.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds): It is just a quick question. In the answer that you provided it says, "... the specific research question in the motion is difficult to translate into a viable project and such a study would require additional resources which have not been forthcoming". Where would those resources come from and has an application been made?

Mr Mark Sheard: Those resources we are talking about there would either have to be financed in terms of outsourcing a study with a minimum internal management resource or, alternatively, an expanded management resource. That would have to come through Archbishops' Council. I have to tell you, Paul, that at the moment quite the

reverse is the case. For understandable reasons, and I make no complaint about this, significant resources from MPA have been redeployed into the Covid Recovery and Management Programme and so, to be perfectly honest, we have not made as much progress as we would have liked there. However, I would hate you to go away with the impression that addressing issues of poverty and disadvantage in any way have fallen off the MPA agenda and that was why I listed one or two other things in my written answer.

22. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Following the Private Member's Motion on Mission and Administration which was passed in 2018, what progress has the Archbishops' Council made to develop centralised services for matters which are purely administrative in nature, in order to lift the burden of cost and time from diocesan offices across the country?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Archbishops' Council: The People and Data Programme is bringing together people data, systems and processes from across the Church of England. The framework of the system is built and being tested; capability includes a national register of authorized clergy.

The National Church Institutions continue to expand provision of digital services including enhanced support for online giving and *A Church Near You*. A cost-effective diocesan website offer has been adopted by 18 dioceses; a free local church website offer is available and 40% of churches are using this facility. This is saving significant costs for churches in hosting or security, and removes any need for dioceses to develop similar services.

The *Transforming Effectiveness* workstream, as part of the *Emerging Church of England* work, seeks to ensure the operating model of the national church is aligned to be more cost effective and respond to what best supports the mission of the local church.

Mr Gavin Oldham: In view of the somewhat thin answer to my question and the omission of GS Misc 1250 on the *Emerging Church* from our papers – which itself carries no reference to the motion referred to in my question, it actually passed in 2017, regarding administration – to whom should I direct my proposal which is published in the current issue of the *Church Times* that the Archbishops' Council should, in future, be accountable for the finances of diocesan church houses throughout the country?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: That is an interesting question, Gavin. You can send it to me and you could send it to John Spence. I am sure John would not mind receiving that.

23. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Over the last few months and years there have been several

reports of safeguarding complaints made against certain archbishops, bishops and cathedral deans, resulting in the National Safeguarding Team establishing core groups to investigate those allegations and, in some cases, the making of formal complaints under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 (CDM). Please provide the Synod with a table listing, in respect of each such complaint during this quinquennium, the name of the respondent archbishop, bishop or dean, the date the complaint was made, the nature of the complaint, whether it was considered by a core group and/or dealt with under the CDM, its outcome (if the investigation has been concluded) or (if not concluded) the current stage of the investigation and when it is anticipated it will be concluded.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The data requested cannot be provided as all complaints considered by core groups, and those brought under the CDM, are confidential. Where proceedings have been determined by a Bishop's Disciplinary Tribunal (for priests and deacons, including deans) or a Vicar-General's Court (for bishops and archbishops), those decisions are publicly available on the Church of England website. Where a penalty by consent has been agreed, details are provided on the relevant diocesan website. In cases where a complaint is not proceeded with, the matter remains confidential.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Given the major concerns that have been expressed about the working of core groups over the past months and given that Safeguarding are meant to be undertaking a major review and putting in place some working practice guidelines, can we be given some timescale as to when this is actually going to happen, because significant disquiet about the way in which core groups operate is building in the Church and there does not seem to be much movement at national level?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: Thanks, Pete. You will see from some later questions, 57, 58 and also 79, reflections on core groups. William Nye's answer suggests that, obviously, this is under review. I take your point that these things seem to be slow, but I think we are also clear that they need to get it right. This will have been heard by the NST and the NSSG, the steering group, and I take that away and we will push on as fast as we can.

Mr David Lamming: Thank you for your answer, Jamie. I asked my question in the light of the information given in answer to question 21 at the last Synod by Kat Alldread saying that there were currently 27 active NST core groups. Given that information has been made public about certain complaints, for example, those against the Archbishop and former Archbishop Carey, and that a public statement was made by the Bishop of Huddersfield of a dismissal of the complaints against the Dean of Oxford, are there any criteria to determine when these matters will be made public?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: Thank you, David. It is complicated, as you know. Speaking medically, of course, and complaints against doctors, there is a whole issue around what would be confidential and what would not be confidential and what would get into the public domain. Obviously, the answer that has been given by me suggests that there are areas where it is clear that information will be given. Obviously, the outcomes of tribunals are published and, similarly, where there is a penalty by consent, the diocese will publish on the diocesan website. But I think you highlight an issue around consistency which, again, we would perhaps need to look at in more detail. It is a very topical area. Pete Broadbent's question raises that and I think you are right to keep pressing us to say, "Are there clear guidance and guidelines?" I think, as William Nye's answer to question 79 makes clear, this is very much on our agenda.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): From the decisions available, have you seen whether the same core groups investigate further but different complaints against the same bishop or dean under the CDM?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: Peter, I am not at all aware of that. I am afraid it is not information that I hold and I do not know whether anyone would hold that beyond those who actually convene the core groups. I am sorry, I cannot give you an answer to that.

The Chair: Point of order, Jayne Ozanne.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Forgive me, I do not know the standing order but I am wondering if we can extend this session by 15 minutes, please, given our slow progress through the questions and given that we have started 15 minutes late. I appreciate the hard work in having to switch between speakers all the time, but it does mean we are not making quite the progress we thought we would.

The Chair: Thank you, Jayne. We were just discussing the exact same thing here and so I am very much minded to test the mind of Synod in extending our sitting by 15 minutes.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: That is carried. We are going to extend our business until 7.15. Thank you, Jayne for that and thank you everyone for the patience that is required for processing questions this way, complete with blue hand delays and untangling such things.

24. *Mr Michael Stallybrass (York)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: During the debate in York on July 13th 2018, regarding the Draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 39, I asked: "that even at this late stage the Revision Committee should consider as to whether it is possible to put something into the Church Representation Rules to allow, in special circumstances, if the chairman feels that it is appropriate and maybe two-thirds of the members there feel that it is appropriate, a secret ballot can take place".

No such provision was included. In the new Church Representation Rules, Rule M28 (2) states: if one-fifth of the members of the PCC present and voting on a resolution so require, the minutes must record the name of each member voting for the resolution and the name of each member voting against.

In the absence of a mechanism such as the one I proposed, Rule M28(2) has the potential to be used to intimidate PCC members who wish to discuss matters, such as serious safeguarding concerns affecting parish officers, for which confidentiality is highly advisable. What is the most appropriate way to ensure that PCC members are protected from such intimidation?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It is always the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the PCC openly debates matters of legitimate interest in a respectful way. With sensitive matters, the chair will need to consider handling in advance with the secretary and standing committee e.g. who should speak to an item; what papers are required; whether to have a vote at the meeting or plan to conclude without voting but follow-up with a proposal by correspondence under Rule M29. The Chair may also need to have preparatory one-to-one discussions with any PCC members who have a particular interest, so that the ground rules for the meeting itself are clear, and the Chair can address any personal or pastoral concerns.

If an item of PCC business relates to a safeguarding concern, it would be appropriate for the Chair to include the Parish Safeguarding Officer in that preparatory work.

Mr Michael Stallybrass: I would like to thank Dr Harrison for his answer, but to say that I am afraid I think that he has really missed the point of what I was getting at. His answer assumes that the chair of a PCC always acts in a gentlemanly and sensitive manner but, unfortunately, this is not always the case. I will refocus my question and I will refocus it bearing in mind that I am somebody who actually has been subjected to and observed some serious abuses, abuses of power, serious bullying and emotional abuse, in the course of PCC meetings. So can consideration be given to inserting provisions into the Church Representation Rules to allow for reserved business when there are particularly difficult personnel issues on hand? And can this be considered in the context of the CRR amendments, which are already tabled for consideration in February, so as to prevent a repeat of the weaponisation of M28(2) that I have already experienced, which totally horrified the archdeacon who was present there and even led to a comment by my suffragan bishop that he felt powerless in that situation.

The Chair: We are straying into argumentative. Dr Harrison, if you are able to answer succinctly, we would appreciate it.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: Well, thank you, Mike. Just to say, I am so sorry to hear your experience. Obviously, if the chair is clergy then they come under the Guidelines

for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy, particularly around the care of others. If it is a lay person, then again I would be very deeply sorry. I think the answer is I will have to take away your questions in relation to the Rules, but to note obviously that you particularly raise this in the issue of safeguarding and I think that is something that I do need to take back to the National Safeguarding Team to look at the whole area of training for those particular matters, not least in relation to the parish safeguarding officers who, of course, can be invited to the PCC with the PCC's permission. That would be a good idea.

25. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What measures are being either taken or considered to support those parishes where the requirement to maintain listed church buildings is increasingly unaffordable, placing undue stress on the church officers, drawing time and effort away from mission within the local community and impairing parish share payment?

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Advocacy work by the NCIs ensured churches were eligible to apply to multiple strands of the Government Culture Recovery Fund. Over £30m of funding, including £11m for repairs to listed church buildings, has so far been secured, with further awards are expected. Officers work closely with government, heritage partners and philanthropic funders to secure funding as and when it is available. Conversation has been had with government about upcoming fiscal events. We have advocated strongly for continuation of the Listed Places of Worship grant scheme, worth up to £42m a year, in the November Spending Review. Officers represent the needs of parishes to the National Lottery Heritage Fund who are re-opening their grant schemes in the coming weeks. We recognise that there is an urgent need for grant funding to support parishes in caring for their buildings and in making the most of them as tools of mission and outreach.

Mr Nigel Bacon: I am grateful for the answer, as I expect all of us are for all that is being done particularly in the current situation. Going forward though, will the Archbishops' Council give specific attention – for instance, by bringing forward legislative changes and providing targeted support – to easing the burden of responsibility carried by those PCCs, often with unfilled church officer positions and small elderly congregations, where even day-to-day church operating costs are barely affordable let alone major repairs?

Revd Canon Simon Butler: Thank you very much, Nigel, for your question and for your kind words to staff as well. In respect of the first part of your question about legislative reform, you are speaking to the right guy, so if you do write to the Legislative Reform Committee via the Legal Office with specific suggestions, we are preparing quite an extensive body of work for the next quinquennium beginning next year that we will be happy to take your suggestions on board.

In respect of the question of targeted support, well, of course, the Council really only has money to target through apportionment or through money that is given by other sources such as SDF money and the like. The view of the Council is, typically, that we trust the local church to identify areas where specific support might be given. Of course, if we were to do anything otherwise it would be robbing Peter to pay Paul because we take money through apportionment which basically comes out of the diocesan pockets. So, yes, as much as we can, we will.

26. *Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: An organisation such as a diocese is insolvent when it can't pay its debts. This could mean either: it can't pay bills when they become due, or it has more liabilities than assets on its balance sheet. How many Dioceses have needed overdrafts or loans to ensure that they did not have qualified audit opinion of their 2019 annual accounts? Is there a central church RAG rating to those dioceses that might be identify as being at risk to continue as a going concern?

Canon John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: We are not aware of any Diocesan Board of Finance's 2019 accounts having a qualified audit opinion. Several did have an emphasis of matter (something the auditor considers has been appropriately disclosed but is of such importance that it is fundamental to users' understanding of the financial statements) relating to the uncertain impact of Covid-19. Auditors' going concern assessments will have taken into account the liquidity support measures the National Church announced in March.

Through its Strategic Investment Board and the Strategy and Development Unit, the Council has worked closely with dioceses to understand estimates of income lost due to restrictions as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. This has helped it award sustainability fund grants to dioceses to support their on-going mission, mindful of their asset base. Of the £35m made available by the Council and Church Commissioners, to date £14.5m has been awarded in grants to 22 dioceses.

Revd Peter Breckwoldt: Thank you, Canon Spence, for your reply. Your answer reminds us of the uncertain nature of some dioceses' finances, especially in this fast-moving environment of Covid-19 and its restrictions. If there was a major disruption caused by a shutdown of a diocese, the main people impacted would be the diocesan staff and clergy who would no longer have their stipends and pensions paid. Has the Archbishops' Council considered, following the appointment of a Director of Risk Management and Internal Audit, how best to ensure value for money from the grants given to the dioceses and in what ways could a central internal audit team help support dioceses and give the Archbishops' Council regular reports of the long-term viability between independent examination via external auditors?

Canon John Spence: Well, thank you for the question and for the supplementary. In my answer, I pointed out all the ways in which we act and we do not have a RAG rating because we actually maintain, through the collaboration of dioceses with the Strategic

Development Team in Church House and the finance team, very close levels of knowledge. We have an intimate understanding of the situation across the dioceses and are, thus, able to monitor that situation. We could look at the use of the internal audit team, but this would mean a further expansion of resource but under the aegis of Archbishops' Council. Every diocese does have its own internal audit responsibilities and we, at the moment, as the previous answer has said, need to be focusing on how we do things once and well rather than in multiple places. I would be thoughtful about our ability to expand the internal audit teams at Church House. I would rather be carrying on with the collaboration and with each diocese working with us at maintaining their own responsibilities.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Would the Archbishops' Council take into account the supplementary question which I asked to question 22 and the answer thereto in considering further the question which has just been asked in question 26?

Canon John Spence: Thank you, Gavin, and can I thank Bishop Martin for kindly agreeing that I too should be the recipient of your letter. We are looking at all potential models. Under the Transforming Effectiveness work that Bishop Martin is leading on, we are trying to work out where we might have collaborations, regional models where things can be centralised at the centre or decentralised from the centre so that, as I have said already, we do things once and do them well. So we will certainly take into account that piece, Gavin.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

27. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Many of us have been disappointed by the lack of leadership: prophetic, spiritual or missional; shown by our bishops during the current COVID-19 crisis. Why has there been no call to the nation to prayer and repentance? And, at this time of deep questioning, why has there been no talk of Christ as the only hope for the nation?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Although I'm sure there are things we could and should have done better, I do not believe the bishops of the Church of England have failed to give leadership this year. Many of us have spoken up for the needs of the poor and those who have been most disadvantaged during this crisis. We have challenged government where we have felt that to be necessary, not least recently over the restrictions placed on the Church. We are now in the midst of a call to prayer, and in our open letter to the nation (4/11/20), the Archbishop of Canterbury and I encouraged Christians and non-Christians to join us in this initiative. Given the challenging and difficult times many are facing across our country we also talked about the opportunity for everyone to look to Jesus Christ as the one who can comfort us in our fear and guide our life.

Revd Mark Lucas: I am very grateful to the Archbishop of York for his comments a few moments ago. I am very encouraged to hear his enthusiasm but it cannot be denied, I do not think, that the Bishops were a very long time in saying anything at all during this present crisis and, indeed, on one occasion when there was actually a Bishop who did a *Thought for the Day* on Radio 4, he gave us a very interesting piece about Abraham Lincoln and precious little about hope that comes in the Lord Jesus Christ. I am glad things have changed but disappointed that they took so long to get to where they are now.

The Chair: Your question, please.

Revd Mark Lucas: And I wished we were further down the road. Well, I suppose that is the question. Sorry.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lucas. Go ahead, Archbishop.

The Archbishop of York: I will happily make a brief comment, which is that I understand, Mark, that you feel disappointed by the lack of leadership. You will not be surprised to hear I do not see it that way, though the answer I gave acknowledges that maybe some things could and should have been done better than they were. This has been a huge year of learning for all of us, but I do believe that we have tried to give leadership and I absolutely know and believe that we take every opportunity, as I myself certainly do, to speak about the hope and faith we have in Jesus Christ. Just because that is not reported does not mean it is not going on.

Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter): Thank you, Archbishop, for your reply and thank you so much for the national call to prayer. However, despite all that you have said – both of you in the Presidential Address – about our shame at the IICSA report, the profuse apologies to its victims, our sorrow at the decline and many other failures, I do not detect in the national resources any indication of a call to repentance as opposed to prayer. Is there a reason why we should not be repenting and humbling ourselves before God at this time?

The Archbishop of York: Graham, thank you very much for the question. The call to prayer is what it says, it is a call to prayer. Of course, it is impossible to speak about the faith we have in Jesus Christ without talking about repentance. Repentance is at the very heart of the Gospel, the call to turn around. So, yes, I long for our nation to turn around. I long for our nation to receive the Gospel of Jesus Christ but, at the moment, this is a call to prayer. I am mindful, as we approach Advent and Christmas, that Jesus was given two names. He was called Jesus, which means “God saves”. He was also called Immanuel, which means “God is with us”. My experience as an evangelist is that, actually, helping people to know Jesus as the one who is with us is the best first step towards discovering he is the one who saves. But, of course, it is both. At the moment, I think we have got it about right, which is offering prayer and service to our nation at this time of need, but I am not disagreeing with you, Graham.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): My question is regarding leadership in the House of Bishops. Given that Cancer Research estimates that three million cancer screening points have been delayed and given that a large section of the British public has restricted access to healthcare, is it time for the House of Bishops to produce a moral framework advising the country and the Government at what point a lockdown actually does more harm than good in terms of help?

The Chair: Apologies, I am told that is not relevant to the original question.

28. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the present crisis arising from the freefall in church attendance there is, quite rightly, a current emphasis on mission and evangelism to produce numerical growth and reverse the decline. As our leaders in mission how many of the House of Bishops:

- a. Have personal experience of leading a parish or benefice into significant numerical growth,
- b. Have led their Diocese into significant numerical growth during their tenure?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Although Part A is impossible to answer without expending a huge and disproportionate amount of time and resources, many bishops were considered suitable for Episcopal ministry precisely because they had led growing churches. I know that when I retire, one of the pieces of ministry that will give me the greatest joy was as incumbent of Saint Wilfrid's, Chichester and the growth that happened in that parish and the people, particularly young people, who became Christians.

As regards Part B, each diocesan Bishop must take ultimate responsibility for the life of the diocese they serve, and therefore very few, if any of us, can feel anything but sadness, that decline has continued on our watch. The bigger picture is that numerical decline has continued for many years across many Christian denominations and throughout Europe. There does need to be scrutiny and accountability. There also needs to be realism about the context we find ourselves in and how we respond to it. Nonetheless I trust we all share the hope of reversing the decline and bringing more people to faith.

29. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Could you please identify (i) the eleven members of the "Vision and Strategy" Group who met three times in June 2020, (ii) the 120 participants who met for the "Future Search" conference in September 2020, (iii) the more than 150 delegates whom the Group consulted in September 2020 and (iv) the 300 young people with whom the Group has consulted or will consult in November 2020?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The initial group consisted of myself, the Bishops of Penrith and Hertford, Dr Sanjee Perera, the Revd Sharon Prentis, the Revd Ben

Doolan, the Revd Dave Male, Mr Mark Sheard, Mr Chris Curtis and Ms Annika Matthews, plus the Bishop of Oxford as Theological Consultant. The Future Search Conference had a cross section of the Church including many parish clergy, cathedral staff, leaders of Anglican mission organisations, theological educators, ordinands, lay leaders in both church and secular work, Synod members, members of religious communities, youth workers, NCI staff and diocesan secretaries. The group of 150 in September consisted of the College of Bishops and Diocesan Secretaries. At the recent consultation with young people there were 172 young people consisting of 85 young people at primary schools from 20 dioceses, 75 from secondary schools from 20 dioceses, and 12 from FE colleges.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr: Thank you, Bishop, for the answer which is a partial answer to my question. My question was intended to be friendly. The weight that General Synod will ultimately choose to give to the Report of the Vision and Strategy Group will depend in part on the identity of those who have been involved and consulted. Could you, please, identify each of those in the second, third and fourth categories identified in my question?

The Archbishop of York: Yes, this probably needs a longer conversation, Stephen, which I am happy to have outside of here because I do not want to mislead you or Synod. It would have been a very long answer indeed. I assumed the names of the bishops and the diocesan secretaries could be taken as read and there may be some confidence and GDPR issues around naming all the others, but we are not trying to keep this a secret. I think the other thing is, which hopefully will become clearer tomorrow when we begin to talk about Vision and Strategy, that the vision that is being shared is the vision that we, the Bishops of the Church of England, with the diocesan secretaries as people with key leadership and oversight responsibilities in the Church, wish to share with the Synod and, then, from it, strategic priorities will emerge. Now those strategic priorities are very much the business of Synod because they will have resourcing implications and so they will need to be discussed, deliberated over and decided. But the vision itself, of course, there is no new vision for the Church of Jesus Christ. It is the same vision we have always had. We are just expressing it in a particular way. I hope things will become clearer tomorrow. We may need some further conversation about whether I can, or whether it is possible to let you have particularly the names of the delegates who took part in the Future Search Conference and, particularly, the children and young people.

The Chair: Can I just invite people to keep questions and answers as brief as possible because we are really struggling to make progress and I sense a growing frustration.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): Since the Church of England is said to be episcopally led and synodically governed, why has the Synod itself not been more involved in this blue sky thinking group that has been set up?

The Archbishop of York: Sorry, I think my answers are getting a bit too long. I will try to be brief. Well, it has because many Synod members have been part of the groups that have been mentioned and, of course, we are doing it, rightly or wrongly, I have been trying to do it in a different way. The usual way we did these things is a paper arrives at Synod which had been written by a small working group which would involve very few Synod members at all. So, already, this way of working has involved many more Synod members than would have been the case, but it has been a different sort of process and, again, I hope tomorrow that will become clearer.

30. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the welcome vision, articulated by the Archbishop of York, to see the Church of England become a Jesus-focussed community of missionary disciples, has the House of Bishops considered the nature of Christian discipleship and its relationship to the church's teaching, doctrine and ethics?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Yes. Much of the varied work of the House of Bishops has a strong discipleship element to it. The Bishop of Oxford's paper on Developing Discipleship which originally came before the House in 2014 is one such example. This paper was later discussed at both General Synod and Archbishops' Council. The Bishop of Oxford has also acted as Theological Consultant to the Vision and Strategy work. More recently there has been a number of discussions around discipleship prompted by both the *Setting God's People Free* work, the development of the Evangelism and Discipleship team and the Vision and Strategy work. And in the dioceses even more work has taken place. If the strategic priorities which arise from this vision are owned and supported by Synod, further work will be needed, particularly around the five marks of mission as marks of discipleship, learning from our sisters and brothers in the Anglican Communion.

Mr Clive Scowen: The supplementary is, in view of the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ to repent and believe the good news and that those who would be his disciples must deny themselves, take up their cross and follow him, will the House of Bishops now give particular attention to the importance of repentance, faith and self-denial in pursuing a life of missionary discipleship?

The Archbishop of York: Well, I think the answer to that is yes because, as I said in reference to a previous question, it is impossible to speak about the Gospel of Jesus Christ without speaking about the new humanity we have in Christ and without speaking about the importance of penitence and repentance. So these things are at the very heart of the Gospel and so, yes, of course, they will be at the heart of Christian discipleship.

31. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What are the key considerations and actions Dioceses, NCI 's and TEIs need to make in order to reach net zero climate emissions in 2030?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Firstly, work out your start point, through measuring/estimating your carbon footprint. See the definition in GS Misc 1262. The Leeds report is a useful example (<https://bit.ly/LeedsCO2>). Our webinars will help guide you (<https://bit.ly/NZwebinars>). Dioceses should encourage churches to complete the Energy Footprint Tool (EFT).

Secondly, identify the major sources of emissions; typically energy use from larger buildings, which are used regularly throughout the day.

Third, create an action plan for tackling these major sources of emissions. If possible, commission energy audits. The “Practical Path to Net Zero for church buildings” is full of suggestions: GS Misc 1262.

Fourth, focus on cutting heat loss from buildings, “decarbonising” heat, and purchasing 100% renewable electricity.

Fifthly, engage broadly, explaining why change is needed and how to act. Seek champions. Eco Church, Climate Sunday, and Eco Schools give frameworks for action.

Sixthly, only after real reductions have been made, offset the residue.

Ms Josile Munro: Thank you for a helpful reply, Bishop. Because there is quite a lot of detail there, I wondered if there is any training that is going to be given to parishes who are quite small: face-to-face training as well as the resources to help them through the whole Path items?

The Bishop of Salisbury: Thanks Josile, that is a great question and really helpful to ask it. The 2030 target for net zero is a big challenge and I am grateful for the way people have responded through the consultation. We would not be able to do this without the involvement of diocesan environmental officers, nor of the involvement of people at MPA and Cathedral and Church Buildings. I want to thank them particularly for the work that has gone into the consultation, especially Jo Chamberlain and Catherine Ross. It has got to be done at a local level, Josile, and therefore I think every diocesan environmental group needs to work at this. What we have discovered is there is considerable expertise across the Church of England and we need to use all of that local resource that we have got. So I think we have upped our game in the way that people who moved the amendment to set that argument wanted. There is much more energy in the system, but we are going to have to work at a local level in order to deliver this target.

32. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Five years on from the signing of the Paris Agreement, what is the Church of England doing to prepare for COP 26, which would have been meeting now in Glasgow but has been delayed to 2021?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England meets regularly with the COP unit of the Cabinet Office alongside other civil society organisations.

It is part of the COP Faiths Task Group, developing an advocacy strategy to come from a faith perspective, aiming to bring a justice perspective to the COP, to use COP26 as a catalyst to transform society in the UK, and to ensure a welcome to the parties in Glasgow in November 2021.

It supports Climate Sunday, which asks every church to hold a climate focused service, make a pledge to cut emissions, and use its voice to call for ambitious commitments at COP26. Aggregating action by churches gives weight when churches speak out.

The Church Commissioners have expertise in sustainable finance, a significant feature of COP26 negotiations.

Preparations are being made for a new Lambeth Declaration, along the lines of the one made ahead of COP21 in Paris.

33. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What outcomes have been reported from the virtual ‘tea party’ hosted by the Bishop of Salisbury, with Nigel Topping, the UK Climate Champion, and Christiana Figueres, a key member of the UN team for the Paris Agreement, in preparation for COP26?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The annual Bishops’ Environmental Breakfast, to which all bishops are invited, could not be held this year and was replaced with a virtual tea party. This enabled Christiana Figueres to take part from her home in Costa Rica, and Nigel Topping to join from the Vatican.

The event, which I hosted, was extremely well attended by bishops and both Archbishops. It is part of the EWG programme to encourage all within the Church to be actively involved in COP26, in particular through engagement with Climate Sunday.

The event raised the level of awareness of these climate talks, the urgency of the climate and ecological crises, and the powerful link to issues of justice, especially in the global south. It demonstrated to those present the understanding within government of the action being taken by the Church on climate change, in particular because of the work of the NIBs.

34. *Mrs Enid Barron (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What has been the take up on the Energy Footprint Tool (EFT), what is being learned, and what plans are there to develop this work going forward?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since its launch in May 2020, over 5,800 churches have engaged with the Energy Footprint Tool (EFT) and over 4,700 churches have submitted the required information to calculate their church's energy footprint. We are pleased with this uptake, given the EFT went live during the peak of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The information collected is currently being quality assured and analysed, and a report is planned for early December 2020. This will include a detailed analysis of the learning from the first year's data, and the results in each diocese. GS Misc 1262 includes a summary of what we know so far about our carbon footprint.

The work will be developed further in 2021. Recruitment is currently underway, and our aim is that staff resource will be in place from January 2021 to begin to develop tools to measure the Energy Footprint of other buildings, e.g. cathedrals, vicarages, offices and schools.

35. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In light of GS Misc 1262, whereby the Environmental Working Group will consider post 2030 "All the emissions (including upstream process & transport) from the procurement of any items we buy (e.g. pews for churches, paper & printing for offices, new cars for bishops, catering for events)" will the Church of England commit to a policy of instructing Dioceses not to dispose of church pews, given the environmental impact of losing the embodied energy committed to their creation which will be lost by their removal, transportation, re-sale and/or disposal?

36. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In light of GS Misc 1262, given that Medieval and Victorian pews were carved from locally sourced, sustainable forests, and recognising that the World Wildlife Foundation stated in its report of 2017 that "Overall, very few companies offered annual performance tables to demonstrate how they hold themselves accountable for year-on-year progress on increasing the percentage of certified sustainable timber in their supply chains" (https://www.wwf.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Jul17/WWF_Timber_Scorecard_2017_0.pdf) will the Church of England consider a moratorium on the disposal or sale of pews which pre-date 1945 on the basis that modern furnishings cannot be guaranteed to derive from certified, sustainable sources?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission, Chair, I shall take questions 35 and 36 together:

It is true that retaining pews can be beneficial environmentally, since the 'embodied carbon' in their manufacture was invested long ago and they are generally made of local wood. Some are also suitable for the installation of energy-efficient pew heating. Individual PCCs must balance this against how their building is used. Some wish to create more flexible spaces, suitable for a variety of activities. The disposal of pews

requires a faculty. The PCC will be asked about the environmental impact of its proposals as part of its supporting documentation.

Care for the environment, as the fifth mark of mission, can be taken into account in the faculty process that must take account of the mission of the church. Achieving net-zero by 2030 will be done by winning hearts and minds. Adding to the burden of faculty rules could be counterproductive in encouraging good environmental practice which is the main goal.

37. *Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Could the House of Bishops share how they are going to reflect on the lived experiences of so many, including myself, in this pandemic who have been denied physical intimacy, either through having to shield from their sexual partner due to serious underlying health issues or through finding themselves geographically separated from their sexual partner due to lockdown? Will you be exploring the mental health implications of such lived experience and the effect such actions have on the health of their primary relationships as part of your ongoing research?

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcombe) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House will, in due course, be making its own study of the material in *Living in Love and Faith* - which includes reference to research on mental health and the physical expression of sexual intimacy. The House, of course, hopes that the wider church will engage with these materials too. The question also highlights the way that the current pandemic has made some of the issues studied in LLF even more acute.

For those interested in considering questions of mental health and sexual intimacy, this is touched upon in the LLF Book, and includes references to some useful academic papers on this subject. These papers dig deeply into a complex area of study and are not easy to summarise in a few words, but they repay study and will help place the question in the context of a much wider field of data and research.

Revd Canon Timothy Goode: Given that there is already published research which offers strong anecdotal evidence that the absence of touch can result in serious mental health issues, is it not a pastoral and ethical imperative for the Church in the spirit of LLF to commission independent research gathering anecdotal evidence on the mental health implications that denying of physical intimacy has on couples ahead of our forthcoming discussions on LLF? Would not the gathering of such information in advance then help inform our conversations together and ensure that the results of our engagement in LLF will include an explicit focus on the health, safety, flourishing and, yes, safeguarding of all those who are personally and intimately affected by the subsequent rulings at the end of the process?

The Bishop of Carlisle: Tim, thank you very much indeed. I am very grateful for this question, which I guess builds on your very helpful recent article in the Church of

England newspaper that I commend to everybody. Yes, we are an incarnational faith. We all need human physical contact and that is not only sexual intimacy. I am really grateful to you for pointing all this out, especially the implications for mental health of both separation and disability and the implications for everybody else as well. I think this will undoubtedly inform our future conversations both in the House and the wider Church. With regard to specific research, the question you just asked, I will take that back to our mental health group that discusses such issues and make that very definite suggestion.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Thank you, Bishop. It is good to hear that the House of Bishops will be studying the *Living in Love and Faith* materials. My question is, given as you know Adi Cooper's report into the death of Peter Farquhar and her finding that stressed that a culture which supported openness and transparency would have better safeguarded him and that we will continue to have problems while people continue to feel forced to hide or lie about their sexuality, when the House chooses to engage with this material will the gay members of the House take a lead and will they themselves feel able to come out so that the conversations in the House can be a bit more open and informed?

The Bishop of Carlisle: Well, thank you for your question, Jayne. It is not really one that I am able to answer for myself, except to say that I do hope that all our conversations will be as transparent, open and honest as they can be.

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Whilst agreeing with Tim and others of the need for both intimacy and physical touch and, of course, human rights to a marriage and a family life, would the Bishops consider that they would be able to answer the question whether or not sexual relationships are essential for Christians to be able to live fulfilled and happy lives, or whether singleness or being unable to have a sexual relationship for whatever reason might not infringe on this ability?

The Bishop of Carlisle: I think that is a really interesting question and it is no doubt one of the things that will be discussed at some length in all the conversations we have about *Living in Love and Faith*. We assume that Jesus himself was celibate and so that may be part of an answer to your question in that we regard him as a perfect person. I am hoping that exactly that sort of issue will be the kind of thing that we will be discussing both in our dioceses and certainly in the House of Bishops, so thank you for asking.

38. *Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the position of the House of Bishops concerning a decision by UK government to increase screening before birth for genetic conditions such as Down's Syndrome and the evidence of increased abortions as a result of the screening?

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcombe) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Members of the House joined other members of Synod in a

unanimous vote at the February 2018 General Synod Valuing People with Down's Syndrome which included calls for the government to ensure that women are given comprehensive and unbiased information so that they can give free and informed consent to non-invasive pre-natal testing (NIPT). Accepting NIPT or pre-natal diagnostic tests does not imply support for abortion on the basis of genetic conditions or disability.

39. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Have any members of the House engaged in the media or on social media to advocate the Church of England's longstanding line on abortion, in the light of the Government's authorisation of medical abortions at home during the coronavirus crisis.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcombe) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I am not aware of members' engagement with this issue on mainstream or social media specifically in the light of medical abortions at home during the coronavirus pandemic, but the House has consistently underlined the Church of England's position that combines principled opposition to abortion with a recognition that there can be strictly limited conditions under which it may be morally preferable to any available alternative.

40. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House made representations to the Government about the Government's extension, without recourse to Parliament, to allow 'DIY' medical abortions at home by pills by post?

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcombe) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops has not made any representations to the Government on this issue.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: Is it not the duty of the Church to admonish the civil Government for abusing the public health crisis to introduce, without parliamentary scrutiny, access to "do it yourself" abortion, meaning lack of clinical care for often vulnerable and scared mothers and death to tens of thousands of babies, easily more than the death toll by Covid, more than 50,000 by this method, and facing an overall figure of more than 200,000 abortions this year alone, nine and a half million since the passing of Act, tens of thousands of abortions in this Covid pandemic?

The Bishop of Carlisle: Andrea, thank you very much for your question. We are aware of just how sensitive and ethical an issue this is and we have been assured by the Government that this is a temporary expedient because women are unable to see their healthcare provider or have been on many occasions. If this situation is allowed to continue after the present circumstances are over, we will certainly be making our position extremely clear. Really, the position is quite simply this. On the one hand, principled opposition to abortion generally but, on the other hand, offering care, support and compassion to all women regardless of the choices they make about this and that remains where we stand and we are very clear to the Government about it.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Bishop, has the House of Bishops, in fact, considered the issue or asked the MPA or any other group for a briefing report on the issues raised by the decision of the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to allow home “DIY” abortions? And, bearing in mind your answer to the last supplementary question, has it done so in the light of the fact that it appears that this is not just intended to be a temporary measure but the consultation is taking place on making the provision for home abortion permanent?

The Bishop of Carlisle: To my knowledge, we have not discussed this as the House of Bishops. I am interested by what you are saying about it becoming a permanent feature. That is something we will definitely oppose.

Questions not reached during Synod.

41. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: While Government will say they have given unprecedented support to many in the Crisis, there remains millions who have had no support. Disabled people on legacy benefits never got the extra £20pw, or are struggling to find permitted work and predicted to be the most impacted group by Covid19. Mortgage payments are a loan and limited to interest. Directors who are the backbone of our economy didn't get financial support, and found themselves among the excluded. Has the House of Bishops made representation on the above issues, and does the Chair intend to issue a statement in support of these three groups - to call for help for all?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With MPA support, several Bishops publicly backed the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's *Keep The Lifeline* campaign to make the £20pw uplift to Universal Credit permanent and extend it to legacy benefits. I myself raised this issue most recently in the House of Lords on the 12th November, specifically referring to the impact on disabled people. The Church of England also published a joint report with the Child Poverty Action Group in August 2020, 'Poverty in the Pandemic', on the financial impact of Covid-19 on low income families, who we identified as one of the groups most impacted by the pandemic. Separately, the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Housing, Church and Community is looking at the impact of the crisis on people in housing need, with a particular focus on private tenants who have received even less financial support than mortgagees. Their final report will be published in February 2021.

42. *Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of substantial decline in numbers as recently reported in Statistics for Mission published in October 2020 what plans are there to address the decline in Church numbers in particular the decline in children and young people attending places of worship? What lessons can be learnt about decline and are there principles to be discovered from more vibrant local churches?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: *Growing Faith* and the accompanying *Faith at Home* campaign is prioritising the connection between church, school and parents to promote discipleship amongst children and young people. Following GS2161, additional research is looking at common factors in churches of any size that have shown sustained growth over the last 5 years and the youth and children's ministry in churches which have seen growth of 10 or more under 16's as reported in their Average Sunday Attendance. This will enable the identification of common practices that are evidenced both in the existing research and in the sample churches, helping to identify key factors that have contributed to growth. Our intention will then be to explore how this can be developed in other churches across the Church of England. Young people will be a clear priority in the developing Vision and Strategy and Emerging Church work.

43. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Does the House of Bishops have any plans to provide training for clergy on the difference between licensed and authorized ministries to help ensure readers, especially in the rural setting, are used effectively?

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Martin Snow) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Formation Criteria for ordained ministry in the Church of England includes the requirement that they are 'able to release and enable others to fulfil their calling to ministry and mission'. As licensed and authorized roles vary from diocese to diocese, national guidance is not straightforward. The three categories into which lay ministries broadly fall are outlined on the Church of England's website: <https://www.churchofengland.org/life-events/vocations/exploring-lay-ministry>.

A Vision for Lay Ministries (GS Misc 1265) expresses the hope for a church where all called into ministries are equipped and supported to exercise their gifts and ministries appropriately. The increasing variety of lay ministries being licensed, commissioned or authorized demonstrate the variety of gifts with which God equips and blesses us. Practice varies from diocese to diocese, and it would be the responsibility of each diocese to ensure the distinction between licensed and other forms of authorisation is understood. However, these distinctions should not be understood as a hierarchy with some roles seen as inherently more or less valuable.

44. *Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Disability Discrimination Act and that disability is now finally named within the Church of England's budget at a time when Covid-19 is disproportionately affecting disabled people; would the House of Bishops please reassure Synod that the goal of full access for the disabled will remain a key priority and that they remain committed to seeking to achieve the full participation of disabled people within the worship of the church and fully opening up lay and ordained ministries to disabled people, for the benefit of the whole church; especially in light of present and future financial pressures?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: I pray for a Church fully committed to the participation of disabled people in every area of our common life, not only ministering to disabled people but affirming their gifts and receiving the ministry they offer - including encouraging disabled people to follow their calling into lay and ordained ministry. This requires commitment at every level of the Church's life.

The disproportionate impact of Covid-19 on disabled people must make us especially aware of their needs and, in partnership together, ensure disabled people's voices do not go unheard. This is a Gospel priority. It therefore remains a vital commitment for myself, the Archbishops' Council and, I hope, this Synod.

We certainly face financial challenges as a result of this pandemic, and it would be foolish to promise at this stage that any specific budget will be unaffected. But maximising the participation of disabled people will remain a core strategic objective.

45. *Mrs Sarah Finch (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House of Bishops responded, on behalf of the Church of England, to the recent resignation of Bishop Bill Love from the Diocese of Albany (New York, USA), who adhered to the agreed teaching of the Anglican Communion as set out, for example, in Lambeth Conference 1998 resolution 1.10? If no response has so far been made, will one be made, and with what content?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: Division in the Body of Christ is always a cause of lament. The House of Bishops would not wish to make statements on individual cases such as this, not least as it is a matter under the jurisdiction of another autonomous province of the Anglican Communion. I have arranged to have a private conversation with the Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church and others on this matter so as to better understand the situation in hand.

46. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Within either Renewal and Reform or the Emerging Church Work, what consideration has been given to the potential reorganisation of Dioceses, so that they might better serve us administratively through improved economics of scale, efficiency of management and effectiveness of mission and ministry?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Each of three strands of the Emerging Church work - Vision and Strategy, Governance and Transforming Effectiveness - are gathering insights and perspectives on the strategic direction, culture, governance and operational configuration for the church as we seek better to serve God's mission in England.

While none of these groups is charged with addressing the structure of dioceses, various responses, particularly the Transforming Effectiveness workstream, explore

what functions are best held at what level, and that will likely lead to a consideration of the nature and role of dioceses and what functions could happen better in larger or smaller configurations. The insights gathered will also be passed on to the Dioceses Commission for their consideration.

47. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: To assist parishes which have decided to introduce individual cups at Holy Communion, to fulfil the command of Jesus to eat and drink in remembrance of him, when will the House of Bishops publish practical guidelines on how best to do so?

The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House recognises that there are conflicting opinions about individual cups. Further discussion of the theological issues is scheduled for a future meeting of the House in January.

However, we look forward to releasing guidance shortly on administering communion in both kinds which members of the House of Bishops will be able to issue to their dioceses.

48. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of Canon B 14A [dispensing with celebration of Holy Communion in any parish church], are parishes which have suspended Holy Communion permitted to do so until such time as the whole congregation can receive again in both kinds?

The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As Canon B 14A indicates, the celebration of Holy Communion may be dispensed with on a regular basis 'on the request of the minister who has the cure of souls and the parochial church council of each parish in the benefice acting jointly', by the diocesan bishop, who 'must be satisfied that there is good reason for doing so'.

49. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House of Bishops considered the opinion prepared by Stephen Hofmeyr QC and others concerning the lawfulness of using individual cups in the administration of Holy Communion, and what was the outcome of that consideration?

The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: All members of the House have received copies of the opinion of Mr Hofmeyr and others. The House has received advice from the Legal Advisory Commission of the General Synod. The House continues to consider how best to address the difficulties that Covid restrictions present for the administration of Holy Communion.

50. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: At the informal meeting of the Synod on 11 July 2020, in answer to a question

from Mary Durlacher (Q.68) whether the House of Bishops would “reconsider the prohibition of use of small individual cups as a valid ‘common sense’ pro tem way of sharing the Communion wine while current constraints remain”, the Bishop of London referred to advice from the Legal Advisory Commission that it was “contrary to law for individual cups to be used for each communicant” and stated, in the light of that advice, “The House cannot authorize or encourage a practice which would be contrary to law.” Subsequently, in a Legal Opinion dated 12 August 2020 and commissioned by Mrs Durlacher, six barristers (three of whom are members of the Synod), including three QCs, challenged that advice, and concluded that the use of individual cups was lawful: see the report in the Church Times, 28 August 2020, page 4.

In paper GS Misc 1259 (Summary of decisions by the House of Bishops and by its delegated committees, March-November 2020) it is recorded at paragraph 44 that at the meeting of the House on 4 September 2020, “The House considered a paper on Holy Communion and the Distribution of the Elements and noted that a study day on this matter would take place on 26 October for all Bishops to attend”.

In the light of the above, please inform the Synod whether the said opinion was considered by the bishops when they met on 26 October and whether, as a result of the study day, the House of Bishops will now authorize the use of individual cups for the distribution of consecrated Communion wine during the current pandemic?

The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: It was the stated intention of the College of Bishops’ Study Day on Holy Communion to deal with the theological issues arising from the question of the use of individual cups, as well as from the online broadcasting of services of Holy Communion. Discussion at the Study Day acknowledged the fact that there were differing opinions as to the legality of individual cups. Further work in this area is scheduled for a meeting of the House of Bishops in January 2021.

51. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Does the House of Bishops agree that the sacrament of the Eucharist within the Methodist Church of Great Britain - which habitually uses individual cups for the distribution of wine - is “duly administered and celebrated” (Anglican-Methodist Covenant, 2003, Affirmation 2)?

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: On 1 November 2003, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Secretary General of the General Synod and of the Archbishops’ Council, and the President, Vice-President, and Secretary of the Methodist Conference signed an Anglican-Methodist Covenant in the presence of Her Majesty the Queen. It was an ecclesial act in which both Churches, among other things, accepted that in the other “the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist are duly administered and celebrated”. That they are “duly administered” does not mean that the rites of the two Churches are interchangeable. Hence each Church retains the duty and freedom to maintain its own

discipline and practice according to its best theological understanding, tradition, and discipline.

52. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of Article 30 of the Church of England's 39 Articles of Religion ("The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike"), what are the benefits of taking both bread and wine in the Lord's Supper?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Communion in one, or both, kinds has been controversial from at least the 3rd Century and practices still differ between Churches. Article 30 captures the Reformation insistence that communion in both kinds has scriptural warrant and is to be the normal practice of the Church at the command of Christ whose body was broken and blood shed for all. Yet, there is no implication that Christ is not truly given through both bread and wine equally, and that by each we feed on Christ by faith with thanksgiving.

The Reformers challenged the distinction between priest and people implied when the priest alone received the wine. Reception in both kinds is thus the visual symbol of the priesthood of all believers. However, Christ is still equally given through both elements, and the Church remains a priesthood of all believers even when, for reasons of necessity, we receive in one kind only.

53. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The recent IICSA report made clear recommendations about Diocesan officers and the NST, all of which are most welcome. However, what efforts are being made to ensure that these bodies are adequately trained in the technical issues concerning computers and the internet and also civil law? How would such training be monitored, and will it be adequately funded?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Work on the development of information sharing protocols will be taken forward in accordance with the IICSA recommendations. As part of this work, any training related needs in respect of data sharing and protection will be identified. Under the present arrangements, responsibility for monitoring training and adequate funding sits with the diocese for diocesan officers and with the Archbishops' Council for the National Safeguarding Team.

54. *Ven. Julie Conalty (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In July 2019 the NST published the Safeguarding Training and Development Practice Guidance (2019) and included in the document was a list of specialist courses that were to be delivered. One of the courses was entitled Emotional/psychological abuse - to include spiritual abuse and healthy Christian cultures. In August 2020 as a consequence of a general inquiry, the NST advised that this course was no longer going

to be developed. What is the reason why the development of a course on so important a topic was cancelled, and what consultation with safeguarding teams was undertaken prior to the decision being made?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The National Safeguarding Steering Group set out a new direction of travel for safeguarding learning at its February 2020 meeting. This included an approach to learning that is “transformative”; in other words, it aims to affect people’s actual behaviours by engaging them at the level of beliefs and values.

From this, new learning pathways have been developed and consulted upon. Whilst there is now no specific Pathway planned on spiritual abuse, the new Leadership Pathway focusses on healthy Church cultures and those in leadership positions to promote healthy culture and address unhealthy culture. All clergy will be participants of this Pathway. The Senior Leadership Pathway, focusing on senior clergy, will have a similar focus on healthy Christian culture.

A new Safeguarding Learning and Development Framework has been developed and will be consulted on in early 2021.

55. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the 2018 diocesan self-assessment key safeguarding data (<http://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2020-06/Safeguarding%20Data%20Report%202018.pdf>), eight categories of abuse were used. For adults, ‘Other/ Uncategorized’ is by far the most used category: 571 incidents compared to 310 for ‘Sexual abuse’ and 219 for ‘Domestic abuse’. Why are there so many concerns where a firm category is not used?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The high usage of the Other / Uncategorized for concerns raised about adults reflects several factors. The Other category will include incidents that are not easily classified including the following: examples where there is more than one primary concern which carry equal weight; some incidents which do not meet a threshold to be described as abuse at all, but may be characterised as complaints; and some adults notified to diocesan safeguarding teams from statutory services such as probation. These will set out where a future risk is being identified based on for example a previous conviction, but where there has not been a recent incident to categorise.

56. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is it correct that PCR2 relates only to files held at a diocesan level or have files forwarded and held elsewhere, such as Lambeth Palace, also been independently audited?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The PCR2 review does include files held at Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Palace and these audits are being conducted by independent reviewers.

57. *Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How are members of a core group appointed and for how long is their appointment?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Members of the core group are appointed in line with section 3.1 of the Practice Guidance. The Guidance gives examples of who may be a member. Members of the core group are appointed on a case by case basis in accordance with the Guidance, and members may be reviewed and changed during the life of the core group. The Chair of the core group is responsible for establishing membership of the group, ensuring all appropriate parties are present.

58. *Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What training is given to core group members, and how often does it take place?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Core groups are arranged according to the circumstances of each case. There is no specific training to be a core group member, however all church officers will have had safeguarding training, and this will include the core group function. Church officers are required to do Safeguarding Training every three years.

59. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the recurring complaints by victims/survivors about the timing, sincerity, delivery and content of apologies, and the likelihood of there being many more apologies needed forthcoming in the future (given outstanding reports) is there any work under way to develop comprehensive guidelines to ensure that the right people address the right issues in a meaningful and timely fashion?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The recent IICSA report highlighted that responding better to victims and survivors is of paramount importance for the Church, and this includes giving apologies which are timely, thoughtful and meaningful. The NST is revising its suite of safeguarding policies, including the policy on responding well to victims and survivors, who have been involved in its development. This policy will address the issue of apologies, within the context of an overall improved response.

60. *Mrs Sarah Finch (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What lessons can the Church of England learn, both locally and nationally, from the Peter Farquhar case, and the Independent Review of it?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The lessons arising from the Peter Farquhar case are clearly set out in the independent review and include: greater scrutiny of candidates in discernment; information sharing clarity at diocesan and parish level; using safeguarding training to enable understanding of risk issues for older people, especially regarding sexuality; ensuring the safer recruitment and practice of volunteers; and

working to create a more open culture where challenging issues can be discussed, encouraging people to share any safeguarding concerns. The National Safeguarding Team will incorporate the training recommendations, is already working on information sharing which was a recommendation from IICSA, and has updated the safer recruitment guidance which is currently out for consultation.

61. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What safeguarding changes are the House of Bishops making to act on the findings highlighted in Adi Cooper's report into the death of Peter Farquhar, which found that: "policies of the Church of England regarding homosexual practice and approach to sexuality and relationships put Peter Farquhar at risk and vulnerable to exploitation" and "A culture which supported openness and transparency would have better safeguarded Peter Farquhar. While people continue to feel forced to hide or lie about their sexuality, they can become vulnerable to exploitation, as was Peter Farquhar."?

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The National Safeguarding Team will incorporate the learning from this review into safeguarding training and guidance. Further recommendations include work on information sharing, which is being done in response to IICSA recommendations, and ensuring the safer recruitment and practice of volunteers. The Safeguarding Team has updated the Safer Recruitment policy which is in consultation currently. The *Living in Love and Faith* work will seek to consult and engage safeguarding perspectives in its ongoing work. It will also play a significant part in establishing openness and transparency as churches engage in learning together about identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage using the LLF resources.

62. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In her recent 'lessons learnt' report on the murder of Peter Farquhar, Dr Adi Cooper OBE wrote: "The policies of the Church of England regarding homosexual practice and the approach to sexuality and relationships continues to put people at risk because it forces people to hide, lie and become vulnerable to exploitation, as was PF". What steps will the LLF implementation group take to ensure that Dr Cooper's concerns about both praxis and theology are comprehensively addressed?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The purpose of the LLF resources is to enable the whole church to learn together about identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage. This involves learning about theology and how it is worked out in the Church's common life. Importantly, the resources emphasise unequivocally that every person is equally loved by God and made in the image of God. This foundational truth must govern, therefore, the welcome, love and care with which every person must be met. The resources also invite people to engage in some depth with matters of identity and sexuality together - openly, honestly, and with grace and compassion regardless of the different perspectives and lived experiences among us. This requires an

unprecedented openness at all levels of the Church about these matters which will help to break the perceived need to hide, lie and so become vulnerable to exploitation.

63. *Dr Andrew Bell (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The independent report by Dr Adi Cooper, commissioned by Oxford diocese: “Lessons learnt from events in the parishes of Stowe and Maids Moreton” includes a number of recommendations which specify a need to promote awareness and change nationally within the Church of England. For example, Recommendation 2 (of 13): “Within the diocese, work on LGBTI+ inclusivity should focus on raising awareness of the safeguarding risks for some older people and the diocese should promote this nationally within the Church of England.”

How will the House of Bishops promote implementation of these recommendations nationally, and how will it ensure that actions taken to promote safeguarding, inclusivity and an open culture are consistent with the Church of England’s current doctrine on sex and marriage?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: One of the ways in which bishops will promote implementation of these recommendations is by encouraging the whole church to engage with the LLF resources. This will contribute significantly to addressing questions of inclusivity and a culture of openness while continuing to maintain the Church’s current teaching on sex and marriage. That is because the resources are unequivocal about valuing every person as made in the image of God and equally loved by God, and therefore about the kind of welcome and love with which every person must be met. This inclusivity is not conditional upon conformity with the Church’s teaching on sex and marriage. The resources also invite people with different perspectives and lived experiences to engage in some depth with matters of identity and sexuality together - openly, honestly, and with grace and compassion. This requires an unprecedented openness at all levels of the Church about these matters.

64. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House of Bishops request that the Government respects the independence of the Church in determining its practice for gathered worship during the coronavirus crisis?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As Chair of the House of Bishops’ Recovery Group I am a member of the Government’s Places of Worship Taskforce and will continue to represent the views of the House in that forum on all issues relevant to the coronavirus pandemic. Bishops joined other faith leaders in sending a letter to the Prime Minister on 3rd November which expressed our disagreement with the Government’s decision to suspend public worship this month. We shall continue to stress the importance of public worship and will argue strongly that Covid-secure Places of Worship should host services of public worship once the current restrictions come to an end.

65. *Revd Canon Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Executive Summary of the IICSA final report, reads: “Deference to the authority of the Church and to individual priests, taboos surrounding discussion of sexuality and an environment where alleged perpetrators were treated more supportively than victims presented barriers to disclosure that many victims could not overcome”. How will the *Living in Love and Faith* process address these taboos and what action will be taken so that the Church becomes a place of safety for people of all sexual orientations and identities?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Both the content of the resources and the Church-wide engagement with them, will help address the taboos surrounding discussions about sexuality and thereby contribute to the Church becoming a safer place for people of all sexual orientations and identities. The Pastoral Principles, which are embedded within the resources, are designed to help ensure that this engagement is as open, gracious, compassionate and safe as possible. This requires an unprecedented openness at all levels of the Church about these matters which will help to break the oppressive silence that has characterised the Church’s engagement in the past. Furthermore, the LLF Next Steps Group will work collaboratively with the National Safeguarding Team to ensure these lessons are incorporated into both LLF and safeguarding development work.

66. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you to all those who have given up so much time and energy to work so hard on *Living in Love and Faith*, which is finally with us, and please forgive me if this question has already been answered within all that has been produced. How will the next steps group be approaching the task of ensuring that engagement with the resources is framed in as pastorally sensitive and safe way for single people, particularly for the younger people in our Church?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you for your kind comments and important question. There are several ways that we hope to do this well. First, the LLF course invites people to reflect on the Pastoral Principles as part of their learning, and to make some commitments to engaging graciously and sensitively with one another. Second, we will be working closely with LLF Advocates in each diocese to support them with facilitation training that is tailored to the different contexts in which people will be engaging with the resources. Third, we will be working with a very diverse ‘reference group’ of ‘grassroots’ people in churches across the country who will help us provide the right kind of support and resources to ensure engagement is as pastorally sensitive and safe as possible. This ‘reference group’ will include young people and single people. Finally, we will work collaboratively with the National Safeguarding Team in developing this work.

67. *Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How will the House of Bishops' Next Steps Group ensure it incorporates LGBT members in a way which gives them better representation than on the original LLF co-ordinating group?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you for this important question. The LLF Next Steps Group is made up of bishops. That means that its representation is limited. That is why the group has decided to establish a Reference Group made up of 'grass roots' people who are actively involved in the life of the Church and who can contribute from diverse perspectives relating to sexuality, ethnicity, age, church context and tradition. This group will act as a sounding board for the group's work in enabling Church communities to participate in LLF in appropriately sensitive ways.

68. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: According to *The Times* on 10 November 2020 (Kaya Burgess, Religious Affairs Correspondent), the Church of England could reverse its opposition to "same-sex marriage" by 2022. Is this the case?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the situation. The *Living in Love and Faith* resources will be used by the whole Church to learn together about human identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage.

This includes gaining a deeper understanding of different perspectives and lived experiences as well as the complexities of these matters. It includes listening to God together. Only when this process has really taken root will we begin the process of discerning a way forward for the Church - 'so that right judgments and godly decisions can be made about our common life'. (p. 422 of the LLF Book). We do not yet know what these decisions will be.

69. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given your acknowledgement and apology in the *Living in Love and Faith* report for the "huge damage and hurt" that has been caused to LGBT+ people by the Church, what actions are you taking and in what timeframe to put in place adequate safeguards to ensure this does not continue?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied as Chair of the *Living in Love and Faith* Coordinating Group: An important part of the work of the *Living in Love and Faith* and Pastoral Advisory Groups has been to become better informed about the damage and hurt that has been caused to LGBTI+ people and to find effective ways of educating the people of God in avoiding such attitudes and behaviours. We have incorporated the Pastoral Principles into the LLF course materials as well as highlighting them in the LLF book. Additional advice is available to LLF Course Group Leaders to create a free and safe space for learning by encouraging behaviours that display a commitment to mutual respect and inclusion. The LLF engagement process

provides the opportunity for people to relate well to each other and to grow in mutual understanding not only of who we are but also of how and why each of us think, reason and act.

70. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In his response to the May 2019 IICSA report on Chichester and Peter Ball, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the then Lead Bishop for Safeguarding, responded 'It is absolutely right that the Church at all levels should learn lessons from the issues raised in this report' (Publication of IICSA 9-5-19). The newly published *Living in Love and Faith*, rightly says 'we should not ignore or downplay another horrific reality [child abuse]' (p. 86) but also states that 'it is important that the specific theological reflection on IICSA be carried out separately from the LLF project' (p. 87). May Synod know the rationale for the exclusion in LLF of the vital and essential learning provided by the IICSA hearings and reports over the past few years, despite the need of the Church to 'learn at all levels lessons [from IICSA]'?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The rationale for the exclusion of the learning provided by the IICSA hearings and reports is provided in the pages of the LLF book that are referred to in the question: these reflections need to be carried out together with victims of sexual abuse (not talking about victims, but with victims) and only after the full published findings of IICSA had been assessed. The purpose of the LLF resources is to explore a Christian understanding of what it means to be human as part of an educational endeavour, the effect of which will be to encourage and create a culture of openness about matters relating to identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage in the whole church at all levels. This in itself is a vital element in responding to the IICSA report.

71. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: As the body responsible for safeguarding doctrine in the Church of England, will the House of Bishops reaffirm the primacy of Scripture over practice in the formation of doctrine?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As the First Book of Homilies (1547) puts it, 'there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture; ... And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is, or may be, drawn out of that fountain and well of truth.'

The classic Anglican expression of the use of Holy Scripture, found in Richard Hooker and elsewhere, is that we read Scripture as our primary source in the light of the Church's tradition of biblical understanding, deploying our God-given faculty of reason - reason itself being shaped by the living tradition of the Church as it seeks to be formed by God's Spirit.

By speaking of the “primacy of Scripture” Anglicans, relate Scripture and the practice of the Church in the closest of ways: “Lex orandi: lex credendi” - what we say in our liturgies is what we believe.

72. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Organisations that have managed their response to Covid-19 well follow best practice by maintaining a Risk Register and a Business Continuity Plan to mitigate the impact of disruption. Does the House of Bishops maintain a Risk Register and a “Business Continuity Plan” to enable it to respond to major negative events? If not, why not? If it does, what did these documents say at the beginning of the year?

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops does not have a risk register or a business continuity plan of its own. The House of Bishops is a House of Synod and not a corporate body and therefore there is no requirement for it to maintain a risk register. The National Church Institutions keep risk registers and have a business continuity plan and were able to respond effectively to the crisis.

73. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Vision and Strategy Group, led by the Archbishop of York, is considering what the future of the Church will look like and what ministry resources we will need as a whole church. But while that work is still underway, parishes up and down the country are closing their doors for the last time, clergy numbers are being cut and clergy posts are being made half-time or House for Duty. What steps are the House of Bishops taking, in consultation with other National Church Institutions, to ensure that such church closures and clergy cuts do not happen before the Vision and Strategy Group can make its final report, and to ensure that the Church takes a joined-up, whole Church approach, rather than individual dioceses acting alone?

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Decisions regarding church closures and clergy numbers are matters for individual dioceses, reflecting their strategy and context. The House of Bishops have committed to sharing their plans with each other in order to ensure that the Church takes a joined-up, whole church approach.

In May the Council and Commissioners announced financial support for dioceses: up to £35m in sustainability funding. The majority of the sustainability funding will be made available in grants to the dioceses in most need, having regard to the resources available to them. This funding provides vital short-term financial assistance for dioceses whilst they develop or begin to implement diocesan transformation programmes and the Vision and Strategy Group completes its work.

74. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the Chair of the Co-ordinating Group confirm that the diagnosis and paths of healing set out in the recently published FAOC Report *Kingdom Calling* (GS Misc 1254) will be fully

incorporated into the strategies, policies and budgets for 'Emerging Church' so that the implementation of this Vision and Strategy will replace the long-pervading culture of clericalism, (which was also identified by IICSA as needing to be addressed), with a culture which enables and equips the whole people of God to be fruitfully engaged in the whole of God's mission to the whole of our country?

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Faith and Order Commission's report *Kingdom Calling* helpfully raises some significant and pervading challenges faced that restrict our theological imagination. In 2021, the direction it sets will be built upon in new resources for vocations work that reflect the calling of all God's people.

The Vision and Strategy will further develop the work in helping to create a culture which enables and equips the whole people of God by recognising the importance of every person in the Church being a missionary disciple. FAOC will continue to provide theological resources for this Vision and Strategy work within the wider Emerging Church process.

75. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the timeline and process (including whether they will come to and through this Synod) for the implementation of the recommendations made to the House of Bishops by the IDG and earlier Independent Reviewer Reports?

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Implementation and Dialogue Group will be publishing their report early in 2021 and would like to present their report at the February 2021 group of sessions, subject to the agreement of the Business Committee. This follows detailed discussion by the House of Bishops, with a further engagement with the House in December.

The report contains a number of recommendations for implementation by different bodies, including dioceses, NCIs and the House of Bishops. The House of Bishops Delegation Committee will be invited to monitor implementation of the recommendations set out in the Group's report, and will report back to the House of Bishops on progress.

76. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The IDG undertook visits to about five dioceses to inquire about the experience of Mutual Flourishing and some dioceses are known to have ongoing Mutual Flourishing groups. How many, and which dioceses, have official and active groups monitoring the understanding, working and use of the Five Guiding Principles and of the Church of England's commitment to Mutual Flourishing?

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: In addition to the in-depth visits to the five dioceses, the IDG wrote to all dioceses at the start of the Group's work to ask about what had been done

to educate and inform the clergy and laity. The Group received responses to this request from 36 dioceses and of these, seven specifically referred to a formal group monitoring the understanding, working and use of the Five Guiding Principles. These included Carlisle, Chichester, Derby, Leicester, Lichfield, Manchester and Sheffield. However, the Group did not specifically ask dioceses about this directly as part of their initial research. This means that there may be diocesan groups established, about which the Group was not informed.

77. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In response to a question at General Synod in July 2020, the Bishop of Rochester stated that bishops are clear about the importance of “Resolution” parishes providing unambiguous and easily accessible information about their theological position to anyone attending the church or searching for a church on websites, including on *A Church Near You*. What actions have bishops and dioceses taken to ensure this information is provided?

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: While this is not an issue the House of Bishops has addressed specifically, transparency and clarity are always to be encouraged. It is, however, for parishes to determine how best to communicate Christian beliefs, across the range of traditions that make up the diversity of our Church. How an individual parish decides to describe itself on its website, *A Church Near You*, noticeboards et cetera is a matter for them and is not something which can be mandated by others.

78. *Mr John Appleby (Newcastle)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What number of parishes in each Diocese have passed a Resolution requesting extended episcopal ministry, and how would a churchgoer identify these within their own diocese?”

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: These figures are available nationally in the annual Ministry Statistics - see p.32 of https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2020-06/Ministry%20Statistics%202019%20report%20FINAL_0.pdf.

In 2019 there were 590 such parishes (4.7% of the total). The national Ministry Statistics do give a breakdown by the bishops providing this ministry. Further details of most of the parishes and which diocese they are in can be found on the websites of the Bishops of Beverley, Ebbsfleet, Maidstone and Richborough.

SECRETARY GENERAL

79. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Secretary General: At the last General Synod we learned that there was no appeal system by which those aggrieved by core group practice could be reviewed and where appropriate rectified. Have any interim

arrangements been adopted on a voluntary basis to address this, pending significant structural reform?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: Anyone dissatisfied by the work of a national core group, or by another aspect of the services provided by the Archbishops' Council, may make a complaint through the National Church Institutions' external complaints policy.

Work to update the core group policy and guidance will include consideration of whether an appeal system, or a dedicated complaint system, should be included.

80. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Secretary General: Given the continuing coronavirus pandemic, when and how is it envisaged that Annual Meetings of Parishioners (for the election of churchwardens) and Annual Parochial Church Meetings will be held in 2021?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The annual meetings are required to be held by 31st May each year. It cannot be known at this point what the situation will be next Eastertide. Should it be necessary to do so, the bishop of the diocese may exercise powers under the Churchwardens Measure 2001 and the Church Representation Rules to extend or alter the time for holding the annual meetings, and/or to modify the procedure for meetings and elections so that they can be conducted remotely. Bishops exercised those powers this year and will therefore already be aware of their existence and scope, should they need to consider making special provision for 2021.

81. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Secretary General: Given the continuing coronavirus pandemic, when and how is it envisaged that the next General Synod will be elected, and its inaugural session held?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: Currently, the Convocations of Canterbury and York will automatically stand dissolved on 31 July 2021 if they are not dissolved sooner pursuant to Her Majesty's directions. The current assumption is that directions will be given for dissolving the Convocations on 13th July 2021 and that elections will be undertaken between July and October 2021 using the online election process. Planning is being done to enable this to happen. It is still expected that the inaugural group of sessions of the new Synod will take place in November 2021. We will closely monitor the situation in light of the pandemic, and engage with dioceses and members as necessary.

The Chair: That now concludes this item, Synod. Thank you so much for your patience. We have obviously had some technical glitches but I am grateful for all your hard work and patience throughout. Our worship will now proceed directly. Please do stay. In a change to our scheduled worship leader this evening, our Chaplain to Synod

will lead us in prayer. I am advised that the House of Bishops' meeting will proceed directly after worship so, do not worry, you are not going to miss it, thank you.

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

Full Synod: Second Day Tuesday 24 November 2020

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 9.15 am.

WORSHIP

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

ITEM 6 VISION AND STRATEGY (GS 2180)

The Chair: Good morning, Synod. Welcome to day 2. Firstly, may I ask people to ensure that they have named themselves correctly on Zoom, so that means having three digits for your Synod number, then B, C or L to denote your House and then your name. That will greatly assist those helping us behind the scenes. Secondly, you should be in possession of an Order Paper for this morning. That is available on the website or on the app, if you have updated your documents.

Let me tell you how this morning will proceed. First, we have two hours on Vision and Strategy, and then we are due to have a screen break at 11.30. Then, we will come to the draft Cathedrals Measure, hopefully at 11.50. We will break for lunch at 1 o'clock. At 2.30, we will come back and we will look at the budget. If that finishes early, or we need more time for the draft Cathedrals Measure, it is proposed that we continue it then. That is how the morning will proceed.

We are now at Item 6, Vision and Strategy, for which you will need paper GS 2180. This is a two-hour session which will be a mixture of videos, speeches, breakout rooms and panel discussions. Again, let me give you the running order. First, the Archbishop of York will speak for 40 minutes, including showing three videos. He will then explain how the breakout rooms will work and it is hoped that those will be in diocesan groups.

From 10.10 to 10.40, we will run the breakout rooms. We will then come back to a panel discussion for 30 minutes. That is 10.40 to 11.10. We will then head back into

breakout rooms for ten minutes for prayer. That is 11.10 to 11.20. At 11.20, for the last ten minutes, until 11.30, the Archbishop of York will wrap up. Over to you, Archbishop.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you very much. If all that goes to plan, I think it will be something amazing, but let us hope that God's Holy Spirit will put the wind in our sails this morning as we look to the Vision and Strategy for our Church of England over the coming ten years. Let me begin with a piece of Scripture that has inspired me and those of us I have been working with throughout this year. St Paul's second letter to the church in Corinth 5:17: "If anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation".

It seems to me that some of the greatest transformations in Church history have come from a reflection on a single verse from Scripture and I just wonder whether this piece of Scripture might be the one for us right now, because it is through our life in Christ that we and the whole Church and the whole world is made new. How urgently we need such a vision for our Church and for our world today.

My dear friends, things change because Christ changes us because it is his Church not ours. It is his ministry not ours. It is Christ's Church and Christ's ministry in all of us and in a thousand different expressions of Church and all the parishes that make up the Church of England, for Christ plays in 10,000 places, lovely in limbs and lovely in eyes not his. We have not really ever tried this before – and I will be the first to admit we may never try it again – but the work that I have been asked to lead is to discern the Vision and Strategy for the Church of England in the 2020s.

That is the vision that will guide us for the next ten years and today is a beginning and there is much work for all of us to do. I realise there has been anxiety about this, but neither have we gone about this work in a conventional way. There has not been a working party. There has not been a committee. Rather, we have embarked upon a large consultative and iterative process involving hundreds of people, including quite a number of Synod members, but particularly engaging younger and more diverse voices than is usually the case.

Only last week, over 150 children and young people were part of this consultation and, if there is time in the wrap-up, I will end with one of their dreams for our Church. The first stage of this process culminated in the bishops and diocesan secretaries of the Church of England meeting to agree the main parts of this Vision and Strategy. This was also a first. Amazingly, we had never met like this before. However, it is the General Synod of the Church of England that has governance responsibility which necessarily includes agreeing priorities and allocating resources, not least the rather important business of making sure we put our money where our mouth is.

Over the years, some of us, myself included, have often wondered what the phrase "episcopally led and synodically governed" actually means. I dare to hope that this morning we are about to find out, for with the diocesan secretaries, the Bishops of the

Church of England are now sharing with the General Synod a vision that we believe that God has laid upon us and we have already agreed this.

From it, a number of strategic priorities emerge. It is these that will come back to the General Synod in February for agreement and endorsement and, then, all the other work that will flow from this, not least our heartfelt prayer which is the most important work we do. But today is the first opportunity for the whole Synod to engage with the vision itself and begin to see the direction that we believe God may be prompting from us. We invite you, Synod, to be part of this ongoing discernment and development and begin the process of putting the vision to work in every part of our Church.

Of course, this work exists alongside and informs the work of other groups mentioned yesterday, such as the Governance and Recovery Groups and the Transforming Effectiveness Group. All these groups work together but we believe it is this vision that will shape them all. Working with Dave Male, the Director of Evangelism and Discipleship, Debbie Clinton and one or two others in a small oversight role of the process, we offer you this vision on a single piece of paper. We hope this may mean it is simple as well as engaging, permissive as well as clear, but I also recognise that it leaves plenty of room to read between the lines and there are advantages and disadvantages in that.

Let me now share this vision with you. Hopefully, it is going to come up on the screen. Here it is. We start at the centre, not immediately with the words themselves but for a moment just the image that you are looking at. As you look at that small circle in the middle of a large blank piece of paper, what do you see? Well, it could be several things. It could be the centre of a target that we are aiming at. It could be the hub of a wheel which will turn, bringing the movement of the spirit into the life of the Church. It could be the central ring of an ancient and ever expanding tree. It could be a pebble dropped into the centre of a lake whose ripples flow out, bringing refreshment and disturbance in equal measure.

However you see it – and different interpretations are encouraged – what you are looking at is the heart of the vision that we believe God is calling us to. Needless to say, we are not saying anything original. How could we? The vision for what it means to be the Church of Jesus Christ does not change. It is not something that we make up in each generation. It is something we proclaim afresh. But there are also times in our life – and I believe that the great challenge facing the world because of Covid-19 is one such time – when God recalls us to a central vocation which is to be a people who are centred on Christ.

This is the heart of the vision: to be a Christ-centred, which means Jesus Christ-centred, and Jesus Christ-shaped Church. In the papers that have gone online this morning, you will find a theological paper, *Salt from the Earth*, from the Bishop of Oxford on this central point. He speaks about a fundamental and life-giving shift in our common Vision and Strategy from a task-centred to a Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped

approach. Of course, there will be tasks and Synod will have a very big say and a very big place in their development.

The other groups that are meeting are already addressing some of the most challenging questions we face in order to simplify our governance, improve our effectiveness and face the challenges that Covid-19 has both created and revealed. But – and Synod it is a very big and most important “but” – I know there has been huge anxiety about what this vision might be. But, this is it, you are looking at it now. There is nothing more but, also, Synod, nothing less than this. We have to start with a renewal of our life in Christ, a renewal of prayer and worship, a biblical and theological renewal where we grow in intimacy with God and overflow with the love of Christ and are able to give a reason for the hope that is in us.

Our first priority is to be a people of prayer, rooted in the revelation of God’s love for us in Jesus Christ, the one who died for us and rose again and who pours his spirit into our hearts for our renewal and for the renewal of the earth. This revelation is given to us in the Scriptures we cherish. It is lived out in the life and traditions of our Church, not least as Anglicans throughout our liturgy and through our commitment to be the presence of Christ in every community in this land because, alongside the phrase “Christ-centred”, you also see the phrase “Jesus-shaped”.

Of course, let me make this clear, we make no distinction between Christ and Jesus. The two phrases are simply a shorter way of saying we are called to be Jesus Christ-centred and Jesus Christ-shaped. Jesus Christ is the second person of the Trinity, fully God, and the one through whom we have access to God. It is in Jesus Christ and, therefore, in the trinitarian life of God that we root ourselves.

We also know the son of God as Jesus of Christ, Mary’s son, the preacher and healer from Nazareth who is still the same Jesus Christ, the one we read about in Scripture, the man who shared our life on Earth, lived a life like ours, taught and healed and showed us what our humanity could be, who died upon the cross for our salvation and whom God raised to life. This, dear sisters and brothers of Synod, is the faith to which we are recalled.

In many provinces of the Anglican Communion, this phrase, “Jesus-shaped”, is used to describe the Christian life as a life shaped by the Five Marks of Mission. I do not think the Church of England has ever formally endorsed these Five Marks, though this is something we may now wish to consider. But in the Anglican Communion they do not just see these as Marks of the Mission of the Church but as Marks of Discipleship; that is, to see our lives as disciples of Jesus Christ as being shaped by the Five Marks of Mission, a Jesus-shaped life. Therefore, this vision is simply and fundamentally about recalling the Church of England at this time of crisis and opportunity to its primary vocation, to be Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped, Jesus Christ-centred, and Jesus Christ-shaped.

As I have said, to arrive at this most simple and yet most profound of starting points, hundreds and hundreds of people have been involved in prayerful discussions. Throughout this presentation, as we look in a moment at the strategic priorities that arise from this vision, we have got some short films from people who have helped in the perspective giving us their perspective. First, we are going to hear from Christian Selvaratnam, who is a theological educator and church planter here in York.

(Video played)

Revd Dr Christian Selvaratnam (York): “Being Christ-centred is central to the Christian faith. Without needing an agenda, we are called to centre our lives on the living Christ, to be with him, to be known by him and to know him and, then, from this flows our mission. It is like the other side of the coin because we are in Christ, we cannot be silent or remain inactive. We must speak in Jesus’s name and acting truly in Jesus’s name is acting in the power of God not the limits of our talents. So we are both called to be with Jesus and called to be sent out by him.

The Marks of our Mission flow from our living relationship with Jesus, hand in hand being inwardly Christ-centred and outwardly Jesus-shaped, each one renewing the other. When I think of being Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped in the local church, I think of the emerging generation. You have such a great passion for prayer and for worship and for the mission of Jesus through his Church.

In the church that I lead, nearly all of our ministry projects have arisen as ideas from ordinary members of the church. That has resulted in nearly all of our evangelistic projects, social action and the passion to make Jesus known to the local community. I think of the students and young adults who are concerned for the homeless people on the streets of our city, so they started ROOF – which stands for Reaching our Outside Friends. They ran some events to raise some money and then each week they got together to pray, to worship, to cook some food and then they took these meals out to the homeless people that they were getting to know.

The next decade will be so critical for the Church of England. Romans 5 says that faith that brings us into a living relationship with Jesus Christ helps us in challenges. It produces hope and that hope does not disappoint us. My biggest hope for the Church of England over the next decade is hope itself, hope placed in the living Jesus Christ. I hope that, over the next ten years, we will go back to the heart of our tradition and faith and be radical disciples, following in the footsteps of the great and ordinary saints who went before us, proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ, in love, caring for people’s needs, calling them to be disciples and followers, transforming society, revitalising churches and starting new churches”.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Before we go on to look at the strategic priorities that emerge from the heart of this vision, I wonder whether we could just try to live out the vision for a minute or so by pausing for some

private prayer and reflection and a picture should come up in a second to help us with this.

The picture is by Gillian Bell-Richards and you can probably tell it is of the Emmaus Road story. There in the centre you see the encounter with Jesus as he breaks the bread. On the left-hand panel as you look at it, you see Jesus walking with them, breaking open the Scriptures, still not yet recognised but with them, and then on the right-hand panel you can just see them in the distance, they have been turned around. They are rushing back to Jerusalem. They cannot wait to share with others the good news that they have received.

There is Jesus at the centre of this picture breaking bread, at the centre of this picture coming alongside us breaking open the Scriptures. There is Jesus sending us out by his spirit. As we think about what it means for us, for our Church, for our dioceses, for our Church of England to be recalled to the central vocation, Christ-centred, Jesus-shaped, let us pause for a minute and pray that the Holy Spirit will guide the Church of England to take hold of this vision and to be transformed so that we can transform the world.

So if we could move on with the picture that now begins to build up. We will return to the centre and from this centre particular strategic priorities begin to emerge and they form the three segments of the next ring that flows from the central vision. These are the things that have emerged from our discussion so far.

There may be more, but these are the things that we believe that God might be calling us, us as the whole Church, us as the Synod, to address. The first is this. We believe that God might be calling us to be much more a Church of missionary disciples – and please note the language, we believe that God might be calling us. What I am sharing with you today is the fruits of contemplation and discussion, not the latest set of whizzy ideas or management targets.

We believe that we are an apostolic Church, that God calls each one of us to be a missionary disciple. This is something that we have been saying in this Synod for some time, particularly through initiatives like *Everyday Faith* and *Setting God's People Free*, but now is the time for us to state this more boldly as a strategic imperative. We chose the phrase “missionary disciples” carefully.

In the New Testament, the same twelve who are named disciples are also called apostles, but there is no point in the New Testament when they graduate from one to the other. They are always those who gather around Jesus and follow him, and they are always those who are sent out by him. And it must be the same with us. We are called to gather around Jesus in worship, prayer and fellowship, and in the power of the Holy Spirit we are sent out by Jesus to be his witnesses and ambassadors, drawing explicitly on the Five Marks of Mission at the centre, the Five Marks also of Discipleship.

Now if we adopt this strategic priority in February, we will need to work out what extra resource and realignment of resources is needed so that every Christian community, be it a tiny multi-parish rural benefice, a chaplaincy in an Oxford college or a church plant on an outer estate, is able to help the people it serves become missionary disciples.

This will involve a life of prayer, a greater emphasis on catechesis, a deeper rooting in Scripture and then a larger vision of what it means to live out our Christian vocation in and for the world, especially taking hold of those Marks of Mission which require us to challenge the unjust structures of our society, to serve the poor, to build communities of peace and make good on our existing bold commitment to be carbon neutral by 2030.

The key performance indicator here will be the number of feet we wash, not the number of people attending our services, though we hope by God's grace both will grow. The next segment says that we believe God might be calling us to be a Church where mixed ecology is the norm. I do not know how you respond to the phrase "mixed ecology". Some people may be anxious that this moves the Church of England away from its historic parish structure. Others may welcome it as a way of embracing new forms of Church, the ones that have proliferated in the last 30 years or so.

I see it this way. The Church of Jesus Christ has always been a mixed ecology. Every church, even St Peter's in Rome, was planted once. Here is what I suggest you do. Next time you are in your parish church, remind yourself of this by going and standing beneath the board in the church that lists the names and dates of the clergy who have served there and, then, do this.

Let us say, as is the case in York Minster, where I have my seat, the first date says, "627: Paulinus", what you have got to do is ask yourself what happened in 626? Well, the answer is this. A bunch of men and women whose lives were centred on Christ and shaped by his life so longed to share this with others and see it bring transformation to the world that they planted a new church. That is how every church begins.

Mixed ecology simply acknowledges that there have always been and will always be different ways of being church and, at our best, they live together in a mixed ecology. Therefore, on the one hand, by using this phrase we simply acknowledge what is but also signal the fact that, in the diverse smorgasbord of the different cultures and contexts which we serve in England today, we will probably need a greater and more diverse expression of church life, hence that proliferation of mission initiatives, church plants, fresh expressions, new religious communities and, this year, the remarkable new communities of faith that have been established online.

All this is a sign of how the Holy Spirit has been leading the Church of England in recent years, noting that the most vibrant and creative new expressions of church life nearly always arise out of healthy, flourishing parish ministry. However, we must acknowledge that the parish system we have inherited was itself a consequence of missionary

endeavour by a Church that was formed and ministered in very different ways – as it happens, almost entirely communal and monastic.

I, therefore, believe that, alongside the flourishing of parish ministry and recognising in these constrained financial times it is always going to be a challenge to do this, we will see God raise up new forms of church and particularly new forms of community life. In fact, of course, it is already happening. Please note that chaplaincy is included. Although often neglected in our thinking, chaplaincy is a ministry that is always on the edge. Whether Church is alongside and ministers to the networks of the world and there is a growing demand for it, it will be a very important part of our future. It also means developing our online presence and ministry. This has been one of the biggest developments of 2020 and will form a vital part of the mixed ecology Church of England of the future.

If we adopt this strategic priority in February, we will need to work out what it means for the way we order and resource our life, not least how clergy and lay ministers are selected, trained, deployed and supported in their ministry. This is a very challenging and exhausting time for clergy. I recognise that some will hear this as another example of a tough job only getting tougher, but with the Clergy Covenant in place I hope that people will hear support of clergy and lay ministers is put alongside the training and deployment issues we must face.

This will be challenging, it will be painful, but it is also hugely exciting as we face the same challenges that we read about in the New Testament as the Gospel crosses boundaries and is birthed in new communities. It is, therefore, only what a faithful Church has always been doing.

Finally, our third strategic priority shows that diversity needs to be held together in unity by making sure we put proper resources into all the different expressions of Church life. So our third proposed priority is this. We believe God is calling us to be a younger and more diverse Church, a Church that serves children and young people and involves them in its leadership and ministry, a Church where black lives matter, a Church for the disabled, a Church that reflects the great biblical vision where every tribe and tongue and people and nation are gathered together and our ministry looks like the community it serves.

Diversity of age and colour and disability and ethnicity is never for us simply a matter of inclusion. It is a biblical imperative and it is the means whereby we will be best able to evangelise our nation and find the very best ways forward for all voices to be heard. Again, much work is happening in these areas already, particularly through our schools and chaplaincies and other initiatives – though with the recent formation of the Archbishops Task Force on race we, shamefully, recognise our failure to root out racism in the Church, recognise our bias or face the issues of prevalent whiteness. But this can change, and by clearly making it a priority we believe that in this next decade we can become a more diverse Church and better serve this nation.

Other issues of diversity also challenge us. With the publication of *Living in Love and Faith*, we now enter into a period of reflective learning as we, the whole Church, are challenged afresh to honour each other and see Christ in each other. If we adopt this strategic priority in February, tough decisions will follow about resourcing and we will have to face up to past failings.

The final circle is neither a vision statement nor a strategic priority but a vital restatement of the reality of what it means to be the Church of England. Any vision and strategy is only as good as the good it does in shaping the visions and strategies of the local church. That is what matters, the thousands of parishes, chaplaincies, Church schools, church plants, religious communities, fresh expressions, mission initiatives, messy churches, food banks and refugee ministries.

This is the Church of England in all its glorious, every inch of the map covered, diversity. Our hope is that this vision and these three strategic priorities will creatively interact with and provoke the dioceses and local churches that make up the Church of England to renew its life in Christ and growing congregations of missionary disciples that are younger and more diverse and better serving the breadth and diversity of our nation become the Church of the networks of the 21st century as well as its neighbourhoods.

This is not a series of tasks but about being centred on Christ, but a thousand tasks will flow from it and the most important will probably be the decisions and initiatives that are taken not here in the General Synod but at the local level in local churches. To hear a reflection about what these three strategic priorities might mean, we are now going to hear from Victoria James, the diocesan secretary in Portsmouth.

(Video played)

Ms Victoria James: “The Church of England vision is to be truly the Church for all people in all places. So, recognising where we already have strengths, our strategic priorities must recognise particularly where we need to give greater attention to those we have been less engaged with. This is why we are looking to ensure that we are younger and more diverse, to be missionary disciples and a mixed ecology should be our norm. If, across the Church of England, we can embed these strategic propositions, then local churches will be reaching more people in more ways and connecting with new people in new ways.

I am excited by the prospect that, in every area, the local churches and parishes are meeting the needs of all in their communities through diverse offerings relevant to their individual contexts and that, as a Church, we can celebrate and rejoice in our diversity. We will then be a Church meeting people where they are and connecting in new and different ways.

I hope that, in ten years’ time, local churches in all their different expressions mean something to everyone in their communities and that even those who do not attend

worship can articulate how the Church is supporting and serving them and their community. We will then be a Church which is felt to be relevant to all. My biggest hope for the Church of England over the next decade is that we become fully representative of the communities we serve and that we are meaningfully touching the lives of those with whom we are not currently engaging and who have not come to know the love of Jesus Christ”.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Synod, we are on the final straight of this presentation and, in a couple of minutes, I will be inviting you to go into your breakout groups. You can see the centre of the vision to be Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped. You can see the three strategic priorities that have emerged. You can see that the vision is to serve the networks of the Church in the dioceses and parishes and other expressions of Church life.

But, around the outside, three other words have emerged through this year that I want to share with you. They are, “Simpler, humbler, bolder”. You may have heard them a few times in the Synod already. These words are not strategic aims. I see them as virtues that we believe God is calling from us at this particular point in our history, and they run through the vision and shape all that we do and all that we are and all that we long for.

First of all, simpler, simpler because we have to recognise that we are not as big a Church as we used to be. Yes, there might be too much bureaucracy, and the work of the Simplification Agenda that this Synod has pioneered is really important and, as other groups look at our governance structure and other areas of our life together, it is this simplicity that must shine through.

Secondly, humbler, humbler first because we are having to face our failures and this is not easy for us. The IICSA report has held up a very shaming mirror to the Church of England, and we must, with great haste, move this agenda forwards and become a safe Church. Particularly, we need to change the culture of the Church, and it should be marked by a much greater humility. We also need to recognise that we are not the only Christian show in town. We need to work with other denominations and, where appropriate and where we can, with other faiths and with all people of goodwill, and we must learn to live within our means.

Then, thirdly, bolder. We must be bolder because the love of Christ compels us. We have a Gospel to proclaim and we live and minister in a world of much pain and confusion. The things that have been entrusted to us in Christ are the very things the world needs, the things it cries out for. We must show people the beauty and the purposes of Christ and build God’s Kingdom in the world. Our determination to be carbon neutral by 2030, this could be the first of a number of prophetic gestures we make to the world to show the world that, with God, all things are possible and that, in Christ, God has a vision for every person and a vision for the world.

Dear friends on Synod, let me make this clear. I want the Church of England to be the Church for all people in all places. I do not know how God will bless and use these ideas I have shared with you this morning. I do not know how you are going to respond to them. But, with simplicity, humility and boldness, I offer them to you today for your prayerful deliberation, believing that if anyone is in Christ there is a new creation and it is that desire for us to be Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped which is the simple message I believe God might be calling us to bear to the Church and, then, through the Church, we might change the world. This is how things change. It happens when we are rooted in Christ.

Finally, before we move into our groups, Emma Parker, the Deputy Warden at Cranmer Hall, is going to give her response to these three virtues.

(Video played)

Ms Emma Parker: “For the Church of England, being guided by the virtues of humbler, bolder and simpler means that, whereas our natural inclination can be to see barriers, boundaries and walls, us and them, God simply sees one category of all, all who deserve and need his grace and mercy. Being humbler reminds us that we are not part of the Church because of any kind of superiority, but because of the gift of faith given freely to all. Being humbler means that we recognise what God is doing beyond ourselves and position ourselves to learn from others. Being humbler means having an altruist orientated heart and a heavily orientated soul.

Being bolder reminds us that, because God sees no boundaries, so we too should be a barrier-breaking Church that prophetically reveals reality and interprets it through the vision of Christ. Being bolder is about realising that, in order for one to flourish, all need to flourish, that the Church can truly only flourish if other communities flourish and our communities only flourish if the Church flourishes. We need to be bold about our belief that Jesus brings life to all.

Finally, being simpler means that we need to search for ways that will help us to reach the vision that Jesus has for us and other communities in a way that gets us there without being distracted and it means being realistic about our resources in a way that is releasing and life-giving for all. In reality, for the local context within which we find ourselves, the virtues of humbler, bolder and simpler mean that, as we look ahead, we are challenged but also inspired. For example, these virtues might challenge us to look down our to-do lists or our PCC agendas and ask ourselves if our items reflect these virtues.

Now these virtues are hardly surprising, but does our practice match our theology? Are our relationships, for example, with children marked with humility, while we are willing to learn from them, protect them and enable them to lead us? My biggest hope for the Church of England over the next ten years would be that, instead of our default being to put our sense of security in our power and control, we would put our security in the

dynamism of God's spirit, learn to love the freedom of Christ and run towards the holiness of our Father.

In other words, my biggest hope is that we trust in God more fully to be the saviour of all and restorer of all creation because everything else that we dare to dream of will follow, whether that is the eradication of child poverty and the environment fully restored and properly cared for. Everything else will follow if we humble ourselves more fully before God, if we pray more boldly in hope and if we simply focus our vision on the task before us in the building up of God's Kingdom".

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Synod, I do hope you are all still there. I am aware that the thing about having anything on Zoom is it is a fantastic opportunity for displacement activity. I have to admit I have been on many Zoom conferences which I have treated rather like having the radio on in the background and I have been doing my emails or doing something else while it is happening, but I do hope you are still there. We are just about on time, amazingly.

In a moment, you are going to be put into breakout groups, which I think, if it works, you will find yourself with others from your diocese so that we can begin to see how this flows through the Church of England, through our dioceses, through our parishes, because that is where it has arisen from. This vision has not come from me. It has come from this huge conversation with lots and lots of ordinary Christian people from every part of our Church.

So these are the questions. What does this mean for your diocese and for the development of your own diocesan strategy? What are you already doing and, particularly, what would you expect Synod to do, if we adopted these priorities in February? And, of course, what is missing?

The task is, if there is one thing you would like to say to us, the little panel who will be coming together in about half an hour, then, what I am suggesting is, when it comes to putting up blue hands for questions, perhaps the groups could nominate somebody to put up your blue hand with your question from your group and we will deal with as many as we can. But I do hope that, whatever is not dealt with today, you will feel free to email me directly or somebody else to get to me because we do want to hear your feedback as this develops.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop. So I now adjourn this sitting and invite members to join breakout groups until 10.40 and then we will come back together. If Zoom crashes, please do log back on using the link for today and I will outline how we will continue.

Hello, Synod. Unfortunately, some people managed to get into breakout groups and some people did not and so we will resume at half past to go into the panel time.

Sorry about that, Synod. We will now move into our panel time and, so, please, would you ask questions by raising your blue hand and then I will hand over to the Archbishop and his panel to answer the questions. I will be taking them in groups of three.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I have two very brief questions. Why was this Synod not part of the discerning and development of the Church's vision early on when even non-Anglicans had a say? Do you not think this Synod had any fruits or wisdom to offer before now? And, surely, if the Bishops have already agreed this, is it not too late to ask our views? And will the Bishops be taking their expenses, chauffeurs and large houses before cutting clergy numbers or closing parishes?

Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle): I am certainly quite excited by the Vision and Strategy that has been presented to us this morning. Up in Cumbria, we are in the middle of refreshing our vision and strategy for the next five years, having been pursuing a strategy now for the last five years and it seems to me that it is important that our diocesan strategies can actually connect into this strategy for the Church as a whole. But, if we are going to do that in a meaningful way, it would help us to know to what extent this is now really a very firm Vision and Strategy that we can rely on, or is it potentially going to be changing over the next sort of six months, a year or so. I do not mind it being fleshed out, but to what extent can we really now rely on it as we relate our strategies to it?

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much for that Vision and Strategy, I agree with it all. I think it will land very well in Liverpool. I just have one question about it being easily understood and that is about the phrasing, "mixed ecology". Could you explain how you arrived at that rather than "new congregations" or "new worshipping communities" or "more"?

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): First of all, thank you for the questions. I think perhaps I should take the first one from Sam and then I will hand over to other panel members. To save time, I will let them introduce themselves. Sam, you and I have had the conversation outside of Synod about this and I apologise if I have not made things clear.

First of all, lots and lots of Synod people have been involved. Secondly, we have done it differently and if we had done it the normal way and just brought a paper very few people would have been involved. Thirdly, the vision is to be Christ-centred. When I say that is all, that is what the vision is, to be Christ-centred, and it is not something that anybody has made up. It is about recalling us to our central vocation.

The strategic priorities, which we are suggesting today, will come back to Synod for discussion and endorsement. Synod may not agree with them. I am sure other priorities will emerge; it would be strange if they did not. We now begin an iterative process, but it is the role of the Bishops to lead in the teaching and proclamation of the Christian faith and we, as Bishops, take that responsibility seriously. Having prayerfully

discerned this with hundreds and hundreds of other people, it is our view that now is the time when we need to recall the Church of England to its central vocation to be people who live their lives in Christ.

So, let us be clear, that is the vision, but it is that which is the thing that we share. The strategy, we now begin discussing it and nothing has been decided, though, of course, I am really excited by these priorities as I believe many other members of this Synod and in the wider Church who have shared in the process are as well.

Chris, you asked about how firm this is. Well, I have already started to answer that. The vision is the vision which is recalling us to something. The strategic priorities will develop in different ways. One of our panel members is Oliver Home, who is a diocesan secretary himself in Bristol. Perhaps, Oliver, you could say a bit more about this.

Mr Oliver Home: Thank you, Archbishop. As I understand it, the vision has been laid out today. This would have been a great opportunity, if the breakouts had worked, for General Synod reps to discuss in their diocesan groups what that means in their own contexts in their own dioceses, how it interacts with diocesan strategies and visions that exist or are emerging.

Clearly, this is a country of the Church where we are reviewing what we do next. The Church today and our communities today are very different from what they were like ten months ago and I imagine in ten months' time. When we start to embed this vision and the national strategy in our own context, it will have changed again. In our diocese, just by way of example, we are in the process of embarking on a new listening engagement process to discern our way ahead.

Clearly, the national vision will feed into that and help shape that and be an input into that. We will all be in different places in our local communities in terms of our plans and in our dioceses. This needs to be, as Archbishop Stephen said, a kind of interact with but also provoke what we do next and how we plan for the future.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, Oliver. The third question was about mixed ecology. Partly the answer to that is that we want to expand the definition of mixed ecology beyond the sort of parish or church plant to include chaplaincy and to include digital. Perhaps one of the people who helped in the discernment process is Molly. Molly, please introduce yourself and give us your reflections on what mixed ecology might mean from where you look at things.

Ms Molly Boot: Hi, my name is Molly. I am currently in the discernment process in the Church of England, discerning vocation to ministry, and, as I discern, I am excited to be part of a Church that is truly a mixed ecology already. This is a process of discernment that we have been engaging in and, therefore, part of that is prophetically calling out who we already are and who Christ is already calling us to be.

I can only speak for myself in my engagement with this process from the Future Search Conference at the beginning to having had the privilege of speaking into some of their conversations with bishops and diocesan secretaries a couple of months ago.

The mixed ecology point is incredibly exciting to me. It is about making sure that everywhere, where Christ is present and active and inviting us to join in with him in his ministry in the Church and in the world, the Church is equipped to be able to do so from a resourcing point of view, from a recognition of ministry point of view and from a training point of view. As someone who is at the beginning of that journey of discernment, I am excited to join in with a Church that is committed to recognising a whole variety of very creative and diverse ministries and helping to enable those to bear fruit.

The Chair: Before we come to the next set of three questions, let me just outline how we will proceed from this time onwards because we will not try the breakout rooms again. We will continue this panel discussion and questions until 11 o'clock. I will then invite the Archbishop to speak again for ten minutes. That will be the end of this item of business and we will then be able to move onto the draft Cathedrals Measure after we have had a screen break.

Please, keep your questions short and responses brief so we can get through several contributions. Please, do be reminded, if you have put in a request to speak you also need to put up your blue hand so that we know you are here and you want to still ask your question.

Revd Graham Sparkes (Ecumenical Representatives): Thank you, Archbishop Stephen, for this morning and the presentation. It was rich in so many ways. I particularly welcome the way you drew us back to such core, simple commitments and, yet, made them contextual for our life today within the Church of God. I do not wish in any way to make your task more complex – it is complex enough as it is – but I wonder has there been or might there be some opportunity for ecumenical and international perspectives to play a part in this whole process?

The Church of England has enormous reach around the world and in shaping the life of all the churches of this country, and I think I speak for my ecumenical colleagues here in saying that our desire would be to enrich this process and to be enriched by it. Dare I say, when we are talking about mission, discipleship and centring ourselves on Christ, these things are too important to be left to the Church of England alone.

Ms Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council): I feel very inspired and hopeful, so thank you to all those involved. There are many young people who attach to diocesan youth councils and youth forums from around the country as well as members of the recently disbanded Church of England Youth Council. Archbishop, what efforts have been made to consult and engage these young people who are keen to be actively

involved in the Church of England decision-making processes but are not attending Church of England schools?

Revd Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities & TElS): Archbishop, your enthusiasm is infectious, so thank you. My question is to explore, as a theological educator myself, there is an element that is kind of missing and that is the element of learning. As you pointed out, as part of the Church being humble, there needs to be some humility that we as a Church need to learn, that we do not have to all the time teach, especially in the context of so many young people and millions of them walking away from the Church. I am wondering whether we need to add on another virtue, as you have highlighted, the virtue of being prudent, being wise, through learning what we as a Church need to understand in the current context so that we can be a better Church, being better, humbler and bolder?

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you for those three really important questions. I will ask Dr Sanjay Perera in a moment to address Graham's question. Just to assure Graham, I hoped there was enough in the text to make it clear that humbler really does mean recognising we are not the only show in town, which I think were the words I used. The inspiration for Jesus-shaped has come from the wider Anglican Communion where this phrase is commonplace in their understanding of discipleship and we thought was worth taking on ourselves. But one of the people who has been helping with the process throughout the year is Sanjay. Perhaps, Sanjay, you could reflect a bit on this.

Dr Sanjay Perera: Hello, Synod. I am not clergy or somebody who is employed by the Church. I am laity who has served in the Diocese of Liverpool and now in the Diocese of Birmingham for the last 20 years, but I was born and served in various dioceses across the Anglican Communion.

When I was invited to the discernment process last May, I was very aware that, whilst this is a mission for the Church of England, we kept the Anglican Communion and all Christian communities in our sight because the heart of the calling of God is for the whole people of God. It encompasses the entire planet. We want to be a Church for the entire world. We do not want to become an isolated or exclusive Church. I felt that this was very much represented in all that was said in prayer, in our theological reflections and our biblical considerations.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Sophie, to assure you that, actually, I know a few members of Synod have felt uncomfortable about the fact that we did not just have a committee and produce a paper. I am proud of the fact that we have gone about this in a different way, involving hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people, particularly the people who came to the Future Search Conference and, indeed, our Schools Conference, of course, were many young people. Synod, what you are hearing through this is young people's voices. You are also hearing the voices of those from diverse backgrounds who are not usually well represented. Again,

I think I must now turn to Molly, who has been one of the people who has emerged in this process, to perhaps say a bit more to you, Sophie.

Ms Molly Boot: I think that, honestly, we can always do a much better job at listening to a wide range of voices. My answer to your question would be that this is the beginning of a process of discernment that will run all the way through the next ten years. I think that, all the way through that process, all we can do is keep working to hear a wider and wider range of prophetic voices which come from the edges and from the places where we would not usually look. I can only speak for myself to say what a privilege it has been to be in the room, but I am one of those people who was invited to be in the room and would hope that I can use that privilege to extend that invitation further as this process continues.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): The third question was about theological learning. Other virtues are available. We do not just have to stick with simpler, humbler, bolder; we can be wiser as well. But, perhaps, Sanjay, do you mind if I come back to you. I know you know each other, but Sanjay is also a theological educator. Can I also point you in the direction of Steven Croft's theological reflection, which will be available on the Church of England website.

Dr Sanjay Perera: Again, as I do, living among ordinands, I am very aware about how this vision, which is still very much at the beginning, it is an iterative process – might impact the theological learning not just of ordinands and those in formation, not just of clergy, not just those who are employed by Christian processes, who are employed within the Church but for the whole people of God. I think that has been very much a part of the process. The Bishop of Oxford's theological reflection speaks of this, how we must continue to replenish theological learning within our mission and calling. I am confident that that is where we are going to as we continue in the next couple of years.

The Chair: Now we come to our next three questions.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): Can I just say how much I appreciate the profound work that has been done as part of this process. I feel somewhat embarrassed as someone who, at least for some, has a reputation as an expansive, arguably unorthodox theologian, but what might you say to a hoary old theologian like me who suggests that the tagline at the heart of the vision is heretical and, indeed, falls into the Nestorian heresy?

Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester): Thank you very much, Archbishop Stephen and your team. You said in your presentation that we are hearing the voices of the young people. I am not too sure whether you have got young people of BAME heritage in your cohort. I would have been happier if one or two of them had been here to express their views.

Revd Dr Amatu Christian-Iwuagwu (London): I am very excited about this strategy and thank you very much for the effort put into it. However, what I did not hear is if we are to grow, and this is a ten-year strategy, you must have an idea of how these will be controlled or reassessed. You mentioned the KPI, but there are no staged gate reviews, so points where we would have to stop and gauge what we are doing and then decide whether we are going to go forward or not with those strategies. Secondly, resourcing. Those in the parish are the ones who will be actually living and implementing these strategies. How many of my colleagues are in that strategic mindset? A lot of training will need to be done in order to start having transforming conversations with those on the ground who will be running the project.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, again, three really important questions. Rachel, first of all, I need to be clear that we are not trying to revive the Nestorian heresy. There has been a lot of conversation behind the scenes on this very topic. I hope the commentary alongside the diagram made it absolutely clear. I had one eye on this question arising because this matters very deeply to me theologically that it is Jesus Christ-centred and Jesus Christ-shaped.

At the moment, we are using that shorthand and my hope and prayer is that because the two words are clearly alongside each other, as they appear in our liturgy, and because the commentary makes it very clear that it is Jesus Christ-shaped, Jesus Christ-centred, I am hoping that you might be satisfied and that we will not unwittingly be presenting ideas about the person of Christ which are not the faith that we have received. I recognise there may need to be some further discussion about that, but I know you are not suggesting it is intended. I do seriously take the point and there has been discussion about it amongst theologians and, on balance, we believe that, if the commentary is clear, the tag phrase works.

Addy, you asked about the presence of BAME young people today. We can only have a panel of four and I hope what has been very notable throughout this process, not least in the presentation and the panel today, is I really do believe that the process we have been part of to arrive here has never involved such diversity from every bit of our Church. No, there is no BAME young person today, but I just wonder whether Sanjay and Molly wanted to make a very brief comment. Sanjay, do you want to go first.

Dr Sanjay Perera: Throughout the process that I have been involved with, there has been, without naming names – which I am not sure I am allowed to do given GDPR – BAME young people within the Shaping Group and the Future Search Conference. We were each asked to nominate ten people and we each nominated a considerable number of BAME young people just to ensure that the Church of England does not revert back to a sort of a status quo that did not reflect the whole people of God.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Molly, do you want to say something on this?

Ms Molly Boot: I would just echo what has already been said, really, that diversity has been the watchword all the way through this process and should continue to be. Like I said, I think we can only ever expand our engagement. If this is a vision that we choose to take ownership of, then black minority ethnic young people in every place, whether that is at a national, local or very local parish level, are those leaders who we need to be prioritising in taking ownership of this incarnational ministry that we proclaim as the Church of England. I personally am very excited about seeing that continue as we raise up young leaders.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Then, thirdly, Amatu raised a really important question about how we go forward. I just need to remind Synod that what we are really presenting today is the vision to be Jesus Christ-centred, Jesus Christ-shaped, and then the strategy. There is lots more work to do, which I will say more about in my summing-up. Oliver is a diocesan secretary. This is very much what he is living with day by day and so, Oliver, do you want to make a respond to Amatu, please.

Mr Oliver Home: What we have today is offering the vision and priorities, as Archbishop Stephen said. This is for us all to work with. I think the first step is for us to wrestle with that, to ask the wider Church to join in with what is being discussed today. At the same time, of course, we need to think about what the implications of this might be. Again, we are a complex system. We are made up of thousands and thousands of parts. We are inviting all those parts to join in and to think about what that means. But that does need a level of understanding the interdependencies both at national, local diocesan level, how we interact together, how we interact with our theological education and other parts of the Church and our ecumenical partners.

At the moment, we have some groups working on that that will be bringing back, we hope, some headline ways in which that might happen in February and then there will be further work interacting again with local and diocesan planning and pursuit. But the key thing right now, I think, is to pray, to participate and to join in and to offer into that because the picture we have across this Church is wonderfully diverse. We want it to be more so and we need to bring those different ideas into play and see how they interact and, therefore, how we can plan together for the future.

The Chair: We have had the 30-minute panel discussion as planned. We were going to go into breakout rooms again but, because it did not work last time, I will go straight to the Archbishop of York and ask him to wrap up, taking not more than ten minutes, please. That will allow us to take our screen break from ten minutes past eleven to half past eleven, which will then mean that we can move onto the draft Cathedrals Measure, an important piece of legislation, slightly earlier than planned, so we have got plenty of time to debate that. So, over to you, Archbishop.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you very much and thank you, Synod, and I am sorry we did not have time for more questions.

Perhaps the most important thing I could say is we do really want to hear your questions, your comments and your observations. Please, please, feed those in. Thank you to Sanjay, Oliver and Molly for being on the panel with me and for the part they have played with many others in this ongoing process of discernment.

Let me just reiterate the point that what we share with you today is the vision to be Jesus Christ-centred, Jesus Christ-shaped. We are showing you the strategic priorities that will come back to Synod in February, fleshed out. There are different groups working on those at the moment. All those groups involve a diversity of people and those groups will come back with some actual strategic policy or suggested policy and ideas attached to each of them for further discussion and deliberation, and so we will go on.

Today, we are at the beginning of a ten-year process not the end. I think that is the thing I want to impress on Synod: this is the beginning. As we now ask yourselves, what does it mean to have our life in Christ renewed and reshaped in this way, what is fundamentally a theological, a spiritual and a prayerful renewal of the Church, we do not quite know where it is going to lead us. Thank you for your engagement today.

The resources, that is the diagram which expresses the central ideas of the Vision and Strategy, a short commentary that goes with it and also a theological paper from the Bishop of Oxford, are all now available on the Church of England website and I think can be quite easily found. You will note that the Five Marks of Mission are right at the heart. Perhaps also another word to Rachel, one of the reasons we have decided to stick with Jesus-shaped is because it is a phrase that has such currency across the Anglican Communion and it would look rather Church of England pompous if we decided that we are going to change it. We want to be in tune with our sisters and brothers across the Communion, but this will signal more work on the Five Marks of Mission itself right at the heart of things, and Archbishop Justin and I are already beginning to think about that.

I am not sure there is anything else I need to say at the moment. You have heard far too much from me today, but I hope what we might have done today is find a new way of working, involving many more people, a new spirit. We might have discovered what “episcopally led” actually means; you know, the Bishops, we are taking a lead. We are saying there needs to be a spiritual, theological renewal of our life in Christ and that it may lead us into some surprising places. That is what we are saying.

It is up to Synod now to work out what that might mean in the things that are important to this Synod for its decision-making and resource allocation. I really look forward to your engagement and your critique. We do it in this spirit of humility, simplicity and boldness and not just us as a Synod but as a whole Church of England. I am a preacher man, basically, and I kind of feel I want to end this morning’s session by saying, “Amen and amen”.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop, and thank you too to Sanjay, Oliver and Molly for joining us as part of the panel. We will now adjourn the sitting for a screen break and we will resume at 11.30.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 11.55 am.

ITEM 504

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

DRAFT CATHEDRALS MEASURE (GS 2136B

Draft Measure for Final Drafting and Final Approval (Revised at the February 2020 group of sessions (GS 2136Z)

The Chair: Synod. Welcome back. I hope you enjoyed your extended break. We now begin Items 504 and 505, the draft Measure for Final Drafting and Final Approval of the Cathedrals Measure, for which you will need GS 2136B and GS 2136Z. May I draw your attention to the financial statement in there? To begin, I will call Canon Robert Hammond to speak to and then move this item: “That the Synod do take note of this Report”. He has up to ten minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Good morning, Synod. The draft Cathedrals Measure received First Consideration at the July 2019 group of sessions. At the February 2020 group of sessions the Synod completed the Revision stage for the draft Measure, which then stood committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its Final Drafting.

The Steering Committee considered the revised draft Measure very carefully and has proposed a number of Special and drafting amendments, which are explained in detail in the Steering Committee’s Report to Synod GS 2136Z.

The Charity Commission has been fully consulted on the proposed Special and drafting amendments and any points raised have been addressed. The Steering Committee would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff at the Charity Commission for their helpful comments and prompt responses when consulted on proposed amendments, particularly given the additional pressures on them due to the pandemic.

The special amendments proposed are mostly technical in nature. They are proposed to resolve discrete anomalies, which the Steering Committee’s Report explains in detail. In particular, the special amendments ensure that the changes required by the draft Measure do not inadvertently incur pension liabilities for those cathedrals which do not use Church pension funds, provide for the Church Commissioners to provide guidance to bishops on conducting visitation, and make discrete provisions for Ripon, Newcastle and Southwark Cathedrals, to rectify anomalies and update or repeal out-of-date legislation.

The Steering Committee is also proposing a special amendment to ensure that the delay in the draft Measure being returned to Synod for Final Drafting does not result in cathedrals having a shorter window in which to adopt a new constitution and statutes, and register with the Charity Commission. The Steering Committee has secured an extension to the longstop date for registration with the Charity Commission which should give cathedrals more time, not less, which is important given the financial and other impacts of Covid-19 on the cathedrals.

I will provide a more detailed explanation of the various special amendments when they are considered by Synod in turn shortly.

The Steering Committee has made a number of drafting amendments to clarify those remaining uncertainties of meaning in the draft Measure which have been identified or to improve the drafting. The Steering Committee's Report explains why each of the drafting amendments is considered necessary and appropriate by the Steering Committee in order to clarify or improve the drafting of the draft Measure.

An unforeseen benefit of the delay of Synod to November has been that the templates for the new constitution and statutes under the draft Measure have been drafted and consulted at the same time as the Final Drafting process. Therefore, it has been possible to identify where the clarity of the drafting of certain clauses needed to be improved at a time when the Steering Committee was able to make those drafting amendments to the draft Measure. For example, a number of drafting amendments have been made to clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18, to clarify that the chapter may set out the functions of other committees and sub-committees and advisory boards in terms of reference. The drafting has been clarified so that it is clear these terms of reference will not only need to reflect the provisions in the draft Measure and the Cathedrals constitution and statutes in relation to the administration of that committee, sub-committee or advisory board, but will also be able to include other relevant administrative matters. This will provide chapters with certainty so that they can be more flexible, as terms of reference can be amended as when required by the chapter, rather than having to include all such administrative matters in the statutes which require a more formal and time-consuming statutory process to amend.

Another example is the drafting amendment to paragraph 6.4 of Schedule 1, to remove any doubt as to whether a meeting of chapter could still be held if either or both of the chief officers are not present, for example if both or one is unwell or if one is absent for another reason.

I hope that Synod will support the special and drafting amendments proposed by the Steering Committee, which we believe will make the draft Measure clearer, and resolve a number of outstanding issues identified following the Revision stage.

I therefore move: "That the Synod take note of the Steering Committee's Report".

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I call Viv Faull. You have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): I have spent some time in cathedrals during my ministry. I first joined the staff of Gloucester Cathedral as chaplain in 1990 and I watched as the landmark Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals, Heritage and Renewal did its work. In 1999, I moved then from Coventry to Leicester Cathedral as Dean just as the Cathedrals Measure, which derived from the work of the Commission, came into force. It brought significant changes to cathedral governance and a task common to all cathedrals, to be as Wesley Carr, then Dean of Bristol suggested, "the seat of the bishop and centre of worship and mission". Cathedrals retain that common purpose.

In subsequent years cathedrals have changed greatly, as has their context. Cathedrals, partly because of an increasing expertise and new clarity of purpose, have had increasing missional impact. Many until the start of Covid-19 were continuing to grow their visitor numbers, outreach work and number of worshippers. These are churches with walls which are working well beyond their walls. Cathedrals in the last two decades have turned themselves inside out.

But such were the changes and stresses, not least of growth, that in 2017 cathedral governance and management frameworks were once again in need of a new framework. As with the call for heritage for renewal, particular crises – financial and relational – in particular cathedrals prompted a thorough review of all, and another Measure which would also include provisions for consistency and safeguarding.

I became Vice Chair of the Cathedrals Working Group in 2017. We were determined to work rapidly, and today's debate is the result of that. From the start, recognising that cathedrals had become places where local and national power was contested, we tried to work collaboratively with cathedrals, where many chapters and staff were already wanting to develop their capability, their accountability, and for which they needed a regulatory framework. We found that a statutory framework was, as we have just heard, too rigid to respond to rapidly changing approaches and to the range of contexts for each of our cathedrals. The Measure before us today therefore sets a framework of accountability and regulation, not least with the Charity Commission. That is a major change within which good practice and continuous learning can develop.

Honest reflection, ongoing learning, prompted and supported by accountability to wider communities of interest, must now be at the heart of our thinking about the future of cathedrals. I would argue this is true for all parts of the Church.

I commend this Measure to you. I rejoice that the cathedrals which provoked this Report because of their then dysfunctionality are now in a much healthier state. I am so grateful to those who have given their time generously to the statutory process, particularly Eva Abeles from the Legal Department, whose skill has transformed our

conversation with the Charity Commission, and to Robert Hammond and Andrew Nunn, who have steered and chaired us with calm and good humour. I am also very grateful to Eve Poole, whose indefatigable work since her arrival has helped get this Measure to Final Approval whilst continuing to ensure the survival of the cathedrals during the pandemic.

The Measure is a means to better governance and management of cathedrals, but this Measure is the means to a greater end. As Adrian Newman, then Bishop of Stepney and Chair of the Working Party wrote in the Report's preface in 2018: "The extraordinary impact of cathedrals is not a function of their governance and management. It is their capability to draw the soul to the Creator, Redeemer and Sustainer of all things".

I support this Measure.

The Chair: Thank you. May I remind members that debate on this item is only on the Steering Committee's Report, and may I encourage members to hold fire speeches on the Measure until, all being well amended, we get to Item 505? I have also been alerted that there remains a problem with the Crystal voting system, so the special amendments, a number of them that we will be working through together, will be done by simple vote, with the exception of Item 505, where we will use the Crystal voting system when we get to that stage. I now invite Julie Dziegiel. You have up to three minutes.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Chair, I also wish to speak on 505.

The Chair: Would you like to hold on to your speech until we get to 505 perhaps?

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Thank you. I have been unable to lower my blue hand. I am sorry.

The Chair: Anne Foreman, is that also the case for you?

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): I would like to speak now, please.

The Chair: Go ahead. You have up to three minutes.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): I speak as a member of Exeter Cathedral Council, although speaking in a personal capacity rather than on their behalf. I wish to thank Canon Hammond and the Steering Committee for the very helpful GS 2136Z. There is much to welcome in the refinement to the Measure made by both the drafting and the special amendments. I was fortunate enough to go to a couple of the Revision Committees and I know how carefully the Steering Committee and the Revision Committee listened.

In the light of the current situation, it seemed sensible to extend the date for registration with the Charity Commission, although Exeter is determined to get on with things as soon as possible. Exeter Diocese is one of those getting-on-with-things kind of dioceses. In common with churches across our diocese, Exeter Cathedral has found creative and imaginative ways to be the mother church, thanks to the dedicated Dean and chapter who, quite frankly, have been working their socks off. The whole atmosphere that they generate is one of hope, which is tangible.

Our cathedral responding to Covid-19 has coincided with a major building project designed to enhance the missional opportunities that our physical building affords. That is within the building and, as the Bishop of Bristol has said, beyond the walls of the building. Of the drafting amendments, those that clarify the role of the chapter in setting terms of reference for other committees ensures a helpful flexibility, and that of bringing in line with the Church Representation Rules the definition of “actual communicant” will serve to ensure an appropriate balance of non-executive members of the chapter.

As regards special amendment 5, I know it is going to be debated, but could Canon Hammond please give some indication of the timescale for the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commission for how the bishops’ powers of visitation are to be exercised? Obviously I support taking note of this Measure.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I am very grateful to Robert and his team for bringing this Measure. My comments are directed not specifically to the Cathedrals Measure but to legislation in general. This is the first piece of legislation we have received since the publication of the IICSA Report, and, therefore, it is the first piece of legislation we have before us that has the phrase “due regard” in it. “Due regard” is described in the IICSA Report as an “acceptable term of art but lacking in specific accuracy”. We note that even his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury does not understand quite what it means. This Measure, in clause 1 and in some of the amendments we will consider later, continues to use that phrase “due regard”.

While it may be beyond the Chair of the Steering Committee’s ability to respond to the use of that phrase in its fullness, it seems to me important that we lay down a marker about the ongoing use of that phrase in our legislative processes, and to ask that we might consider going forward the question of whether this is a useful phrase. Is there sufficient clarity in its use to give confidence to those who will use our legislation to know exactly what they can and cannot do, where they have room to manoeuvre and whether the use of that phrase gives them confidence in the ability to use the legislation.

I will, of course, be voting for this and all the drafting amendments, but it seems a good thing to raise at this point in this process.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): In very quick response to Simon, I do not like to catch the Prolocutor on this, but if you read the draft of the Safeguarding Code of Practice Measure, which we will be discussing later today, it makes provision to amend this very

Cathedrals Measure in respect of that phrasing, to bring it in line with the other safeguarding legislation, and to take out “due regard” as a phrase.

The Chair: I see nobody else requesting to speak, so I invite Canon Robert Hammond to respond to the debate.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Thank you for those points. Please remember everything that Bishop Viv said at the last debate, and bear that in mind. To Anne Foreman, visitation guidance is now in place and it will be revised for use under the draft Measure to reflect what is agreed with the Charity Commission under the Memorandum of Understanding.

To Simon, yes, a very good point. I hope that Neil Patterson’s response gives you an answer to that. I think that is outside the scope of this legislation as presented to us at the moment, but you will have heard what Neil said. With that, and those comments, thank you very much.

The Chair: I now put Item 504 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote using Zoom.

The Chair: The Steering Committee proposes a number of special amendments to the draft Measure. They are set out in the Order Paper at Items 509 to 515. Item 509 covers some 12 amendments, all of which are concerned with providing that, instead of the existing corporate body of the cathedral ceasing to exist, the existing corporate body continuing. Unless any member indicates now that he or she wishes to speak against a particular amendment in that group, I intend to take them en bloc. I now invite Canon Robert Hammond to move Item 509. You have up to three minutes.

ITEM 509

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Special amendment 1, clause 2 provides that instead of the existing corporate body of the cathedral ceasing to exist, it will continue but two of its three constituent parts, the Council and the College of Canons, will no longer be part of that body corporate. The continuing corporate body will be the chapter.

This special amendment is considered necessary because the draft Measure currently provides for the existing body corporate of the cathedral to cease to exist, and all its assets and liabilities to be transferred to the chapter as the new corporate entity. Under section 75 of the Pensions Act 1995, this process would normally trigger a pension scheme debt liability, known as section 75 debt, that can be considerable. Although the Church of England’s clergy pension scheme and church workers’ pension scheme both include specific provisions to avoid any section 75 debt being triggered, it has been brought to the Committee’s attention that some cathedrals do not use the church

workers' pension scheme; therefore the proposed special amendments are necessary to avoid incurring section 75 debt for those cathedrals which do not use the church workers' pension scheme. Specialist pensions advice was sought by the Church of England Pension Board, which confirmed that no debts will arise under section 75 in relation to the operation of the draft Measure if the special amendment is approved by Synod.

A helpful consequence of this change is that it will simplify the implementation process of the draft Measure for Cathedrals as there will be no need to transfer any employees' contracts, properties, et cetera, from an existing body corporate to a new body corporate.

A number of consequential special amendments are set out in the Steering Committee's report to Synod as special amendments 2 to 4, 6 to 10 and 20 to 22. These consequential amendments need to be made to reflect the fact that the existing body corporate is to continue.

For these reasons, the Steering Committee considers it is of great importance that the special amendment is passed by Synod and I move item 509 en bloc.

The Chair: Point of order, John Wilson.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): This is relating to the last vote. There seems to be some delay from the simple vote appearing on the screen, and, within the 30 seconds allowed, it only appeared on my screen for the last three seconds. Can we either extend the voting period, or is there some way we can get it up on the screen quicker?

The Chair: Thank you, I will consult with the Registrar. Thank you, Mr Wilson. We will be extending the simple vote time to one minute as opposed to 30 seconds.

Item 509 is now open for debate. I see no blue hands, so I now put item 509 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Item 509 is carried. May I now invite Canon Robert Hammond to speak to and move Item 510? You have up to three minutes.

ITEM 510

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): In September, the Charity Commission and the Church Commissioners agreed the heads of terms of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to provide how they will co-regulate cathedrals and exercise their respective powers in conjunction with each other. The details of the MoU itself are currently being negotiated.

Special amendment 5 is being proposed to enable the Church Commissioners to agree how the Bishop will exercise his or her visitation powers in discussion with the Charity Commission through statutory guidance to which the Bishop would be required to have due regard. This is necessary as the MoU will be entered into by the Church Commissioners and not the bishops. I move Item 510.

The Chair: Item 510 is now open for debate. I see no hands blue or otherwise, so I now order a simple vote using the Zoom poll on Item 510.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 511

The Chair: May I invite Canon Robert Hammond to speak and to move Item 511? You have up to three minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Special amendment 511 provides that the power of investment cannot be used to invest endowment monies (that is capital monies) in improving non-endowment properties, as the current drafting does not directly address this issue. I move Item 511.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I see no one requesting to speak, so I now put Item 511 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Item 511 is carried. I now invite Canon Robert Hammond to move Item 512. You have up to three minutes.

ITEM 512

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): The Steering Committee was concerned that the delay to Final Approval and the parliamentary stages of the legislative process due to Covid-19, as well as the financial crisis resulting from Covid-19, would make it difficult for all cathedrals to be ready to register with the Charity Commission by 31 March 2023. Therefore, it has been agreed with the Charity Commission that the longstop date should be extended to three years after the date on which the Cathedrals Measure receives Royal Assent. The Steering Committee considered that by extending the longstop date in this way, should there be any further unexpected delays between Final Approval and Royal Assent due to the virus, cathedrals would still have three years to make the necessary changes and apply to register with the Charity Commission. I move Item 512.

The Chair: Item 512 is now open to debate. I see no requests to speak, so I put Item 512 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 513

The Chair: We now move to Item 513, which covers three special amendments, all of which are concerned with placing Ripon Cathedral in the same position as other cathedrals within the parish. Unless any member indicates now that they wish to speak against a particular amendment in that group, I intend to take them en bloc. I now call on Canon Robert Hammond to speak to and move Item 513 en bloc. You have up to five minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): For historical reasons, Ripon was not a parish church cathedral for the purposes of the Cathedrals Measure 1963, but it is a cathedral which has a parish. As a result, Ripon is the only cathedral which has both a chapter and a PCC which in itself is a registered charity. This historical anomaly is administratively onerous and costly, and raises complex governance issues. Therefore, special amendment 16 is proposed to put Ripon in the same legal position as parish church cathedrals for these purposes, so that Ripon's Chapter also operates as a parish's PCC.

Two consequential special amendments are also needed. If the special amendment is passed by the Synod, the Committee will propose two special amendments, which are consequential on special amendment 16, although I think we are doing that en bloc. The consequential amendments put Ripon in the same legal position as parish church cathedrals for these purposes and provides that the special amendments relating to Ripon Cathedral will come into force on the date Ripon adopts its new constitution and statutes.

Special amendment 16 and the consequential special amendments 12 and 19 are supported by the Chapter of Ripon Cathedral and by the PCC of the relevant parish.

I therefore move Item 513 en bloc.

The Chair: Item 513 is now open for debate. Joyce Hill. You have up to three minutes.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): I have a declaration of interest to make to begin with. I am a member of the Ripon Cathedral Chapter, and, in fact, I have also been a member of the Revision Committee of the present Cathedrals Measure, which is before us.

I wanted to take this opportunity of thanking Synod for allowing us to deal with this historical awkwardness under the umbrella of the Cathedrals Measure. I would like

especially to offer our thanks to the Legal Office for their work behind the scenes on disentangling us from a historical anomaly. It really does have the support of the chapter and the PCC, and, indeed, the wider cathedral community. We rejoice that this is now being tackled. I offer it up in a sense as our own grassroots version of the simplification agenda which this quinquennium has been sponsoring.

The Chair: I now invite Canon Robert Hammond to reply.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): No reply necessary other than to say thank you very much. I am very glad that the Cathedrals Measure is able to start the simplification process in some small way, particularly around parish church cathedrals.

The Chair: I now put Item 513 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 514

The Chair: For Item 514, be aware that this covers five special amendments, all of which are concerned with Newcastle Cathedral Endowment Fund. Unless any member indicates that they wish to speak against a particular amendment in that group, I intend to take them en bloc. I now invite Canon Robert to move Item 514 en bloc.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Special amendment 23 repeals the reference to the Newcastle Cathedral Endowment Fund in section 40 of the 1963 Measure. This is because it is one of the funds listed in Schedule 3 which will be transferred from the Commissioners to a cathedral by the draft Measure. In addition, due to the changes agreed in order to resolve the pensions issue, there will no longer be a transfer from the existing cathedral corporation to a new chapter corporate entity. This means that there is no reason to delay the transfer of the funds listed in Schedule 3 to the date on which the new constitution and statutes come into force for that Cathedral. Therefore, special amendments 14, 15, 17 and 18 provide for section 40 of the 1963 Measure to be repealed on Royal Assent, and for clause 47, which provides for the transfer of all the funds in Schedule 3, to come into force on Royal Assent, too. I therefore move Item 514 en bloc.

The Chair: Item 514 is now open for debate. I see no requests to speak, so I put the item to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 515

The Chair: I now call on Canon Robert Hammond to move item 515. You have up to three minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): It seems that the legal title to Southwark Cathedral was not vested in the chapter under the process provided for in section 44 of the 1963 Measure; therefore it would still have had to be vested in the rectory trustees when the rectory trustees charity was brought to an end recently. However, as the rectory trustees were unaware that they still held the legal title to the Cathedral, there was no deed of transfer of the Cathedral itself to the chapter. Special amendment 24 resolves the anomaly by declaring that the legal title to the cathedral is vested in the chapter, which is the beneficial owner, and therefore ensures that the transfer anticipated by the 1963 Measure is finally given effect.

Special amendment 18, which has just been approved by Synod, provides for this declaration to come into force on Royal Assent day so that this anomaly is resolved as soon as possible.

Synod may also notice that section 5 of Southwark Cathedral 1937 Measure, which is mentioned in section 44 of the 1963 Measure, sets out specific consents required when certain powers are exercised in relation to the chapter house and adjoining land. Therefore, Special amendment 24 also amends the 1963 Measure to update the reference to consent for the relevant provisions in the draft Measure.

I should point out that this special amendment is supported by the Chapter of Southwark Cathedral. I move Item 515.

The Chair: Item 515 is now open for debate. I see no request to speak, so I now order Item 515 be put to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 505

The Chair: We now move on to Item 505: "That the Measure entitled 'Cathedrals Measure' be finally approved". I invite Canon Robert Hammond to speak to and move Item 505. You have up to ten minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): When I was asked to chair the Steering Committee for the Cathedrals Measure, I thought I knew a bit about cathedrals. What I realised over time is that I knew a bit about one cathedral, Chelmsford Cathedral, one of our newer cathedrals, but I did not understand what a diverse complex range of organisational structures our cathedrals are.

Following the Cathedrals Working Group Report in 2018 and its recommendations, Synod requested a draft Measure to be brought forward to implement those recommendations. After many, many hours of work by the legal team, by the Church Commissioners, by the Charity Commissioners, the Steering Committee, the Revision Committee, consultations and discussions, not least on the floor of Synod and at fringe meetings, we have this draft Measure which we are asking you to approve today.

The draft Measure makes provision about the governance, management, property and financial affairs of cathedrals. I am not going to rehearse all the changes that this draft Measure makes, but perhaps, most significantly, the draft Measure puts cathedrals into a firm governance footing which is fit for the twenty-first century. It provides for co-regulation of cathedrals by the Charity Commissioners of England and Wales and the Church Commissioners and brings them under the Charities Act. It provides for a clear governance structure, separating governance and management activities. It provides clarity over the roles and responsibilities of those involved in our cathedrals. It provides for better professional control of finance, risk and audit. It clarifies issues of property ownership and, most importantly, it has safeguarding at its heart.

We are immensely grateful to the Church Commissioners for the transitional funding they have been able to make available to cathedrals to assist with the implementation, and for the practical support they will offer over the next couple of years. This is a really significant Measure in the life of our cathedrals. By providing clarity for leadership, governance and management, by seeking to implement the recommendations of the Cathedrals Working Group, by adopting a really consultative approach to our work, the Steering Committee hopes it has provided a draft Measure which will allow cathedrals to get on with their vital task in our nation of providing a focus for the life and the work of Church of England in the dioceses.

It therefore gives me great pleasure on behalf of the Steering Committee to move: "That the Measure entitled 'Cathedrals Measure' be finally approved".

The Chair: Before opening this item for debate, may I remind members who have submitted a request to speak that you also need to raise your blue hand, in the same way as we could only call you if you are standing in Synod, were we in person. From the outset the speech limit on this debate will be three minutes. There are a number of requests to speak. Item 505 is now open for debate. I call first Eve Poole.

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio): Our cathedrals bear the names of the cities of this land. Deep in the heart of each they stand sentinel watching over them. But who watches the watchers? This Measure marries Church and state in that partnership through the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commission, to encourage our cathedrals in their mission to the whole nation.

As section 8(4) of the new Measure states, in the future, "The members of the Chapter of each cathedral have the general control and management of the administration of the

Chapter and are, accordingly, the charity trustees of the Chapter for the purposes of the Charities Act 2011”.

While this is not the most important innovation in this Measure, it is the most culturally significant. For the first time cathedrals will be formally accountable to the state regulator. In the future the Charity Commission and the Church Commissioners will partner together to increase public trust and confidence in cathedrals as charities. Because we want cathedrals to be exemplars of best practice in this, as they are in music and liturgy and heritage, we have baked into the Measure the need for the chapter to keep its role as a learning organisation continually in view, so the Measure gives the new Nominations Committee a formal duty to advise on the diversity and the training needs of members of the chapter, and to make recommendations on how these might be constantly improved. We are grateful to the Church Commissioners for funding training to support this and for expert support for the registration process.

Throughout I have been very proud to be part of such a robust and productive legislative process. One hears dark tales about acrimonious Revision Committees that end in stalemate. We had a brilliant Steering Committee, together with a skilful Revision Committee, who worked incredibly hard to marshal the many amendments we received and have come up with elegant solutions for their accommodation. I urge you to give this Measure Final Approval. I thank every single person who has been part of this journey for their companionship along the way.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): It is unquestionably true that many cathedrals are in need of better financial governance, and if this Measure assists with improving matters in those cathedrals then it should be welcomed. I do wonder, however, if in being properly concerned with governance and finance, we are accidentally lessening the traditional role of a cathedral chapter as being a worshipping community and reducing it to the level of being simply a board of charity trustees.

I wish to draw your attention to clause 26 of the Measure. This allows the chapter to allocate a house vested in a chapter as a residence for a person holding office in the cathedral from which to perform the duties of the office. This seems unremarkable, but the equivalent section in the 1999 Measure is currently being used by the Chapter of Blackburn Cathedral to reallocate a house allocated to a residentiary canon. The Chapter is seeking to move the canon from a house in the cathedral complex to another house 22 miles away and is now taking eviction proceedings in the county court to evict him from his home. Whether that section can be used in this way will be a matter for the courts to decide, but the fact that the section is even thought to be capable of such use should cause us to pause before approving this Measure containing clause 26. If the clause can be used in this way, every office holder in a cathedral needs to be aware that they can be removed from their home at the whim of the chapter.

Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd David Ison): Chair, I want to assure Synod that deans have been well consulted, are extremely supportive of this Measure, are ready for it and

are planning ahead on the basis of the Measure coming into effect. It was suggested in the debate on the Business Committee Report that the time of Covid has brought additional stress and therefore we should have postponed this debate. I want to make the opposite and positive point that the opportunities of Covid-19 mean that the legislation is timely and offers real opportunities to rethink the ways that we do things; to simplify them and make them more sustainable. To take just one example, making cathedral councils advisory offers new imaginative possibilities for how cathedrals can open up more widely their consultation and engagement with local, regional and national communities. A particular point to bear in mind is that it gives assurance of support and structured relationships for cathedrals in working with both Charity Commission and Church Commissioners, and we should all welcome this.

When I was working as Dean of Bradford in the noughties we experienced as a cathedral the isolation that had been brought by insolvency, with no road map about how to proceed in such a crisis. The Measure provides clarity and support, which will help to avoid such crises and situations in future.

The changes to governance structures to be in line with other charities will provide dioceses and cathedral supporters with assurance of good governance of cathedrals as praying communities. It will be very helpful for fundraising for us to have a charity number at last and to be understood as being alongside other churches and charities. Please stop cathedrals being exceptional in this regard. Do support us going forward and vote enthusiastically for this Measure. We would welcome it.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): It has been a profound privilege over the first few years to sit first on the Cathedrals Working Group and then on the Cathedrals Measure Steering Committee. A former member of Synod for Oxford told me that, as Oxford does not have a cathedral that is subject to Church of England legislation, when the last Cathedrals Measure was being debated in Synod, the Oxford members all went shopping. I like shopping sometimes, but engaging with the wonderful institutions of our cathedrals has been an amazing experience.

We started by going through the report of the last Cathedrals Measure. It was published in a book of over 250 pages. It has felt as though we were standing on the shoulders of giants. We have examined the financial issues facing some, if not many, of our cathedrals. We discussed governance structures and at one point we all stood in a line from those of us who wanted more legislation to those of us who wanted more guidance. I remember who was at each end.

What has been key to this process has been the extensive amount of consultation that was undertaken. We did not always get it right. Failing to consult with residentiary canons early in the process was a real mistake. I hope and believe that the iterative consultation process has resulted in a solution that is workable for all, which is quite an achievement given the variety of cathedral structures that there are. I also hope that consultation can become embedded in the way that work in other areas is undertaken.

Under this Measure cathedrals will have to register with the Charity Commission, in common with all other Church of England bodies other than small PCCs. This should result in the public having greater confidence in the way our cathedrals are structured and perhaps make raising funds a little more straightforward. There is also a supervisory role for the Church Commissioners and there is to be a Memorandum of Understanding between the Charity Commission and the Commissioners clarifying each role.

Cathedrals are also required to have finance committees and audit functions in line with best governance practice. This, together with a split of governance and management functions, should prevent some of the financial issues that were occurring which led to the formation of the Working Group.

Before being involved in this process, I was, frankly, ambivalent about cathedrals. I am a low church person, practically subterranean. Cathedrals did not impact me much. Now I understand them, I appreciate their unique role in our Church, and in our society, and I would never pass up a chance to visit any of our magnificent cathedrals. Ripon is the next on my radar. When I do visit them, I always encounter God and see demonstrated a faith that I recognise and relate to. I also try to leave a gift-aided donation. We have our legislation as a result of extensive consultation, accompanied by guidance. There is something for everyone. Please support it wholeheartedly.

The Chair: Synod, before I call Canon Bruinvels to speak in this debate, given the amount of passion and hard work and how well we have galloped through this item so far, we are nearly at the finish line, so I need to test the mind of Synod on extending this session by up to 15 minutes. We are going to do that with a simple vote using a Zoom poll. You are voting either for or against extending the sitting so we can put this item to bed.

The motion was put and carried on a simple poll via Zoom.

The Chair: We have the consent of Synod to continue by up to 15 minutes. I now invite Canon Bruinvels to speak in the debate. You still only have up to three minutes.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I have held public office and currently hold public office, and I am very proud of some of the offices I hold currently, in particular being a Church Commissioner, being a member of the Guildford Cathedral College of Canons and being a member of the Guildford Cathedral Council. I want to welcome this Measure but firstly thank all those who have made it possible: Adrian Newman, Viv Faull, Eve Poole and Robert Hammond, who is carrying it through, may I say, very well indeed.

This Measure was needed – I have no doubt about it – to secure good governance and to support the Charity Commission aims and, most importantly, as a Church Commissioner something that we are all concerned with on the Board of Governors,

that the financial management is right for today. The accountability is clearly there, but I am sad, in one sense, because although the Council is still there, it has much more of an advisory role. I have always seen myself as a critical friend to the Dean and the Chapter, even though I am not on it.

Being a critical friend, being one of those stakeholders working with the lieutenancy, working with the military, and working with the High Sheriff, the cathedral is for all the people. Guildford Cathedral on Stagg Hill is known as the “people’s cathedral”. Indeed, I paid two and six for a brick many years ago to contribute to it, even before I later joined the choir. I have a special relationship with the Cathedral. When the numbers are falling in so many churches, it is the cathedrals, beacons on the hill like on Stagg Hill, that really give the shining light of worship, evangelism and being there for the whole community.

I want to pay tribute to the Chairman of Guildford Cathedral Council, Dr Peter Shaw, and to the Dean, Dianna Gwilliams, and my fellow members. We are an active lot. We do our best for that cathedral. We are there and we will continue in whatever advisory role comes before us. Whether we hold people to account in the same way, I have no idea, but by being critical friends we will continue to support them.

I welcome the Measure. I thank all the hard work that has been put behind it, and I can assure all the deans and chapters, as a member of the Church Commissioners I will do my best to support you in your aims. I remember my days in the choir singing a voice of joy and happiness.

The Chair: [Microphone muted] We are able to meet our new deadline.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Thank you for that excellent debate and thank you for all those comments. To Dr Eve Poole, thank you. The partnership between the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commissioners is absolutely vital. To Fr Paul Benfield, obviously I cannot comment on a specific case or how the current Measure is being used. To Dean Ison, I am so pleased that cathedrals are planning for the future and we want to support the cathedrals as well. To Julie Dziegiel, thank you for all your work on the Cathedrals Working Group and the Revision Committee. I am really pleased you are a cathedral convert. Enjoy your visit to Ripon, it is a beautiful cathedral.

To Canon Peter Bruinvels, I am glad that you welcome the Measure. Thank you for your thanks. I just about remember what two and six is. As I said when we were in York, my father was a choirboy in Chelmsford Cathedral, and it is fascinating to see how memories of serving in cathedrals take our knowledge and our understanding and our belief in the beacons on the hill, as you said. I know you will continue to be a critical friend of Guildford Cathedral.

Finally, I must thank some of the people for the immense amount of work and effort they have put in to produce this Measure. First, the fantastic Steering Committee, who have held the reins on this work, always with an eye to the importance of seeing the bigger picture, and to the Revision Committee, with its eagle eye for the detail. I have lost count of how many times the committees have met face-to-face or by Zoom, but it was far more than is usual, so thank you all for your commitment. To my Vice Chair, Dr Eve Poole, the Third Church Estates Commissioner, for the way she has negotiated this through the Church Commissioners, the Charity Commissioners, the College of Deans, the Association of English Cathedrals, the Cathedrals Administration Finance Association and probably more that I am not aware of. To the cathedral staff of the Church Commissioners, Michael Minta and your team.

To the many groups and individuals who have individually or collectively been consulted, made proposals, amendments or comments which have strengthened this Measure, thank you. Most of all to the legal team at Church House. I was going to say here at Church House, but of course we are not all together. Alex McGregor, Paul Stevenson, Chris Packer and especially Eva Abeles, who has carried the bulk of the responsibility for this Measure. Were we at Church House I would ask you to join in me in a round of applause. As we are not, please join me in offering our sincere thanks and a virtual round of applause. You have been absolutely fantastic. Thank you so, so much.

With that, I heartily commend that the Cathedrals Measure be finally approved. I hope that Synod will see fit to do that and provide the governance, financial and leadership footing from which our cathedrals can grow, thrive and be centres of work and mission in our Church in the twenty-first century.

The Chair: We now put Item 505 to the vote. The question is: “That the Measure entitled ‘Cathedrals Measure’ be finally approved”. In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses. We will be using the Crystal voting platform as Dylan walked us through at the start of this item. I direct that the bell not be rung on this occasion.

The vote on Item 505: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 32, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, those in favour 126, against none, with 2 recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, 151 in favour, against none, with 3 recorded abstentions.⁵ The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The motion for Final Approval has been carried and the Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee.

⁵ The voting figures announced by the Chair (but not the result) differ from those recorded here, as it was subsequently discovered that a number of duplicate votes were recorded by the remote voting platform. The figures shown in the Report of Proceedings (here) are the corrected figures.

That now concludes that item. Before we break for lunch, may I remind Synod to check their emails because that is where you will find the Zoom details for our session this afternoon, which will resume at 2.30. Enjoy your break.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

ITEM 7

FINANCIAL BUSINESS

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL'S BUDGET AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT FOR 2021 (GS 2181)

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. We are resuming our session and we come to Items 7 to 14, the Archbishops' Council's budget. For this you will need GS 2181. In a few moments I am going to ask John Spence, the Chair of the Finance Committee of Archbishops' Council, to present this item. He has pre-recorded his speech and so we are now going to watch it.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Good afternoon, everybody. How strange it feels to be meeting with you in this way rather than up on the stage in York, where David White will have been giving me lessons in how to get on and off the stage without falling over. And what a long time ago July 2019 seems. I gave my budget presentation to the General Synod at that time with much confidence. Yes, there were storm clouds, but we felt good about the prospects looking ahead, fuelled by the generous settlement from the Church Commissioners, which I will come back to.

At that meeting I was able to recommend a flat apportionment for 2020, pointing to the fact that while we were facing more costs through cost of living and safeguarding and so on, these had been met by the generosity of our partners including the Church Commissioners, the Corporation of Church House, the Allchurches Trust. And that generous settlement, who will forget Loretta Minghella with her apple cores, lemons and tape measures? The Church Commissioners had found a methodology by which they could be particularly generous for the 2020-22 triennium and hope to be able to do so in the future.

On the back of that we were able to not only continue our Low Income funding and our Strategic Development funding (SDF) but to create a new Strategic Ministry Fund, aimed at enabling the additional numbers of ordinands coming through to curacies to be funded with levels of support from dioceses according to their financial position. We were able to create a Transformation Fund for dioceses, for those who were totally wanting to transform their models to the needs of the next 20 to 30 years and, very importantly, we were able to launch our Social Impact Investment Fund, a work which continues to progress.

These sums may seem very large to you, but I would point out that they have to be put in the context of a Church of England economy amounting to £1.4 billion and that if a diocese wants to go through a complete strategic transformation, it is unlikely to be able to do so for less than £5 million.

All seemed well until along came Covid-19 which erupted on us like a volcano having a major impact. Immediately emergency actions were put into place. The Commissioners agreed to allow for variances and stipend funds for dioceses and created other measures to improve the cash flows of dioceses and cathedrals alike.

We came together between the House of Bishops, the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council in something we now call the Co-ordinating Group, and decided to change those allocations, creating a new £35 million Diocesan Sustainability Fund, by taking money away from other funds to create that space.

Since then we have been tracking very carefully what is happening and we have seen Parish Share at national level hold up commendably well. The immediate reaction was to see a drop in the income back in Q2 of greater levels as people were understandably very cautious. You can see now the pattern at national level, but I would point to two things. Firstly, the impact is bound to get greater as the time of Covid restrictions increases, as reserves are used up and as other resources become exhausted. Secondly, we have seen an enormous range between dioceses. I thank all of those who have worked so hard to minimise the impact at parish, deanery and diocesan level. Surely there are more things that we can learn from those who have done well.

The Sustainability Fund has been proving popular. The criteria were that we wanted to focus on those lower asset dioceses, with lower income populations, but this is not just about bailing out, it is about supporting the change programmes that the dioceses are having to put into effect in order that they can cope with the new world in which we live. So far we have seen 22 dioceses apply for £14 million. We expect that number to increase to about £20 million with the best part of 30 dioceses by the year end or soon after.

Included in the emergency actions was a review of the budget that we had previously circulated in anticipation of a July Synod. Where we were recommending a flat budget for 2021 apportionment, we have now been able to find ways of reducing this to a 1.6% reduction. That is what I am recommending to you today.

Members may wonder why it is not more. Earlier, and quite unrelated to Covid-19, the House of Bishops had launched two major reviews, one around governance and one around Vision and Strategy. Their work is under way. I fully understood when the Archbishops wrote to Archbishops' Council and asked us not to make any financial cuts which would cut across the ability to implement those reports and the recommendations therefrom when they came through.

In June, I went to the House of Bishops with a paper on Transforming Effectiveness, not about cutting budgets, but about working out how we can strip out the engine to remove duplication of bureaucracy, do things better, do them once and do them well. That stream of work in Transforming Effectiveness is now underway under the leadership of Bishop Martin Seeley. I am delighted by the levels of people who have been getting involved in the consultations through the inter-diocesan finance forum at diocesan and at other functional level.

This really is the time to grasp nettles. It is the time to accept that there is an imbalance between our wish-list and the resources that we have available. In that 2021 budget we had some money put in for safeguarding and for the environment with the help of the Church Commissioners. But we cannot go on looking to that source all the time. We need to decide what is going to be done now and what simply does not need to be done any more, whether by the Church whatsoever, or whether at this or that particular place. We do need to accelerate the legislative reform agenda. We do need to really push ahead with liberating and trusting our parishes to do their work for the Gospel of Christ.

I must share with you, members of Synod, that I have to look further ahead. My job is not just to give you a 2021 budget but to look ahead to 2022 and beyond. We can expect to see further storm clouds. The Church Commissioners' income projections and asset growth projections are damaged by Covid. I look at the diocesan impacts as they carry on. Who knows what shape our diocesan and parish worshipping communities will look like when all this comes to an end?

The IICSA Report means we will need to find still more money for safeguarding. The Archbishops' Council has already decided to devote a significant chunk of their reserves to the short term and interim emergency support schemes ahead of the development of the long-promised redress scheme, of which more tomorrow. When the governance and Vision and Strategy reviews do come through, they themselves will need funding for implementation. All of this means that looking further ahead we are going to have some real battles to overcome if we are to achieve our goals.

I put it to you, General Synod, that we can do so with confidence and that we can hold the Cross high because across the Church I see so many wonderful signs. I see the growth in the number of ordinands who will come through to curacies, giving us a refreshed priesthood that can so well interface with the younger generations of today. In my nine years as a Commissioner, and my eighth year now in this role, I have never seen such leadership from the House of Bishops. I have high expectations of what the reviews will bring forward.

Across parishes across the country, at parish, deanery and diocesan level, we have seen the way in which people have creatively adapted to meet the needs of the digital revolution under Covid, with wonderful new forms of worship and new ways to develop hybrid worshipping communities. We have seen the giving strategy being rolled out and warmly welcomed, with many hundreds or even thousands of parishes now signing up

to direct training in areas of contactless giving, inspiring generosity, as well as all the digital forms of worship that we know.

Ladies and gentleman, it is not the House of Bishops who are the Church of England. It is us. It is us, or should I say you, who will inspire the holding of the Cross so that we may indeed walk forward with confidence. It is in that mood that I commend to you the various recommendations in your Order Paper as set out on the slides. I formally move them collectively at this stage. I may be required to do so individually later. And I welcome debate and questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much, John, who has moved Item 7 to take note of this Report. In a few moments I will be announcing the matter is open for debate, but so that John can respond to the debate, he would like to do so after every three speeches. In order to allow him to do that, under the power of Standing Order 21(3), to allow a member to speak more than once, I need the consent of Synod. I am therefore going to order a simple vote to seek your general consent for John to speak more than once on each item of financial business as necessary. Voting will take place using a Zoom poll.

The Chair: Point of order, John Wilson.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Chair, sorry to interrupt you but are you coming back to me with a point of order?

The Chair: When we have finished the Zoom poll, yes.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Point of order, John Wilson.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): I am struggling to find the Order Paper that John referred to in his presentation. I cannot find it on the website or see where we can download it.

The Chair: John, I am informed it has been emailed to members. It is on the app and it should be on the website. I am sorry you are having trouble getting it. The matter is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): I am speaking in this debate in my capacity as Deputy Chairman of the Finance Committee. I would like to build on a number of the points that Canon Spence has made. Synod, as always, I read the Synod Questions paper with great interest when it is published, and last week I was both surprised and disappointed to note the general absence of questions relating to finance and church growth while the focus on what I might call issues of special interest abounded.

While these are all important, may I encourage you to focus for just a few minutes on a slightly bigger picture. The Church of England is under significant financial stress.

Market volatility increases risk and uncertainty for the Commissioners' future income distributions and the ability of the Pensions Board to be able to reduce the incredibly high level of contributions currently required for clergy pensions. Restrictions on access and public worship have decimated the income of our cathedrals, and of many churches, not just their property income but also regular giving. The slow decline in the numbers of regular worshippers in our churches and worshipping communities continues to constrain parish income and consequently parish contributions to dioceses. All of these issues combine to put huge financial stress on dioceses with average diocesan Parish Share receipts currently being 12% lower than a year ago, and the expectation is for greater financial stress in 2021.

However, the big picture is actually about growth. Financial issues are merely a consequence. Our financial challenges would rapidly diminish if we set and achieve a ten-year goal of, say, 3 million of our fellow countrymen being brought, by the grace of God, to the point where they can use the words from our service of Holy Baptism: "I repent of my sins. I turn to Christ. I submit to Christ". It is the financial giving of the faithful members of our churches which underpins our churches' financial health, not the Church Commissioners, who have very clear and specific distribution objectives, and not our national or diocesan financial reserves, because while these can provide temporary relief from financial stress, reliance upon them in the medium to long term is unsustainable.

Thus, coming to the budget before us today, I see that this is a stopgap budget. Undoubtedly, difficult decisions lie before us next year in developing a budget for 2022. Due to the need to meet our commitments to safeguarding, together with the financial pressures created by Synod relating to unplanned and unfunded environmental objectives, the budgeted expenditure for 2021 is actually increasing in the face of the financial stress that I have already referred to. To recognise that stress, diocesan apportionment has been slightly reduced. However, this is all being funded by bringing forward Commissioners' funds allocated to later years and by drawing upon reserves, neither of which is prudent nor sustainable in the medium term.

When the Vision and Strategy and governance groups finally report in the early part of next year, we will need to look very carefully at how we can cut our cloth for the future. Synod must be prepared to be radical and be willing to adopt Archbishop Stephen's call for a simpler church, which recognises that we must reform our structures and governance to reflect the size, shape and mission of our Church today. I commend the 2021 budget to you for your approval, but in anticipation of the need for a much more radical budget for 2022 and beyond.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TElS): Greetings from Durham. I want to make three brief points, if I may. First, I want to say thank you to the General Synod and, through it, to the dioceses and parishes, and Church Commissioners, for your continued investment in the training of future leaders in the Church's mission. £18 million is a very significant amount of money, but it supports a diverse pool of 1,400 called, gifted and

energised ordinands across the breadth of our Church and our land. Canon Spence has spoken of a refreshed priesthood, better able to reach younger people across our country, and I, for one, am certainly encouraged as I see many young ordinands with many years still to serve offering themselves and being given a deep missional and theological training.

It is tempting at times of significant financial challenge, as Carl Hughes has reminded us, to cut investment in training and development. Synod's continuing commitment to invest in tomorrow's leaders and ministers is to be welcomed, and as a TEI Principal I do so.

Second, I want to assure the Synod that the TEI sector has been one of the parts of the Church that has responded quickly and imaginatively to the pandemic restrictions. There was not the time to report on this at our informal meeting in July, but Synod members will be aware,, I am sure of TEIs of every hue that have embraced online learning and formation, enabling courses to be continued and training to flourish, enabling training in digital evangelism and mission to happen at the same time. Some of us in this new term have been doing blended online and onsite formation. Others are continuing online only. All of us are ensuring that ordinands continue to receive the best learning opportunities possible.

Third, I want to say as a TEI sector we recognise the need for ongoing change in how we serve the Church in the formation of ministers to lead and serve the mission God has called us to. We heard in our debate on vision this morning of the need to bring the best theological resources into the hands of lay people as well as ordained, and support a culture of lifelong learning across the Church. We welcome that. As we heard from Archbishop Stephen yesterday, these next few years will be a time of great change and great challenge, but a joy and an adventure. Part of the adventure, if I can put it like that, will be a review of the funding of theological training that is currently taking place. Across the TEI sector we are engaging with that review wholeheartedly. But I know we will want to do that as a Synod as well, and so I look forward to a debate in Synod on the proposed changes before a future budget is put before us. Thank you for your support and prayers for our TEIs as we serve the present and future of God's mission through the Church of England.

Mrs Margaret Sheather (Gloucester): In the context of such major financial issues, including the very heavy pressures that Carl was talking about just now, the point I want to make may seem rather a detailed one, but I think it is one that is at the heart of the most local mission and evangelism that can support Church renewal. I am looking for some further clarification about the reference in paragraph 22 to the future resourcing of several key elements of the evangelism and discipleship operations, where it states, "The remainder of the increase reflects additional planned expenditure on Fresh Expressions and Sports Ministry partially offset by a reduction in the Life Events programme budget".

It may not be intentional but this could be read as a reduction in one activity in order to develop the other two further. If this were the case, it would seem strange to position them against each other, as all three activities are about reaching into the community and about conversations based in daily life, but potentially leading to connection and to faith. They can also overlap, of course, with those met through sports, for example, having children or wanting to marry, and everyone will certainly encounter death and grief at some point.

In 2019, I understand it is estimated that around 14 million people saw something of the Church at work by attending a service related to a life event. A further 1 million in-depth conversations probably will have taken place with those who were at the heart of each event. Encountering the Church at these times can forge a link for support or open people's eyes to new possibilities for reflection. It has been very good to see the development of the Life Events programme supporting strong and effective ministry in the Occasional offices. It would be helpful to know more of the thinking behind this budget decision, what the expected impact of reduced spending on the Life Events programme is likely to be, and why this is thought to be okay. I hope to receive some assurance that all these evangelistic activities are equally valued.

The Chair: Canon Spence to respond to those three speakers.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Good afternoon. May I thank Synod for your forbearance in allowing me to speak more than once. I will deal with those points in reverse order. Margaret Sheather, I wish to immediately give you the assurance that the Life Events team are equally valued. This is merely an operational piece. It is not in any way that the two things have a trade-off against each other. There is a serious point. You do have to reflect as to why we would need significant central resource when one might say that life events should be at the heart of the life of every diocese. I understand we can give central support, but I am mindful that a few years ago when that central funding was reduced we immediately saw a significant reduction in the number of marriages. I believe we have got to work all the time to create the sustainability of the Church at local level, with subsidiarity meaning that the most powerful contribution comes in the local community: the centre being subsidiary to those who touch our parishioners directly.

To Philip, I thank you very much for your affirmation. I have been delighted to see the co-operation and collaboration going on between the Ministry Council and the TEI sector, and the readiness of the TEI sector to embrace significant change. I look forward to the debate you mention, Philip, subject to the Business Committee's agreement, when I hope we will bring out truly the new TEI sector's ambitions to reach out. We have a lay ministry strategy for the first time that is worthy of the phrase and seeing the TEIs embrace both the ordained and the lay sectors will be terrific. Can I say what a joy, Philip, when you talk about 1,400 ordinands? It will be 1,399 next year to be precise. Compare that to about 1,150 just four years ago.

Needless to say, I agree with Carl on his points. It would be odd if my Deputy Chairman and I did not talk with a single voice. It gives me the opportunity to say thank you to the Finance Committee for all your support. I just say this one point. Carl gave us a figure of 3 million people, just 5% of the population. Actually, in the shorter term, 1.5 million would give you the financial transformation and a platform to then reach out to truly be the Church for all the people of England.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Canon Spence. I call Sue Slater followed by Robin Lunn.

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): I am interested that the way our budget is split up into votes is the same from year to year. Obviously, that has to happen in order for us to be able make comparisons, but it bothers me that Vote 1 is called Training for Ministry, when, actually, we all know that it is about training for ordained ministry. The emphasis that we have already heard today, particularly in the Vision and Strategy debate, and the emphases of all sorts of other reports that have been coming out are so much about the role of lay ministries. We have just heard that there is now and there is going to be more talk about lay ministry and lay ministry training in the future and that the TEIs want to do that. I myself benefitted when the Lincoln School of Theology trained me as a reader alongside people who were being trained for ordination.

I think we ought to be reflecting in the title of our Vote 1 that that is a vote for training for ordained ministry while at the same time I would urge that we need to think very carefully for the future about where the money is going to come from for training more lay people, as most dioceses now are having to think about reducing the numbers of stipendiary posts that they can afford, and developing a strategy for having teams concerned with both lay and ordained ministry to pursue the mission and ministry that we all share and are part of.

The Chair: Thank you. After Robin Lunn, the Bishop of Burnley. We have a number people wishing to speak, so I am going to reduce the speech limit to three minutes.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): My intervention is just a couple of relatively brief questions, John. Thank you very much for your report this afternoon. The first one is: how concerned are you that parishes are likely to hold back payment of Parish Share in at least the first part of 2021 until financial circumstances hopefully stabilise? While understandable in some respects, do you wish to send a message warning of the potentially serious consequences for the whole mission of the Church if that continues? My second question is: is the Transforming Effectiveness workstream progressing as urgently and as objectively as you would wish?

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North): This is again not a speech, more an extended question. We have a Government that is about to break its promises to the poor. They are going to cut the overseas aid budget from 0.7% of GDP to 0.5%. We criticised that yesterday in Synod. Archbishop Justin has been courageously outspoken

in doing the same. It is right to call the Government to account because there is no more dishonourable promise to break than that made to the poor, especially at a time of financial crisis. Given that we have been rightly critical of government, it is vital, surely, that we as the Church of England do not break our own promises to the poor. This Synod has made a number and just some examples. We made a promise in February 2019 that we would have a worshipping loving serving Christian community on every significant estate in the country because in half of those estates there is no Church presence. We made a promise with the Leeds Motion that we would hear the voice of the poor in our structures. That is to say nothing of all the promises made in the Gospels. In straitened times there is easy and constant justification for breaking such promises and withdrawing from areas of deprivation, but surely it is more critical than ever that we are there. My question is: does the Covid crisis mean inevitably we are going to break our promises to the poor? If we are not to what advice does John have for DBFs, for TEIs and for us as a Synod?

The Chair: Canon Spence, could you respond to those three speakers, please?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I am doing it in order this time. Sue, it is absolutely true that Vote 1 is headed up Training for Ministry and at the moment it is only ordained ministry. I would share your hope that with a lay ministry strategy now in place we might decide whether in future there is a central need for funding for the training of lay ministry. That should be under consideration and that is the only reason I would actually stop from accepting your suggestion of a change of title.

What would I say to parish treasurers, Robin? I would say I fully understand. I have been one. Reserves are there for a rainy day and the rainy day is here at monsoon levels. Yes indeed, if you understandably decide to hold back reserves, and let us remember that reserves have been increasing while income has been static, if you hold back the reserves, you may cause lasting damage to the very institutions that you wish to continue. Please, we are one Church, we are a whole church and while we who have jobs at the centre are there to support the 16,000 parishes, let us always remember that we are the whole body of Christ.

Transforming Effectiveness is proceeding with pace, Robin. I am content about that. Objectivity, I hope, and I say this to all people involved in the debate and in the workstream who are on this call today, we need objectivity, we need realism and we need radicalism. None of us can afford to be defensive when it comes to thinking through how we get things done brilliantly the first time, every time.

And, Philip, the work you have done on Estates Evangelism is well understood and so very highly and rightly respected. I am not aware that we have turned away any application for estates finance. If I look across in addition to the lower income communities funding stream, SDF – Strategic Development Funding – is deliberately targeted at areas of deprivation and low income as one of the key criteria. The work we are doing around other aspects of ministerial and strategic transformation at diocesan

level is similarly primed to give greater support to those serving areas of low income. So, Philip, I do not think we are about to break our promises to those. I am not one who can talk about the voice of the poor being at the table but financially I am satisfied that we are rightly determining. Right at the start of this process of Renewal and Reform Adrian Newman tackled me very hard: is the right church the one that is flourishing in the green and bushy byways of suburban England or is it the church that holds the Cross in the areas of greatest deprivation and challenge? I am satisfied in my mind that the evidence points to the fact that we are doing that well.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I call Peter Breckwoldt followed by Charles Read.

Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury): Thank you so much, Canon Spence, for your presentation of the budget today for 2021. When we think about this budget it is against the family business. Our Lord Jesus Christ said in Luke 19 that the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost. It is the family business.

Against this family business we are facing significant challenges. You have already outlined Covid-19. We have thought about falling income, falling numbers, falling morale, less young people in our churches. This is a picture, a snapshot of the Church today. In the light of all this we are called to refresh our vision, and rightly so, as a Church. We need to weigh our core activities, our major activities, possibly with a value-for-money study, asking the question is this actually helping us to focus on the family business, namely to seek and to save the lost?

I personally would commend the idea of thinking about a zero-based budget approach for 2022, where we might analyse each of the main areas of activity asking the question does this really help us seek and save the lost? That surely has to be at the heart of our ministry and mission right across the Church. Yes, if we are truly to be helpful in 2022, we need to keep the family business as our focus. When this is done then the work that we bring we need to bring to the foot of the Cross, and there we need to be in step by following our Saviour and our God, the Lord Jesus Christ. I warmly support the budget today.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): My day job is to work in a TEI in the Eastern Region Ministry Course and to be Director of Reader Training in the Diocese of Norwich. You will not be surprised that I want to comment on Vote 1, as I often do. I want to support what Sue Slater said about training ordinands and readers alongside each other, which we have been doing in Norwich and the ERMV for quite a long time, along with the Diocese of Ely and the Diocese of St Albans. I commend that as a good way of starting out licensed ministry. That could easily be expanded to other forms of lay ministry.

That leads me to three things I want to say, if I can get them all in in my allotted time.

First of all, the growth in lay ministry, which we are seeing and which we anticipate growing more, is to be welcomed. I want to add my voice to those of others who said

that we need to think about what the Vote 1 money is for, and either expand Vote 1 so it includes various forms of training for lay ministry or else create another pot that will fund lay ministry, so that we are indeed putting resources into both lay and ordained ministry. Others have spoken on this and I am not going to say any more, but I want to add my voice to that.

Secondly, we need to make sure that we can still fund the correct and appropriate ordination training pathways for each candidate and not be tempted to just put people on what appear to be a cheap option but are not. I speak as somebody who teaches on a regional course where many of our students (but not all) are studying part time, and we are often thought to be cheaper than sending somebody to a full-time residential college like Cranmer Hall where Philip Plyming is the warden and where I used to teach.

Those financial arguments are not as clear as they first appear, because the costs of training someone at the ERMCC are sometimes in part borne by the students in a way that is hidden, so we do need to make sure that we can fund the right pathway for the right candidate, which means some candidates will be funded on more expensive pathways, because that is what they need and what the Church needs them to do.

Thirdly, we need TEIs to be relieved of the burden of forever worrying about money. When I taught at Cranmer Hall we had a big whiteboard in the admissions office that plotted the progress of people who came on interview and we were always worried about how many students we were going to get and would we get enough to make the books balance. That is true of every TEI. If the review of RME and funding takes that financial worry off TEIs it will be a great relief.

Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth): Throughout the budget paper, and in the debate so far, I have heard references to the Church Commissioners funding various budgets and supporting other aspects of the Church's work. We have other funding partners too: the Corporation of Church House, the Allchurches Trust and the Clewer Sisters. I admit I had not heard of the Clewer Sisters until today. All these organisations have played their part. As a very recently retired member of the Corporation of Church House, I am very aware of how important the contribution of funding partners can be to the Church's budget.

My question is do you think there will ever be a time when we, the Church – and that means all of us not just the national Church but all the way down and up from the parishes and the dioceses – will ever be able to stand on our own financial feet, or will we always need the support of these partners? If that is the case, is that not an inherently very risky place to be? How can we be sure that our other funding partners will always have the funds available for us to access? If we cannot be sure, what is our backstop?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Thank you. I might say that Peter's ability to put the argument for a zero-based budget in a biblical context I find quite inspiring, Peter. I am

sure that everybody involved in Transforming Effectiveness was listening to you carefully. We did actually look at a zero-based budget approach (not rigorously) in preparing the 2020 budget, and I think all I would say is we recognise now one of the things that comes out of Covid is the need to be much more radical and to remove the sense that we can defend the status quo. That option has gone.

In terms of the points around Vote 1, first, I am not aware of any legal reason why we are not able to expand Vote 1 to include finances for lay ministry training if that is what required. It just has not happened in the past. I do think on the back of an emerging strategy we might get there now.

Secondly, I would always hope that a diocese would choose the best route for their ordinands, not what is the cheapest for the sake of it. It is true that we have seen a greater than expected migration to part-time training courses and away from full time. I respect the dioceses' decisions, but equally I am aware that whole position is being reviewed. I understand that piece.

To be honest, in terms of moving away from the TEIs having any financial fears, I am afraid I do not quite get that one if all it means is they are given financial security while there is greater financial insecurity for the Church as a whole. What I am really hoping out of the current debates, and you alluded to Philip Plyming's point earlier, is a dynamic TEI centre which is both [recompensed] properly for the ordinands that we place with them, but, equally, are proactively looking to grow their income streams into lay ministry and other aspects of the Church so that is what creates the financial stability.

Lucy's relationship with the Corporation of Church House gives me the chance to publicly thank them for all their support, and the Allchurches Trust and the Clewer Sisters. The Corporation, as you may recognise, have suffered a massive collapse in their income because of Covid. That will be another of the storm clouds on my horizon, but I thank them for all the help they have given us.

There was a time when I came into this role where the budget for Votes 1 to 5 was nearly entirely funded through apportionment. We deliberately moved away from that as the call came to renew and reform the Church and to move from passive decline to ambitious growth. Yes, the time will come again when we financially stand on our own feet, when that work begins to pay the dividends it needs to pay, when we have reduced all the pieces, as has been said, that we do not need to spend. We go right back to what Peter said, when we have removed those things that do not add to the family business and that do not sustain themselves when placed at the foot of the Cross. For now I believe, and it will be the case for the years to come, that the right thing to do will be to take income from sources beyond apportionment in order that we can give the financial support required to all the transformational initiatives, the governance and the Vision and Strategy reviews and so on currently under way.

The Chair: Canon Spence, we have a number of people still wanting speak, so if I could interrupt you. Forgive me.

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Since the change from the Darlow formula to the SDF and Lower Income funding, we have seen some great new growth projects and better targeting of financial support for churches in more deprived areas. There was the hope when Synod passed these changes that dioceses that lost Darlow funding would be able to make up the shortfall themselves. Despite every effort, this has not proven to be the case, with significant cuts to stipendiary posts across many dioceses already planned before Covid hit. Many have observed the proliferation of half time and House for Duty posts being advertised which look like full-time roles. There is a concern that there will not be enough full-time stipendiary posts for the increased numbers of ordinands and curates in training, and that, in fact, some will be taking half-time posts simply out of necessity. Those reductions lead to church decline and church closures, sadly, and the buildings then need to be cared for by already strapped dioceses and trusts.

Has the time come to reluctantly admit that without historic reserves, many parishes and dioceses are simply not able to afford even a modest level of ministry, and that some central funds are needed to be directed back to subsidise existing parish ministry as they used to do? I know this sounds far from radical, and we cannot go back to the problematic system of Darlow, with all of its inequalities and issues, but surely we can find some way to ensure that a modest level of ministry is still possible in dioceses without historic reserves and ensuring that we are still prioritising parish ministry for the poorest.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): I want to refer back to Carl's speech when he floated the admirable growth idea of an extra 3 million people in the Church of England. That is an interesting idea. That is 200 per church across the entire Church of England. An interesting idea. But weekly attendance is falling. Not a single diocese grew in weekly attendance over the last five years despite much effort by many people in many places. This is not a new phenomenon. Organised religion has been falling in attendance for the last century across Europe. Is God trying to tell us something?

There is nothing wrong with planning a budget for growth and seeking to grow. Jesus had some harsh words for people who did not plan properly before starting building projects. If the growth does not happen, what is plan B?

Mrs Enid Barron (London): I just want to check that this is the right point in the discussion to make a point about environmental expenditure in the budget? I missed the first part of the debate because I could not get in. I really want to warmly welcome the extra expenditure on the environment. Canon Spence has had the painful experience of me nagging him about the environment in the past and I am really grateful to see this additional expenditure.

I had the impression from something Carl Hughes said this might seem a little bit of a luxury, an optional extra. I would like to stress that the money spent on the environment is absolutely essential. It really chimes in with the Archbishops' Vision and Strategy. It chimes in with us being a prophetic church and it chimes in with us being a church which appeals to the young. The environmental work completely underpins all the other Marks of Mission. It is absolutely intrinsic and essential. With even a small extra expenditure which we had last year we have seen a huge amount of work come out of that. I commend this and suggest that it would be lovely if this is kept as a high priority in the future.

We have been reminded by various people and we know that climate change is the biggest challenge, apart from the whole breakdown in ecosystems, facing the planet. If we do not take our environmental responsibilities seriously, there will not be a church left to grow, so thank you so much Canon Spence and colleagues, and please do keep this as a high priority.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I think you are coaching me to keep my replies short, which I am very happy to do. Tim and David, you gave me very legitimate challenges in the same broad area. Tim, I have to say that, sadly, the economies to which you refer are not just being seen in those dioceses that received Darlow money;x it is being seen across the Church.

It brings me back to David's challenge as to what is our plan B. I find our plan B to be a plan of despair, a plan D, because what is the alternative? The alternative is that we quietly retrench and become an ever-shrinking pool of people who are only dealing with themselves, shrinking in number and growing in age. I look at what we have done in the last five years in Strategic Development Funding, and I see some amazingly exciting initiatives achieving large numbers of new worshippers in the most unlikely communities. I must say, Chair, one of the things we need to do is a proper webinar to truly educate Synod members on this. The plan B for me is a plan D, a plan of despair. We have got to keep going. And, of course, Tim, we should consider every possible option. If there was a reason to bring back some such element, I would never rule it out. I have just argued objectivity and radicalism, so I will not avoid anything. I tend to find focused purposeful spend to be more impactful than general subsidy.

Enid, I have been nagged by more persistent naggers than you. You have always been very polite and very focused. We have heard from the Archbishops repeatedly, yesterday and today, about the importance of climate change as the biggest single issue, and I have no doubt as to the importance of that funding.

The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin): I just want to say thank you very much for the support that comes to the dioceses from central funds. You throw us a lifeline and we are extremely grateful for that. However, I just want to say to my fellow General Synod members that we cannot just continue with the thought of, "It is business as usual". We have to decide what is the ministry that is needed in our dioceses, in our

parishes, et cetera. We have also got to ask the hard questions about how we sustain this. What are the resources that we have? We cannot continue to plan in our dioceses and in our parishes for something that somebody else is going to finance. We together must be asking the question of ourselves how are we going to sustain ministry? What kind of ministry? We cannot on the one hand spend millions training clergy and then at the other end we fire them. It does not make sense. It does not connect together. We need seriously to be looking at how we equip the whole body of Christ. That means lay and ordained. That means in those places where we do not have the traditional church. We also need good able people in those places.

I want to say that I do not share any sense of despair. I know that this is God's Church and if it is God's Church, it is going to thrive in spite of our mealy-mouthed attitude sometimes when it comes to the Church. We need to regain our passion for the faith and sharing that faith. Others will not be attracted to it if our lives are not showing signs of being changed by our Lord Jesus Christ. I want to say thank you and commend the budget.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): Of course we should invest in the future of the Church and pray for and hope for the growth of the Church in number and in holiness, in outreach to those on the margins as well. There are no easy answers to how we do this, it is inherently complicated and difficult, but I will be, with pleasure, supporting this budget.

I have to say that I worry, and I worry profoundly, about the sustainability of churches such as ours. We are a medium to large-sized church serving a predominantly rural area. We are a small market town. Our giving has gone down. We have not been able to collect any fees. Our biggest asset, the hall, has become a big liability. Hopefully, all of that will change, but what I would also want to say is we need to look at generosity in a more nuanced way. It is not just about giving through the plate or through a direct debit scheme or through the Parish Share scheme.

One of my wardens paid for our quinquennial out of her own pocket. Somebody else did something utterly heroic. After paying share last month, we had 38 pence in the bank. It is a desperate situation. The cost of mission and evangelism, not just for the Church but at a local level has in many ways gone up exponentially. If ten months ago you had said to me in a small market town of 5,000 that we would be running a food bank and that would have served over 60 families on a regular basis, I would have thought you were mad. There are huge costs that are invisible and being borne in other ways than through traditional methods of giving back to the Church. Digital evangelism and setting up the hybrid church all come with costs, even if it is only people's data costs.

So, I do worry about the sustainability overall of the Church. In fact, I have sleepless nights about it, if I am honest. If we were a business we would have been put into administration or liquidation. There is no other way round that. But I am going to

support this budget because I believe it is right that, even though we may occasionally feel we are in plan D, to be reminded that we are not. I would ask what pastoral and financial assurance can you give that, despite the pain, it will be worth it, and the churches that are feeling the pain are genuinely contributing to the raising of the Cross across the whole the Church of England? Thank you, Chair, and thank you John.

Mr Jonathan Walker (Leicester): I am one of those new Synod members whose time on Synod may be very short-lived come next summer. I would like to thank the staff and colleagues in Leicestershire for making me welcome and getting me here, since I was only elected 11 days ago. I wanted to reflect as a new member and say how encouraged I am by this debate and to support the budget proposals you have before you.

I think a litmus test of many bodies, secular and in the Church, is in how they address and how they talk about money, and how they relate it to their mission and calling. I want to say that you have passed that test, I think, with flying colours. I am so impressed by the leadership.

John Spence, I would like to thank you very much for the way you have introduced these matters and how you have brought faith and spiritual leadership to the matter of finances, but in a way that is also realistic and not fanciful. It is no better to say, "The Lord will provide, so let's set a budget of millions over." I have appreciated that to the extent that I have found the financial discussion and debate and presentation at least as encouraging as that on future vision. That does not happen very often, and that is a credit to you and to others who have contributed to this. I would like to commend you for the process. We are where we are. It is an exciting time. It is a place that will return us to living by faith, and I think that that is such an important place to be. I think that is where our hope is. It is not in ourselves. It is in faith and it is in our trust in God and in following after Jesus Christ.

The final serious point I would make is the area where it feels to me, and where it has felt to me in my too many decades in the Church of England, it is far too unradical in relation to breaking down not just lay ministry but lay leadership. One of the main constraints, in my view, on lay ministry is that it is all too easily seen that leadership remains always with the ordained ministry and we will have lay people and they can do some useful things but, ultimately, it is not about leadership. It has always been emphasised to me that if you want to see who is leading, see who is being followed. Leadership comes all the way across an organisation and rarely just from the people notionally in the positions that have leadership in the title. One place for radical review is the whole business of lay ministry and leadership.

The Chair: Jon, congratulations on your maiden speech. We thought that might be the case, so we are glad we did that right.

Synod, before I ask Canon Spence to respond to those three speakers, and possibly

the whole debate, I would like to test your mind on a motion for the closure. We have a number of other items that we need to vote on in this particular item. I am going to test your mind on a motion for the closure on Item 7.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Canon Spence, could you respond to those last three speakers and anything else that you might want to say in the debate? You have up to five minutes.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I would like to thank again all members of Synod for your contributions this afternoon. I must say I have found them refreshing, interesting, challenging and inspirational. Bishop Rose, I include you in the latter. Thank you so much for the words and the call you gave to others along the line. To Jon, what a wonderful maiden speech and, yes, lay leadership absolutely has to be taken on board. Andrew, you gave us real food for thought about your market town and just how many hidden costs there are.

If I took your three contributions together, together with others in the debate, I would talk about the theme of radicalism. I would talk about the theme of breaking down barriers whatever they may be, or breaking out of hidden costs, Andrew. You talked about the hidden costs of training and bringing people on board to digital evangelism. I would like to get rid of the hidden costs of faculties that are unnecessary, that we take so many more items through the legal reform agenda at a pace which enables us to strip out all these incumbencies to the best operations of the Church. I would like us to understand how we truly release lay leadership and lay ministry. Jon, I will say I am much encouraged by what Bishop Martin and Bishop Chris Goldsmith in the Ministry Council are doing in this space.

We were never called to be a conservative body of Christ. We were called to be a radical body. Andrew has highlighted why now we must grasp the nettles. There is an imperative to do things faster, more urgently, more radically, to preserve the body of Christ. We all know that the rose which is the healthiest, Bishop Rose, is that which is pruned most vigorously from time to time. I am not suggesting anything personal, Bishop. I merely point to that from my gardening experience.

Let us go forward, Synod, and yes, vote for this budget, but give us the clear mandate in so doing that this is, as Carl said at the very start of this debate, one step towards something more rigorous and more radical, in order that we can indeed hold the Cross of Christ high and bring others to the glory of faith that we so enjoy. Chair, I will be very happy to successively move all the resolutions standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Canon Spence. We are now going to move to a vote on Item 7. Whilst we are doing that could I ask the six members of Synod who have a blue hand raised to lower them. This will be a simple vote via Zoom poll on Item 7 that we take note of this Report.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 8

The Chair: We now move to the other items on our Order Paper. First of all, Item 8, Canon Spence, I need you to move each one. Could you move Item 8, please?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 8 on your Order Paper.

The Chair: The matter is now open for debate. The speech limit is two minutes. I call Tim Hind.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): I wonder if, Canon Spence, you would be able to explain why it is that the amount that is shown on our Order Paper is about quarter of a million different from that which was used in your presentation?

The Chair: Canon Spence, that is the only blue hand, so could you respond to that point, please?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): The reason, Tim, is that in Vote 1 there are elements of increase. My paper refers to a £0.9 million increase. In fact, Vote 1 is only going up £0.3 million, the rest of the costs being items being taken through other means: the Church of England Ministry Experience Scheme, the cost of funding the Strategic Ministry Fund. These are different elements. Vote 1 is rising by one amount. The overall increase in expenditure is greater.

The Chair: I see no one wanting to speak, so I put Item 8 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 9

The Chair: Canon Spence, would you move Item 9?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 9.

The Chair: This matter is now open for debate. I call David Lamming.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you for the clarity of your presentation and for all the work you do behind the scenes on behalf of the Church in relation to finance. My question relates to the first bullet point on page 6, paragraph 22, of the budget paper GS 2181 relating to safeguarding. You refer there to the additional

£1.2 million expenditure on safeguarding, but that paragraph does not refer to anything relating to redress.

Can I just remind you of what you said in the debate in Synod back in February: “Let us be very clear, this is not about affordability. It is about justice. Justice cannot have a different value depending on the finances of this or that diocese. Whatever we are told is required by those responsible that is required for redress, then those funds will be found”? Could you comment on that in relation to next year’s budget? Does any part of the budget relate to redress, either an interim scheme or longer term. If mid-year we are told that monies are required, how will those be found?

The Chair: I see no one else wanting to speak. Canon Spence, could you please respond to David?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Thank you, David. I am very happy to stand by those words I said in February. Things took a little while as people waited for the IICSA Report to come out. In terms of next year’s budget, there is a £250,000 item which is entirely for an emergency interim support scheme requested in July by the Bishop of Huddersfield, to which we responded immediately, to enable some very immediate support. I have put my name down to speak on the Safeguarding debate tomorrow, but can report that Archbishops’ Council has already voted to make a substantial sum available for an ongoing support scheme until the full redress scheme is available, in the recognition that that will take quite some time. I can assure you, David, that the actions are matching the words.

The Chair: I now put Item 9 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 10

The Chair: We now move to Item 10. Canon Spence, could you please move?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 10.

The Chair: I see no one wanting to speak, so we can move straight to a vote on Item 10.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 11

The Chair: Now we move to Item 11. Canon Spence to move, please.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 11.

The Chair: This matter is now open for debate. I call Jenny Humphreys followed by the Bishop of Truro. The speech limit is two minutes.

Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells): I have two very dear friends in the Anglican Communion. One was born in India and one in New Zealand. Both were ordained in the Church of England and have worked for the Church of England for various mission agencies and dioceses throughout the Anglican Communion throughout their ministries. One is now retired but actively engaged in refugee advocacy in Central Africa. The other is the dean of the cathedral in Lusaka, Zambia, where I am a lay canon. They have both been a huge influence on my Christian journey and that of many other people throughout their ministry and are great examples of Christian discipleship. I certainly would commend that they, and all the other people who have similar stories, continue to receive their mission agency pension contributions to which we, through the Archbishops' Council, contribute.

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Philip Mounstephen): I speak not just as a former chief executive of one of the mission agencies but as the new chair of the Freedom of Religion and Belief Forum. I thank Jenny Humphreys very much for what she just said. I want to make two simple points. First, I believe the Church of England gets tremendous value out of its mission agencies and it is the only way in which financially we support them. Further, Vote 4 specifically, as Jenny highlighted, enables clergy to be deployed around the Communion without damage to their pension entitlement. It is a very strong commitment to the wider Communion and to the global Church. Given our pressing of Her Majesty's Government yesterday to preserve aid at a level of 0.7% of GDP, it would be bizarre in the extreme if we did not maintain this commitment ourselves.

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): As a member of Crosslinks and as a former member of the Church of England Pensions Board, I want to thank the Church for continuing its generous support of missionary agencies in their work of the presentation of the Gospel worldwide. May it long continue.

The Chair: There is no one else wanting to speak, so Canon Spence, would you like to respond to the debate on Item 11?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Very briefly. Jenny, Bishop Philip and Brian, there were three voices and one message. We thank you for reminding us first of the global contribution that people make on behalf of the Church and, secondly, this item, which so often goes without debate and which can appear so minor, has a far greater strategic importance than the numbers would suggest.

The Chair: Now we move to a vote on Item 11.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 12

The Chair: Now we go to Item 12. Canon Spence, would you please move?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 12.

The Chair: The matter is now open for debate. The speech limit is two minutes.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Once again, I want to thank Mr Spence for the excellent work in sharing out what must be a limited budget across so many vital areas. I want to thank him specifically for the way major amounts of money go into the retirement housing grant, which gives assurance to so many of us who are now going to have to seek rented accommodation in retirement.

One thing that causes me concern is some of my friends who have already retired have found that as their partners or themselves become frailer and things like walk-in showers to replace bathrooms or rails are needed, the response from the housing board has been very mixed. Often they ask for grants from the local authority which, depending on where you live, are not forthcoming, or they seem to drag their feet until the occupant offers to fund them themselves or part fund them out of the limited savings they have. There seems to be a climate of inconsistency. Would he ask the appropriate questions of those responsible to ensure the funding is available so that people in retirement do not have to fund improvements to the houses they are renting?

Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry (Leeds): Canon Spence, thank you very much for all the work that you and others are doing. My question relates to the CHARM scheme and the fact that during the pandemic people who were registered for the scheme were told that much of the work was being put on hold, except for those who were very close to retirement, and that caused considerable anxiety to clergy who were perhaps three years away from retirement. Will this new grant allow the housing department for CHARM to now go ahead and to revitalise its stock of housing where necessary?

Canon David Froude (Bristol): Just a word of thanks on behalf of the many clergy pensioners and their dependants who are supported in their housing needs. I hear the two previous speakers made comments about how the money should be spent and the concerns that they have, but as a former Pension Board trustee I want to thank the Archbishops' Council for the support that they give to the pensioners.

The Chair: I see no one else wanting to speak, so, Canon Spence, would you like to respond to the debate?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): David, thank you for your final contribution. The last time I saw any review of satisfaction about CHARM, the levels of satisfaction were high.

Jonathan, I note what you say. I will liaise with the Chief Executive and Chair of the Pensions Board on the two issues. Your issue should purely be related to Covid. There should not be a financial reason for the work not continuing. The whole funding formula is based on the funds needed for the stock of housing to be kept revitalised. Jonathan, I would always understand CHARM going first to the local authority given there are specific grants to which people have a right, but, no, there should not be variability. I shall pick both issues up with my colleagues.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Canon Spence. Now I put Item 12 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 13

The Chair: Now we move to Item 13. Canon Spence, please would you move?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move Item 13.

The Chair: The matter is now open for debate. The speech limit is two minutes. I call upon Mark Barker.

Revd Mark Barker (Rochester): The Archbishop of York spoke earlier in his vision address about living within our means as part of the simpler value he was discussing. While I am encouraged to see a reduction in the apportionment bill by 1.6%, I am aware that Rochester Diocese is potentially looking at a 6% reduction in Parish Share and giving across the diocese, and that this is a better position than in many dioceses. That means a 1.6% reduction is actually a percentage increase from dioceses compared to the loss of what the dioceses are receiving. I believe that, on average, charities are budgeting for a 6% reduction in income next year and I would have hoped to have seen a like reduction in the apportionment in order that, as Philip North said in the earlier debate, dioceses and parishes may utilise what reduced giving they receive to be in support of those affected by the growing tsunami of need in our communities, so we can hold the Cross up in the parishes even higher as the local church, which must surely be the hope for our nation and communities at this time.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Canon Spence, John, I would like to ask your advice as a diocesan lay chair and member of our diocesan board of finance. We have been facing, as the previous speaker explained, a significant shortfall in income. Winchester is not a diocese blessed with reserves, and so everything that we have to spend pretty much comes from the parishes. We do not call that share, we call it our common mission fund. That has reduced by somewhere around 25% to a third. We have had to make significant cuts. We are trying to keep our pie chart looking the same so we spend about the same centrally on diocesan staff and about the same on parish ministry. It is difficult therefore to make the case for giving more to the central church. How would you advise that I should speak in our diocesan board of finance?

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): John, I have a question for you relating to the table of apportionment at page 11 of the budget paper. This shows in the penultimate column pooling arrangements for 2019-20 which vary between a reduction in the apportionment to London of some £792,000 compared to an increase, I think the largest, for the Diocese of Leeds of £154,000. Last week when I put that at the pre-Synod meeting of our diocesan team none of us was aware of the basis upon which these adjustments were made. Perhaps we ought to have been, but perhaps you could explain how some dioceses after the initial apportionment get varied up or down by quite significant amounts.

The Chair: I see no one else wanting to speak, so, Canon Spence, could you please respond to the debate?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): If I could start David by thanking you. The detailed workings of the apportionment are too complex for me to explain in the time available. I will arrange that you are sent a note as to explain exactly how the various adjustments work and I will ask that it is posted on the Synod website for others who want to see it.

Mark and Alison, your points were of a rather similar hue. First, I do not think that a 1.6% reduction is sustainable, Mark. I remind you, first, that the budget cycle works well in advance of when Covid broke upon us. Secondly, we made modest adjustments to the budget for 2021, having been asked not to do anything that would get in the way of the ability to implement the various reviews under way.

And, thirdly, the Transforming Effectiveness piece will have to produce both increases in effectiveness and reductions in cost by enabling us to understand those things that we should stop doing altogether and those things that we should do only in one place rather than several.

To you, Alison, thanks for all you are doing in Winchester. I hope that would be the message to your diocesan board of finance. I am always happy to come and talk with them by whatever means, on Zoom or whatever, but I would say please understand that this is a one-year situation. We fully recognise that there is a need for more fundamental change going forward. Radicalism comes to my mind again. I would also encourage your diocesan board of finance to learn from the example of other dioceses. I would remind Synod members that we have one or two dioceses who have through their own efforts seen virtually no reduction in their income from what we tend to call Parish Share.

The Chair: I therefore put Item 13 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on simple poll via Zoom.

ITEM 14

The Chair: Now we come to Item 14 and I ask you to please move this, Canon Spence.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): With your leave, Chair, before I do so, can I just take 30 seconds to thank you for chairing this debate so patiently and thoroughly? May I place on record my thanks to the entire staff at Church House, all the teams that give me such support in what is purely a voluntary role, particularly the finance and strategic development teams, and of course especially my ever-present stalwart David White, who is a constant support of guidance, support and friendship. I so move Item 14.

The Chair: I see no one wanting to speak, so I am going to put Item 14 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple poll via Zoom.

The Chair: Members of Synod, thank you very much for that debate. Apologies to those who we did not have time to call, but I want to say to Canon Spence thank you very much for the wisdom, the skill, the candour, the passion and the expertise which you have brought in answering these questions. We are greatly indebted to you for all that you do on our behalf. Thank you very much for answering these questions and moving these items in our debate today.

We will now adjourn Synod for 30 minutes for a screen break. We will meet back here at 4.45 pm.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 5.10 pm.

ITEM 506

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

DRAFT SAFEGUARDING (CODE OF PRACTICE) MEASURE (GS 2182)

The Chair: Good afternoon, synod. We now move to Item 506 but, before that, I just need to give a couple of housekeeping notices. Firstly, if you have not done so already, would you please amend your name, rename yourself on Zoom, so that we can see a three digit Synod number – I am 055 for instance – and then the letter B, C or L, to give us a clue as to which House you belong to, and then your name. When you are called to speak, if you could please announce yourself as you would do in Synod if we were here in the chamber with your name, diocese and Synod number. That really helps people who are keeping a note of all of this.

We move to Item 506, which is the First Consideration stage for the draft Safeguarding (Code of Practice) Measure. Members will need the draft Measure (GS 2182), the

Policy paper (GS 2182P), and the Explanatory Notes (GS 2182X). I call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, the Dean of the Arches and Auditor, to move Item 506, “That the Measure entitled ‘Safeguarding (Code of Practice) Measure’ be considered for revision in Full Synod”. Dean, you have up to ten minutes to speak.

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): This limited but highly significant piece of legislation is being brought to Synod today for First Consideration, as you have heard. As the Policy and Explanatory Notes make clear, this provision is an important part of the Church’s response to the IICSA Report of 2019 on case studies relating to Peter Ball and the Diocese of Chichester. It also relates to the humbler and simpler and safe Church parts of what his Grace the Archbishop of York was telling us about the vision this morning.

The recommendations in the IICSA Report, which were founded on the evidence presented to the inquiry, included one which related to the use of the term “due regard” in the legislation as it currently stands concerning safeguarding guidance issued by the House of Bishops. Amongst other witnesses, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury gave evidence to the effect that the term of art “due regard” was unclear.

The difficulty here is that guidance, which is what it relates to, can mean different things in different contexts and so the associated term in that context of “due regard”, therefore, itself becomes unclear. On a matter of such vital importance for the life of the Church and for those in society whom we seek to serve, lack of clarity is unacceptable. It is also unnecessary because putting it right can be achieved by the proposed amendment to the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure of 2016.

The mechanism of the proposed new provision is simple. The House of Bishops, firstly, is to be placed under a statutory duty to issue a Code of Practice on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults. Next, a new section 5A is to be inserted into the 2016 Measure and it will include an expanded list of relevant persons who may be made subject to requirements in the Code, as well as the Code more generally giving guidance. There would be a statutory duty to comply with a requirement imposed on one of those relevant persons. The word “person” includes not only natural persons, such as clergy, licensed lay workers, churchwardens and members of PCCs, but also various diocesan bodies. Failure to comply with the requirements would constitute misconduct for the purposes of the Clergy Discipline Measure of 2003.

The duty to have regard under section 5 of the 2016 Measure is to be replaced, along with certain parallel legislation dealing with specific situations relating to safeguarding, including, as we saw and heard this morning, the new Cathedrals Measure 2021. The same will also apply to the Diocesan Boards of Education Measure which we will be considering tomorrow.

As the Chairman and the agenda have both explained, the Business Committee has consented to the motion in respect of this Measure being, “That the Measure entitled

‘Safeguarding (Code of Practice) Measure’ be considered for revision in Full Synod”. That reflects the desire for this really important legislation to come into force as soon as is properly possible. I feel very honoured as my first legislative duty in General Synod to have been asked to Chair the Steering Committee for this Measure and I commend it to Synod.

The Chair: Dean, thank you so much for that. The motion is now open for debate. I remind members that, under Standing Order 51, speeches must be directed to the general purport of the Measure rather than to points of detail and, even if you have put in a request to speak, you need to raise your blue hand.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Perhaps it should fall to me to welcome the Dean of the Arches to her role and to her place in Synod. I have enjoyed working with her already and I know we are going to be well-served in the years ahead. I, of course, want to welcome this proposal and on behalf of the clergy – I am sure I speak for almost all of us – to say that we want to and expect to be held to the highest standards in safeguarding both in terms of our duties and the consequence of any failure to perform those duties.

But, in saying that and in reading the Measure and around it a bit, I have been left with the question: what about the laity? It is important that this Measure holds lay people who play a role to account. It confers duties in section 5, but what it does not seem to me to do is to address the issue of any sanction relating to failure to perform those duties. Surely, I would argue, the sanctions need to be included in legislation rather than in a Code of Practice.

With that in mind, I would like to speak to three areas. Firstly, relating to churchwardens. Sanctions exist under the 2016 Measure and the 2001 Churchwardens Measure around suspension and disqualification of churchwardens, but this only applies to the situation where an offence is committed, an arrest is made or harm is perceived to have been caused. It does not seem to apply to a situation where a churchwarden is given a duty under these proposals but then fails to carry them out or ignore them. I recognise that there is special provision in the 2001 Churchwardens Measure to allow a bishop to delegate duties to another person, but these only apply to duties conferred under that Measure and not to those under the 2016 Measure as it would be amended by the Code of Practice.

So you could have a situation where a churchwarden is not doing their duties but still holds the office of churchwarden. It seems to me that we need to give to the bishop a power to disqualify churchwardens for failure to perform safeguarding responsibilities in this Measure. I cannot see that they exist as they are, although I am very happy to be corrected by the Dean’s learned wisdom. This is something I think we must return to in revision in full Synod.

Then I want to speak briefly about the new clause 5A(n). At 5A(n) we are referred to people who work “on any basis” and I wonder whether that phrase is another of what IICSA call “term of art”. Does “any basis” include voluntary as well as employed basis? If as I assume the answer to that is yes, then I think more thought is needed. Where is the sanction and who is to exercise the sanction for a failure of a person under the employment of a PCC to perform their duties?

We currently have no formal process to sanction lay volunteers, and maybe this Measure should give us an opportunity to think about that. I wonder if it would be better to give the PCC a power to remove a lay volunteer. I certainly do not think it should be left to the incumbent to do that on his or her own bat, especially with the threat of the CDM as currently is. I think some work needs to be done on that.

There is then a final point I want to make about where there are some gaps in 5A(n). In the Diocese of Southwark, we have a proprietary chapel which has become the source of a particularly serious safeguarding matter, as is well known. Where people are employed by private trusts or third parties but in a C of E context, we ought I think to bring them into the same safeguarding regime as everybody else and I wonder whether that has been overlooked.

We see people at the moment worrying about the future. We have seen it, for example, in the well-publicised CEEC video, people looking for structural places in the Church of England. I fear that, with funds being possibly squirreled away in the coming years into private trusts to fund ministry, we may find there is a loophole there that we might be better to block before it becomes a serious concern. I, broadly speaking, welcome this, but I think there is quite a bit more that needs to be attended to in this Measure.

The Chair: I was so excited about looking for blue hands, I forgot to say the speech limit at the moment is five minutes.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Ven. Paul Ayers (Leeds): As an archdeacon, I am heavily involved in safeguarding and I agree with a lot of what Simon has just said. Archbishop Stephen spoke this morning about a hasty response to IICSA and I am concerned that this may be a bit too hasty. When my kids were at university, they told me that the motto for getting work in on time was, “Don’t get it right, just get it written”, but the opposite applies to legislation and we need to remember that IICSA is not infallible.

I have four concerns. The first one is a concern about asking for First Consideration without seeing at least a draft of the Code of Practice. The current policy and practice guidance is lengthy, complex and it is constantly being revised by the NST, who are also far from infallible, and not even tracked changes are given. Is it envisaged that all of this should form the Code of Practice and, if not, what is envisaged?

The oldest trick in the synodical book is to push through First Consideration of a general principle because we will get the detail later and, then, when the detail is presented, we are told, “Well, we voted for the general principle so we must approve the detail”. My second concern is about the requirement for the House of Bishops to issue this without all the scrutiny. There is no provision for this Synod or anyone else to comment or revise what the House of Bishops issue.

My third question, echoing what Simon said, is a question about what sanctions or penalties are envisaged and for what persons or bodies and by whom to be imposed for breaches of the Code of Practice if it is not for something within CDM? If compliance is to be a legal requirement, what happens when someone judges that someone has not complied and who is to judge? Are we wanting to invite more litigation?

My fourth concern, finally, is about an apparent movement towards what is sometimes called mandatory reporting, whatever that may mean. We all know that mandatory reporting sounds very attractive but it is very difficult to pin down. In jurisdictions where it exists, it takes very different forms and it is not straightforward to decide who must report what to whom and, again, what if they do not. I think we need answers to these questions before we can simply approve the motion that is before us. We should not legislate in haste.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln): Clause 2(1) of the draft Measure provides for repeal of the troublesome “due regard” provision and proposes a replacement phrase “must comply” with the requirement as regards the Code of Practice. Synod, I wonder if we can do better with the drafting of these new provisions. The model of using soft law to regulate professional standards is not new. By “soft law” – sometimes called grey law – I mean the Code of Practice that is referred to. I note also that there will be a corresponding amendment to section 8 of the 2003 Clergy Discipline Measure.

The soft law of the Code of Practice will have hard sanctions where there is a breach of its provisions. Any Code of Practice must communicate well with those it seeks to regulate in order to guarantee standards. There is an elusiveness in the current draft and the use of the word “requirement” does not go far enough to distinguish between mandatory and discretionary obligations. This is what is in the Policy paper, GS 2182P, paragraph 2.2, where there is a reference to the SCIE guidance.

In my view, any Code must set out these four things: one, principles; two, best practice; three, clearly defined obligations or duties; and 4, any additional guidance. So I have concerns about the drafting of the proposed clauses, 1(3) and 1(4), whose drafting in compliance with a requirement does not reflect good practice in the regulatory professional standards and does not stand up to the demands of what we are seeking to do here.

I would prefer to see language that mirrors what I understand would be a new code and responds more fully to the gravamen of what the IICSA Report said and the underlying

purposes of our own Policy paper. Can I respectfully ask that this is looked at again in Revision Committee.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): When I first started talking about safeguarding in the Church of England, I was taken aside by a senior church figure and told that this was problematic because I was trying to get ourselves aligned to the ordinary safeguarding law whereas we have a system suitable for the Church of England, and therein I think lays much of the problem. The system suitable for the Church of England started with perhaps a good idea and then had things bolted on and bolted on and changed and added to and already in the debate we are having suggestions put in.

I am very much behind Carl's way of thinking that we really need to get the scheme of things clear and everybody needs to have a system that is coherent from the outset with proper structure. To avoid us falling into this problem again of just keeping adding and losing focus, I just would like to say that one of the problems is that we clearly are not always human rights compliant. If we start talking about how to discipline churchwardens and how to discipline people who are employed, we are now getting into HR territory, we are getting into ACAS territory, we are getting into Unite territory. I wonder if, before we start going down those sorts of routes – which may need to be done – would it not make an awful lot of sense to have some discussions with Unite, the trade union, and possibly ACAS themselves as well.

The final point I want to make is to remind everybody of the research from the Sheldon Hub in August of this year to show how vitally important it is that we get this CDM matter right because Sheldon reports to us that 40% of our clergy who fall foul of CDM contemplate taking their own lives. Some of us have some experience of what it is like for people and families going through the CDM process and we must get it right because to get it wrong through sloppiness is not only wrong in law; it is cruel.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): I reflect Simon Butler's concerns that there may be a disconnect between the way that the clergy are treated and the laity are treated in this. In particular, when we are talking about safeguarding and clergy discipline, there is certainly an implication that the discipline applied to clergy might apply not only if they fail to follow the House of Bishops' guidelines but if they actually transgress by committing safeguarding offences.

We do not have the same situation applying to the laity where if a churchwarden or a member of a PCC actually engages in serious psychological abuse – which is not a criminal offence but is an offence within the guidelines – there does not appear to me at the moment to be any sanction which enables the churchwarden or the other member of the PCC to be disqualified from office because of behaviour which is actually going against the Code of Practice, the guidelines that we as a Church all subscribe to.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I support this Measure but I do have one concern which needs to be addressed at the Revision stage. The Code of Practice issued by

the House of Bishops is not subject to approval by the General Synod in any way, even under the Deemed Approval process. The House of Bishops may issue a Code which imposes requirements on clergy and failure to follow those requirements would be misconduct under the Clergy Discipline Measure. So, the House of Bishops may introduce new forms of misconduct without any form of scrutiny by Synod and, in practice, it will not be the House of Bishops which drafts these new requirements but the National Safeguarding Team. I consider this to be constitutionally wrong. Synod should have to approve a requirement, failure to follow which would be misconduct.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): In the virtual synodical forum, we are unable to show support for other speakers by simply clapping as we perhaps would have done when we are all together, so I would like to underscore what Archdeacon Paul Ayers has just said. There are all sorts of things in this Measure which are much to be supported and I hope very much that we will take it through to the next stages, but we do need a strong commitment to ensure that the Revision stage is done thoroughly and that the issues that Archdeacon Paul and others have raised in this debate are very carefully looked at and that we do not fall into what he describes as “the oldest trick in the synodical book”. We must not allow that to happen.

I would also just like to make the remark that, as we look to the mixed ecology that we were talking about this morning and having all the different kinds of exercises in leadership patterns of churches, we need to ensure that we have some way which imposes not quite HR but ecclesiastical discipline over those lay people who may find themselves leading churches in that mixed ecology that we look to. The issues around elected leaders in churches have also just been raised, but I would just like to underscore again the need for us to ensure that the Revision stage here is extraordinarily thoroughly done so that we can support the principle but not lead ourselves into all kinds of unintended and difficult consequences.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I want to build a little bit on some of what Simon Butler said by questioning the omission of religious communities from the list of relevant persons in the proposed clause 5A. I have raised this with both the legal staff and the Steering Committee so they will not be surprised by it. To me, the most important intention of this Measure is to put beyond any doubt that we are determined that there should be no place with anything remotely described as the Church of England where abuse or inadequate safeguarding can exist or thrive. I am not suggesting for one moment that there are some parts which are more or less likely than others to harbour abuse but, rather, we make it clear to those inside and outside the Church, but especially the survivors of previous abuse, that we are determined to leave no stone unturned and that no one is exempt.

The danger of making a list that seeks to be comprehensive is that more attention is given to what it omits rather than what it includes. In the context of how we have

stylised legislation in recent times, I am surprised that there is no provision for extending this list of relevant persons.

So I ask the Steering Committee not only to fill existing gaps, such as including religious communities, but also to look to including a simple way of adding new groups that may emerge in the future and which should then be included without having to go through a full legislative revision of the Measure.

The vision set out so enthusiastically by Archbishop Stephen earlier looks for a mixed ecology. Consequently, this will throw up other groups and individuals that we cannot yet imagine but who should be subject to the same oversight, not least those in the social media context where safeguarding is so critical.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I am very interested in this discussion about how lay people can be brought into this regime. It is absolutely clear that the responsibilities of lay people must be those that are observed by clergy. By the same token, of course, lay people can need protection from malicious accusations and, so far, it has been very difficult to find an answer to that question.

The other thing I would like to say is there is no definition – there probably will be in the Code of Practice – of what we mean by “vulnerable adult”. My own view, which I have expressed in Synod before, is that all adults can be vulnerable at certain times and if we have a definition of “vulnerable adult” which is too narrow, then some can be missed.

The obvious and worst case of all that we have come across is the murder of Peter Farquhar and the Oxford case. He was not regarded as a vulnerable adult but he turned out to be extremely vulnerable, and so I think that is a major question to be approached.

Revd Simon Talbott (Ely): I am the convener in Synod of the small group of clergy who are members of the Church of England Clergy Advocates, which is the Church of England branch of Unite. I would just like, in that vein, to speak in support of the items raised by Martin Sewell and Carl Fender. We need, yes, this particular piece of legislation, but it needs to be handled very carefully, particularly as it sits alongside the revision of the CDM which is currently underway.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I have until recently been a regional chairman of NHS Complaints. I have also served on clergy discipline tribunals. I welcome the Measure, but the Measure is only going to work if you have got the right people working within the Code of Practice. The people that I work with all have to show due regard and they have to have guidance in the training to be able to cross-examine and to understand any complaint before them.

My concern is that, whilst this is extremely well-intentioned – and I do thank the Dean of the Arches, who I know very well – it does depend on the people who are going to

police it. A huge amount is put into this with high expectations, but I worry, for instance, with the Code of Practice whether the core group will have the right people serving on it. So whilst we are determined to make certain and raise awareness, reassure the victims that we are here and meaning business, you were mentioning earlier, Simon Butler and others, about discipline: how is discipline to be done? Well, discipline will only be done if we have got the right people trained to understand and interpret any kind of complaint behind them.

For instance, I think there should be legal expertise. Although I am legally trained, on any NHS complaint there was always a legal guider. Similarly, there is in a court of law, with the jury there are legal people offering it. Whilst, of course, I am very pleased that the Code of Practice is coming forward, I worry about those people in the core groups. I worry how often they are going to be reviewed. I worry whether it is going to be considered that they will automatically be reappointed. The danger is that the same people could be there and a different complaint against the same bishop or dean or whoever it might be. I urge some caution on it and I urge some training, training in cross-examination, training in understanding what a complaint means and making certain that there are legal members available.

I end with, obviously, we are providing – and I know we are – through the CDM a lot of guidance, but I want much more than that and I would urge Morag and the team to look for giving that training, the training – I am repeating myself – of cross-examination. Of course, I support the Measure. I wish it had even come earlier. The Code of Practice is going to be crucial. As Paul Benfield says, I would hope all the lay and clergy would be involved and it is not just the House of Bishops.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): I well remember being deeply involved in the 2016 Safeguarding Measure and having debates during that about the phrase “due regard”. I lost those debates. I am now delighted that IICSA has picked us up on the use of it and pleased to see that this legislation is tackling IICSA’s requirements on it. I would like to pick up on the Code of Practice and the House of Bishops’ role. Of course, the House of Bishops must issue it because we need to continue to take our lead responsibility for safeguarding.

However, if anyone thinks that we would produce a Code of Practice without consulting widely, including lay and clergy, please think again. This is a legal requirement of who issues it and, absolutely, I am sure we would ensure that it was widely consulted on beforehand. I think a lot of very helpful comments have been made, particularly by the two Archdeacons, Archdeacon Ayers and Archdeacon Miller, on ensuring that processes are followed carefully through the revision process and also I think the questions that Martin Sewell raised around laity and just how carefully we have to step in that in terms of requirements. But, Synod, please endorse this at this stage. Take it through to revision. Revise carefully, and please be assured that the House of Bishops will make sure the Code of Practice is properly consulted on.

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): I would like to emphasise the point that Simon Butler made regarding proprietary chapels. My church is the proprietary chapel that he mentioned and I would not wish it to go unsaid that we would not fully support his request that proprietary chapels must be included in this order.

Revd Stephen Corbett (Blackburn): I was not intending to speak in this debate. I am not a lawyer and I am not a safeguarding specialist. I am just a vicar. I do recall being a relatively new member of the Synod that at the February sessions we had conversations relating to this and what I have heard in the introduction to this debate is that much of this that we are discussing now is to be dependent on the CDM of 2003.

The Sheldon Report recommended the replacement of CDM. I do not have the papers in front of me, but I recall that the House of Bishops voted, following a Report I think from the Bishop of Lambeth, Bishop Thornton, to replace the CDM. What I am hearing is we are going to introduce a Code of Conduct that we have before us – only a draft one – and it is going to be based on something that we have agreed in principle, I think, to replace. Perhaps we are putting the cart before the horse. Could we get the replacement of the CDM sorted and then we can produce a Code of Conduct, which I agree with Simon Butler needs to be applicable to lay officers as well as to clergy. Let us get it in the right order and then perhaps we will have something which can stand the test of time, going forward in a robust manner.

The Chair: Before the next speaker, I am just going to authorize a simple poll using the Zoom poll to test the mind of Synod for closure of this debate. I see that the Bishop of Lambeth has put his blue hand up. I would quite like to hear him after Damian Feeney. So, Damian Feeney, the Bishop of Lambeth and then we will close the debate. I put this poll to Synod now that we close the debate after the next two speakers.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

Revd Damian Feeney (Lichfield): I am very heartened by the thought that there is going to be a more through-composed sense in the Revision stage and that there will be proper accountability due to lay officers, but I wonder if I could make one further plea and it is this. The position of ordinands with regard to the CDM process is anomalous to say the least.

I was in theological education for six years, and where the actual authority for their discipline, so to speak, lay was perhaps murky at best, a kind of pulling together of the training institution and the relevant diocese. I hope very much that those people who fall into this category should be properly covered by due process and by a Clergy Discipline Measure and that, therefore, the sorts of problems which often occur where people fall down the cracks in between these various categories could be addressed.

The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton): For the purpose of this performance, I am the Bishop to Her Majesty's Forces. I also happen to be the Bishop

at Lambeth as well. In whichever role I appear, I am chairing a group looking at the revision of the CDM, so I thought it might be helpful just to add a couple of words in the light of various speeches that have been made. I am very supportive of this Measure and do hope that Synod will back it. I understand that, of course, there are other matters that we are discussing which will be picked up, I hope, by the revision that we are bringing forward.

Just to let Synod members know, I am very hopeful that we will bring a paper before the February Synod group of sessions setting out a direction of travel and, indeed, indicating that I believe, and the House of Bishops have agreed, that we need to replace the Clergy Discipline Measure with something else altogether. However, I have to say that the Church of England is not necessarily known for being the speediest when it does its work and replacing the CDM will take some time.

Therefore, it is very clear to me that this Measure is important to put through not only to show what we mean and to show that we are committed to what we mean in the light of the IICSA Report, but also to pick up some of the matters that are being debated in this Measure which can then, I believe, be taken forward.

I am very grateful to the Dean of the Arches, who I have already had various conversations with and is proving very supportive indeed with the work that we are doing more generally. I do believe this Measure is important. I actually think the whole question of lay officers and how we do indeed put in place proper measures is a very important one, as indeed is the point made just now about ordinands.

There is much to be done. The paper in February will simply be setting out how we are going to go about it because it will take some time to bring those changes in. Please, do support this, but I am listening carefully to all that is being said.

The Chair: I call on the Dean of the Arches now to respond to that debate. Dean, you have up to ten minutes to respond.

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): Thank you very much indeed, Mr Chairman. I just saw the message about the ten minutes on the chat with gratitude. This has certainly been a very good way of virtually meeting a number of members of Synod who I did not already know. I am very grateful to those expressions of welcome and support for me personally in carrying through this work which, as I said earlier, I regard as very important and a great honour to be entrusted with this, and so I thank members of Synod for those expressions.

I also thank and I am heartened by the fact that none of those who have spoken have taken issue with the principle of the need for our Church to be grappling as a matter of urgency with safeguarding and introducing and strengthening and putting in place proper measures. Really, what has been addressed very helpfully are a number of matters which can be taken forward in a variety of strands. Firstly, in the work of the

Steering Committee which I shall be chairing, I have been scribbling away madly while everyone has been talking, and I think I have got a good summary of people's concerns. I will touch on some of those in a moment.

The second strand of work which is intimately connected with this Measure is, of course, the House of Bishops' Code of Practice workstream. I am very grateful to the two Bishops who have spoken about that, assuring Synod that the House of Bishops is listening and has listened to the points that have been raised in the last three-quarters of an hour or so. I will look to the House of Bishops to consult widely in the ways that have been indicated and to align the work that they do on the Code with the work that Bishop Tim at Lambeth is leading with regard to CDM generally.

Yes, there are connections between this Measure and the Code and the wider topic of CDM. They are connected but they are not logically dependent upon one another. For the reasons which I alluded to in my opening speech, and which was set out in the Policy and Explanatory Notes and referred to again by Bishop Tim, this matter is urgent. It is urgent and important that the Church of England responds and is seen to respond to the perfectly valid and important points made by IICSA. That is why I am very grateful that none of the speakers has taken issue with the fundamental principle of stronger safeguarding legislation. We need to get on with it, but we need to get on with it wisely and carefully.

A number of specific points have been made. Several speakers spoke about the relationship of this Measure to laity. This is clearly a matter which the House of Bishops is going to have to continue to consider carefully and, also, the Steering Committee. I do know from one of my other hats that I wear that this topic has already started to be considered and recognised as important but complex by the National Safeguarding Steering Group and also listening, as that group always does very carefully, to the National Safeguarding Panel. So, yes, profoundly important; yes, complex and requiring really careful thought.

When this Measure returns to Synod, clearly a great deal more work will have been done both to the draft Measure and in terms of the House of Bishops' work, as well as the parallel CDM review, and so Synod will undoubtedly have more detailed information in February next time that it is considered. I am not going to mention everybody by name, I am afraid, because there was some useful overlap of points, but I do want specifically to respond to Dr Mike Todd to thank him for his very helpful correspondence that we have had and that has been had with the Legal Office and the specific position of religious communities.

Also, to address at the same time the point made by Mr Damian Feeney about ordinands. Both of those communities of people require careful consideration to ensure that they are covered. Certainly, I know from my own work, wearing yet another hat with regard to TEIs, of the complexity of which Mr Feeney speaks. The complexity with regard to religious communities, I would very much hope, is improved by the Measure

which has now been passed with regard to rationalising those bodies. Certainly, work in relation to Dr Miller's point has already started in terms of thinking about that and the point has been drawn to Bishop David Walker's attention as Lead Bishop for those communities.

Several speakers, including Fr Luke Miller, spoke about the relationship of this Measure to the mixed ecology within the Vision. Yes, that is absolutely right and as important and probably connected with the points that have been made about laity and the need for them both to be accountable and protected. Again, there will clearly need to be liaison between my committee and the House of Bishops as we both work on those matters. I very much take the point about the need for more and very careful work.

I am extremely grateful to members of Synod for the points which they have already raised. I would encourage Synod members to continue to raise matters. If you have not had a chance to speak today, please email Synod Support or the Legal Office or me. It is probably best if you go through Synod Support so that everything gets properly registered and tabulated, but if you have got further points please raise them and they will be taken into account. Upon that undertaking and commitment, I would very much hope that Synod is prepared to vote in favour of the motion which is, "That the Measure entitled 'Safeguarding (Code of Practice) Measure' be considered for revision in Full Synod". Thank you once again for all your contributions.

The Chair: I, therefore, put Item 506 to the vote. I am going to authorize a simple vote by Zoom poll in this instance, "That the Measure entitled 'Safeguarding (Code of Practice) Measure' be considered for revision in Full Synod".

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote by Zoom.

The Chair: The Measure now proceeds to the Revision stage in full Synod. This is expected to take place during next February's group of sessions. That completes the item of business and thank you for all those who have taken part in that very important debate. We now stay logged on, please, as we move to the next item.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 6.15 pm.

ITEM 15

APPOINTMENT OF ONE MEMBER OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2183)

The Chair: Good evening, members of Synod, ecumenical friends and anyone else who is tuning in. We come to the last item on the agenda for today, Item 15, which is the appointment of Matthew Frost to serve a second five-year term on the Archbishops' Council from 25 November 2020. I invite the Archbishop of York, Stephen Cottrell, to move Item 15. You may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Synod, I start with an assumption. Always dangerous I know but, nonetheless, I will assume that you have already read GS 2183, which gives further details of this appointment to the Archbishops' Council and that you have clocked the Errata for this Item listed on Notice Paper III. I, therefore, do not intend to repeat all that information now.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and I are extremely grateful to Matthew for his contributions to the work of the Archbishops' Council over the last five years. Matthew was one of the main authors of the 2017 Report, *Setting God's People Free*, and has continued to be part of the advisory body responsible for implementing the recommendations this Report set, things that have already been referred to today. Matthew's insight into leading change and identifying how this can be achieved have been profoundly helpful.

Matthew is also a member of the Strategic Investment Board, bringing a wealth of experience and understanding around the management and evaluation of projects. His input has been a constant source of encouragement and constructive challenge. In addition, Matthew has considerable experience in the not-for-profit sector, having been the Chief Executive of Tearfund and leading on Medair's programme in Afghanistan. He currently serves on the boards of Christians against Poverty and Open Doors.

Matthew is one of six Archbishops' Council members that are appointed jointly by the Archbishops with the approval of the General Synod and we are grateful that Matthew has indicated he is willing to serve a further term until 2025. Therefore, the Archbishop of Canterbury and I commend this appointment to you and I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop. Please, may I remind members that if you wish to speak that you indicate by using the blue hand, thank you. Item 15 is now open for debate. I call the Chair of the House of Laity, Jamie Harrison, to speak. You have up to five minutes, thank you.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): It would be remiss of me if I failed to seek to speak in favour of the reappointment of Matthew to be an appointed member of the Archbishops' Council. As you will be aware, the Council has 19 members: Obviously, the two Archbishops – it is a joint Council point – the First Estates Commissioner, ten members elected by the three Houses of the Synod and six who are appointed members who are both lay and ordained.

Appointed members, as we have already heard from the Archbishop, bring many skills and expertise, experience, a wide vision and, where appropriate, a challenge to the work and the decisions of the Council. We have already heard a lot today, helpfully, from John Spence, one of our other appointed lay members of the Council. As Synod can see from GS 2183, Matthew brings and has continued to bring huge areas of

expertise particularly in leadership in an NGO context, as well as his work in Government.

Allied to his skills in strategic thinking and how to deliver things on the ground, he has a profound outward looking Christian faith, so well expressed in his chairing of the Lay Leadership Task Group which, as we have heard, led to the Report, *Setting God's People Free*. As a Co-Chair of the *Setting God People's Free* Advisory Group, along with Bishop Rachel of Gloucester, we are delighted that Matthew continues to play a very active and significant role on that Advisory Group.

Equally, his understanding of key issues brings to the Strategic Investment Board much wisdom and, of course, challenge as we look at a whole range of financial matters to bring mission and ministry and growth together across the Church. So it is quite right that we should welcome – and I certainly hope we can welcome – his willingness to be reappointed to an Archbishops' Council which grows in its need to think clearly and effectively over the next five years. I trust that Synod will join with me wholeheartedly and with the Archbishops in reappointing him for five years.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): I want to preface my comments by saying this is nothing about Matthew in particular. I think he is an extraordinary man and a great gift to the Church. It is more about the term that we are asking appointed members to serve. Many in Synod will remember that I was one of the first appointed members. We were appointed for terms of three years and then we were staggered in order to ensure that there was a renewal of fresh voices on the Council.

My concern here – and I think it is more wanting to lodge a concern – is that having someone serving for ten years means that that freshness, that new outside voice, is not current. The whole point of the Archbishops' Council's appointed members, as I was told when we first started, was to bring an outside perspective. I would just ask that we look, as we seek to reappoint other members, at ensuring that we keep to that commitment of having an opportunity for fresh voices to come on, that we look at three to five year terms and that we do not have people who serve for so long that they become part of the institution, in a sense.

The Chair: I invite Archbishop Stephen to reply. You have up to five minutes.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, and thank you Jamie and Jayne, Jamie for your support of Matthew, and Jayne, also, I know supporting Matthew but making a point that I think I would have liked to have made myself. I was rather hoping somebody might ask a question like that. I have only just become a member of the Archbishops' Council myself. I am learning. Although I have been hugely impressed by the commitment of the people involved on the Archbishops' Council, I think many of us on the Council, perhaps all of us, would note that we do not have the diversity that we need to be the very best that we can be because, I think I may have mentioned this morning, diversity for me is actually one of the ways we make

better decisions because we have all the perspectives or as many perspectives as possible around the table.

So, Jayne, I agree with you that we do need to be constantly thinking about bringing in fresh voices. I am concerned that I think there is only one BAME member of Archbishops' Council. Apologies if I have got that wrong but I think there is only one. There are only five female members, so we do need to look at that. Thank you, Jayne, for the reminder of that. Nevertheless, right now before us is the appointment of Matthew, or the reappointment of Matthew. I hope that has your fulsome support because Matthew brings so much to the work that we do.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop Stephen, for your reply to the debate. We move to vote on Item 15, the appointment of Matthew Frost as a member of the Archbishops' Council. I put Item 15 to the Synod by ordering a simple vote. Thus, this is a simple vote on Item 15.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote by Zoom.

The Chair: Item 15 is carried. That concludes this item of business. Everyone, in a moment please join in with the closing worship which will be led by Canon Shayne Ardron and followed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby, dismissing us with a blessing.

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

Full Synod: Third Day Wednesday 25 November 2020

WORSHIP

Revd Leah Vasey-Saunders led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 9.15 am.

ITEM 16 SAFEGUARDING (GS 2184)

The Chair: Good morning, members of Synod. This morning's session is largely devoted to safeguarding matters. Members will need GS 2184 which sets out the response to safeguarding recommendations made by IICSA in its final Report into the Anglican Church published last month. Members will also wish to refer to the Financial Statement in the Second Notice Paper at pages 4 and 5. We shall begin shortly with a presentation under Standing Order 107.

I would like to extend a particular welcome and express appreciation to three survivors, Jane Chevous, Roz Etwaria and Gilo, for their willingness to take part in this presentation and for enabling us to hear from them directly today. Thank you for this valuable contribution to our proceedings and to our understanding of these matters. They will be joined by the National Director of Safeguarding, Melissa Caslake.

The presentation will last for up to 30 minutes. At the end, I invite Synod to keep silence for a space for personal reflection and I shall draw that to a close with a short prayer. I shall then invite the Bishop of Huddersfield to speak and move Item 17 and we shall then move to the debate. Members are reminded to use the blue hand icon to indicate a wish to speak. I know members of Synod will be well aware of the sensitivity and care with which we must approach any discussion of safeguarding matters and I know that you will approach this morning's business with that same care.

If anyone wishes to make contact with a safeguarding adviser following the Synod's consideration of these matters today, they can do so by contacting safeguardingeo@churchofengland.org and that email address will be displayed in the chat for reference. Before I ask Melissa Caslake to introduce the presentation at Item 16, I invite the Synod to pause for a moment in prayer.

"Almighty and ever-loving God, you call us to walk with integrity in the service of others. May our service be filled with kindness and respect for all God's people, giving special protection to children and the vulnerable. Give us grace that we may seek the truth. Listen attentively to those wounded by abuse and choose to act with compassion and justice. In your mercy, give us the strength to walk humbly and faithfully and to love one another as we are so loved by you, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

I now invite Melissa Caslake to introduce the presentation.

Ms Melissa Caslake (National Safeguarding Officer): Good morning, Synod. I am Melissa Caslake, the National Director for Safeguarding for the Church of England and I am introducing this presentation and debate on safeguarding. I am grateful to Synod for giving me this opportunity to speak and for enabling time to be given to debate this extremely important issue.

Synod will be hearing later on from the Bishop of Huddersfield and Lead Bishop for Safeguarding, Jonathan Gibbs, who will open the debate. Bishop Jonathan will speak about the final Report and all the recommendations arising for the Church of England from the independent inquiry into child sexual abuse.

I would like to add to the context of this debate by recognising the progress that has been made towards good safeguarding through the work of colleagues across the Church. For example, the recent launch of *Safe Spaces*, the revision of safeguarding training and policies and an increased focus on building relationships and listening to victims and survivors.

However, I also recognise that any progress we do make in safeguarding is often as a result of the time and attention that survivors themselves give to the problems that they see and they continue to seek better outcomes often at personal cost to themselves. I pay tribute today to all survivors of Church related abuse. We also know that there is so much more to do, especially in listening, recognising and acting on what they tell us about their experiences. I know that victims and survivors of abuse may be watching this today. A virtual Zoom room is available all morning between 9.00 and 12.30 pm. It is facilitated by a member of our national team, Godfred Boahen, for anyone who would like to talk or seek support.

If you would like to receive the link, please email safeguardingeo@churchofengland.org. The link to this room has also been provided to colleagues in MACSAS and Survivors' Voices. I am extremely grateful to the following speakers who have decided to come and share their knowledge and experience with you today and it is my privilege to introduce them to you now.

Speaking first will be Jane Chevous and Roz Etwaria. Jane is the co-founder of Survivors' Voices and Roz is the founder and project manager of littlero.org. Speaking next will be Gilo, a Survivors' Reference Group member and co-editor of the book, *Letters to a Broken Church*. Thank you.

Ms Roz Etwaria: I am going to share you with a quality, a fact that applies all around the world, across race, class, income and gender and any other artificial division of humans, but it is not grand. Children are sexually abused universally. The stats by One in Four read that one in four girls and one in six boys are abused, but years of experience show us that those figures are much, much higher.

I am Roz Etwaria from littlero.org and an ambassador for Survivors' Voices. We offer help, hope and healing and, along with Jane from Survivors' Voices, we want to share the opinions of victim survivors from our Church of England focus group and beyond. Jane will magnify the story but let me share the common ground. Children, the most vulnerable in our society, are abused and that affects me and you. We do not have to have suffered individual violation. The scars affect generation after generation after generation.

Physical and mental health too, from blood pressure to emotional meltdowns. You see, the amygdala, the centre of our emotions is affected by childhood sexual abuse and that has a massive impact on trust. You see, the ability to trust is marred. It is time to turn the other cheek. But that is an opportunity for the Church of England to lead the way globally and they can do this by recognising that "sorry" can be the strongest word, by an independent investigation into abuse. You see, he who pays the piper calls the tune, so that does not grow trust.

To build bridges with victim survivors, there need to be independent investigations. Thirdly, by collaborating with victim survivors and taking and making the victim survivor

the centre of the approach. Now I will pass you on to Jane whose story is my story. It is our story and it is Jane's story.

Ms Jane Chevous: Good morning. If my father died suddenly, what would you say to me? I want you to hold that thought. I want to share with you today as a person with a story, not as a one in four statistic. It is a difficult story but also a hopeful one. It is a story of connection and compassion and collaboration.

At the age of 13, the Church was my refuge. I had been sexually abused by my father for as long as I can remember. I joined a church choir and youth group and I found joy in the liturgy and a family, a place where I felt safe and had worth. The Church was my sanctuary throughout my teenage years which were marred by multiple experiences of sexual abuse and vulnerability.

I told no one because I was ashamed and scared, but our deaconess saw my troubled soul and she held a safe space for me. She listened. I shared my feelings and her generous heart gave me some connection and brought me to the unconditional love of God. I spent many hours in Our Lady Chapel weeping, praying and lying in the soothing arms of Jesus. Through depression and anorexia, self-harming and suicide attempts, I was hurting so badly I wanted to be with God more than I wanted to be alive.

The church was my salvation. That is the power of a church that holds a safe space, that listens and meets survivors with care and compassion and love. When I was 18, I lost the Church, my safe place. In my vulnerability, two priests raped me and sexually abused me. The worst part was the spiritual abuse. They told me this is what God wanted and that this was an expression of God's love. I lost trust in the Church. It was many years before I found the courage to report the abuse. Sadly, the reporting to not one but two bishops added to the emotional distress. After years of trying, I gave up. Not being believed does that.

I want you to just think back to when I told you at the start that my father died. What was your reaction to my loss? Did you wonder if I was telling the truth? Did you think, "Refer her immediately to a bereavement counsellor"? Or did you want to show me compassion? I am sure that is what all of us would want to do when people come to us who are grieving.

You see, abuse is not just a betrayal. It is a loss. It is a huge loss, a loss of self, a loss of identity, a loss of safety, a loss of connection and a loss of worth. Healing is a grieving process. So how is it impossible for the Church to have a safeguarding process that says to survivors, "We believe you. We are so sorry. How can we put things right?" Because that is not what happens.

Last year, I reported again and, after 13 months of a core group process, I got, "We can't say if we believe you. It was too long ago to be important now. It doesn't matter enough to hold anyone accountable". How did safeguarding become about risks and

secrets and not compassion and justice? When did we contract out healing and pastoral care and spiritual care? And how did we create a safeguarding machine that excludes survivors? So how do we turn the other cheek?

God talks about love shaping the very content of justice and that means justice that is restorative for everyone affected by abuse. That means all of us. Yes, even bishops. That means justice that is accountable because it is independent. It means justice that is collaborative with survivors at the centre. This is one of those *kairos* moments when we have an opportunity to turn it right around.

It requires all of us to be bold and committed. So, connect. Read *Letters to a Broken Church*, then go and meet with survivors in your diocese. Apologise and ask them how you can restore trust. We can help you to find survivors and to meet with them safely. Be compassionate, believe survivors and support them with recovery. And collaborate. Commit to co-producing everything with survivors.

We all want to be a Church that is free from abuse and the good news is that we can change and the key to that change is us, all of us. The poet, Audre Lorde, wrote, “It is not difference which immobilises us, it is silence”. Do not be silent. Listen to us. Hear us and work with us.

Gilo: Please forgive me if I cough a bit. I am living with long-Covid, so I am struggling with that a bit. Hello, Synod, and chairs. I am Gilo and I am here today representing the Survivors’ Reference Group (SRG), survivors who have been trying to work co-operatively and proactively with the Church in recent years.

We do not claim to represent the views of all survivors, but we do believe that all survivors should be heard and we feel perhaps that it is a shame that only 20 minutes has been allocated to Survivors’ Voices at this Synod when safeguarding is so high on the agenda. It is survivors, and our persistence in seeking truth and justice, who have brought the Church to this point today.

IICSA only came about after decades of abuse, denial, cover-up and re-victimisation of survivors. Recommendations from IICSA go so far but are not the end of the story. Talk of the Church apologising to survivors seems to us to be just more words. IICSA stated that “lasting change will require more than platitudes” and, at present, many bishops are hiding behind what we have seen as the centralised contrition by two Archbishops which, in effect, allows the rest of the senior layer to hide behind a fire blanket.

Genuine apology must show genuine repentance and atonement. This should include, we feel, ownership of all the many re-abusive harms that have been visited upon survivors and a public act of penance. There must be real accountability. Despite all of the reviews, reports, inquiries, and even after IICSA, nobody in authority has been

prosecuted, really held to account or even really disciplined over failures to protect, covering up, or the appalling treatment of survivors.

The SRG calls for real ownership of such bad behaviours as disclosure denial and walking away, silencing, gaslighting, distancing, dishonesty and complicity with corruption. Some of us have already started calling for published letters of apology and some of us believe that resignations for some of these behaviours are appropriate. The culture of the Church will not change until there is real accountability and that accountability stretches or should stretch across the highest level of the Church. There must be genuine and heartfelt commitment to never letting all of this happen again.

As for other recommendations, when operational responsibility for safeguarding is removed from bishops, they still retain statutory and should retain moral responsibility and accountability for failures. It should not be a get-out-of-jail free card. When the DSA structure is made accountable to an independent body, the NST also must be made fully accountable and subject to external oversight.

We have a fear that a huge, new bureaucratic and expensive structure will be created with a new NCI (National Church Institute) with even more layers of increasing complexity which does little to improve effectiveness. Keep it simple with genuine external independent oversight. Remove the National Safeguarding Team from the control of Archbishops' Council, comms lawyer, management layer.

The NST will need to be redesigned after years of what we perceive as control, manipulation and poor practice from within Church House culture. This should involve serious input from survivors. Part of atonement is the redress scheme. We acknowledge that the Interim Support Scheme is already up and running, but this is just a lifeboat to prevent survivors drowning whilst waiting for the actual Redress Scheme.

We are conscious that the Interim Support Scheme has already begun to move considerably from the Lead Bishops' statement about it in *Church Times*. So there is much work that is needing to be doing all the time. The final Scheme must be properly resourced and funded. IICSA recognised the lifelong impact of abuse – I am going to say that again: the lifelong impact of abuse – and the needs of survivors and so the Church must too.

You are looking at lifelong impact here, incidentally. We urge you to end association with the lawyers and other agents and reputational launderers and so forth who have already brought survivors much harm and the Church much reputational damage through unethical and dishonest tactics. Letters from survivors about this have already gone to the Lead Bishops. We feel that you have a moral duty not only to your own survivors but to others as well to ensure that these lawyers and insurers are held to account for their unethical practices.

We believe you should call on them to help repair the damage by paying substantially into your Redress Scheme. Crucially, we say that redress must include all who have previously gone through this broken, broken system. But redress is more than that. Redress also needs to involve reconciliation and this too must be survivor-centred. Restorative justice when asked for and, even if not, restorative justice offered, so we believe that the Church should set up a truth and reconciliation process.

The whole of the Redress Scheme and the Restorative Justice Scheme, all of these things which add to the repair of lives in the face of often catastrophic loss, loss of housing, loss of jobs, loss of pension, loss of income and loss of savings that we are aware many people live with, all of these things must be designed, as Jane and Roz said, in full co-production with survivors. That survivor input and expertise must be properly resourced and remunerated.

We are aware that there are Synod elections next year and we look forward to support from you, members. At this point, I would like to thank Synod members who have stood with us in the fight for truth and justice. You know who many of them are. Some of us would not be here today without your encouragement and support in facing down systemic cruelty and corruption.

I will end where I started. Implementing the IICSA recommendations will only go part of the way to improving things. A clear majority of survivors support the introduction of well-designed mandatory reporting within a statutory framework so that knowledge or concerns about abuse of children in regulated activities must, not should, be reported to the statutory authorities with legal consequences for failure to do so.

If Synod members are unsure what mandatory reporting involves, we would urge and encourage you to look at the *Mandate Now* website, which outlines a very full, simple, clear introduction to MR, as it is often known. If the Church officially gets behind the call for MR – which is almost certainly likely to be one of the recommendations at the close of IICSA next year – then the Church can use its power and its influence to benefit the whole of society, protect children today and into the future. The Church can ensure that the decades long scandal in your Church is never allowed to happen again.

Ms Melissa Caslake (National Safeguarding Officer): Thank you so much to those speakers, Jane, Roz and Gilo, for their powerful presentations. I know that Synod will be greatly moved by everything that they have heard this morning. Thank you again.

The Chair: May I, from the Chair, add my own thanks to Roz, Jane and Gilo for sharing their stories with us this morning. In order that we can pause for our own reflection on them, I now invite the Synod to spend a moment in silent reflection, which I will bring to an end with a prayer:

“Lord, renew your church in the love of truth and in passion for justice. Take from us all hypocrisy and deceit and teach us to serve with humility and honesty those whose lives

are broken. May your Son, the Good Shepherd, guide and shape the life of your Church that all may find a welcome, secure in your presence. We ask this through Jesus, the Lord of the Church. Amen”.

ITEM 17

The Chair: I now invite the Bishop of Huddersfield to speak to and move Item 17. Bishop, you have up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs): Synod, the most important voices that you will hear today are those of the survivors who spoke a few minutes ago during the presentation. I am enormously grateful to Roz, Jane and Gilo for being willing to speak to us today, for challenging us and making us feel uncomfortable and for being prepared to work with us to hold the Church to account and to enable us to see ourselves as others see us.

Theirs are the voices we must seek above all to hear and to heed. The motion before us today has three main elements: a full acceptance of the IICSA Report, a sincere apology to victims and survivors for the harm done by the Church, and endorsing and committing Synod to urgently implementing the six recommendations outlined in GS 2184.

Let me begin with the six specific recommendations in the Report relating to the Church of England. These represent vital next steps on the journey, though in themselves they are by no means the end of the journey. Let me summarise them briefly. Firstly, proposals for the structure of safeguarding in the Church of England. Here, there are two main elements. Diocesan safeguarding advisers should become diocesan safeguarding officers to indicate their right to make independent decisions about safeguarding matters and, in turn, they should be professionally supervised and quality assured – the word “managed” is also used – by the National Safeguarding Team.

Secondly, revising the Clergy Discipline Measure. Here, there are a number of proposals with two headlines being dropping the twelve-month time limit on safeguarding related complaints and reintroducing the penalty of deposition from Holy Orders in the most serious cases.

Thirdly, there are two recommendations relating to information sharing with the Church in Wales and with statutory sector partners. Fourthly, and most importantly, the Report recommends the introduction of a consistent national policy on support for victims and survivors. This needs to cover everything from our initial response at the time of disclosure and reporting through to what should be included in a Redress Scheme, to which Synod committed itself in principle back in February.

As Synod members are aware, an Interim Pilot Support Scheme has begun operating in the last few weeks with the support of the Archbishops' Council and a project manager has just been appointed to begin work on scoping and designing the Redress Scheme.

Finally, continuing with external auditing which the Church of England has begun to do in recent years with five-yearly audits of dioceses and cathedrals. Synod, I hope that none of these recommendations would be controversial for any of us and that you will, wholeheartedly and unanimously, support their adoption today.

Working backwards through the motion, the second clause states that Synod "...sincerely apologises to victims and survivors for the harm done by the Church". Now let us be quite clear, we do indeed owe that apology to victims and survivors and that will continue to be the case in the future, but we have been issuing apologies like this for quite a long time and we need to be absolutely clear that this alone is not enough and may even be starting to wear rather thin.

We need to understand that apologies in themselves are not sufficient and can actually become meaningless or worse if they are not backed up with specific action, which brings me to the final element which is contained in the first clause of the motion, "That this Synod fully accepts the IICSA Report".

Let us think for a moment about what full acceptance of the IICSA Report actually means. It means hearing and taking to heart the profoundly shocking picture which the Report paints of the failure of the Church to protect children and vulnerable adults from sexual abuse, of our failure to respond adequately when victims and others came forward to report abuse and of the way in which Church people's responses were more shaped by a concern to protect perpetrators and the reputation of the Church than to protect and support those who had suffered abuse.

It also means accepting that these failings cannot just be consigned to the past. In 2018 alone, 449 concerns about sexual abuse were reported with over half involving church officers, ordained and lay. Yes, the Report acknowledges that a lot of progress has been made in recent years with significant increased investment in safeguarding, greater awareness of the issues across the Church and much excellent work being done by safeguarding professionals and others at all levels.

But the Report also makes it clear that, as well as the specific recommendations that it makes, there is still much to be done to change the culture of the Church, especially around issues of deference and the exercise of power as well as to ensure the provision of adequate resources to continue improving the Church's safeguarding work and to respond with justice and compassion to victims and survivors.

Synod, full acceptance of the IICSA Report means going beyond the six specific recommendations that I have outlined already. It means taking seriously the kind of culture change that is still needed in the Church so that abuse cannot be hidden and

abusers cannot hide. It means accepting the cost in terms of time and resources of ensuring that safeguarding training really does transform people's attitudes and perceptions rather than just teaching them to jump through hoops.

It means putting in place structures of oversight at all levels that help ensure operational decisions are made by professionals with appropriate expertise, independent of interference or pressure from elsewhere within the Church. Above all, it means putting victims and survivors at the heart of our concerns so that we work and journey with them to help them rebuild their lives. That will come at a serious cost, and so it should, as we develop plans for supporting survivors and for redress.

Synod, there have been some real signs of encouragement recently, especially the Archbishops' Council's backing for the Interim Support Scheme, but I am still concerned that there is a risk that we will not rise to the challenge. There are so many other calls on the Church's time and attention and resources. There is still an in-built tendency for us to look to the interests of the institution rather than to heed the demands of justice and compassion. But the irony is that behaving like that would be catastrophic and, in the end, be far more costly for the Church than being bold and generous now.

Synod, I hope you will back this motion wholeheartedly and unanimously, but please do not let it stop there. I ask you to hold us to account in the years ahead. Hold the NST and the NSSG to account. Hold your bishops to account and your bishop's councils and your DBFs. Hold the House of Bishops to account and the Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners. Hold us all to account, time and time again if necessary.

Today is another milestone in our journey, the journey towards greater justice for victims and survivors and to a Church that is safer and healthier for all God's children. We have begun that journey, but I am aware that there are and will be obstacles along the way, obstacles to do with finance, structures and the culture of the Church. Synod, please join with me in committing not only to the recommendations before us today but to the kind of deep, personal and institutional change that our Church so needs and that the Kingdom of God demands. I move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Item 17 is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Thank you to the Chair, but thank you most of all to the survivors who have put themselves in a place of pain and difficulty for the sake of justice. I had not prepared a speech before hearing them because I wanted to respond to them and so, please excuse me, there may be a slight lack of coherence.

I want to support this motion very strongly indeed and, indeed, in some ways to go further. Independence, certainly. Change within the Church, certainly on deference and on transparency. We might like to note and remember that the IICSA Report and

other Reports have said that our lack of transparency over issues of sexuality has contributed to this trauma and hideous shame and over power, which is we must have genuine independence.

I have thanked the three survivors who spoke, I am sure many others will, but we need to remember that today, amongst the Bishops, amongst the members of Synod, there are other survivors, perhaps undeclared and unknown, for whom every word in this debate is profoundly painful. I cannot express deeply enough my sorrow at that, at this whole subject having to be so important because our failures were so important.

We need to accept that the reputation of the Church has been devastated. I have done two interviews over the last two days on television, one with CNN and one with *Newsnight*. They were both about the 0.7% that we discussed on Monday, but in both of them, quite rightly, the challenge came implicitly or explicitly, “But how can you talk about that thing? How can you lecture us on morality given the IICSA Report?” The only way in which this Church of England will find its way to having any moral authority is by, as Gilo said, repentance, by apology, by action and by reparation.

Mandatory reporting, it seems to me that I liked what he said about that but that is going to be for later. But I want to end with one very simple statement. We are too slow. We are too slow. Please hear the frustration in my voice. We approved redress in February and it has just started. We do not have the structures and the systems that enable necessary decisions to be taken at the speed they should be taken in a way that says to survivors and victims, we are genuinely sorry.

We must accept these recommendations. We must move with speed in order to have a system that does not guard the Church – that is God’s problem – but that guards justice and mercy and repentance and reconciliation and restorative justice. Anything less means our apologies are vain and our words are empty and we will face justice from God if we do not seek God’s mercy for our failures.

Ven. Julie Conalty (Rochester): I am the Bishop’s Lead for Safeguarding in the Diocese of Rochester and I declare an interest in that I am involved in a small way in the pilot of the Interim Support Scheme. I want to talk about being Christ-like. The IICSA Report revealed that we had repeatedly failed to model ourselves on Christ, the Christ who stood with the marginalised and the victims, who saw those who were overlooked and who included those who had been shunned. Worse still, we knew this and, if we had not witnessed first-hand the grooming, the manipulation and the emotional, physical, sexual and spiritual abuse, we had heard the stories. The survivors had been telling us.

So what did we do? Did we fight for justice or did we focus on keeping the show on the road, keeping up appearances like whitewashed sepulchres? Well, if you have read the IICSA Report, I think you can reach your own conclusions. It is not pretty. Synod, we have been talking about Vision and Strategy. I was asked recently about my vision for the Church of England and I found myself saying this. My vision is that we will be

brought to our knees. What I meant was broken, humbled and truly penitent because, before we can be Christ-centred or Jesus-shaped, before we can see that new creation that we have been talking about, before all that we need to address our failings, our sin, the times when we have abused, re-abused and colluded with abuse.

We also need to recognise that somehow we, the Church, have allowed our clericalism, our tribalism, our naivety, our concern for reputation, our culture of fear and secrecy about sexuality to corrupt us and, worse still, we have sought to keep it hidden. I want to say this. If we are at all serious about our vision and strategy for the 2020s then we need to make some radical changes, top to bottom, across all our parishes and chaplaincies, in our church plants and in our online Church.

Being Jesus-shaped is not appearing like Christ whilst sustaining a culture that fosters abuse and cover-up. Safeguarding is being Christ-like. It is central to our mission. It should be at the core of our Vision and Strategy, running through every segment and strand. So let us add the word “safer” to those virtues that the Archbishop of York set out for us. Yes, humility is critical, but just appearing to be more humble will be a cosmetic cover-up unless we make some radical changes to the way we behave. Synod, we will not change the world unless we change first.

I have seen some glimmers of hope in the pilot of the Interim Support Scheme and in the proposal for the Redress Scheme but, above all, I see hope in Christ and in us being truly more shaped like him. The big question, however, is whether or not we are willing to be transformed. If not, then our Vision and Strategy will simply be a few more gallons of whitewash. Humbler just does not cut it, Synod. Broken, penitent and transformed are closer to the mark. Let us start with this apology, but we need to go so, so much further. I support this motion.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds): Thank you to the survivors who have shared their stories today and also the survivors who are watching online and who have shared personal stories with individuals in Synod. These are the voices that are most important. These are the people who we are discussing today. Synod, we have an opportunity here not just to accept the six recommendations but to go a stage further because I do not think that the recommendations take it far enough. It is a great travesty, the fact that we have had to have IICSA. Actually, we should have put things right ourselves.

Maybe at this point I should declare an interest. Some of you may see over my shoulder the certificates that have been awarded from the police. I served as a police officer and I still serve as a volunteer police officer. I have been alongside people who have made that disclosure, maybe not from the Church but have made a disclosure that they have been sexually abused. I have been a family liaison officer who has supported people through such things. We are not just talking about theory here, we are talking about lives destroyed.

I think the question is how do we build confidence in our processes? How do we rebuild confidence in our Church? Archdeacon Julie has just spoken about being Christ-like and I am sure that if Jesus was to come into the Church in relation to any kind of abuse, be it power, be it sexual abuse, be it to children or vulnerable adults, I could see him really turning the tables upside down. Which offices would he go to in our structures and close them down and say, “We do not do it like this anymore”?

I think the only way in which we can actually build confidence is to remove this from the Church. Yes, we need our safeguarding officers and in my own diocese we have safeguarding officers. I am pleased to say we have tried to do things right. At least one of them is an ex-police officer who I served alongside. I know the integrity of the person. I know that there would be no cover-up there, but can we say this about every safeguarding team? Is there always the worry about reputational damage? That really should not feature whatsoever in our actions.

The only way that we will be able to actually do that is by removing it from ourselves. So why not have an independent – not appointed by the Church – body? Maybe they could look over other organisations as well. Maybe that would have been a great thing if IICSA would have suggested that. Why not refer our cases to them? We could still do the work in-house but we have got an external overview, not just appointing people to go into dioceses every few years to see how it is going. We could have had five years with things going wrong there.

So, Synod, I will support this wholeheartedly but my prayer is that we go a stage further and that, actually, we remove it from the Church and we bring in that independence. Maybe that is some work that really needs to be done. To those who are worried about reputational damage, I say, what a great shame, reputational damage is already done.

Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS): A deep thank you to Gilo, Roz and Jane for sharing with us and to you, Bishop Jonathan, for taking on this role for the whole Church. I have just got two points. One risks sounding like a broken record but it concerns what the Archbishop has alluded to: the culture, the lack of transparency about human sexuality, the need for secrecy and discretion that we have in our Church.

As a member of LLF, I have, along with others, frequently thought we should be addressing that and, as we have discovered with the publication of LLF, that has been given to some other yet unnamed group. My first point is a plea for joined-up thinking here. IICSA says it. The Archbishop has said it. Let us get some joined-up thinking about human sexuality and the Church's attitudes so that we can become at least a safer Church. That is my first plea, which I admit I have been a bit of a broken record about.

The second is more of a question for Bishop Jonathan. I would be interested in his reflections. I am delighted to see that the one-year rule for anything to do with safeguarding is to be done away with. I am just wondering what his thoughts are about

why we did not do that when we did it about abuse itself, what deep cultural protectionism was at the basis of that since we have already made some adjustments, as I understand it, to the CDM process. Sorry, Synod, a broken record remark and then a question for the Bishop. I thoroughly support this motion.

His Honour Judge Peter Collier (ex officio): I do not want in any way to detract from the evidence of the survivors, the things that they have said and the big pictures, but part of this debate is about the six recommendations which we are committing ourselves to. I declare an interest in that I am chairing an Ecclesiastical Law Society Working Party reviewing the Clergy Discipline Measure. GS 2184 in relation to recommendation 2 from IICSA is misleading to the extent you may think that what is in the box above paragraph 18 is the IICSA recommendation but, as indicated by Bishop Jonathan earlier, there are specific recommendations that IICSA made.

They are limited recommendations and none of them is particularly controversial in relation to the Clergy Discipline Measure. You might also think that the proposed limited details of reform described in paragraph 18 arise from the IICSA Report. They do not. Synod, there is a risk that when we produce a new Measure we do so by setting off from a flawed basis, as with the current Measure.

In 1996, a Synod working party produced a Report entitled *Under Authority* which produced a new system of clergy discipline. When that Report was presented to Synod in November 1996, Synod asked that a separate grievance procedure should be included when the draft Measure was presented. For some reason, that did not happen.

The result was a Measure that opened wide the door to complaints from the most serious to the most trivial, yet subjected them all to a complex procedure designed for the most serious cases. That has led to many of the problems that are now well-recognised and much evidenced through the Sheldon Hub community.

Synod should understand that IICSA did not attempt any analysis of a CDM. It did not examine in detail any CDM cases in the way that it did analyse and examine issues and cases about child abuse. It was also working with a lack of data about how many cases there were in relation to child abuse.

The only numbers they had were of complaints against clergy in relation to safeguarding generally. In 2017, that was said to be 39 cases. However, last year, after the IICSA hearing, the CDC for the first time asked in its annual returns for the number of complaints that related to misconduct of a sexual nature towards a child. In 2019, that was six. None of those led to a tribunal hearing. They were either admitted or dealt with by way of automatic penalty following a criminal conviction. In 14 years of tribunal hearings, there have been none in relation to sexual abuse of children.

A new replacement Measure must be based on a thorough analysis of the CDM, its weaknesses and its strengths – of which there are some – and also a proper understanding of the theology of discipline and the key role of the bishop in relation to discipline. GS 2184 does suggest a way forward by referring to professional standards. Our anxiety is that such a path could lead to the creation of a bureaucracy akin to some other regulatory bodies governing our secular professions and, for reasons set out in an addendum to our interim Report, we counsel against such a route being taken.

There are three clear different types of case. Firstly, serious misconduct that is likely to result in prohibition. That would clearly include any child abuse cases. Secondly, misconduct that is less than serious. That may well include not following some guidelines and policy that would result in lesser penalties. Thirdly, there are grievances that are in need of efforts to resolve them.

All cases of all three types must be speedily investigated. We would suggest regional panels of people independent of the diocesan structure available to do that work and report to the bishop. Hopefully, those people might be able to work for resolution of what are clearly grievances along the lines of the model developed in the Diocese of Gloucester. They will report where there is misconduct or that they have found no substance in a complaint.

The bishop will, in cases of lesser misconduct, impose a penalty in accordance with a guideline from the CDC and without the need for consent. In cases of serious misconduct, the bishop would refer the matter to a tribunal where the case would be managed by a judge with significant experience of secular case management and the matter would come quickly for determination before a tribunal.

The CDC would be responsible for oversight and for issuing guidance on procedure and sentencing. It would also be responsible for national training of all involved in the processes to ensure consistency across dioceses. It would be a system for the most part dealt with locally but, in relation to serious misconduct, there would be a need for a centrally run tribunal system. Such a system would easily pick up the six IICSA recommendations about the CDM. It would also comply with the [...]

The Chair: I am sorry to draw you to a close. Thank you very much.

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): I would like to join others in thanking Jane, Roz and Gilo for speaking to us today and, although difficult for them and uncomfortable for us, I would also like to thank them for continuing to hold us to account. I was conscious yesterday that, when we discussed the Safeguarding Measure and the Code of Practice, it was the voice of survivors that was missing. That is not good enough.

Whilst I believe that we, the Church of England, have begun to see change, better resourcing, new policies and procedures and better designed training, there is still more

that we have to do. Movement towards an independent safeguarding service and redress is significant, but there is still more needed. As Gilo reminded us, the IICSA Report said that lasting change requires more than platitudes.

Synod, we must put victims and survivors and not synodical processes or concern for the institution at the heart of our concerns. We need to do more to take seriously their involvement as co-producers as we develop plans for supporting survivors for redress, for independence and what that really means and, yes, for our Code of Practice. In fact, we need to involve them as co-producers in all that we do to develop a safer Church.

Maybe most importantly we do need to address our culture. That is the way we do things around here. Culture change is only successful when it involves its leaders and when behaviours are reinforced by training, communication, mentoring and audit. I have been encouraged by the way the National Safeguarding Team have developed training for clergy which is about much more than ticking boxes. It is about behaviour and self-reflection. Yes, it will take longer but culture change does.

Although not mentioned in the recommendations in the IICSA Report, IICSA does challenge us, as Judith Maltby highlighted, to address clericalism and deference to those in power and tribalism. We need to do this. The Church will only be safer if it is a place where every voice is heard and every life is respected equally and everyone feels safe. The IICSA Report pointed out our lack of transparency regarding sexuality and Judith Maltby has rightly asked for joined-up thinking.

I want here to make a brief comment on the *Living in Love and Faith* process. I know that the Church has not always been a safe place, particularly for the LGBTI+ community. The LLF Next Steps Group, along with the National Safeguarding Team and those within the LGBTI+ community, will consider what more can be done to make the LLF process safer and support the material that is already in the LLF resources.

Synod, I hope that you will back this motion wholeheartedly and unanimously but, like Bishop Jonathan, I agree that to accept in full the IICSA Report is doing more than just supporting the six specific recommendations and I hope that Synod is up for this.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): I would like to pick up on one important point from the Archbishop, which is that we need to be more Christ-like and I would just like to flag up that we do actually see Christ-like in this process and that is the enormous forgiveness and generosity of the survivors. So what I would say to the entire senior level – and we have heard some challenges already – is do dare to reach out to those you have wronged. You will find them more generous and welcoming than you fear.

I now want to pick up a little from what Peter Collier has said because he has given really important points and where I can take it on is this. Whilst few cases get as far as the Presidents' Tribunals, a vast number are dealt with in the core groups. This is the large and the grey middle. This may or may not have happened. This may or may not

be inferred. This may or may not be waiting. This person may or may not be a risk, whatever that means. These are the most uncertain and complicated assessments. And who do we trust this work to?

Well, as Peter Bruinvels's question yesterday revealed, these most complex of issues are handled in core groups by a bunch of amateurs with no experience, no training, no legal guidance and no test of competence. Imagine the uproar if I proposed that the doctrine of the Church should be determined in such a cack-handed fashion. You would all be up in arms.

But fragile complainants broken by abuse and clergy fearful for their jobs, their marriages, their reputations their pensions and their homes all have their futures and welfare routinely put at risk in our quasi-legal casino which does not deliver fair play. There is no lawyer present to advise on specialist law or proper procedures. The Church does not and has never employed and does not plan to employ a single safeguarding lawyer. Because we made that economy, we have a useless system and we will be paying out millions in compensation. Even today, post-IICSA, winners in our system leave angry with a burning sense of injustice.

One of our bishops has had the courage to describe our system as Kafkaesque. I would like to hear some more of that. I hold, as many of you know, a unique and privileged position with you, Synod. I am trusted to receive confidence from the consumers of our system, complainants and respondents alike. They talk to me. One terminally ill person sent me their case papers so their story would not be lost. This is what I am hearing.

Our system does not apply the principles of the Human Rights Act. That needs to change. The right to a fair trial is regularly and systematically breached. There is no equality of arms. Core groups meet in secret, often the composition is secret – although the odd privileged party might be told more about this than the rest of us. The core group might not even take minutes and, if they do, they will not share them even in redacted form. You have no right to see what is recorded about you even if it is your own information that has been captured badly.

In a recent case, the complainants gained privileged access and sat at the table with a core group meeting, who they all knew, to help decide if their case was meritorious enough to get an investigator appointed. I am not joking. In other cases, complainants were not even told their core group was sitting. Under our system right now, the same firm of solicitors can provide the solicitor to the complainant, the solicitor to the diocese and the province and no rule is broken. We have no conflict of interest policy. That must change urgently. No matter how mistaken, egregious or misguided, there is no appeal process against any of the processes.

To my question 79, the Secretary General gave the extraordinary answer that an aggrieved complainant or respondent can raise an internal complaint. That would be

determined many months later. If you are right, the Church may or may not learn the lesson for the next case – if it survives your suicide. Meanwhile, the process and injustice would grind on and you would be helpless to stop it. The Learned Lessons Review, incidentally, will never be published either. That is wrong.

Last summer, you will remember the celebrity, Caroline Flack, committed suicide because she felt an incident was exaggerated beyond its importance, not because of what she had done but because of who she was. She was broken on the wheels of institutional injustice.

Synod, we are damned lucky this has not happened within the Church yet but it nearly did. In September, a complainant was referred to me. A nice, intelligent man had seriously attempted suicide because the way he was being dealt with by our system was an unbearable pressure on him and he was broken by it. It was lucky that a passer-by found him. That is how grievous our institutional system of justice has fallen into. That is what we are dealing with.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I want to pay tribute to the work of the diocesan safeguarding advisers up and down our country. From my experience of them here in Liverpool and some nationally, they are professional, hardworking, conscientious and compassionate. When things go wrong, they can find it very hard to bear and fret about whether they should have done things better and differently in the hope of a better outcome for survivors.

I also want to pay tribute to all the counsellors and the listeners that DSAs are often in touch with who can offer support to survivors. So when we do talk about our failures in safeguarding, I also want to acknowledge this small and very important group of people who are genuinely trying to work as well as they can for survivors.

Whilst I support all the recommendations in the Report, including the bit about auditing the work of diocesan safeguarding departments, just to acknowledge that it can be quite demanding on them and that can take time away from the very thing that they have been engaged in in the first place. But, of course, as has been mentioned by other people, the root cause of this is culture, power and deference as outlined on pages 7 and 8 in appendix A. It is beyond the scope perhaps of this debate, but it would be good to hear what is being done and how it can be overcome.

Finally, it is right that we should face the darkness of our failures but I hope we can also focus on the light. That was very movingly put when Jane spoke about the Church that held her but also the Church that damaged her. But I hope that we can acknowledge that there are many survivors who have reported their abuse and have found that they were listened to, loved, supported and held and have found some measure of peace.

There is much more that we still need to do but let us also focus on their stories too. We have been told what is good and what the Lord requires of us. It is that we do justice, it is that we love kindness and it is that we walk humbly with our God.

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): The IICSA Report has shone a bright spotlight into the dark and cobwebby corners of safeguarding within the Church of England and it makes for incredibly painful reading. It is painful because it exposes failure of process, practice and pastoral care, but all the more so because of the lives that have been damaged as a result of our failure. These are real people with real pain and we have heard from Jane, Roz and Gilo this morning and thank you for that.

Action is imperative. We need to take those actions that are recommended as a result of our failure [*audio connection lost*] not just go into the boundary of what is required. We should surely begin to look [*audio connection lost*] with survivors. Paragraph 10 of the Report makes reference to the fact that IICSA has not yet made recommendations in relation to mandatory reporting or into the Seal of Confessional and goes on to say that a group has been set up to look at the Seal of Confessional.

We are not yet, it seems, thinking about mandatory reporting. Is there any good reason why we should not take the initiative in consultation with IICSA in order to bring in further strengthening of our practice more quickly before we are forced to do so by a recommendation but in the acknowledgment that it is something that we need to do?

Mandatory reporting will not be the whole answer, obviously, and it may or may not have saved the pain of abused survivors, but it may well be go some way to reduce re-abuse which has been so prevalent and of which we have heard mention. It may be part of the solution to a way of cleaning out our cobwebby corners and our Augean stables.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): I was ordained into a Church, and IICSA has showed us this so, so shamefully, but I realise now I was ordained into a Church that when it came to safeguarding was concerned, first of all, to protect its own reputation; secondly, to limit damage; and, thirdly, most shamefully, to ignore abuse and its consequences. Over the last 30 years or so, I have seen the Church change and I have been part of that change in different ways.

So, now, we do not ignore abuse. We train clergy and we have a way of protecting children and vulnerable adults. We have made some progress but there is still obviously a third stage of change that we need to go through. Therefore, in supporting this motion I want to very, very clearly also support what Gilo and others were saying and what Archbishop Justin and Bishop Sarah have been saying about the three big things that are before us now in order to be a more Christ-like Church.

The first and the most important is that we change our culture. There is a culture of clericalism and deference in our Church and that cannot continue because it is deeply,

deeply unhealthy and it allows some of us to find ourselves in positions where people feel that somehow we have become above reproach and that we cannot be criticised. This is really, really bad for us. Part of this culture change, therefore, must mean that, when we make mistakes – because we will make mistakes and things will go wrong, we will not always get it right – part of the culture change is to be open and transparent about that as followers of Jesus Christ.

Judith, your record may be cracked but I feel that its day has come. I received a little bit of criticism on Twitter yesterday about not being perhaps as clear as I should have been about what is meant by being a younger and more diverse Church. Diverse certainly does mean that we are absolutely committed to this LLF process and we see the connection between our safeguarding failings and the way that LGBTIQ+ people have been treated in our Church. All these things must change.

Therefore, we welcome independent scrutiny and we look and reach out to the survivors and offenders who have reached out to us, saying “We want your help. We want to build a new culture. We want to stop being in this place where we have to keep saying sorry”. Goodness, I am deeply, deeply shamed and deeply, deeply penitent.

I am finding myself, in this new role, falling to knees in sorrow and shame for what has happened but, more importantly, I want to rise up and be the change and make the change we need to make, which is primarily one of culture but, therefore, must mean that we welcome independent scrutiny and that we get on urgently with the business of reparation. Getting all this right, Synod, is going to cost us a lot of money. Getting it wrong is going to cost us our soul.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Twice in this Synod you have reminded me of my words from last February that justice transcends affordability. Several of you have been in touch with me since then expressing your frustration about the pace at which we have proceeded.

Now I could give you excuses. There is a gap of capacity between agreeing appointments and them being filled. I could talk about being knocked sideways by Covid. I could talk about the enormous caseloads that our safeguarding team have been handling. I could argue about concerns pre-dating the IICSA recommendations. All of these might be true but we now need pace.

As soon as Bishop Jonathan came to Archbishops’ Council in July to ask for an immediate Interim Emergency Support Scheme, we were able to allocate those funds. As soon as he came to us last month to tell us how much would be needed to bridge the gap between that Interim Scheme and the full Redress Scheme, the funds were allocated and I will take to Archbishops’ Council at the next meeting my recommendation on how that is funded – and this is a large sum of money. But it is not

enough, Synod. We have got to move faster. We need pace, transparency and simplicity.

If we are to put in place a Redress Scheme which covers all aspects of reparation, not just financial but all the other ways in which people's lives can be addressed and all the safeguards that that itself will need, we will need a whole-Church response. If we are to put the funding in place, and this will take involvement of the whole Church from dioceses through Council to Church Commissioners. We cannot have endless arguments about who pays what.

I entirely endorse Martin Sewell's concerns about core groups. Justice needs to not be there; it needs to be transparently there. It needs to be simple to understand. I would certainly argue that imposing on diocesan safeguarding officers a mandatory reporting obligation when they have concerns about their own dioceses does not involve the Seal of Confession.

So my commitment is to work with Archbishops' Council, quickly moving to the first stages of independence – which may not be as far as Paul Cartwright seeks – to work urgently on the full understanding of what a great redress will look like and to put the funding in place and to always keep the goals of transparency and simplicity at the front of our minds.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Chair, as a longstanding campaigner for the critical need for an independent safeguarding process, I strongly welcome this much needed and long-awaited motion. It is a good example of how, in the end, the Church of England can finally get there despite many, many roadblocks. What has it taken? Courageous victims coming forward and having to fight their own cause and a public inquiry which finally laid bare for all to see the dark underbelly of the Church of England where, due to a culture of deference, abusers could hide in plain sight.

The IICSA Report was damning and clear about the factors at work which led to this abuse occurring. First, the culture of clericalism within the Church of England and, second, as the Archbishops and Bishop Sarah have highlighted, the taboos surrounding discussion on sexuality.

When asked how far the reaction of some within the Church to homosexuality possibly inhibits the reporting of child sexual abuse, DI Murdock, who was involved in the Peter Ball case, made it clear that one of the facts that influenced his view of the public interest in bringing prosecution was the risk that some Church witnesses would be exposed as homosexuals in court, which would, in his words, have seen their roles within the Church effectively finished. Anyone reading the transcripts are left in no doubt that homophobia within the Church deterred the reporting of sexual abuse.

So have things changed? Has our culture changed or have they, in fact, got worse? Are we more open, honest and transparent about matters of sexuality or are we, in fact,

more secretive, closed and in denial? Well, the honest answer is that it depends what part of the Church you are in, both geographically and in terms of tradition. It is another postcode lottery, which is horrific when you stop and think about the lives that are at stake: young lives.

So, Synod, I hope we will agree these recommendations but, in the end, it is only honesty and transparency that will address the most critical area that needs changing: a change to our toxic culture. And it is here that we need to act. I hope that the House of Bishops themselves will lead the change and model the honesty and transparency that is needed and not pretend that there is only one gay bishop in the college, nor club together to ignore the pain that the Church continues to inflict every day on its gay clergy and lay leaders and, indeed, the LGBTI community.

It is time to be honest and open. It is time to dig deep and find courage, as these survivors have shown themselves. It is time for a change in culture before more people, mostly young people, get hurt.

Revd Mike Smith (Oxford): I am a new boy to this Synod. I came to Synod firstly in February and now at both sessions of Synod I have had the privilege of listening to Gilo speak. Thank you to Roz, Jane and Gilo for their incredibly moving words. I committed myself to spend the summer reading *Letters to a Broken Church*. It turned my stomach and made me physically ill, but I am glad about that. I hope this is truly the time that we show that we are prepared to change.

I welcome this motion and the Report behind it. It is a good start but, as others have said, I hope we can go significantly further. Survivors I accompany in my parish tell me, like Gilo said, that we need to do more to see repentance, redress and reconciliation. I offer my commitment to see that we do that in my diocese and I hope here at Synod. Let me say one or two things specifically.

I am not sure that recommendation 1 goes far enough. As others have said, I do not understand simply why we cannot create something truly independent. I fear any test that sets us up where we appear to be still marking our own homework is not good enough. We have seen this week a Prime Minister who dismisses independent advice to him. What that does to his reputation, the same will be done to us. I agree with Gilo, Roz and Jane that we must have true independence.

I have spent many years in a diocesan bishop's office and I was astounded when I saw that we still operate systems of paper-based personnel files, so I hope recommendations 5 and 6 will truly once and for all embrace the digitisation of clergy files.

Finally, with recommendation 8, I have lost count of the number of times that reports, including IICSA, do not refer to the effectiveness of parish safeguarding. No one in 25 years of ministry has ever really asked me how effective my parish safeguarding

ministry is and so I hope we can truly do something about parish-level safeguarding work and scrutinise how effective it is, otherwise we will be resting on our laurels.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): Thank you especially to the survivors who spoke this morning. Synod, I speak, of course, in support of the motion but I want to underline theologically the significant need to address cultures of deference and power in our Church. If we, as a Church, are going to become a place which is more just and more generous, humbler and simpler, if it is to be possible for all of us to safely breathe and live in the Body of Christ, this will entail, I think, dethroning a fake picture at the heart of our theological anthropology, a picture which has mesmerised us for far too long.

This is the picture which privileges and imbues whiteness and masculinity and heterosexuality with normative power. We have lived in and promoted a culture which says that middle class, middle-aged, white, straight men are the norm and, crucially, show forth most fully who Christ is. We still give their voices first place and first trust. This Church culture consciously and unconsciously damages all, including many who at first glance seem to benefit from its promotion.

As survivors remind us, it has destroyed real lives. This culture, I believe, is not of or in Christ. Christ shatters cultures shaped around lording it over others and invites us to discover how bodies, global majority bodies, disabled and LGBTQIA bodies, the readily exploited bodies of women and children, which have so often been treated as inconvenient or alien to the Body of Christ, can teach us how to be the living Body of Christ in our world today.

Our Church safeguarding culture has made important steps towards a better, humbler and restorative approach, but we dare not lose sight of the theological imperatives to interrogate and dismantle the deep cultural motors of abuse. I think this will entail using both external and internal theological consultants in order for us to become a safer Church. The survivors of abuse and the very many of us who have been damaged by patriarchal structures of deference, privilege and power surely require it.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Bishop Jonathan, thanks for your wise and gracious leadership in this matter and thank you, Jane, Roz and Gilo for your gracious words. I welcome the IICSA Report that has plumbed the depths of the evil behaviour that has stalked our corridors and exposed the dysfunction in our processes, but rebuilding is better when you start at base and I hope we can do that.

I want to address my own concerns to our brokenness as a Church, to use Gilo's phrase, to our culture in which that brokenness is so wrapped up. The recommendations are a simple part. IICSA has a lot to say about our culture and our motion, as has been noted, calls for a full acceptance of the Report. We need a thorough cleansing of the brokenness and evil that has marked us, of the accusations of distrust.

As believers in the good news have suggested, we need to plan to tap deep into the means by which we know God renews us and sets us free. We need a good healthy season of deep corporate repentance. But I suggest we also need a season of truth-telling and reconciliation, especially in regard to the problems of our survivors when they seek to summon up the courage to disclose their abuse.

I would join Gilo in calling for a truth and reconciliation process where victims can speak out how they have encountered the system publicly and where those in authority can speak out their story and their regret and apology. We need a place of grace where truth and justice can be found. Let me be clear, this is not for the primary abusers – they need to go before the courts and pay the price for that abuse – but this is to clear the air, to cleanse the system where the whole system has been seen to conspire against them.

This will require a lot of courage and boldness, of humility, maybe even the simplicity that Archbishop Stephen has spoken of, the simplicity of the Gospel, and it will require a lot of truth and grace. But I believe it will allow us a radical new start that we so badly need to seize the *kairos* moment that Jane has spoken of.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I very much support this motion and I would like to add my thanks to the survivors who have had the courage to come and speak to us today. I had not intended to speak in this debate and I just have one brief point to make. That is that it needs to be noted that the Church has a clear sexual ethic and that those who perpetrate appalling acts of sexual abuse, such as those that we have heard about today and previously, are placed in *[audio connection lost]* all the more appalling. But, in that context, I do think we need to hear a clear statement that the holding of the Church's traditional sexual ethic is not in itself a safeguarding issue.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): I also want to pay thanks to Bishop Jonathan and Archbishop Justin for their words and, in particular, to Gilo for his clear articulation about how the Church needs to change and needs to be seen to change. Yes, the IICSA Report makes shocking and disturbing reading and we have to recognise the terrible impact that actions and lack of actions by the Church have had and continue to have on the lives of the people affected, but I want to remind Synod that abuse is not only sexual.

The House of Bishops' Guidelines show that abuse can be emotional and psychological, bullying, abuse of power. "Who do you think you are to criticise me, a bishop" is something which was said to me. I have to admit that I am a survivor and I have also been on suicide watch for another survivor of serious, emotional and psychological abuse within the Church. My plea is that, in our action in response to IICSA, we must not ignore these other forms of abuse. We also need to remember that safeguarding offenders are not just the clergy.

We need to change our culture in a way that enables us as a Church to listen to survivors and to let them know that they have been listened to. The way that disclosure denial and walking away seems to be prevalent has to change. Those involved in investigating and dealing with abuse must be independent of pressure from inside the Church.

In my case, there was a real fear over voicing concerns. I was explicitly told that, as a reader, I should be aware of the backlash I would experience if I raised my concerns. I just want to end by saying that I support this motion but only as the start of a much longer journey of reconciliation.

Revd Dr Helen Dawes (Salisbury): Thank you, Chair, for calling me for this maiden speech and thank you to Jane, Roz and Gilo for beginning our session this morning. As a parish priest, I find that safeguarding work takes a greater proportion of my working time than I think many recognise.

I need to say to you, Synod, that I find doing this work very hard. It reminds me of the depth of sin in the world and particularly of the depth of sin in the Church. I wish that it were not so but it is and I know it is in part the sin in me that wishes it were not. We have got this so badly wrong and the result is that it has been those who we have hurt so desperately who have had to lead us into truth. We are accountable to God for that.

In our local churches, we are preparing now for Christmas and we have no place leading people in worship if, in one way or another, we are resisting being led into truth. When we talk about changing things all through the Church, we all need to know our part in that.

I want to emphasise how, in the local church, this is going to mean clergy, laity and survivors working together so that we have the courage to recognise and admit to the depth of sin in the Church and to move forward together towards truth and hope. One day, Synod, we all know that there will be no Church of England but God will still be God and how we cared for each one of his children will matter.

The Chair: After Mr Friend has spoken, I shall test the mind of the Synod on a motion for closure on this item.

Mr Simon Friend (Exeter): Thank you to Roz, Jane and Gilo. I want to make a specific point that relates to a question I raised at our recent diocesan synod. The question was: how much money has the diocese paid in settlement or redress both directly to survivors of abuse perpetrated by members of clergy and indirectly through the diocesan insurance?

The answer given was that the diocese is not legally liable for damages or redress resulting from the abusive acts of members of clergy within its diocese. The answer did go on to say that the diocese is committed to supporting victims and survivors of abuse

and to supporting PCC in any way possible when they find themselves subject to litigation and claims for damages arising from acts of abuse. I welcome the national initiative for redress.

My question arises from the issue that it is the parish and not the diocese that is legally responsible and, therefore, financially liable for any damages claimed. While the diocese may be made aware of claims made against PCC, the diocese is not legally a part to those proceedings. However, it is not the PCC who license and authorise the ministry of clergy or licensed workers; neither do PCCs line manage licensed clergy or have power to conduct NDRs. These are all the responsibilities of the diocesan bishops and their staff.

What, if anything, are we going to do about this inherent disconnect between authority and responsibility? I accept that it is a fundamental structure of the Church of England which causes these ongoing legal difficulties when we have these sorts of claims. But, in the light of IICSA, is this not the time – a *kairos* moment as Jane reminded us – to reconsider the fundamental structures that have created this situation we now find ourselves in?

It is my understanding that the National Safeguarding Team are not looking at this inherent disconnect in the legal structure, but I would argue that this must be considered. We know that, in effect, with legal responsibility resting with PCCs, it is the insurers and their legal teams who effectively take control of cases for settlement and many survivors have described that process as another form of abuse.

It also seems – though I am assured it is not the case in my own diocese – that, in effect, those who have the power to license can distance themselves from the legal responsibility of that licensing when something goes wrong. It is perhaps that mandatory reporting might overcome this disconnect and take legal responsibility back to the bishops who license the clergy.

The Chair: Members of Synod, we are anticipating coming to the next item of business at midday after a screen break and so, as you will realise, I must already apologise to you that we are going to impinge on the time for that. It is for that reason that I am now going to put to you the motion for closure on Item 17 and for this purpose I order a simple vote. This is a simple vote on the motion for closure on Item 17.

The motion was put and carried on a simple poll via Zoom.

The Chair: The motion for closure on Item 17 has been carried and so I now invite the Bishop of Huddersfield to respond to the debate. Given the significance of the debate, I do not want to reduce his time and so, Bishop, you have the full ten minutes.

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs): Chair, thank you very much indeed. I want to reiterate what I said right at the beginning, which was that the most

important voices we would hear this morning were those of the survivors and, therefore, to reiterate my personal thanks to Roz, Jane and Gilo for the very powerful, challenging and uncomfortable message which they gave to us in the presentation immediately before the debate. Those are the words of which we need to take the greatest account and I hope and pray that those will remain with us long after this debate has concluded.

I am also enormously grateful to the large variety of people who contributed from different perspectives to the debate, the two Archbishops, clergy and lay colleagues from across the country. What I am going to do is to pick up on some of the themes that come out of this because they came across very strongly and repeatedly. I will also try to pick up on one or two of the specific points.

The first thing is putting survivors absolutely at the centre of the Church's response. It is uncomfortable, challenging but vital that we hear their voice and that we commit ourselves to journeying with them, to working with them to co-production of everything that goes forward from here. Their voice will help hold us to account. The other word that was mentioned many times was the need for a change in culture, honesty, transparency, challenging deference and secrecy, challenging patriarchy and the misuse of power.

I think the speeches we have heard right through the morning have reminded us how big that challenge is. It is about changing the way we are as the people of God, the Body of Christ, in order that we may more truly reflect our commitment. It will require energy and there is an urgency about that. That was one of the other messages that came across so strongly. We must rise to these challenges. We must do so now.

In terms of specific points, the theme of independence and the importance of independence was rightly emphasised by a number of speakers. The challenge for us is how we can retain accountability over safeguarding in the life of the Church at every level, nationally, in our dioceses and in our parishes. We cannot abdicate responsibility for safeguarding and yet we must be held to account by those who have that appropriate degree of independence at all levels.

You have heard the commitment of the Archbishops, of the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops, indeed, to that principle of independence. It will be vitally important. The Church cannot mark its own homework. We have heard concerns about process and structures. There were concerns raised – and I hear the force of those concerns – with regard to some of the very difficult cases there have been over this last year in terms of the operation of core groups. We are committed to a review of the process and practice there.

It was, on the other hand, fitting that Martin Sewell's challenging speech should be followed by Pete Spiers who reminded us of the dedicated work of safeguarding professionals up and down the country in our dioceses and in the national Church. Of course, their expertise is at the heart of the operation of that process. There is a

balance to be held there and there is much work to be done, but I am grateful for Pete's endorsement of the work of those professionals while recognising the force and challenge of Martin's and other people's comments.

In regard to the Clergy Discipline Measure, Peter Collier and the work being done by the Ecclesiastical Law Society, thank you so much for that contribution and the work you are doing. Of course, the Bishop of Lambeth, Bishop Tim Thornton is also chairing a group looking at the future of the Clergy Discipline Measure. Those pieces of work need to be brought together and there are a number of questions to be addressed there, which Peter brought to us today. Page 11 of GS 2184 contains more detail about the proposals of IICSA in relation to the CDM but, plainly, there is a complicated process to be worked through and it is important that we get it right.

Judith Maltby again spoke to us with regard to a particular point, the twelve-month rule. I do not quite understand why that was not addressed before. All the evidence is that abuse, of course, is so often reported much later because it is so difficult to talk about. I was talking with a colleague only this week who experienced domestic abuse in her family context. It has taken a long time for that to come out. The Presidents of Tribunals do have the ability to overrule that principle, but I think it is absolutely right that that should be taken out. And I think it says a lot about the difficulty of changing our cultures when recognising the complexity of dealing with abuse. Mismanaging abuse is itself abuse, as Judith also reminded us.

I just want to come on, towards the close, to pick up other themes from the speeches. The importance of speed; the need to recognise the cost that this will be; the challenge over working out how we handle complex issues like mandatory reporting in order that abuse can never be hidden and is always brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

Yes, there is a national issue there and IICSA will have some important things to say, but we need to be engaged in that discussion fully. Gilo's challenge to us about the need for some kind of truth and reconciliation process, to cleanse the system, which was mentioned also at the end of the debate by Peter Adams, I think there is great merit in us considering how that might play its part within the whole context of redress.

That is where I want to conclude my remarks. Simon Friend, thank you for your speech and the reminder to us about the danger of different parts of the Church dodging responsibility. This is an issue for the whole Body of Christ. It is an issue for our parishes, our dioceses, for the National Church Institutions, the Archbishops' Council and for the Church Commissioners.

In the context of setting up the Redress Scheme – and I will be meeting, in fact, with the board of the Church Commissioners tomorrow to talk about their engagement with that whole process – there are going to be many issues about the principle of subsidiarity and where the appropriate level is, but the reality is this is an issue for the whole Church

and it is vitally important that we work through this together and that no one dodges responsibility. This is about the Body of Christ, and when one part is hurting then all of us hurt and we must take responsibility for that.

So a huge thanks, Chair, firstly to the survivors and to everyone who have contributed to the debate. We will take up all of the issues that have been raised, in particular about culture, about the need for developing new ways of doing things, of our taking responsibility, of our working with survivors to bring about the kind of lasting change that is needed in order that the Church may become a safer, healthier place for all and that we may, indeed, honour our Lord Jesus Christ in the way we fulfil our calling to be His Body here on earth. Thank you very much indeed.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. I am sorry that it was not possible to hear from all those who wished to speak today. Before we move to the vote, may I invite you to gather your thoughts and reflections on all that you have heard this morning in a moment of prayer.

“Oh God, the protector of all that trust in thee. Without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy. Increase and multiply upon us thy mercy. That thou being our ruler and guide, we may so pass through things temporal that we finally lose not the things eternal. Grant this, oh heavenly father. For Jesus Christ’s sake, our Lord. Amen”.

The Chair: I now put Item 17 to a formal vote and order a counted vote of the whole Synod. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 17. Voting will take place using the Crystal voting platform.

There were voted on Item 17: in favour 363, against none, with no recorded abstentions. The motion was carried.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your attention during the course of the morning. We will now have a break and resume at ten minutes past twelve.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 12.10 pm.

The Chair: Members of Synod, welcome back and I hope you have had a good break. Before I move to our next business I am going to invite the Secretary General William Nye to speak to us for a moment or two.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Thank you, Bishop Jonathan. Members of Synod, I am sorry to trouble you again. I just need to say a further word briefly about the formal voting system. I told you yesterday afternoon that we had been told of a potential problem arising with the Crystal voting platform which we have been using for the formal counted votes. We were informed by Crystal Interactive yesterday that their voting platform was recording some duplicate votes in respect of some members. In other

words, some members were recorded as having voted twice on the same vote, with the result that the detailed figures provided to the Registrar and the Chair, which were therefore announced to the Synod, were incorrect.

Crystal Interactive have now analysed the results of the formal counted votes carried out on Monday and Tuesday as we asked them to. The most important point to say is that the duplication issue has not affected the result of any of the formal counted votes that were taken. Secondly, because we were concerned about this problem, we have asked Chairs to reduce the number of votes taken by formal votes and use more simple votes, the Zoom polls that you are familiar with. The Chief Legal Adviser has looked into this and advised me that despite incorrect figures having been announced by the Chair, as the result of the vote on each motion (i.e. that it was carried) was correctly announced, those results stand and the motions in question were duly passed by the Synod.

Yesterday, before we did the little update we were told by Crystal Interactive that this duplication problem would be solved by members using the Crystal voting platform in the way that we explained yesterday afternoon. Thank you very much for your co-operation in doing that. It is much appreciated. Unfortunately, it turns out this has not entirely solved the problem, as we were informed, and Crystal Interactive has told us there are still some duplicate votes being recorded. So far as further formal counted votes are concerned, we now have a means whereby Crystal staff are able to remove the duplicate votes from the voting figures following the end of the voting period for a formal counted vote. This takes about two minutes. There will therefore need to be a short delay between the ending of the voting period and the announcement of the result when we have a formal counted vote. You may have spotted this at the end of the last debate.

Synod staff have been told by Crystal Interactive they can readily identify these duplicate votes and remove them and ensure that the figures provided to the Registrar and the Chair are the correct ones. We will of course monitor the situation carefully and report to the Synod on the accuracy of any further formal counted votes. A Notice Paper setting all this out will be distributed shortly. I am very sorry that we have had this problem with the system, and I apologise for troubling you with it again. Thank you, Bishop Jonathan.

The Chair: Thank you, William. Members may in due course wish to raise points of order on what we have just been told. It would be enormously helpful if those points of order were not made during the business that we are about to debate. We would be very grateful for members' co-operation on that point.

ITEM 502
SPECIAL AGENDA I
LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
DIOCESAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION MEASURE
DRAFT MEASURE FOR FINAL DRAFTING AND FINAL APPROVAL (GS
2131B)

The Chair: We now move to Item 502 and 503, the Final Drafting Stage for the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure. Members will need draft Measure GS 2131B and the Report of the Steering Committee GS 2131Z. I also draw to members' attention paragraph 17 to 19 of the Second Notice Paper, which details the financial implications of this business.

I now call Professor Muriel Robinson, Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 502: "That the Synod do take note of this Report." Professor Robinson, you have up to ten minutes.

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): Good afternoon, Synod. Synod will remember that the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure ("draft Measure") received First Consideration at the July 2019 group of sessions. At the February 2020 Synod, the Synod completed the Revision stage for the draft Measure which then stood committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its Final Drafting.

The Steering Committee considered the revised draft Measure carefully and has proposed a number of special and drafting amendments, which are explained in detail in the Steering Committee's Report to the Synod. The Department for Education and the Charity Commission have been consulted on the proposed special amendments and any points raised have been addressed.

The Steering Committee is proposing special amendments to ensure that the delay in the draft Measure being returned to Synod for Final Drafting does not result in dioceses having insufficient time in which to make a scheme as required under the draft Measure. In addition, the Steering Committee is proposing a special amendment to make it clear who the company law members of a DBE, which is a company limited by guarantee (CLG), are, as well as who the members of a DBE, which is a charitable incorporated organisation (CIO), are under its constitution. My fellow Steering Group member, the Ven. Douglas Dettmer will provide a more detailed description of the special amendments when they are considered by Synod in turn shortly.

The Steering Committee has made a number of drafting amendments to clarify those remaining uncertainties of meaning in the draft Measure which have been identified, or to improve the drafting. In the Steering Committee's Report we explain why each of the drafting amendments is considered necessary and appropriate by the Steering Committee in order to clarify or improve the drafting of the draft Measure.

An unforeseen benefit of the delay of Synod to November has been that the templates for the schemes to be passed by diocesan synods under the draft Measure have been drafted during the Final Drafting process. Therefore, it has been possible to identify where the clarity of the drafting of certain clauses needed to be improved at a time when the Steering Committee was able to make these drafting amendments to the draft Measure.

An example of where this has been particularly useful can be seen in the various drafting amendments to paragraphs 9 and 10 of Schedule 1, which were made because during the preparation of draft template schemes it became apparent that the process for withdrawing from a scheme for a joint DBE could be simplified.

I hope that Synod will support the special and drafting amendments proposed by the Steering Committee, which we believe will make the draft Measure clearer and resolve a number of outstanding issues identified following the Revision stage.

I therefore move Item 502: "That Synod take note of the Steering Committee's Report."

The Chair: Item 502 is open for debate. I would remind members that speeches are invited specifically at this stage of this business on the Report of the Steering Committee and that more general contributions are more appropriately made as and when we come to debating Final Approval.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): When this Measure was considered at the Revision stage by this Synod in February, I proposed an amendment with the support of the then Dean of the Arches Charles George that the option for a DBE to be constituted as an unincorporated body under clause 3(b) should be removed. In the event, this amendment was lost. The Revision Committee had noted that they shared the Dean of the Arches' concerns about whether an unincorporated structure was the most suitable for a DBE, and also noted in respect of the option for a DBE being a sub-body of a DBF, that conflicts of interest would need to be carefully managed.

However, at the Revision stage, the Steering Committee, while not supporting my amendment, indicated its support for the matter to be debated on the floor of Synod. In the event, in February there were only 124 members present in the chamber for this legislative debate and fewer than 40 members stood. As an aside, members' lack of attention to their legislative responsibilities should, I believe, be a matter of considerable concern. The debate in February only proceeded after a count to confirm that a quorum was present in each House.

I remain firmly of the view that the use of an unincorporated association as the legal form for a large charity such as a DBE is neither appropriate nor fit for purpose. Unincorporated bodies are appropriate for small membership organisations with no staff

or premises. Also, such bodies are unable to enter into contracts or own property in their own right. I am of the opinion that this Measure, in reality, did not have a meaningful Revision stage. I believe the Measure is flawed in allowing the DBE to be an unincorporated corporation. However, it is now too late to amend this Measure further and in the interests of not losing the whole Measure, I will be voting in favour.

I have taken this decision after discussions with the Chief Education Officer and the Chair of the Steering Committee, who have indicated that dioceses are now moving away from the use of unincorporated associations in favour of best practice legal form, ie a CIO (charitable incorporated organisation). I am also reassured that the guidance to DBEs accompanying this Measure will very clearly state that best practice legal form is that of a CIO, and that the risks of the use of the unincorporated option will be explained in detail. I very much hope that this will be the direction of travel over the next couple of years, and I intend to raise periodically, hopefully personally if I am re-elected, a Synod question in the next quinquennium to monitor progress in moving the legal forms of DBEs into structures aligned with best practice governance which are appropriate for large charities in the 2020s and beyond.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I was the Chair of the Revision Committee for this Measure. Certainly the point that Carl Hughes subsequently raised at the Revision stage was one that the Revision Committee gave careful consideration to and was sympathetic to, but felt it really was a matter for Synod as a whole to resolve, which is why it was left to the Revision stage. Personally I have some sympathy with what he says, and I think I would have voted for the amendment if 40 members had stood for it. However, we are where we are. For the reasons that he says, I think it is entirely safe to proceed with the Measure as it is, with these special amendments which will be dealt with shortly, not least because there are so few dioceses now wanting to keep the unincorporated form for their DBE. It is certainly my hope that, as they reflect further on the detailed guidance which will accompany the Measure once it is law, that even those dioceses will come to the view that it is much safer to use one of the other forms of body that the Measure provides for. I am very grateful that Carl is wanting to now support the Measure, as I hope we all will.

I would just want to make the point that the problem of the debate in February has been reflected on both by the Business Committee and the Standing Orders Committee, on both of which I have the privilege to serve, and certainly the Business Committee is aware of the importance of ensuring that legislative business does not occupy what you might call graveyard slots where everybody has decamped to the tea room, and that will be taken into account in future.

From the point of view of the Standing Orders, at the moment if a Steering Committee does not expressly accept an amendment, 40 members are required to stand. One of the things the Standing Orders Committee has been looking at, and I think will bring forward shortly, is an amendment that would allow for a neutral position where a Steering Committee could say, "We cannot support this but we think Synod ought to

debate it”, and in those circumstances the 40-member rule would not apply. Also, there is consideration to reducing the number from 40 to 25. So, the problems that Carl adverts to are real with regard to our process in February, but the relevant bodies that are charged with ordering the agenda and the Standing Orders have taken them very seriously and, hopefully, such a problem will never arise in future.

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (Dean of the Arches): I would very much like to echo what has been said already by Carl Hughes about the importance of both the particular point and the general point. I am well aware of the activity of my predecessor on this subject. I would very much like to stress the importance of drafting well done guidance to make it very clear to people who are making important structural decisions about this so that they fully understand the legal consequences of the vehicle they choose.

I would also like to echo what David Lamming said in Synod two days ago about the importance of the General Synod’s legislative functions generally. I am very pleased to hear from Clive Scowen of serious consideration being given in that regard. With my thanks to them, I just wanted to make clear my position since my predecessor has been mentioned today.

The Chair: I do not see anyone else wishing to speak. I therefore invite Professor Robinson to reply to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): We had expected this point to be raised under Final Approval, so I may be slightly less fluent on this than I might otherwise have been. I am very grateful for these points being made. We think they are very important, both the general ones about process and about when legislation is timed so that members have the energy after big debates to be able to engage with such important matters. Also, we share the concerns that maybe unincorporated bodies would not be our own choice. However, we are clear from the consultation carried out by the education team that each diocese has a different take on this, depending on their situation.

We thank Carl and Clive and the Dean of the Arches for their comments. We echo some of them but we still feel the drafting as set out in the Report is what we need. We would like to move on then to the special amendments in a moment, but first, could I move Item 502: “That the Synod do take note of the Steering Committee’s Report”.

The Chair: I now put Item 502 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 516

The Chair: The Steering Committee proposes a number of special amendments to the draft Measure. They are set out in your Order Paper at Items 516 and 517. Item 516 covers four special amendments and, unless any member indicates now that he or she

wishes to speak against a particular amendment in that group, I intend to take them en bloc. I therefore invite Professor Robinson to move Item 516 en bloc.

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): It is going to be the Ven. Douglas Dettmer for this section.

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): Special amendment 1 to clause 23 changes the longstop date for the making of a new scheme under the draft Measure from 1 January 2022 to 1 January 2023. The Committee considered this change necessary to allow dioceses sufficient time to make a scheme as required under the draft Measure now that Final Approval and the parliamentary stages have been delayed due to Covid-19.

As a consequence, three further special amendments will be needed. First, should it appear that a diocese will not have a scheme in operation by the required date, the draft Measure requires the Archbishops' Council to refer the fact to the Archbishop of the province concerned. Special amendment 2 makes a consequential amendment to the date by which this must be done. Special amendment 3 is a transitional provision to allow the current DBE members for a diocese to continue in office until the new DBE scheme for that diocese takes effect, which will be a date no later than 1 January 2023. As a result, diocesan synods will not be in a position of having to elect new members to their present DBEs from the start of the new triennium in January 2022 for a term of only a year or less. Accordingly, the next fresh election of DBE members by a diocesan synod would be for service on the newly constituted DBE no later than the start of 2023. Special amendment 4 is consequential to special amendment 3.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, I beg to move Item 516: "That the Synod approve special amendments 1 to 4".

The Chair: That item is now open for debate. I see no one wishing to speak. We can therefore move to put Item 516 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Professor Robinson, I am not sure whether we are back in your hands for Item 517, but, if so, I invite you to move that item.

Professor Robinson (Lincoln): Chair, no, it is still Douglas.

ITEM 517

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): We turn now to special amendment 5. A company limited by guarantee has both directors and members under company law each with different rights and obligations in law. A charitable incorporated organisation (CIO) has both trustees and members, again each with different rights and obligations in law. The members and directors of a company limited by guarantee and the trustees and

members of a CIO may be the same individuals or they may be different people, depending on how the company or CIO is constituted. At present, all incorporated DBEs are companies limited by guarantee. The Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 1991 makes no provision for who the company law members of an incorporated DBE should be. The draft Measure also makes no such provision at present. Therefore, the Committee considered it appropriate that the draft Measure should expressly provide for who the company law members of a DBE, which is a company limited by guarantee, will be, and likewise the members of the DBE which is a charitable incorporated organisation.

The Committee considered it important to include this clarification because all the references to members of the DBE in the draft Measure are to those persons serving as board members, in other words as the trustees of the DBE, which reflects the way in which DBE trustees or board members are described in the 1991 Measure. However, it could be unclear in an incorporated DBE whether the provisions for the removal of a person as a member of a DBE refer to the removal of the person as a board member only, in other words as a trustee, or also as a company law or CIO member. Therefore, this special amendment clarifies this.

On behalf of the Steering Committee I beg to move item 517: "That the Synod do approve special amendment 5".

The Chair: Item 517 is open for debate. I see no one wishing to speak, so I put Item 517 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: Synod, we now move to the Final Approval stage for this business. I call on Professor Robinson to move Item 503: "That the Measure entitled 'Diocesan Boards of Education Measure' be finally approved". Professor Robinson, you have up to ten minutes.

ITEM 503

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): The Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 1991 ("1991 Measure") provides the legal framework within which the Church of England's dioceses engage and work with Church schools. As a result of significant changes to the education landscape, it is increasingly evident that the 1991 Measure needs to be updated as a matter of urgency to confer the functions and powers on the diocesan boards of education (DBEs) that they need in order to play their part in supporting and promoting the development of Church schools in the 2020s and beyond. Synod will recall that there are some key changes as to how DBEs can be structured in the draft Measure. This of course has already been raised. The 1991 Measure provides for DBEs to be either incorporated or unincorporated. A key change in the draft Measure is

the introduction of the third option: for DBEs to be constituted as a statutory committee of the diocesan boards of finance (DBF).

This is because it appears that most unincorporated DBEs interpreted the option in the 1991 Measure to be unincorporated more widely than had been anticipated and so are operating in practice as a committee of their DBF. The draft Measure seeks to regularise the committee structure for a significant number of DBEs which, it is understood, wish to continue operating in this way.

Before deciding to offer the three choices for the structure of the DBEs, the Education Office consulted those involved – the DBEs and DBFs – during the summer and autumn of 2018. From the responses to that consultation, it was clear that a relatively small number of DBEs which are currently not incorporated would like to operate as independent registered charities from their DBF, whether as incorporated charities or remaining unincorporated. However, most DBEs which are not incorporated at present have indicated that they wish to continue to operate as a committee of the DBF.

The Church of England's Education Office has listened to this advice and sought to provide that the draft Measure only required changes to arrangements where they are necessary. This is because it is not considered helpful to impose change on arrangements that were perceived at a local level to be working well, particularly as a requirement for extensive change would have a cost attached.

Therefore, all three options are included to reflect the wishes clearly expressed by the DBEs, and in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, so as not to impose any changes on DBEs from the centre when they can continue to be given the choice on how to structure themselves. Retaining the option for DBEs to be unincorporated independent charities was felt to be reasonable as it is a recognised legal structure for charities in charity law and charity law permits charity trustees to choose the most appropriate form of structure for their charity. That said, the Education Office is aware of the perceived drawbacks of such a structure for a charity of the nature and size of a DBE. These concerns have been drawn to the attention of DBEs and will continue to be drawn to their attention in guidance to be produced by the Education Office.

The approach has been taken that it is preferable to encourage those DBEs that wish to be independent charities to adopt one of the incorporated structures available to them rather than impose the change so that DBEs can take the appropriate steps when ready to do so. The impact of the Covid-19 crisis has made it even more important that the unincorporated option is retained, as some dioceses are struggling with the financial and organisational fallout of Covid-19, and so may not be in a position to provide the staff time and incur the associated costs of incorporation at this point in time.

An amendment to remove the option for a DBE to be unincorporated was proposed by a member of Synod at Revision in February 2020, as you have heard. In its response to that amendment, the Steering Committee noted that although the Steering Committee

supports the policy position, the changes should not be imposed on DBEs where local arrangements are operating successfully, and therefore did not support the amendment. If sufficient members had indicated their willingness for such a debate to take place, it would have been an appropriate matter for Synod to consider and debate. However, Synod chose not to debate this matter as 40 members did not stand.

In its Report, the Steering Committee asked the Education Office to produce guidance which highlights to dioceses the risks involved in choosing an unincorporated structure for its DBE, so those risks can be carefully considered when a decision is being taken, and if an unincorporated structure is chosen, the diocese is aware of the risks and takes appropriate steps to mitigate them.

The Steering Committee understands that the Education Office has already engaged with dioceses on the relative risks and benefits of each model and will continue to do so. It is also understood that, at present, only a couple of DBEs are intending to remain unincorporated independent charities for the time being.

The draft Measure reflects the current and anticipated future educational environment in which DBEs are operating, in particular by making suitable provision in relation to academies and multi-academy trusts. It is of great importance that this draft Measure is given Final Approval today by Synod, as the 1991 Measure needs to be updated to enable DBEs to manage their governance effectively in responding to changes in their own setting without the need for lengthy approval processes involving the Department for Education; to undertake their roles and support Church schools in the educational reality in which the DBEs are now functioning; and to support the development of Growing Faith. This last point is, of course, particularly significant given the potential for mission and discipleship offered in our Church schools as highlighted in the Vision and Strategy presented yesterday by the Archbishop of York. This legislation, if passed, will improve the effectiveness of DBEs and thus enable them to better support schools.

We hope that members of Synod will recognise the real benefits of this Measure and will support it. I therefore move Item 503: “That the Measure entitled ‘Diocesan Boards of Education Measure’ be finally approved”.

The Chair: Item 503 is now open for debate. Members are reminded that motions for the closure, the speech limit or for next business are not in order in this debate. I call the Bishop of Durham followed by Christina Baron. Bishop, you have up to five minutes and thereafter the speech limit will be three minutes.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): Good afternoon, Synod. I speak as Chair of the National Society and will also refer to my own diocese. The DBE Measure is the key piece of legislation establishing the means by which the structures of the Church partner with the state in the delivery of education in England. As such, it is vital that it equips us to continue our historic role in the modern world and I have been pleased to see the progress of this new Measure through Synod. Its enacting will bring many

benefits. It is an opportunity to affirm and consolidate the way in which diocesan boards of education operate as a key part of their dioceses. It strengthens the foundation of the relationship between the dioceses and the governing boards of our schools, academies as well as voluntary schools, and the historic trustees of those schools, and it enables us to modernise our structures more flexibly as we keep pace with future developments in the world of education and education governance.

As Bishop in a diocese with a currently unincorporated DBE, I am keen we progress swiftly to a point where we can be comfortable that we are operating within the governance parameters of the Measure. I welcome the pragmatic approach that the legislation takes. It does not impose a requirement that would mean that our DBE and those of the majority of dioceses would immediately need to undertake a costly restructuring exercise. Now is not the moment for creating additional calls on diocesan funds if this can be avoided.

However, the Measure does mean that any diocese will have the flexibility in the future to alter the composition of its DBE and/or its governance structure within the much less restrictive parameters which this Measure introduces. This flexibility, and the new far simpler process for any changes, means that we can be confident that DBEs can modernise appropriately in due course. The adoption of the Measure ensures that DBEs and Church schools, whether voluntary or academies, can see more clearly the statutory underpinning of the relationship. This frees both sides to work together more productively. It is comforting to know there is provision for keeping the face of the Measure up to date with changes in the law without the need to restart the lengthy processes we are currently engaged in. Synod's time can be focused where it is needed and we will still be able to reflect the development of the state school system in a timely way.

This, and the ability to change the composition of the DBE without the need to involve the DFE, are examples of Synod simplification aims operating in practice. I am reminded that the current DBE Measure is the last major piece of Synod legislation which has not yet been updated to reflect that wish to simplify. Approving this new DBE Measure will therefore be a significant advance in that work.

I commend to Synod the encouragement this Measure brings for diocesan synods to think more widely about the role of their DBE and its work with children and young people and to build strong links into churches as part of Growing Faith. As Lead Bishop for Education, I am very grateful for the Steering Committee and Revision Committee's time, skill and effort on this new DBE Measure.

Finally, I take this opportunity to applaud the enormous amount of extra work undertaken over these past months by DBEs, diocesan education staff teams and especially the work of head teachers and school staff. They have been utterly brilliant and deserve our thanks and praise. I commend the Measure to the Synod. We need it and we need it now.

Christina Baron (Bath & Wells): I am speaking rather unusually because our Bishop is ill and the Bishop standing in for him, the Bishop of Taunton, ---

The Chair: Christina, we are not hearing you. Perhaps we can pause and try to sort this out. Perhaps we could move on to the next speaker and try coming back to you in a moment. We will move to David Lamming. The speech limit remains at three minutes.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I am going to inject a note of dissent into this debate. Let me make that clear at the beginning. I appreciate fully what Clive Scowen has said about the Business Committee and the Standing Orders Committee having taken note of the concerns expressed following the debate at the Revision stage in February, but I endorse everything that Carl Hughes has said about the unsatisfactory nature of those 124 members Synod present in the chamber. I am pleased to see that we have 390 participants at the present time. It was not only a matter of whether the full Synod was quorate. I attended both meetings of the Revision Committee and at the second meeting only one member of the Revision Committee was present and three members of the Steering Committee. I query whether that is in accordance with at least the spirit of Standing Order 54(2) that the members of the Steering Committee may not form a majority of the membership of the Revision Committee.

We have had what I regard as a flawed synodical process for this Measure, which has meant it has not been properly considered and, in particular, the important concerns expressed by the former Dean of the Arches Charles George, and clearly set out in the Revision Committee Report in February, have not even been addressed by Synod.

My concern is what you are doing is passing a piece of legislation which, hopefully, is going to stand good for a good many years and it is going to require the approval of Parliament. I just wonder when we have a provision in the Measure in clause 3 providing for continuation of an unincorporated association as one of the vehicles for a DBE, and provision for it to be a committee of the DBF, with the potential for conflicts of interest, which Charles George also voiced and are set out in the Revision Committee Report in February, whether that really will pass the test of expediency when it goes to the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament.

We have, in effect, a Measure which contains a provision which is not fit for purpose in the third decade of the twenty-first century. What I want to suggest is that if we vote against this Measure now – we know what the concerns are – it can go back to the Steering Committee. The Business Committee can authorise it being brought back to Synod in February with the opportunity then for it to fix this and to catch up with the timetable that the Steering Committee wish.

Members of Synod, I would urge you to consider whether we ought to support the Measure for Final Approval at this stage.

The Chair: Christina Baron, we will try you again, with apologies. After Christina, I call John Naylor.

Christina Baron (Bath & Wells): I am speaking because, unusually, we have no Bishop at this Synod. Our Bishop is ill. The Bishop standing in for him, the Bishop of Taunton, Ruth Worsley, has been told she does not have speaking rights, so I am speaking on her behalf.

Dioceses have different numbers of Church schools. Some do not have very many. We have 181. We have our own Bath & Wells multi-academy trust and eighteen mixed mode multi-academy trusts which we work with, and many of them have seen the value of chaplaincy. There is much concern at the moment for the wellbeing of young people and of our key worker teaching staff. We have seen two such multi-academy trust chaplaincies trialled, virtually and physically, set up during the pandemic, reaching Church school and non-Church school communities. This is helping to further our ambition to engage with all that is good in the Growing Faith programme, as we seek to connect church, school and households in both practical and spiritual ways.

The revised Measure sets out the responsibilities and remits of DBEs in a way that reflects the current educational landscape and will offer a far more relevant approach, especially in regard to the coming of academies. It enables DBEs to engage more constructively with other education stakeholders to seek to secure the very best for the young people and children in our Church schools.

The Bishop of Taunton is Vice Chair of the Diocesan Board of Education and the DBE believes that the option to draw closer to the diocesan board of finance by being a statutory committee of the diocesan board of finance means that we will be able to build on our ambition in relation to the Growing Faith agenda.

Some may feel the opportunity of becoming incorporated as a DBE might appear to offer a stronger governance route, but each diocese operates very differently, with a very different make-up of schools, academy trusts, site trustees and so on. It is important to keep all three options, therefore, to enable clear local decisions within dioceses rather than imposing a national approach.

The Diocese of Bath & Wells welcomes the new Measure and looks forward to the opportunities it offers us to align our resources as a diocese to the Growing Faith agenda and our commitment to place mission and evangelism at the centre of all that we do, and build up a younger and more diverse Church for the future.

The Chair: John Naylor followed by Canon Elizabeth Paver. After Canon Paver the speech limit will be two minutes.

Mr John Naylor (Lichfield): This is in fact my maiden speech, although many of you may know me as the guy who plays the keyboard for the wonderful singing at General Synod. I cannot wait for it to happen again.

I should declare an interest in that I am in my ninth year as Chairman of Lichfield Diocesan Board of Finance. I too was disappointed that last February so few members chose to attend in person the Synod debate on this very important subject. It was even more disappointing that there was what I could only describe as tittering when the Bishop of Ely provided a very succinct summary of the current relationships between the DBFs, the DBEs, the DBEs and the DBFs, and several other acronyms. It is complex but it matters and it needs to be understood.

It seems to me that this Measure is a good one in that it commits dioceses to organise their affairs and, in particular, the relationship between the DBE and the DBF, in a way that suits them best. In our dioceses we have some 45,000 children in our Church schools, many of whom would not otherwise come into contact with our Christian faith. We have an excellent and highly rated primary multi-academy trust and we are in the process of setting up a secondary MAT, with close co-operation between the DBE and the DBF. We are moving cautiously and by consent towards our DBE being a sub-committee of the DBF, which is one and the same as the Bishop's Council are the DBF directors. We believe this will provide for even greater co-ordination in the diocese on matters of education. It will also enable the DBF as assist lender of last resort within the diocese to be more closely aware of the financial dynamics of the DBE. We would be better joined up and better able to serve the interests of the pupils in our schools, who must come first.

However, I do have a question of those who drafted the Measure. Are they satisfied that assets properly belonging to a DBE will be securely ring fenced if and when they become a sub-committee of a DBF and their accounts are consolidated? I hasten to add that while reading the Measure I may have missed this particular point, but I would like some assurance on it. We have given our DBE an assurance on this matter.

Apart from this, I very much welcome the Measure because it allows dioceses to order the relationship between their DBE and DBF as they see fit, and I would urge Synod to vote enthusiastically in favour of the motion to approve it.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): May I express my thanks and congratulations to all who have been working so hard to bring this Diocesan Boards of Education Measure to its Final Approval stage.

As has been said, the 1991 Measure was, in many respect, not fit for purpose in 2020. Twenty years in education has covered so many changes and expectations. I believe the meticulous scrutiny by the Steering Committee and the Revision Committee and General Synod input have now given us a Measure which will serve all dioceses and our Church schools well.

As we have heard, justifiable concerns regarding the status of diocesan boards of education in this new Measure have been thoroughly considered, and the need for a diverse approach has been allowed for. One size does not always fit all. This Measure will enable DBEs, both incorporated and unincorporated, to flourish.

In Sheffield, the diocesan board of education is at present unincorporated, but of course we will take on all the advice that comes centrally from the legal department. Within our schools, the relationship between the diocesan board of education and the diocesan board of finance has been an excellent one. The extent to which the diocesan synod allows time on its agenda for educational debates varies considerably from diocese to diocese. We are very fortunate in Sheffield that the director of education is often brought in to give us updates on what is happening via the board of education's decisions in our schools. I think most of the members of Synod, with their interaction with our Church schools, would also have many examples of the fine work that is going on there.

In our own dioceses we have also seen the SIAMS inspections at 100% "good" and above, and a growing understanding of Christianity training, such that we are now training a number of community schools as well as the Church schools.

There is significant development of high-performing diocesan-led multi-academy trusts, with plans to grow it to between 20-25 schools and the development of 20-25 school-based congregations, an initiative that perfectly captures the Growing Faith agenda, and making the most of the overlap between our ministries in schools, congregations and households.

We are very proud of our schools, as I am sure many, many other dioceses and boards of education are. As a foundation governor of our own Church of England school in the parish, I would like at this point to echo what the Bishop has said in his speech and take this opportunity to highlight the incredible work of all the staff in our Church schools during this year of [...]

The Chair: Canon Paver, thank you very much. We will have to draw to a close. After Clive Scowen, Debbie McIsaac.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I just want to respond to one or two points made by David Lamming. First, with regard to the Revision Committee's second meeting, yes, unfortunately, some people were ill and not able to attend. It was December last year. Had we not had that meeting then, it would have had to have been held far too late for the Revision stage to be taken in February and we would only be doing that now. Given the urgency of getting this legislation through, that would have been very unsatisfactory. The Steering Committee are full members of the Revision Committee and we were quorate, so there was nothing improper about what we did, although, obviously, it would have been better if people had not been ill and been able to be there.

The point about unincorporated DBEs and committees of DBFs, all concerns of the former Dean of the Arches, were dealt with at the first meeting of the Revision Committee which was much more fully attended. It was a clear decision to leave that for the Revision stage.

What David Lamming is urging on us now is to reject this Measure. I urge Synod not to accept that view. It is important to get this through and the idea that we can just bring it back in February simply is not the case. If we vote against this now the whole legislative process has to begin again. It would involve unacceptable delay in getting this Measure on to the statute book. It is fit for purpose. It may not be ideal in certain respects, but to say it is not fit for purpose is to overstate the case massively. I urge Synod to accept this Measure as it is, in the knowledge that almost all DBEs will be incorporated or committees of the DBF in due course.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): I would like to echo what Carl Hughes said at the beginning of this. I think that Synod needs a very compelling reason to vote in favour of legislation which is in this respect inadequate. The legal form that a DBE takes really does seem to me to matter. My recollection is that the initial resistance to including this came because there was a desire to persuade diocesan boards of education to take some steps forward. I am sure that has now happened. All I want to draw to Synod's attention is that we should be very reluctant, unless there is a compelling reason, to vote in favour (or even abstain) when the legislation appears to be inadequate.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Much to David's surprise, I am fully supporting him and the previous speaker's concern. If the thrust of what we are trying to do is to simplify and to strengthen, we have given too many options. Given the fact that we in Suffolk have a huge number of schools and if we follow various government plans for either joining in various schemes or setting up our own schemes, we are going to be running an organisation which is actually far larger than the financial turnover of the diocese. I think this could well and truly blow up in our faces and we will be back here in three years' time doing it all again. There is an opportunity here to rethink and the fact that Synod did not do the task of scrutiny earlier, as David has already indicated, and so have others, means that we should proceed with great caution. I would also recommend with him that we do not pass this piece of legislation.

Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham): For us in Birmingham, the Diocesan Boards of Education Measure is all about ensuring light-touch effective systems. We anticipate that we will choose the route to becoming a statutory committee of the diocesan board of finance. As a currently unincorporated diocesan board of education, it looks best for us as it basically formalises our current arrangements.

Our passion is to see all the children and staff of our local school communities flourish; for them to know that they are unconditionally loved by the Lord and made in the image of God, so that they can live life in all its fullness, helping them to build confidence to be

able to come alongside people from all walks of life and be open to all. Our hope is to instil a lifelong love of learning. The Measure before us will help us to keep our focus on this main task. Thus, it is very popular with us in the Birmingham area.

Therefore, fellow members of Synod, as we grasp the benefits of this Measure, let us wholeheartedly support the motion before us today.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I agree with David Lamming and others who have spoken against this Measure. It is bad law and I cannot support it. I urge others to vote it down as well.

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): As a member of the Steering Committee, I echo the comments of Professor Robinson and the Bishop of Durham in pointing to the urgency and significance of this Measure in bringing our Church of England diocesan engagement with education and our national engagement into the twenty-first century.

I would point out a couple of important considerations here. One is that the preparation of this legislation has involved considerable discussion both with the Department for Education and with the Charity Commission, and is being presented with their endorsement.

Secondly, simplification is so often about flexibility and pragmatism where that is appropriate. Pragmatically in this case, in terms of the Church of England's use of our financial resources nationally and in the diocese, to impose one model on dioceses rather than enabling the flexibility, with appropriate and detailed guidance about risk management for whatever option is taken, seems to me, in the light of Covid-19 particularly, even more important than it would be anyway. I urge Synod to support the passage of this Measure through Final Approval and I thank those who have been so deeply involved in preparing this legislation and thinking it through.

The Chair: I call Simon Butler, after which the speech limit will be one minute.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I really want to respond to those who are urging the defeat of this Measure to remember that this is the final stage of the synodical process. All parts of the process so far have been quorate. All the due diligence has been done synodically speaking. When we get to Final Approval and the brakes suddenly go on, it really is too late to be asking us to defeat a Measure at this stage. I think we should proceed. I think we should vote on it as soon as possible and we should pass the Measure. Let us not put the brakes on now.

The Chair: I see no one else indicating that they wish to speak, so I invite Professor Robinson to reply to the debate. Professor Robinson, you have up to ten minutes, but you may not perhaps need all of it.

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): I will try not to use all of it. I would like to start by thanking Synod for the thoughtful and helpful contributions offered, both those in favour and those who are raising concerns, particularly in view of the challenges of doing all this by Zoom.

I would also like to thank the members of the Revision and Steering Committees, all those who have taken the time to submit amendments for consideration or those in the dioceses who have offered advice. Special thanks of course to the legal team, and in particular to Eva for her support as I took on the role of acting Chair. I will not go through all the responses individually because I am conscious of time, but it has been good to hear the support and recognition from so many people of the ability to allow the diocese to decide what is right for them. That is what really matters.

I think we did offer opportunities for these things to be discussed. As Clive Scowen has said, we talked about this at the first Revision Committee. It has been discussed thoroughly. We have consulted out as well through the diocesan boards of education and the boards of finance to find out what the mood is out there. We hear these concerns around offering dioceses a choice of future structure, which have been aired again today, but we do remain convinced that the best way forward is to ensure that the principles of subsidiarity are followed and that dioceses should be empowered to make appropriate and local decisions, after taking careful account of the guidance, which will be provided and which will emphasise the particular risks of the unincorporated model.

We would like to remind Synod that all three models are legal structures for charities. We would also point to the feedback from the diocesan directors of education, which suggests that all but a couple of dioceses have already decided to adopt either the DBF committee route or fully incorporated models.

Finally, and most importantly, we would remind members of General Synod that we are all also members of diocesan synods. We are ideally placed to ensure that due consideration is given at diocesan level to the risks and benefits of each model as the new Measure is implemented because we have to approve the scheme.

This Measure is not just about the organisational model of each DBE, but about many other urgent areas where a Measure last amended in 1991, before at least some of our Synod members were even born, is impeding good governance of our Church schools and academies, and thus potentially damaging the invaluable efforts of our DBEs and schools to further the Kingdom, as I rehearsed in detail earlier in my opening speech.

The loss of the July group of sessions has already unavoidably delayed this urgent and important legislation. The whole Steering Committee is with me when I urge Synod to vote to accept this Measure so that it can proceed to Royal Assent without further delay.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Robinson. The question is: “That the Measure entitled ‘Diocesan Boards of Education Measure’ be finally approved”. In accordance

with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses. Although this is a counted vote by Houses, I direct that the bell be not rung on this occasion. Voting will take place using the Crystal voting platform.

The vote on Item 503: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 29, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, those in favour 114, against 12, with 8 recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, those in favour 122, against 22, with 4 recorded abstentions. The motion was therefore carried in each of the Houses and therefore carried by the Synod as a whole.

The motion for Final Approval has been carried and the Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee.

Members of Synod, that concludes this business.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 1.28 pm.

ITEM 507

THE NATIONAL MINISTRY REGISTER (CLERGY) REGULATIONS 2020 (GS 2185)

The Chair: We come to Item 507 the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020. Members will need their Order Papers which have the amendments on them, Notice Paper II, paragraph 20, with the financial implications, and GS 1285 and GS 1285X.

ITEM 507A

The Chair: First, I shall ask the Bishop of Bristol to move Item 507A, the preliminary motion, “That the Regulations be considered.” This will provide an opportunity to make general comments about the regulations or to raise specific points which do not relate to the amendments on the Order Paper. If the preliminary motion is carried we will then move to the amendments. Members who wish to comment on an amendment should not do so on the preliminary motion, but should reserve their comments for debate on the amendment. I will be imposing a speech limit of three minutes fairly early on in the debate. But first, I call on the Bishop of Bristol to move Item 507A, “That the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020 be considered”. She may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faulk): Madam Chair, members of Synod, thank you for staying on over lunch time. The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* relates that on 12 May 1603, a week after the new King James VI and I had entered London, he wrote to the bishops requiring them to compile lists of all clergy and preachers with details of their academic qualifications, their licences, if any, and their

place of residence. Detailed responses were not forthcoming and at the end of the summer Whitgift (then Archbishop of Canterbury) was still trying to obtain answers. This shows us that people have been calling for a national clergy register for over 400 years without any success.

As we heard this morning, the wheels the Church of England can grind very slowly and I do understand the, shall we say, rugged independence, whether at episcopal or parochial level, which added weight to the brakes over the years. But we are now, at long last, getting to the point of putting in place the legal structure for an accurate, complete and up-to-date national register of all clergy authorised by their bishops and enabling public access to that register.

In July last year, Synod gave Final Approval to a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure which gave the Archbishops' Council power to make the regulations necessary. And now we are asking you to approve regulations that will make the register a reality.

The difficulty with producing a register is that to be useful it needs to be complete and comprehensive and the registers we have had in the past have not been complete. One most often consulted does not include all clergy as they always have the right not to be included and it sometimes includes clergy who seem to have permission to officiate in or from heaven. That lack of comprehensive inclusion makes even basic research onerous. In the early 2000s, I was trying to report on the number of women who had been ordained priests since 1994. Dioceses did not have the figure, nor did the Ministry Division of the National Church Institutions. In the end, a diligent researcher compiled lists from nine years of back copies of the *Church Times*.

Most professionals would be astonished that there is no means of verifying whether someone is an authorised member of their profession. This would simply seem to be part of properly looking after those people for whom a profession is responsible and for there to be a public national searchable database.

A national register comes with other benefits. It will provide for the first time in the Church's history a single list of all clergy authorised to minister with information about where. It will provide greater awareness of self-supporting clergy, clergy on PTO and clergy in chaplaincy roles. It paves the way for including similar information on licensed lay ministers and readers. The national register will be delivered by putting in place a new computerised People System that will enable bishops and their staff to maintain accurate clergy records and share information more effectively, as the records will only need to be updated once and information can be transferred when clergy move from one diocese to another. It will be linked to A Church Near You.

The trigger for the production of a national register was the Gibb Report into Bishop Peter Ball, which recommended a national public register for clergy with permission to officiate. This is a practical outworking of our determination to lead a Church that is demonstrably safe. Without a national register it would remain possible for someone to

impersonate a member of the clergy, or for a cleric who had been suspended or removed from office to claim that they had been authorised by the Church.

In order to prevent this we are putting in place a national online register available on the Church of England website. This will enable members of the public and people such as funeral directors to verify a person's claim to be an authorized Church of England minister. It will enable clergy to check that other clergy are appropriately authorised before inviting them to officiate. It will enable bishops to check whether there are other bishops who have granted the cleric PTO who need to be informed if they withdraw or do not renew authority or PTO. It will enable employers to check that someone already has appropriate authorisation from a bishop if they are considering whether to employ them as a chaplain.

In order to meet their legal safeguarding obligations, bishops already need to hold complete and accurate information about all the clergy they have authorised for ministry such as when their Disclosure and Barring Service checks need to be carried out and the renewal of safeguarding training.

The human resources team at the National Church Institutions has been working with bishops, their staff and diocesan offices on how to support bishops in their oversight of clergy by providing them with a new computerised People System which will help them and their staff to maintain the records they keep about their clergy. The records on the new People System, maintained and updated by bishops and their staff, will be used to provide information to the Archbishops' Council to enable it to publish the national register. The national register will be publicly available free of charge and accessible on the Church of England website with a search facility. As changes are made to the records kept by the bishops, the People System will automatically reflect these changes in the information held by the Council for the purposes of the national register.

If someone's authorisation comes to an end, they will no longer show in the register, which only shows current authorisations. It will be made clear that there could be all sorts of legitimate reasons why clergy are not included in the register, for instance, if they are taking a temporary break at retirement. At the point when a new authorisation takes effect they will appear again in the register. If for some reason someone is engaged in public ministry and this is not recorded on the register, people can raise concerns with the relevant bishop, and it will now be possible to establish the reason, and either ensure that the register is properly updated or carry out an investigation into why they are carrying out ministry on an unauthorised basis. It will be much harder for clergy to carry out a public ministry if they are not authorised and not listed in the register.

You may be wondering why this needs legal regulation. First, keeping accurate and up-to-date records about who is authorized to minister, and in what way and in what location, and updating records when the authorisation has ceased, has not always been taken as seriously as it should have been. Making it a legal requirement will ensure that

it is done properly. Secondly, if a register is to its job properly it needs to include absolutely everyone so that nobody can claim to be authorised and say they are not in the register for some reason.

Finally, the General Data Processing Regulations require us to have a stated basis for processing personal data. Making it a legal requirement for data on authorised clergy to be maintained and published gives us the necessarily lawful basis to make it permissible for bishops and the Archbishops' Council to process such data they are doing so in order to meet a legislative requirement.

Members of Synod, we have been waiting over 400 years for a national clergy register. It is now time to make it happen. I therefore move that: "The National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020 be considered".

The Chair: The matter is now open to debate. The speech limit is three minutes. I call on Steven Lynas followed by Barry Hill.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): I realise there are 376 people who want to get to their lunch but this is timetabled and we have to do it. I want to reflect, having spent 11 years as a bishop's chaplain, on the difficulties of tracking down clergy's ability to minister legally. You would not believe the amount of time that bishops' chaplains have had to spend checking when some priest is being asked to come into the diocese to take a funeral or a wedding as a one-off. It is extraordinarily diverting from the tasks you really need to do on any given day. Very often you only get short notice and it can be very hard to check whether somebody has PTO or a licence, or whatever. For that reason alone, an electronic version that covers the whole Church of England would be really good news.

There is another reason why we need do this thing. Yesterday the Archbishop of York in the Vision and Strategy (one of those bits on the circle) was reminding us we are going to be ministering to a world which has parishes and networks. The network thing is becoming increasingly important in our society. What happens now is people who happen to know a member of the clergy will ask them to take a funeral or baptism or wedding, with no reference to what parish they belong to. Those of you who are parish clergy will know the difficulty that sometimes arises when a family wants somebody else to take a service. There is no way of checking simply whether somebody else is legitimate or not. In the world of networks and fluidity about authority in the Church this is a must-have.

Lastly, Chichester Diocese, the Report and IICSA revealed that in some dioceses there was huge inefficiency about recording who was able to minister. This register will stop that happening. Mike Smith reminded us earlier about the joys of digitising clergy blue files. I see this register as a first step towards digitising the wedges of paper that sit in bishops' offices which tell us about clergy job history. Let us have this register. Let it be

a first step towards more digitisation, so that we can better serve the Church and the community by knowing quickly who is authorised and who is not.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Thank you to the Bishop of Bristol and those who have helped. This is excellent. It seems like a no-brainer for lots of reasons. Not that that means it will not take us a number of centuries to get there. I want to make a minor point, aside from the excellent reasons why we should have this, but a locally significant one. For those of us particularly in team ministries or in collaborative patterns of churches which are slightly complex, we have had, as I think others know, some difficulty over the years in places like *Crockfords* or A Church Near You and others in identifying a number of clergy serving a number of churches where particular ones take the lead in particular places. Reflecting that online in a way that is easy and more straightforward for those who are part of our churches to notice on things like A Church Near You has been far from easy. It is a really minor point, but could that be taken properly into account, especially given team ministries and complex bizarre patterns of collaboration, which in years to come I suspect will become more common?

Secondly, if it is being used on things like A Church Near You, although not legally required, perhaps there could be some opt-in ability locally to include not just licensed lay ministers but lay staff of churches and significant volunteers who may wish their details to be there, so we echo the theological imperative of reports like *Setting God's People Free*, so it does not look like the clergy have a role which is far more preferential than others.

The Chair: Mrs Herbert next. After that I will put a motion for closure. Other people who wish to speak can speak towards the end of this debate, potentially.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): I agree with previous speakers, I think this proposal is excellent and it is very welcome. It will lead, as someone mentioned, to us being a simpler church and will save some clergy lots of time. I just wondered how it will be publicised and promoted externally beyond our own walls so that maybe parachurch organisations and some large conferences could be encouraged to use it as well as a way of checking that clergy are in good standing if they are being asked to speak, for example.

The Chair: I now put a motion for closure on Item 507A.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: I call on the Bishop to reply please. The speech limit is two minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): Thank you to Steve Lynas, Barry Hill and Caroline Herbert. There were some really useful points there. Steve, I imagine every bishop's chaplain was cheering as you spoke about the complexity of the tasks that bishops' chaplains have at the moment. Thank you for talking about networks of

fluidity, which I am sure we will be increasingly working with. I know the National Church Institutions are thinking about how this might be the beginning of digitising the blue files, and that would be really good. This is just the start and there needs to be some very careful thinking about that, but thank you for raising it.

Barry Hill, that is an important point about team ministries. We will take that back and make sure that is recognised by the building of the database. Thank you for making sure we take that into account in the new mixed ecology.

Caroline Herbert, this will be publicised widely – and maybe wildly – by the National Church Institutions. That is the push. The pull might be those of us who have influence in parish church organisations, conferences and so forth to ask for those checks to be done, particularly those on organising panels. That would be really helpful.

Thank you for those points. Thank you for this short debate. I am very grateful.

The Chair: I now put Item 507A to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: We now come to the amendments at Items 518 to 522. The 40-member procedure applies. That means the mover of an amendment will have not more than three minutes to speak to it. I will then call the Bishop of Bristol to speak for not more than three minutes in reply. If the Bishop does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members indicate by means of a Zoom poll that they wish the debate to continue and the amendment to be voted on.

ITEM 518

The Chair: I call on the Ven. Andrew Brown to move his amendment, Item 518. He may speak for up to three minutes.

Ven. Andrew Brown (Sodor & Man): Gura mie ayd. Thank you, Chair. Fastyr mie. Good afternoon, Synod. Sodor & Man is the Church of England on the Isle of Man. That is the one in the middle of the Irish Sea, not just off the south coast of England. We are a Crown Dependency with our own government, Tynwald, and our own language, as you have just heard. Our Lord Bishop sits in the upper chamber of Tynwald. Because we make our own law and because the Church of England is the church established by law on the island, our Manx church law has to conform to the Isle of Man's unique legislative landscape. Therefore, there is a minor error in these regulations at GS 2185. That is a reference to regulation 2(2) to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011, section 99, enabling an assistant curate to be given another job title, which was re-enacted in the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Measure 2007, section 61.

Section 61 was extended to the Isle of Man by the Church Offices Measure (Isle of Man) 2011, but section 99 has not been extended. So the reference to section 99 should, in its application to the Isle of Man, be a reference to section 61, as you can see from your Order Paper IV at section 518. Hence the amendment which stands in my name needing to insert the amended clause in Regulation 2, after paragraph (3). Gura mie ayd. Thank you, Synod.

The Chair: Bishop, please respond. You have not more than three minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): I will not take the full time and I cannot emulate the linguistic ability of the Archdeacon, but I am very grateful for his points. I am grateful to several people for their sharp eyes and their broad awareness of the range of legal arrangements within the Church of England, and I therefore accept this amendment.

The Chair: Item 518 is now open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak, so I now put Item 518 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 519

The Chair: I now call on the Revd Christopher Smith to move his amendment Item 519. He may speak for not more than three minutes.

Revd Christopher Smith (London): This suggestion, which in no way seeks to undermine the principle of the register, is a small point in respect to Regulation 3, which deals with the matter of relevant information to the Archbishops' Council. In the draft Measure the registration officer is always someone other than the person whose details are being sent to the register, except in the case of diocesan bishops who are not Archbishops, which strikes me as anomalous. Each Archbishop registers the other one. Parish clergy are registered by their diocesan bishop and so on, but under 3(3) as currently drafted, "For the bishop of a diocese, the registration officer is that bishop". My concern there is that for diocesan bishops to be their own registration officers looks a bit like asking them to mark their own homework. It is not helpful where safeguarding is concerned.

My proposed amendment would take out the inconsistency by make the Archbishop of the relevant province the registration officer. Guarding against the implication of allowing any group to mark their own homework seems entirely in line with the Bishop of Huddersfield's plea earlier today for transparency and accountability. It would also avoid the potential for embarrassment if a diocesan bishop is suspended or otherwise inhibited. In those circumstances, I realise that Regulation 3(7) kicks in, and I see that Mr Scowen has made a suggestion for making that sub-section clearer. Even so, since

it would have been the Archbishop who suspended the diocesan bishop, it would seem logical for the Archbishop to supply the information to the register.

The Chair: Bishop, would you reply, please? You have not more than three minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): I am grateful for the proposal and I would like the wisdom of the Synod on this one. I understand Fr Smith's purpose in suggesting this amendment and understanding the context of today's debate, and therefore the force of his argument about not marking your own homework. The argument in favour that we have made so far is that bishops will be registering most of their clergy and therefore they will be familiar with the system, and therefore their staff will be particularly able to enter their details – a simple name, contact detail, form of authority and the area to which it relates – on the system.

Clive Scowen's following amendment is also really helpful and I will be supporting that amendment, but I would like the advice of Synod on whether, if you like, what is perceived as potentially a conflict of interest (though it is not) ought therefore to be remedied in this way. I am grateful for the amendment but want to resist it at this point.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. Because this amendment is not supported, I need to ask whether there are 40 members who wish the debate to continue on this amendment.

The motion was put and carried on a simple poll via Zoom.

The Chair: There are 40 members who wish the debate on this amendment to continue, so we will do that after lunch. We have got to 2 o'clock, so I now adjourn this debate for later. Please look out for emails and be ready to resume at 2.30.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 2.40 pm

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod, and welcome back for this afternoon's business. I realise that for some people this may feel a little bit like extra time. I am not sure whether it is that we have all been so good or so bad that we have got some bonus business in a moment, but it may help if I just explain how it is intended that we might proceed this afternoon.

We will come in a moment to Item 523, following which the hope is that we can return to the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations debate and pick up at Item 519 before proceeding to prorogation. For that purpose, I need to put to you a variation in the order of business, that is to say that the rubric which currently gives prorogation as timed business at 3.30 should be changed to read "not later than 4.30".

I invite you to indicate your consent to that and for this purpose I direct a simple vote. It is a simple vote on the variation to change the time for prorogation to not later than 4.30. This will take place using a Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 523

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

PAYMENTS TO THE CHURCHES CONSERVATION TRUST ORDER 2020 (GS 2188)

The Chair: We move now to Item 523 and the Payments to the Churches Conservation Trust Order 2020. For this item, members will need the Order (GS 2188) and the Explanatory Notes (GS 2188X). To be clear to members, the order is not itself amendable. I now call Dr Eve Poole, the Third Church Estates Commissioner, to speak to and move Item 523. Dr Poole, you have up to ten minutes.

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio): Hello, Synod. I will definitely not be ten minutes. I am grateful for the opportunity to speak out for the CCT, prompted by Andrew Gray's request for this debate, and thank you all very much for your continued forbearance in this brave Zoom world as we all blink towards the finish line. Some of you are fans of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011. Some of you are not. Either way, you will be pleased to learn that, even before Covid, we had plans to reform it.

The task is now more urgent than ever because, after a period of stability in the level of church closures – around 20 a year over the past decade or so – we think Covid may well be the final straw for some of those churches that have been hanging on by a thread. Whilst several bodies like the Friends of Friendless Churches and similar Trusts stand ready to help, the Church of England has its own official helper, created in the original 1968 Pastoral Measure as part of our deal with the state.

Synod will know that the Church of England manages 45% of all of England's Grade I listed buildings and, as part of the Ecclesiastical Exemption, it was recognised that there needed to be a vehicle which could look after the most highly listed and historically significant of our churches if they were no longer needed for regular worship but unsuitable for alternative use. The CCT is an independent charity and celebrated its 50th anniversary last year. It looks after 356 churches for us. For every pound of the grant funding we give them, they spend £6 on church buildings and community development, which is a strong return on our investment.

The Trust uses the security provided by our core funding to attract many additional donations in grant funding and is growing its commercial revenue streams in support. They welcome over 1.7 million visitors a year and are supported by a volunteer base of

nearly 2,000 people. We are acutely aware that the nature of church is changing and the CCT has a role to play in our outreach, as well as helping us to manage the strategic challenges of our historic estate.

The work is not always easy. As we heard on Monday about the CCT's project in Sunderland, developing trust and relationships with communities requires sustained engagement. The Sunderland proposal did indeed meet local opposition, but the CCT listened carefully and changed their plans. In the end, no objections were received to their resubmitted application for listed building consent. It is quite right in considering this funding order for the new triennium that Synod is reassured about the governance and accountability of the Trust.

The Commissioners have a shared management agreement with our Government co-founder – now DCMS – and CCT Trustees are appointed by the Crown. One member is drawn from Synod and a DCMS nominee serves as a member of the Commissioners' Mission, Pastoral and Church Property Committee. I have attended the CCT's Board. I meet with their Chair and their Chief Executive regularly attends my Committee to present their strategy and to answer questions.

As we have seen, there is further scope for scrutiny of the Trust's work through Synod, through questions and debates like this, as well as through regular office level meetings. We would urge any Synod member, like Simon Cawdell and Andrew Gray, who encounter particular problems with individual churches to raise them with the CCT or the Commissioners' staff and I am grateful to both for the correspondence we have had since questions on Monday and Simon's meeting with the CCT this morning.

As a registered charity, the Trust's annual report and accounts are audited. They are also formally laid before Parliament and Synod each year and are available on their website. The Trust has a five-year strategy with key performance indicators on which progress is reported every six months. They enjoy strong support from Government and recently won an additional £1.3 million for capital repairs on 18 churches as Covid recovery support.

In terms of our contribution to their statutory funding, this Order provides for a modest increase, raising the annual contribution from £1.43 million to £1.5 million per annum over the next three years on the basis that a budget of £2 million will be set aside for expenditure on new vestings. The Order also provides for an additional amount of up to £900,000. This would be paid from the proceeds of disposals of other closed churches if there were sufficient sales and is by way of a contingency provision in case we do need to vest more churches in response to this pandemic.

In approving this Order, Synod will be affirming the work of the Trust and its contribution to the mission of the Church. It will also have a wider impact, helping us to make the case to the Government for their continuing support of our historic heritage and the work of all those who care for our buildings.

In closing, some history. In his landmark 1958 Report, Lord Bridges argued that the Church should never disown its responsibility for its buildings, not least because it would make it difficult for them to be claimed back should they, once again, be needed for worship. Today, in Colchester, a CCT church is to reopen as an orthodox church. In Ipswich, a Fresh Expressions' community is exploring the use of a CCT church.

As Synod heard yesterday, we are a Church living in hope and the CCT is a vital part of our mixed ecology both now and in the future. I urge Synod to approve the motion before you.

The Chair: Item 523 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limited of five minutes.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): Synod, we live in a climate where money is tight and today you are being asked to sign a cheque for the sum of four and a half million pounds to the Churches Conservation Trust. It is, therefore, my duty to raise a serious concern regarding the overheads of the CCT. My focus is not the money that is spent on the repair of church buildings but on the running costs.

In 2012, the Churches Conservation Trust employed 52 full-time staff at a cost of £2.1 million. Today, that figure has jumped to 71 full-time staff costing £3.2 million. That means 19 extra staff and an increase in overheads of £1.1 million. So the running costs are up by a third and, yet, the CCT has only taken on 14 extra properties. So what are these extra staff all doing? Well, according to the Church Commissioners, in the answers that Dr Poole gave on Monday, the CCT made a conscious decision to increase capacity to work with communities. She also said that more staff equates to more income – to which I added some supplementary questions and to which I am still waiting for answers.

To deal with the first point about dealing with communities, the CCT had a target of dealing with 50 communities and has, so far, managed to deal with 95. Therefore, that is one of its KPIs that has been ticked off. Unfortunately, it has failed, by its own admission, its eight other key performance indicators. Furthermore, it is clear that more staff does not automatically lead to more income. In 2020, the CCT had an income of over £8 million, but £7 million of that was grant funding because the National Lottery typically gives money to the CCT.

It does not take 19 extra staff to submit Lottery grant applications and so we cannot draw a direct correlation between increased income and increased overheads. Therefore, I decided to compare the CCT with two other charities, the Friends of Friendless Churches and the Norfolk Churches Trust.

Here, I must declare an interest. My father is a voluntary trustee of the Friends of Friendless Churches and the Norfolk Churches Trust is, of course, local to the diocese I

represent. The Friends of Friendless Churches has an average staff cost of £875 per building. The Norfolk Churches Trust has an average staff cost of £4,000 per building. And the Churches Conservation Trust? £9,000 per building.

Why is the scale of cost so different? All three organisations maintain churches and all of them hold open days manned by volunteers. If the Churches Conservation Trust ran to the same efficiency as Norfolk Churches Trust, you could halve its operating budget. If it ran to the efficiency of the Friends of Friendless Churches, it would require just £300,000 in staffing costs. The Friends of Friendless keeps all but 12 of its churches open on a daily basis.

Now it is true, as Dr Poole pointed out, that the Churches Conservation Trust undertakes large transformational projects. We could have a separate conversation another day about whether you think that turning churches into offices constitutes conservation; however, let us look at its track record in this department. A project to convert All Souls, Astley Bridge into a £5 million business and community centre has run into financial trouble. A multimillion-pound project to turn St Mary at Quay, Ipswich into offices for a charity has also failed. It was ten years in the making and it is now vacant. Is this a good use of the Church's money? Furthermore, what happens when overspend affects day-to-day heritage and maintenance?

Let us take St John the Baptist in Inglesham, Wiltshire. In 2017, it had its lead roof stolen. To replace it would have cost £60,000. The CCT claimed they did not have the money and so, instead, they put in a temporary felt roof. Water has now leaked in, damaging the medieval wall paintings. The repair and the restoration of that church will now cost over £360,000. So why in three years has the CCT not been able to find £60,000? Where is all its additional money going? Its running costs is the answer.

Over the years, both the CEO and the deputy CEO have both raised their salaries, but by how much I am afraid I cannot tell you because the CCT no longer publishes its individual salaries. However, I can tell you that in 2010 the CCT spent £1.3 million keeping churches open and supporting volunteers. Today, it spends £900,000 more than it did in 2010 and yet its volunteer base has plummeted from 4,000 to 1,800. In fact, all its metrics seem to be declining. Despite the increased overheads, its visitor numbers are falling, its legacies are falling, its donations are falling and its volunteers are falling.

Should we be pumping money into an organisation that is failing? Synod, I am asking you today not to sanction incompetence. I believe the Church Commissioners need time to carry out a full, robust audit on the Churches Conservation Trust and bring this Measure back to Synod in February with a clear plan that shows where the money is being spent, how effectively it is really being spent and, ideally, coming back with an action plan for increased efficiencies in its costs. Covid-19 has strained our Church finances. Now is not the time to be wasting money. Synod, in the name of good stewardship, I must ask you to vote against GS 2188.

Mrs Wendy Coombey (Hereford): I am also a member of the Church Buildings Council. I wish to speak in support of this motion. In Hereford Diocese, we have for many years taken the approach that we work with our PCCs to encourage them to see their church buildings as assets for mission. Over that time, we have worked very closely with the Churches Conservation Trust. We share ideas with them, we draw on their expertise, we use their resources, and it is all used to support the local church.

I know that I am bringing up probably a perspective from one rural diocese and I know about the current challenges that are facing our PCCs, and I agree with Eve Poole that those challenges are going to get tougher and they are going to get harder in a post-Covid world, but I think we are going to hear a lot more from closing and struggling churches.

Now you have heard an economic argument that for every pound the Church Commissioners invest in the Churches Conservation Trust they are able to turn that into a further six from other sources – and I do not think it actually matters that it is from the Heritage Lottery fund, it still is a good value-for-money sum in my opinion. The vast majority of that money goes into the care and maintenance of church buildings and where it is used to employ staff, those staff focus their energy directly on local communities. They are our communities. They offer support and many dioceses are not able to offer that support.

For me, Synod, there is more than an economic reason for us to support their work. The CCT are not just keepers of monuments. That is not all that they do. In fact, it is probably very little of what they do. They are innovators. They support. They encourage. They seek new solutions. They look for creative uses. Yes, sometimes those creative uses do not work but we have to allow them to take risks.

They do not just work with closed churches but they work increasingly with open ones too. They see their role as supporting the ongoing Christian witnesses in the communities where they work. They work at a very local level. They work with people – and, again, I would say our people – helping people to engage with church buildings and, more often than not, that includes what is left of the worshipping community. They do not stop being holy spaces or spiritual places, the place where many people throughout their lives have encountered and worshipped God, a place of collective memory.

This does not go away just because they close. In my experience, closure is rarely without pain. For some, it carries a sense of failure and it sometimes ends up as a gaping wound that is difficult to heal, even if there were really good reasons for that closure to happen and sometimes it is the right decision. I believe that the work of the CCT helps heal those wounds. They work with others and they offer new hope, simply by bringing people together in common purpose through community engagement and fresh perspectives and new energy.

Please, be under no doubt that the CCT do see this work as missional and they take that responsibility very seriously. To make that investment, you have to have people and resources to do it and, yes, resources mean money. Their work is important. We need them, our communities need them and our Church needs them and so, I ask you, please support that work and support this motion.

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): I would like to join my voice in supporting our last speaker, Wendy Coombey, and the Third Estates Commissioner in singing the praises of CCT. In the seven years that I have been here, I have worked with them extensively and I hold CCT in the highest esteem.

I hear the cry for more accountability but, to be quite honest, I cannot see what greater accountability already exists given the fact that CCT report to DCMS and to the Church Commissioners every six months. Their annual accounts are laid before Parliament and Synod. They are subject to the Charity Commission and, as we have heard, the Trustees are appointed by the Crown after consultation with the Archbishops and the Cabinet Office.

One of the things that I think is really important is the fact that CCT enjoys the confidence of the Government and that is really important because we do not want the DCMS to turn the tap off. We are experiencing considerable stress in the Church in the maintenance of our network of wonderful historic buildings and I suppose, along with many, I anticipate that there will be some closures of our buildings, particularly in the rural areas, in the years ahead as a result of the impact of Covid-19.

We need CCT there to be working in partnership with us as we look after these buildings. I think that the message that this Synod puts out is really important this afternoon and so I invite you to support this Payments Order wholeheartedly.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): At the outset, I must register an interest that, as of 1 November, I have been a trustee of the Churches Conservation Trust. Friends, mission and evangelism comes in many forms and I wish to share with you the vital part that CCT plays and has yet to play in the mission and evangelism of our nation. For the past seven years, I have been an adviser on the Southwark DAC, attending and contributing to monthly meetings and being present and advising at countless site visits and churches across the diocese, seeking to open up our church buildings so that they are accessible to the mission and ministry of all God's people.

One of the many perks of this role has been to learn from the many specialists that make up the DAC, talented and learned people with considerable expertise in a whole range of disciplines, all gathering together, all focused on one aim, to aid in and encourage the mission and ministry of God's Church and the flourishing of God's people. One of the greatest pieces of learning I have received from all my time on the DAC is that our church buildings are missional. They are brought into being to be a sign and symbol of God's immeasurable love, generosity and hospitality.

The main reason I accepted the nomination to become a trustee of the Churches Conservation Trust is that I was excited to see that they too understand that our church buildings are missional, sacramental spaces, saturated with the prayers of the faithful, generation upon generation. The CCT does not see our ancient parish churches as rarefied relics of a bygone age, museum exhibits to be viewed out of context as we would view an exhibit in the British Museum.

The CCT seeks for the church buildings under their care to be open and welcoming consecrated spaces for worship and prayer. The CCT is investing in the very communities the church buildings are there to serve so that they may become hubs for the community, where people can gather and build dynamic loving community in places of mutual flourishing. This is a profoundly Anglican vision, one that is utterly consistent with and helps realise our shared vision of being engaged in every community in our nation. Yes, these church buildings may not hold regular services at present or be places of gathered worship in communities, but the CCT recognises that the mission and evangelism of the Holy Spirit stops for no one.

The church buildings that are under the care of the CCT are vital, missional, sacramental spaces where, to use the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector, the invitation at present may be less to the Pharisee who wishes to be seen and honoured by others when they worship and more to the tax collector who desires a safe space to humbly and solitarily come before God and quietly whisper, “Have mercy on me, a sinner”, places where the tiny mustard seed of faith may carefully be watered and nurtured in the hope that, with the help and engagement of the Holy Spirit, it may once again grow and mature.

By investing in the local amenities where the churches find themselves, the CCT is encouraging people in groups to invest emotionally and financially in their local church buildings, to love their local churches again and, ultimately, grow to be fresh and new expressions of God’s purposes in the local community. This vision is already resulting in an increase in volunteers and financial giving.

Let me be clear, we are moving into uncharted territory where discussions about future resourcing of our churches will be up for discussion. It is highly likely that churches will close as part of that process and I am proud to be a trustee of a charity that will be ensuring that many of these church buildings will continue to serve the needs of the communities where they find themselves. I, therefore, commend the work and the vision of the CCT to commit to Synod and encourage Synod to pass the budget before them, which will enable the CCT to continue to serve the Church in this important work of mission and evangelism.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): I do find myself sometimes frustrated by the fact that we nowadays often find that our churches are in the wrong places either because people have moved away or, indeed, because some wealthy landowner has built a church in a place where we would never have chosen. What we have here is the Churches

Conservation Trust being a place of last resort for these buildings and we have heard about a lot of their work.

I just want to make one simple point. The Church Commissioners are proposing to provide £3.3 million plus another £1.2 million from the sale of church buildings over the next three years, 2021-24. This is expected to attract £8 million in Government funding. The Government does not need an excuse to cut that. If we are not enthusiastic about this, then we put it at risk. That is £8 million that parishes do not have to raise and £8 million that dioceses do not have to make cuts to find. Please, wholeheartedly support these payments to the CCT because to do otherwise would be to shoot ourselves painfully in the foot.

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): In my benefice of 11 churches divided into eight parishes, scattered across a wide area of rural Cumbria, the issue of caring for our heritage is a significant challenge. One of my parishes, which happens to be one of the poorest and most under-resourced parishes in the country has three places of worship, all of them historically and architecturally significant. One, St Ninian's ("Ninekirks") is already in the care of the CCT. They not only keep it open as a regular place of pilgrimage, but they keep alive its mission and ministry. Most recently, it has become the unlikely home of a rural Fresh Expression. But, most of all, we know from Facebook and Twitter posts that during Covid it has been a significant place of refuge to a great many in our local community and beyond.

Then there is St Wilfred's Chapel, Brougham, which began life as the private chapel of Lord Brougham, famous for inventing the Brougham carriage. On a trip to the Netherlands, he took a liking to a church stuffed with priceless seventeenth-century carvings, which he benevolently recycled into his private chapel and they now form a priceless collection which is maintained by a tiny, impoverished and dispersed local community, which is frantically trying to prevent the plaster falling off the walls to destroy it, putting their hands into their own pockets to do so.

I declare an interest because Brougham is now applying to go into the care of the CCT. Its ageing congregation has diminished critically and, without the CCT's lifeline, an important part of our history and heritage will be at very serious risk. Neither of these, however, is the parish church, which is maintained in Clifton, the site in 1745 of the last pitched battle on English soil as Bonnie Prince Charlie retreated towards his eventual and still lamented exile.

When I inherited this parish responsible for these three priceless buildings, the PCC consisted of three exhausted persons presiding over a financial crisis. I tell this story to highlight the fact that the work of the CCT really matters to our mission and ministry in our most vulnerable communities. It is not just remote rural communities either. Many of you will remember Bishop Philip North's impassioned advocacy for inner city parishes in danger of being left without any church buildings. This applies to them also.

Andrew Gray is right to scrutinise costs and effectiveness but, let us be clear, impeding the CCT's funding will not help with efficiency, nor are we going to encourage new funding partners if we are not putting our hands in our own pockets. Supporting the CCT not only preserves the mission and ministry of some of our most important heritage buildings, but also the underprivileged communities that do not have the resources to support them, and it is needed perhaps most especially in this Covid world. So, Synod, I plead with you to support this motion.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): I would like to add my voice to those who have endorsed the work of the Churches Conversation Trust and are urging Synod to approve this motion. In our own Diocese of Exeter, there are ten churches in the care of the Churches Conservation Trust. In my own archdeaconry, there are three.

I was delighted to hear only recently from the incumbent of the parish including one of those about his extraordinarily positive experience of relationships with the Trust, even from before his arrival when the Trust actively welcomed him, made contact with him and engaged with him. Subsequently, they have extended invitations to cultural events and asked the parish church for its interest in using their wi-fi, necessary for security reasons in order to live stream services from the building. The closure of that church for public worship many years ago was a cause of sadness and this incumbent's evaluation of the relationship with the Trust is that the Trust has done much to retain the confidence of the local community in the future of its church as a continuing place of worship.

That is the next point I would like to make, picking up very much on Timothy Goode's words about the missional capacity of churches in the care of the CCT. It is by no means in the interests of the Church of England for the particularly aesthetically and historically significant heritage assets represented by our rural parish churches particularly to be lost, either through conversion into domestic accommodation or, ultimately, through reduction to controlled ruins.

The important point is that churches in the care of the CCT remain consecrated churches which are actively welcomed by the Trust for use for occasional worship as well as cultural activities and as places for private prayer. It is in the interests of the mission of the Church of England that we manage to retain as the repository of last resort for these churches our capacity to do so. The structural capacity represented by the Trust needs to be maintained and that happens through, as Julie Dziegiel so helpfully reminded us, the encouragement and leveraging of £8 million of state funding. So may I encourage and urge Synod to support this motion to continue this funding.

The Chair: Point of order from Canon Butler.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Chair, as we seem to be debating the merits of the Churches Conservation Trust and not the fees' Order, I would like to move a motion of closure on this item.

The Chair: I have already called Mr Greenwood, Canon Butler, but I will put a motion for closure after he has spoken. Thank you.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I will not take very long on this point. I am grateful to Andrew Gray for asking for this debate and I hope that he will receive satisfactory answers to his question. I am grateful also for the many speakers who have spoken in support of the work that the CCT do. My point is a very simple one. It is about the title of the charity. It is not about churches, it is about church buildings, and so at a suitable point perhaps trustees could consider changing their name to the "Church Buildings Conservation Trust"?

The Chair: As I indicated a moment ago, I wish to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 523 and for that purpose I order a simple vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: The motion for closure on Item 523 is carried. I now invite Dr Poole to respond to the debate. Dr Poole, you have up to ten minutes.

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio): Thank you very much to all of you who have spoken in this debate. I am not going to try your patience by prolonging this for the ten minutes I have been offered. Just a brief response to say particularly to Andrew, I am really sorry I have not got back to you with answers for your detailed questions but I was a bit busy with the Cathedrals Measure yesterday and we will get back to you in full and make sure that you get answers to the questions you have raised.

Tim Goode mentioned that he was a trustee of the CCT and so I know he has been listening to this debate and will be able to feed that back directly and I will also be talking to the Trust direct as well as DCMS so they know the concerns raised today. In closing, I would like to reflect briefly on my own reasons for supporting this funding Order. When I was doing my MBA in Edinburgh, I ran a charity which is now called the Historic Churches Scotland Trust. Our first church in Orkney shares Skail Bay with Skara Brae. Both bear witness to our nation's long history in that place. We cannot preach stewardship and not exercise it.

As many speakers have said, these hallowed places bear witness, whether we look after them or not. In Scotland, the state has largely chosen not to and so the burden is on charities to do so. In England, we are fortunate that part of the original settlement agreed between Church and state was that we should exercise the stewardship of these buildings in partnership and it has proved remarkably successful in the 50 years since, despite the vicissitudes of the economic cycle. I really hope that the aftermath of Covid

does not trigger a wave of church closures but, if it does, the scaled-up CCT will need to stand ready to take its share.

This funding Order gives us the flexibility to rise to that challenge, if we need to, and is carefully calibrated to factor in offsetting from concomitant additional sale proceeds to avoid any additional commitment of core funds. I urge Synod to agree it so that we might demonstrate the same commitment to the state that it has shown us over these long years in partnership, particularly in the midst of this crisis where the state has already acted in good faith by allocating over £30 million to our church buildings already in our time of need.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr Poole. I now put Item 523 to the vote. For this, I order a simple vote.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

The Chair: The motion at Item 523 is carried and so the Payments to the Churches Conservation Trust Order 2020 has been approved by the Synod. That completes this item of business, thank you.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 3.39 pm.

ITEM 519

(Resumed debate)

The Chair: Synod, welcome back to the debate on the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020. You will recall that we had got to Item 519 on Order Paper IV, and so you may wish to find that again. This is the Revd Christopher Smith's amendment. We heard his opening speech and a reply by the Bishop. We then had 40 members indicating they wished to debate this amendment and so now I open the floor for debate.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): I am grateful for the principle of having a clergy register which will make life considerably simpler for many reasons, but I would like an assurance that it will not be used as an alternative to checking with the dioceses about visiting ministers for the protection of those involved. Safeguarding is so important that we need to have as many checks as possible in place and I would like to be assured that this register is not going to be used as a short cut to checking and that thorough checking will continue to take place whenever anybody is proposed to come and visit a parish.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I think we are on Fr Smith's amendment, are we not, 519, Chair? I want to support the amendment, not because it has any great value except it is totemic. It does seem to me that one of the things that

we were engaged in earlier today was that sense of thinking about why it is that the Church messes up on so many occasions. One of the reasons that it is the case is that we invest far too much in people who are diocesan bishops doing everything and the phrase “the Church marking its own homework” is precisely one that has been used in the context of safeguarding.

I do not think we should ever be putting into place a regulation that says that diocesan bishops should be policing themselves. Therefore, I think Fr Smith’s amendment, although it is really essentially not very germane to the main issue about the clergy register, which I think is really important and which we should support wholeheartedly, but there just ought to be that sense that we say, okay, let us be reticent about passing any more legislation that puts staff and bishops in that invidious situation where they are doing something which looks after their own interests or their own ways of operating.

I could wax lyrical, but will not, on the reasons why I think monepiscopacy has got us into all kinds of messes over the past years. Perhaps one of the ways we can be a new way of being Church is to start having a bit more collegiality and teamwork among Bishops and a lot less deference. Well, I am up for both those things, particularly the lack of deference. But I do think I want to support Fr Smith’s amendment, simply because it gives us a chance to say, “This is the way we intend to operate in the future”.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): One rule for bishops, one for everyone else. No, that is not what the Bishop of Bristol said, but there is a danger that that is what is heard. Mr Cummings earlier this year did not say one rule for Prime Minister’s advisers and one for everybody else, but that is what was heard and he was duly excoriated. What I am talking about is perceptions. I have lost count of the number of times that cultures of deference and clericalism in the Church were criticised in the safeguarding debates this week.

Changing cultures is not just a case of fine speeches, but also our resisting such cultures whenever and wherever we encounter them. Have you noticed that Zoom does not do deference? No front seats for the Bishops in this Synod chamber, so why are there when we meet face to face? While I am on my virtual feet, one more example of deference: why is the Synod’s list of members arranged in hierarchical fashion, Bishops first, Clergy second, Laity last? Why not simply in diocesan order with all representatives listed under their dioceses in alphabetical order simply denoted L, C or B?

The Chair: Mr Kemp, please can I call you to order. Please would you keep the speech on topic.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): My closing point would be if we want to tackle deference, let us tackle it. Let us mean it when we say we want to tackle deference. I support the amendment.

Revd Mike Smith (Oxford): I am a member of the bishop's chaplains club. Like Bishop Viv invited us to, and my heart rejoices utterly at the thought of this regulation going through, it is nothing but good news, I am going to support, Viv, Fr Christopher's amendments, for the simple reason I think there is a slight inconsistency in your logic, the flaw being that diocesan bishops' blue personnel files are held at Lambeth and Bishopthorpe. If we are creating a system, we need to be consistent. If we are creating a system where this national register one day might lead, heaven permit, to allow us to digitise those blue files, then I think we need to be consistent. No diocesan bishop, I think, would ever put up an argument to hold their own personnel file.

The Chair: I am now inclined to put a motion for closure on this item of business, 519, and that will be done by a simple poll on Zoom.

I see no blue hands. I am going to move to vote on Item 519. That will be done by a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 520

The Chair: I now call on Clive Scowen to move his amendment, Item 520. He may speak for up to three minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): This amendment is really designed to remedy some unclarity in the wording. Regulation 3(7) currently provides that: "Where there is a vacancy in the see of an archbishop or diocesan bishop or in the office of the dean of a Royal Peculiar or a registration officer is unable to exercise functions as such, and the functions of registration officer have not already been delegated, the registration officer is the person authorised to exercise functions of a similar nature".

Now that form of words, although brief, is, I suggest, deeply obscure. Who is the person authorised to exercise functions of a similar nature? Depending on the context, there could be a variety of people who would fulfil that description. Furthermore, it seems to me to be *ultra vires* the power of the Archbishops' Council conferred by the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure to make regulations to require the bishop of each diocese or the holder of any other specified office in the Church of England to provide the Council with specified information.

So this amendment seeks to bring clarity and to cure the *vires* problem by setting out precisely who the default registration officer is in the event of a vacancy in the office of the specified registration officer or of an inability of that person to act. So, in the case of

an Archbishop, it would be the senior bishop of the province. In the case of a diocesan bishop, it would be the senior suffragan bishop of the diocese, or, if there is no suffragan bishop, the senior archdeacon. In the case of the dean of a Royal Peculiar, it is the senior clergy person in that Royal Peculiar or, if there is no such clergy person, the person who is for the time being a registration officer for clergy who have authority to exercise ministry in the diocese in the area of which the Royal Peculiar is situated.

This form of words, although longer than its predecessor, leaves no doubt about which person is to exercise the registration officer function in the event of a vacancy or inability to act and so fulfils the requirement of the enabling Measure to identify the holder of the specified office. I beg to move, Chair.

The Chair: I call on Bishop Viv to respond.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): On a procedural question, I did not get the chance to respond under the previous amendment and so maybe I could do that in my summing-up right at the end, very briefly just for the record. On Clive Scowen's amendment, he does offer clarification on who becomes the registration officer in the event of a vacancy in see or the office of a dean of the Royal Peculiar. We are grateful for that. We do not want a lack of clarity in this process and I, therefore, accept the amendment.

The Chair: Item 520 is now open for debate. I see no one asking to speak and so we move to a vote on Item 520. This will be done by a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 521

The Chair: I now call on the Revd Paul Benfield to move his amendment, Item 521. He has three minutes.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): This amendment is, as it says in the Explanatory Statement, simply "... corrects an omission by making the necessary provision for clergy who hold office on freehold rather than on common tenure". It is a rather complicated amendment, as you will see from the various paragraphs. I would like to thank the Legal Office, Edward Dobson, and Chris Packer, legislative counsel. There has been quite a lot of toing and froing between us, but we think we have got it right now and it does what it aims to do and so I move the amendment which stands in my name.

The Chair: I call on the Bishop to speak for not more than three minutes in reply to the amendment.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): I agree with Paul Benfield. I am glad that work has gone on behind the scenes to make sure this was helpfully worded and I, therefore, accept the amendment.

The Chair: Item 521 is now open to debate. I see no one indicating they wish to speak and so I now put Item 521 to the vote using a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote via Zoom.

ITEM 522

The Chair: We now move to the final amendment, Item 522. I call on the Very Revd Tim Barker to speak to his amendment. He may speak for up to three minutes.

Very Revd Tim Barker (Dean of Guernsey): The Archdeacon of Man raised the language bar rather high before lunch and so, Chair, “Warro, Synod”! In relation to Item 518, Andrew Brown explained the legal context of the Crown Dependencies. The Channel Islands, the Bailiwicks of Guernsey and Jersey, are independent of the UK and the legal context is quite different to that in England in some particulars. So this is a necessary but technical amendment to ensure that the regulations are compatible with the law as it applies in the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the Bailiwick of Jersey. I am also grateful to the staff of the Legal Office for their advice in dealing with this matter. I move the amendment standing in my name, “À la perchôine, Synod”!

The Chair: I call on the Bishop to speak for not more than three minutes in reply to the amendment.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): Again, I am constrained by the English language. I accept the point that Tim has made and I am very grateful for his amendment, as with others today, and I accept it.

The Chair: Item 522 is now open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak on this Item and so I now put Item 522 to the vote. This will be conducted by a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on simple vote via Zoom.

Item 507B

The Chair: I now call on the Bishop to move Item 507B, “That the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020 [as amended] be approved”. She has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faulk): I am very grateful for the contributions, particularly from the eagle-eyed amenders. If I had had the chance to speak under the previous amendment, 519, to conclude, I had asked for Synod's advice, I got it and I am very happy with what you have decided. I think it is wise and I think it continues the sense of change that there must be. It was good to hear the range of voices in that short debate.

To conclude with Stephen Trott's concern that this may be a shortcut, I hope that it will be more effective, more thorough and give greater assurance in the work that particularly bishops' chaplains have to do in the area that you have raised and so I hope you are sufficiently reassured by that.

Fellow members of Synod, I am, as I say, grateful for our common mind on this and, after 400 years that, finally, there can be a National Clergy Register. I commend this to you because I admit I have lost the wording that I am meant to say at this point!

The Chair: Thank you. Item 507B is now open for debate. The speech limit is three minutes.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I want to pick up on a point that was made in the opening part of the debate as to why this register only includes clergy when an increasing amount of ministry is being provided by non-clergy. When the Miscellaneous Provisions (No. 2) Measure was being developed, as I recall it the initial intention was to produce a National Clergy Register in response to shortcomings identified from a safeguarding point of view, but quite quickly it was recognised that the breadth of ministry in the Church of England goes well beyond that of the clergy.

So, perhaps as a slight correction to Bishop Viv, we are not here in these regulations creating a National Clergy Register. We are doing part of the work to create a National Ministry Register, but when the original Measure was extended to include other people than clergy, it was recognised also that, firstly, registering the clergy was the most important priority and also extending it to all people holding lay office was a complex piece of work. Therefore, it was agreed to allow a phased introduction of the register so that we could get on as quickly as possible with the important task of a register for clergy.

But the rest of the work is still to be done. In many ways, the register of people holding lay offices is more complex, yet it is even more important because of that complexity. It is complex because of how do you deal with all the points that we have had to make minor corrections to today with regard to clergy.

At the time the Measure went through we had not even heard of the term "mixed ecology" but, following the enthusiastic introduction of that term into our language earlier this week, completing the scope of the National Ministry Register will be increasingly

important as people holding lay offices will in many cases be exercising ministry as being the lead person in the particular place.

I do not know whether Bishop Viv is able to give us some idea of the timescales for the workstream, but it really is important that we do finish this task in due time and not wait until we are pushed into it by adverse events.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): I suspect, being a diocesan officer and a member of this Synod, I am like many of you a heavy user of Crockford's Online. If you are, I wonder if you have noticed, as I have, that I think more clergy are choosing to opt out of having a public entry there and particularly, I think, newer clergy.

I just thought, as we choose – I think quite rightly – to make it a public matter on a register we keep that we might think about why that is in terms of clergy wellbeing and public ministry. I do wonder if there are some clergy who wish not to be so publicly known.

Many of us will know that occupying a public office exposes one to unsolicited contact. Not, of course, clergy, but any of you who follow Jayne Ozanne's feed will know that she endures a formidable and disgraceful stream of hate mail for her perfectly legitimate stance. There are clergy who may endure similar things or fear similar things. Inevitably, such mail also seems to me very frequently misogynist and directed against women in a particularly unpleasant way.

I think there is a question for wellbeing about communicating to the clergy what it will mean to be on a public register. I note, of course, that contact details will not necessarily be made public but they can often be found out once clergy are identified and known. Clergy who may feel they are anonymous may have to recognise that they are not. But, behind that, is a formational issue.

This, I suppose, is for the bishops and TElS and DDOs like me, we need to keep teaching those who enter public ministry – and this can be true of many forms of licensed and public lay ministry as well – that to occupy a public office is to be known and to be accountable. I think some of those in shared public ministry may not know that as fully as they should. Those are reflections as I support this regulation and will vote for it in due course.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): I think the last speaker, Neil, has made a great point, which is protection of public data in the fairly invidious age in which we live and also against the background of greater roles for laity. As clergy cuts are being proposed and might happen, there is going to be much greater need for laity. I would like to know how they are going to encourage the local. So many decisions on who is going to take a service necessarily takes place a bit at the last minute if there is sickness and illness. How are we going to run the thing if every time there is going to be consultation with this

list? We cannot even keep an up-to-date list of deanery members. How are we really going to make it work and how is it not going to cost a lot more money to do so?

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): A few years ago, someone – who shall remain nameless – managed to convince large numbers of Church of England clergy that he was a bona fide Anglican cleric, including several bishops, and he managed to officiate at a funeral in a cathedral also dressed and styled as a Church of England priest. He was interviewed by the *Church Times* and appeared on local media speaking about Church affairs on a regular basis. Eventually, he was approached by his local archdeacon and, after that, he desisted from the deception and has ceased to style himself as a priest.

The challenge faced by those of us who are concerned about this fairly widespread deception was that it is very hard to prove an absence of valid orders. Not being in Crockford, as we have already heard, is not evidence that someone is not ordained. He had claimed to clergy friends of his to have been ordained overseas and it was very difficult to ascertain from the likely provinces that he had not been ordained there.

This register would have proved incredibly helpful as it would have meant that people could have quickly and easily checked whether he was what he claimed to be. Of course, it still would not have proved that such a person had not been validly ordained overseas, but it would have made it clear that he had never held office in the Church of England in any way. I wholeheartedly support this new register for the sake of safeguarding in such situations, bizarre though they may be.

The Chair: I now call on John Wilson, after which I will test the mind of the Synod on a motion for closure.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): I welcome the development of this register. It has taken 400 years, we are told, to get to that. In Church of England terms, that is quite speedy. It is important that we have this public register, but mine is really a query. Looking at the Government website, listed amongst the recognised counter signatories for passports is “ministers of a recognised religion”. I just wondered whether or not we would encourage, say, agencies such as the Passport Office to check against that register to make sure that, when somebody gets their passport application signed by somebody who says they are a clerk in Holy Orders, they actually are on the register. It really is an important one, but I do welcome the publication of this new register.

The Chair: I now put forward a motion for closure on Item 507B. This will be conducted by a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote by Zoom.

The Chair: The motion for closure is clearly carried. I now call on Bishop Viv to respond. She has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull): Thank you for all those who have contributed at this stage and throughout the debate. Mike Todd, thank you for your reminder that this is just part of a process. The work on the lay ministry register will follow as soon as it can, but there is some hard thinking to go on about the variety of lay ministries which now gloriously exist in the Church of England. On the Measure that we had passed previously, you made the decision that the Clergy Register should be at the start and so that is what we are doing today and I think we are nearly there.

On Mary Durlacher's point, in general terms, this will enable keeping a register much easier and it should be much easier for making sure there is certainty about visiting clergy and clergy newly arrived in a multi-parish benefice or other form of combined work. When it comes to lay ministry, that is one of the reasons that this is coming up afterwards because it is more complicated and there may well be, as you say, more frequent changes, but that is being addressed and will be considered.

John Wilson, that is an interesting idea about the passport, the countersignatures being checked. It is probably not the business for today but I am sure others will note it.

Tiffer Robinson, thank you so much for reminding us of the risk of impersonation and how difficult it has been in the past, so this is a really important step-up.

Neil Patterson, thank you for reminding us both of the responsibilities that come with ordination, that you do enter public office, but thank you also for reminding all of us that that can bring vulnerability. I am very aware of that and there is provision that, if somebody is for very good reason needing to keep their location away from the public domain, there will be a national decision about whether that should be possible and that they should simply be ascribed to the diocese in which they hold the bishop's licence, so there is that assurance.

Thank you all for your contributions in what has been I think a good debate and, above all, I hope in a minute a decision that will take the Church forward.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. I now put item 507B, "That the National Ministry Register (Clergy) Regulations 2020 [as amended] be approved" to the vote. This will be done by a simple Zoom poll.

The motion was put and carried on a simple vote by Zoom.

The Chair: The regulations, as amended, will now be referred to the Archbishops' Council and, once made, laid before Parliament under the Statutory Instruments Act 1946. That concludes this item of business. Thank you, Synod.

Before I pass on to the Archbishop of Canterbury to prorogue this group of sessions, I am sorry to have to share with you some sad news. Many of you will know that Simon Baynes, a member of the House of Laity for St Albans, has been very ill for some time.

I need to share with you the sad news that Simon died on Monday in his own home. He was a keen member of Synod and supported the Church in many ways. I know he will be missed by family, friends and the Synod. We will now keep a moment of silence.

“I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die”.

The Chair. I now pass over to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Archbishop of Canterbury prorogued the Synod.

Index

Note: The abbreviation LLF is used for *Living in Love and Faith*

- abortion:
 - at home 88–9
 - and Down’s Syndrome 87–8
- abuse:
 - and atonement 185–6
 - by clergy 184–5, 194–7, 204, 205–6
 - domestic 17, 208
 - emotional 204
 - independent investigation 182–3, 185–6, 201, 202
 - and justice 185, 187, 190, 191, 198
 - lifelong impact 186
 - and loss of trust 183–5
 - mandatory reporting 170, 187, 191, 199, 201, 206, 208
 - and need for repentance 18, 23, 185, 191, 202, 204
 - Other/Uncategorised 95
 - and power 189, 191, 198, 203
 - psychological 204
 - spiritual 94–5, 184
 - survivors 46, 96, 182–8, 188–209
 - within family 184
 - see also IICSA; safeguarding
- academies, and Draft Boards of Education Measure 218, 219, 221
- accountability 141, 240
 - and safeguarding 175, 178, 184–6, 190, 205, 207
- administration:
 - of cathedrals 137–8
 - centralisation 72, 78, 91
- adults, vulnerable 97–8, 167, 173, 182, 189, 193, 199
- aid, overseas 18, 41–2, 162
- Allchurches Trust 143, 153, 154
- Amending Canon No. 40 15–16
- Amending Canon No. 41 15–16
- Anglican Communion:
 - and divisions 91
 - and Jesus-shaped church 109, 121, 125
 - and LLF 26
 - and mission agency pensions 162
- Anglican-Methodist Covenant 93–4
- Annual Parochial Church Meeting, and Covid-19 105
- apportionment 77, 143–4, 147, 154, 164–5
- Archbishop of Canterbury, Presidential Presentation 16–29
- Archbishop of York, Presidential Presentation 16–29
- archbishops, safeguarding complaints 73–4
- Archbishops’ Council:
 - appointment to 178–81
 - and Boards of Education Measure 215
 - Budget 2021 143–60
 - and Church Commissioners 49, 143–8
 - Co-ordinating Group 144
 - questions to 71–8
 - and register of clergy and lay ministers 72, 233
- Archbishops’ Task Force on Race 113
- Association of English Cathedrals 142
- atonement, for abuse 185–6
- attendance, Church of England 80, 89–90, 147, 155
- BAME see Black and Minority Ethnic Anglicans
- Big Conversation 58–9
- Bishoprics and Cathedrals Committee (Church Commissioners) 66
- bishops:
 - and collegiality 246
 - and discipline 195
 - expenses 118
 - housing and carbon footprint 66
 - leadership called for 78–80
 - and National Ministry Register 227–9,

233, 246
 powers of visitation 130, 133
 safeguarding complaints 73–4
 Bishop's Disciplinary Tribunal 73, 194, 195, 196
 Bishops' Environment Breakfast 84
 Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure 2014 50
 Black Lives Matter 18
 Black and Minority Ethnic Anglicans:
 and Archbishops' Council 181
 in ordination training 58
 young people 122–4
 body of Christ, Christians as 203, 208–9
 boldness, need for 31, 115–16, 125
 Brexit, impact 18
 Bridges Report (1958) 237
 Budget 2021 143–60
 and Church Commissioners 49, 143–8
 and environment 145, 147, 155–6
 and House of Bishops 144
 zero-based budgeting 152–4
 bullying 204
 Business Committee:
 and Draft Boards of Education Measure 213, 220
 report 45–53, 139
 and Special Standing Orders 5
 businesses, and response to Covid-19 37–8

 Canon Law, B 14A 92
 Canterbury *see* Archbishop of Canterbury
 carbon emissions:
 reduction 68
 zero 61, 82–3, 86, 112, 115
 carbon footprint, measuring 66, 83, 85
 Care Act 2014 41
 cathedrals:
 chapters 130, 131, 136, 137–8
 councils 139–40
 financial management 137–8, 140–41
 governance 128–9, 137, 138, 139–40
 increase in attendance 141
 and investment powers 133
 and mission 128
 parish church 134–5
 residential canons 138, 139
 and safeguarding 137
 see also Draft Cathedrals Measure
 Cathedrals Administration and Finance Association (CAFA) 142
 Cathedrals Measure 1963 134, 135, 136, 139
 Cathedrals Working Group 128, 129, 137, 139, 140, 141
 change, social 18
 change, cultural 95, 115–16, 246
 and safeguarding 186, 189–90, 192, 196, 198, 199–205, 207, 209
 chapels, proprietary 169, 175
 chaplaincy 113
 bishops' 230–31, 247, 250
 school 221
 charitable incorporated organisations (CIOs) 213, 215–16, 221–2, 224
 Charities Act 2011 137–8
 Charity Commission:
 and Cathedrals Measure 126, 127–30, 132, 133, 137–42
 and Churches Conservation Trust 240
 and Draft Boards of Education Measure 211, 225
 CHARM scheme 68–9, 163–4
 children:
 abuse of *see* abuse; safeguarding
 and church attendance 89–90
 and impact of Covid-19 38
 and Vision and Strategy 107
 Christian Concern 26–7, 47
 church buildings:
 listed 76, 235
 and mission and outreach 242, 243
 post-Covid sustainability 68
 Church Buildings Council 239
 Church Commissioners:
 and Archbishops' Council Budget 49, 143–8

- Bishoprics and Cathedrals Committee 66
- and Cathedrals Measure 132–3, 137–42
- and Churches Conservation Trust 236–40, 242
- disinvestment and carbon reduction 68
- Mission, Pastoral and Church Property Committee 66
- questions to 66–9
- and safeguarding 208
- Church of England:
 - carbon footprint 66, 83, 85, 112
 - as Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped 108–111, 114–16, 118, 121, 123–5, 191–3
 - and diversity 113–14, 122, 123–5, 180–81
 - governance 20, 91, 108–9, 115, 144–5, 147
 - Nominations Committee 138
 - online presence 32, 33
 - reputational damage to 186, 189, 191–3, 199
 - and service to the community 31–2, 34–5, 43, 236, 237, 241
 - as simpler, humbler, bolder Church 30–31, 115–25, 147
 - website 62, 229
 - see *also* National Ministry Register; Vision and Strategy
- Church of England Clergy Advocates 173
- Church of England Education Office 54, 55, 217–18
- Church of England Environment Programme (CoEEP) 83, 145, 147, 155
- Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No.2) Measure 228, 247, 250
- Church of England Youth Council (CEYC) 54, 120
- Church House, staff 9, 48, 166
- A Church Near You* 72, 104, 228, 231
- Church Offices Measure (Isle of Man) 2011 233
- church planting 112
- Church Representation and Ministers Measure 74–6
- Church Representation Rules:
 - and annual parish meetings 105
 - and Cathedrals Measure 130
 - and safeguarding 76
 - and secret ballots 74–5
- Church schools:
 - and evangelism 218, 221
 - and LLF 29
 - and school-based congregations 223
 - and teaching on marriage 54–6
- Church and State, and cathedrals 137–8
- churches, closure 46, 235, 239, 245
- Churches Conservation Trust 46, 66–8, 235–45
 - and Church Commissioners 236–40, 242
 - and mission and outreach 236, 239–43
 - running costs 237–8
 - trustees 236, 240
- churches, local:
 - and Covid-19 31–5, 144
 - and online presence 32, 33
 - and Vision and Strategy 112–15, 149
- churchwardens, and safeguarding 168, 171
- Churchwardens Measure 2001 105, 168
- CIO see charitable incorporated organisations
- clergy:
 - abuse by 184–5, 194–7, 204, 205–6
 - and Big Conversation 58–9
 - house-for-duty 155
 - LGBTI 202
 - National Register 72, 227–34, 245–53
 - reduction in numbers 48, 102, 118, 155
 - retirement housing 69–70, 163–4
 - safeguarding training 196, 199

- self-supporting 228
- suspension 62–3
- in Team Ministries 231, 232
- wellbeing 251
- see also* National Ministry Register; Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016
- Clergy Discipline Commission:
 - questions to 62–4
 - and tribunals 194, 195, 196
- Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 63, 73–4, 167, 170, 172, 175–7
 - and grievance procedure 195
 - and safeguarding 188, 194–5, 208
 - Sheldon Hub report 171, 175, 194
- Clergy Support Trust 59
- Clerk to the Synod 7
- Clewer Sisters 153, 154
- climate change 18, 19, 156
 - and investment 68–9
 - and justice 84
 - and measurement of carbon footprint 66, 83, 85
- Climate Coalition 60–61
- Climate Sunday 61, 83, 84
- CMEAC *see* Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns
- Commission on Housing, Church and Community 89
- Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns, recommendations 18
- common good 31, 34
- community service, and redundant churches 236, 237, 241
- conscience, and LLF 26, 27
- COP 26 83–4
 - Faiths Task Group 84
- core groups (safeguarding) 73–4
 - appeal system 104–5, 197–8
 - appointment to 96, 174, 196–7
 - and secrecy 197, 201, 207
 - and treatment of survivors 184–5
- Coronavirus Act 2020 41
- Corporation of the Church House 143, 153–4
- Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing
 - Act of Synod 58–9, 113
 - Facilitation Group 58–9
- Covid-19 16–17, 77, 109, 144
 - Business Continuity Plan 102
 - and disability 31, 33, 38–41, 49, 89, 90–91
 - and ethnicity 31, 38–9
 - green recovery 60–61
 - impact on cathedrals 130, 133
 - impact on dioceses 144, 145–7, 217, 218
 - and local churches 31–3, 43, 98, 144, 147, 152
 - and poverty 31, 32, 38–9, 89
 - recovery group 20, 72
 - response to 30–45
 - Risk Register 102
 - and sacramental life 32, 33–4
 - vaccines 33, 44, 70–71
- Culture Recovery Fund 61, 76, 236
- curacies 145, 155
- Darlow formula 155, 156
- DCMS *see* Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport
- deaf people, representation 6
- deans, safeguarding complaints 73–4
- declarations of interest 134
- deference 189–91, 196, 198, 199–202, 207, 246–7
- Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport 66–7, 236, 240, 244
- Developing Discipleship 82
- digital evangelism 148, 157
- diocesan boards of education:
 - assets 222
 - as charitable incorporated organisations 213, 215–16, 221–2, 224, 226
 - as independent registered charities 217
 - as statutory committees of DBFs 212, 217, 219, 220, 221–4, 226
 - as unincorporated structures 212–14,

217–20, 223–4, 226
 Diocesan Boards of Education Measure
 1991 216, 218, 222
 Diocesan Boards of Education Measure
 2021 51, 167, 211–27
 company law members 211, 216
 final approval 216–27
 final drafting 211–16
 special amendments 214–16
 diocesan boards of finance:
 and apportionment 164–5
 and boards of education 212, 217,
 219, 221–4, 226
 and qualified audit 77–8
 Diocesan Environment Officers 83
 Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Measure
 2007 232–3
 Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors 186,
 188, 193, 198, 201
 Diocesan Sustainability Fund 102, 144
 Diocesan Synod Motions, Leeds 71–2,
 151
 diocesan synods, and diocesan boards
 of education 219, 223, 226
 dioceses:
 apportionment 77, 143–4, 147, 154,
 164–5
 engagement with LLF 28
 environmental programmes 83, 145,
 155–6
 financial mutuality 20
 impact of Covid-19 144, 145–7
 and insolvency 77–8
 and mutual flourishing 50, 103
 reorganisation 91–2
 secretaries 107–8
 structures 20, 91
 Sustainability Funding 102, 144
 and Transformation Fund 143–4
 and Vision and Strategy 117
 youth councils 120
 Dioceses Commission 92
 Director of Risk Management and
 Internal Audit 77
 disability:
 and impact of Covid-19 31, 33, 38–41,
 49, 89, 90–91
 and ordination training 58, 91
 Disability Discrimination Act 1995 90
 Disability Jesus 39
 discipleship:
 Anglican Communion perspectives
 109
 and evangelism 148
 Five Marks 109–112
 missionary 111–12, 114
 and teaching 82
 Disclosure and Barring Service 229
 diversity, and Church of England 113–
 14, 122, 123–5, 180–81, 200
 doctrine, and practice 101
 Down's Syndrome people 61–2, 87–8
 Draft Amending Canon No. 39 74–6
 Draft Cathedrals Measure 51, 126–42,
 167
 and Charity Commission 126, 127–30,
 132, 133, 137–42
 and Church Commissioners 132–3,
 137–42
 drafting amendments 127, 130
 Final Approval 136–43
 Memorandum of Understanding 132–
 3, 140
 special amendments 126–7, 130,
 131–6
 Draft Church Representation and
 Ministers Measure 74–6
 Draft Safeguarding (Code of Practice)
 Measure 166–78
 DSA see Diocesan Safeguarding
 Advisors
 due regard, and safeguarding 130–31,
 167, 170, 173–4

 Ecclesiastical Exemption 235
 Ecclesiastical Law Society 194, 208
 Eco Church 83
 Eco Schools 83
 ecumenism:
 representatives at General Synod 2–3,

178
 and Vision and Strategy 120
 education *see* church schools; diocesan
 boards of education; Theological
 Training Institutions
 Education Office 54, 55, 217–18
 EIAG *see* Ethical Investment Advisory
 Group
Emerging Church of England project 72,
 90, 91, 103
 Energy Footprint Tool 83, 84–5
 environment *see* climate change
 Environment Working Group:
 and COP 26 84, 85
 and green post-Covid recovery 60
 environmental officers 83
 environmental programmes 83, 145,
 147, 155–6
 Episcopal Church, The 91
 episcopate, women in 50
 Equality Act 2010 58
 estates evangelism 151–2
 and deprivation 71–2
 Estates Evangelism Task Group 71
 Ethical Investment Advisory Group,
 question to 70–71
 ethnicity:
 and BAME ordinands 58
 and impact of Covid-19 31, 38–9
 eugenics 39–40
 Evangelical Council 47
 evangelism, digital 148, 157, *see also*
 estates evangelism; mission
 Evangelism and Discipleship team 82
Everyday Faith 111

 Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, and mission
 86
Faith at Home 90
 Faith and Order Commission:
 and LLF 29
 and Vision and Strategy 103
 families:
 and Growing Faith programme 223
 Five Guiding Principles 50, 103–4

Five Marks of discipleship 109–112
 Five Marks of mission 82, 109–112,
 125, 156
 food banks 32, 157
 Formation Criteria 90
 Francis I, Pope 23
 Fresh Expressions 112, 148, 223, 237,
 242
 Friends of Friendless Churches 67–8,
 235, 237–8
 Future Search conference 80–81, 120,
 121, 123

 General Data Processing Regulations
 81, 123, 230
 General Synod:
 app 7, 13
 ecumenical representatives 2–3, 178
 elections to 105
 new members 2
 remote meetings 3–15
 speech limits 30, 36, 39–45, 46, 49–
 50, 137, 160–61, 163, 169, 190, 218,
 220, 222, 225, 227, 230, 231–2
 staff 5, 9, 45
 Gibb Report 228
 giving:
 impact of Covid-19 147
 online 72, 146
 ‘good disagreement’, and LLF
 Reference Group 100
 governance:
 cathedrals 128–9, 137, 138, 139–40
 Church of England 20, 91, 108–9,
 115, 144–5
 government, *see* Parliament
 Growing Faith programme 90, 218, 219,
 221, 223
 Guidelines for the Professional Conduct
 of the Clergy 76

 Holy Communion
 in both kinds 92, 94
 by Extension 65

- and individual cups 64, 92–3
- Spiritual Communion 65
- homelessness, and young people 110
- homophobia 201
- hope:
 - and response to Covid-19 31, 33, 43–44, 79
 - and Vision and Strategy 109–110, 117
- House of Bishops:
 - and Archbishops' Council budget 144
 - Delegation Committee 103
 - and leadership 78–80, 145
 - questions to 78–104
 - Recovery Group 20, 98, 108
 - and safeguarding 86–7, 167, 170–72, 174, 176–8, 202, 229
 - and same-sex marriage 100
 - sexuality report 24
 - teaching document *see Living in Love and Faith*
 - and Transforming Effectiveness 145
 - and Vision and Strategy 118–19
 - see also* Five Guiding Principles
- House of Laity, and Preliminary Motion Procedure 4
- housing:
 - affordable 89
 - clergy retirement 69–70, 163–4
- How Clergy Thrive* 58–9
- Human Rights Act 171, 197
- humility, need for 30–31, 115–16, 121, 125, 187, 192, 204
- identity, and theology 25, 97–8
- IDG *see* Implementation and Dialogue Group
- IICSA (Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse) enquiry:
 - and Chichester diocese 101, 167, 230
 - and Church's shame 18, 79, 115, 185, 191, 199
 - and Peter Ball case 101, 167, 201
 - recommendations 97, 167, 185–7, 188–94, 196, 198–203
 - report 18, 20, 28, 79, 94, 96, 99, 115, 145, 188–91, 230
 - response to 46, 166–78, 181–8
 - and terms of art 130, 167, 169
- image of God, creation in 22, 40–42, 97–8, 224
- immigration, cross-Channel 19
- Implementation and Dialogue Group 50, 103–4
- inclusion, and diversity 113
- inclusivity, and sexuality 98
- inequality, and Covid-19 31, 35, 36, 40
- Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum 145
- Interim Pilot Support Scheme 189, 190, 191–2, 200
- international development, funding 18, 41–2
- internet, and online presence 32, 33
- investment:
 - and cathedrals 133
 - and climate change 68–9
 - impact of Covid-19 147
 - in pharmaceuticals 70–71
 - Social Impact Investment Fund 143
- Isle of Man, and National Clergy Register 232–3
- Issues in Human Sexuality* 24
- justice:
 - and abuse 185, 187, 190, 191, 198, 201
 - environmental 84
 - and legal aid reforms 61
- Kingdom Calling* 59–60, 102–3
- Küng, Hans 21
- laity:
 - and safeguarding 168–9, 171–3, 175–8
 - and theological training 148, 149, 154
 - see also* leadership, lay
- Lambeth Conference 1998 91
- Lambeth Declaration 84
- Lay Leadership Task Force 180
- lay ministry:

and A Church Near You 231
 and Communion by Extension 65
 funding 59–60, 152, 154
 growth 152, 158–9
 licensed/authorized 90–93
 and national register 250–52, 253
 see *also* leadership, lay; Readers
 Lay Ministry Advisory Group 60, 180
 Lay Ministry Data Project 60
 leadership, bishops and archbishops 20,
 78–80, 125, 145
 leadership, lay 158–9
 and safeguarding 168–9, 171–3,
 175–8
 Leadership Pathway 95
 learning, theological 121–2, 147–8
 Legal Advisory Commission:
 and individual cups 92–3
 question to 64
 legal aid reforms 61
 Legal Aid Sentencing & Punishment of
 Offenders Act 2012 61
 Legal Office 76, 128, 135, 142, 177,
 178, 248–9
 legislation, reform 76, 145, 159
 legislative business
 Draft Cathedrals Measure 126–42
 Draft Safeguarding (Code of Practice)
 Measure 166–78
 Standing Orders Made Under section
 1 of the General Synod (Remote
 Meetings) (Temporary Standing
 Orders) Measure 2020 3–15
 lessons learnt reviews 198
 LGBTI Christians:
 clergy 202
 and inclusivity 98
 and *Living in Love and Faith* 47, 100–
 101, 200
 protection 47, 196
 Life Events Ministry 148–9
 LInC funding see Lowest Income
 Communities Funding
 Listed Places of Worship Grants
 Scheme 76
 Liturgical Commission, question to 65
 liturgy, and doctrine 102
Living in Love and Faith report
 16, 21–9, 49
 and common vision 22, 114
 debate needed on 47, 52
 learning resources 22, 25, 27–8, 97
 and local churches 28–9
 and mental health issues 86
 Next Steps Group 27, 99–100, 196
 and Pastoral Advisory Group 25
 and Pastoral Principles 25, 47, 99,
 100
 and safeguarding 86–7, 97, 99, 100,
 196, 200
 and Scripture 24–5
Living in Love and Faith Advocates 99
Living in Love and Faith implementation
 group 97
 Living Ministry, *How Clergy Thrive* 58–9
 love of God 20–21, 22, 25, 109, 184
 Lowest Income Communities Funding
 143, 151, 154
 Marks of Mission 82, 109–111
 and the environment 86, 112, 156
 and justice 112
 marriage:
 same-sex 100
 teaching document see *Living in Love
 and Faith*
 traditional teaching 54–6
 mental health, and Covid-19 17
 Methodist Church, and individual cups
 93–4
 ministries, licensed/authorized 90
 ministry:
 with children and young people 90
 extended episcopal 104
 funding 151
 Ministry Council, questions to 56–60
 Ministry Experience scheme 160
 Ministry Statistics 104
 mission:
 and cathedrals 128

and Covid-19 17
 Five Marks 82, 109–112, 125
 and sacramental theology 34
 mission agencies, pensions 162
 Mission, Pastoral and Church Property
 Committee (Church Commissioners)
 66, 236
 Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011
 232, 235
 Mission and Public Affairs Council,
 questions to 60–62
 mixed ecology church 32, 112–14, 118–
 20, 157, 232, 237, 250
 and safeguarding 172–3, 178
 multi-academy trusts (MATs) 218, 221–
 3
 mutual flourishing 50, 103

national call to prayer 53, 60, 78
 National Church Institutions:
 and central support services 72, 78
 and Culture Recovery Fund 76
 and digitisation of files 232
 external complaints policy 105
 and risk registers 102
 National Director for Safeguarding 182–
 8
 National Health Service, and response
 to Covid-19 30–31, 32
 National Investing Bodies (NIBs):
 and carbon emissions reduction 68–9
 climate change and disinvestment 68–
 9
 and pharmaceutical industry 70–71
 National Lottery Heritage Fund 76, 239
 National Ministry Register (Clergy):
 and bishops' chaplains 230–31, 247,
 250
 and Guernsey and Jersey 249
 registration officer 233, 247–8
 Regulations 2020 72, 227–34, 245–53
 and safeguarding 229, 245–6, 250,
 252
 National Safeguarding Panel 177
 National Safeguarding Steering Group
 73, 95, 177, 190
 National Safeguarding Team 29, 73, 76,
 94–7, 99, 169, 171, 186, 188, 190,
 196, 206
 National Society Council, questions to
 54–6
 National Younger Leadership Groups 54
 Nestorianism 122–3
 Newcastle Cathedral, Endowment Fund
 135
 Next Steps Group (LLF) 27, 99–100,
 196
 Nominations Committee 138
 Norfolk Churches Trust 68, 237–8

One in Four 182
 openness, and sexuality 97–9, 101
 ordinands:
 funding 150–51, 154–5
 gender imbalance 58
 numbers 56–8, 145
 on residential or part-time courses 56–
 8
 and safeguarding 175–6, 177
 and training 147–8

Paris Climate Agreement 68, 83–4
 parish church councils (PCCs):
 chair 75–6
 and removal of pews 86
 and safeguarding 75, 169, 206
 Parish Safeguarding Officer 75, 76
 parishes:
 and engagement with LLF 28
 and mixed ecology church 112–13,
 114–15, 123, 157
 parish share 76, 144, 147, 150–51,
 157, 164–5
 Resolution 104
 and response to Covid-19 31–2, 35,
 98, 144, 147
 and safeguarding 75, 202–3, 205
 Parliament:
 and abortion 87–9
 and Churches Conservation Trust

236, 240, 242, 245
 and Draft Boards of Education
 Measure 211, 225
 Ecclesiastical Committee 220
 joined-up 31
 and legal aid reforms 61
 and national carbon emissions
 measures 61
 and overseas aid 18, 41–2, 150–51,
 162
 Places of Worship Task Force 98
 and protection of LGBTI people 47
 and reopening of churches 32, 42, 98
 passports, countersigning 252–3
 Past Cases Review 2 95–6
 Pastoral Advisory Group:
 and *Living in Love and Faith* 25
 Pastoral Principles 25, 47, 99, 100
 Pastoral Measure 1968 235
 Payments to the Churches Conservation
 Trust Order 2020 235–45
 PCR2 *see* Past Cases Review 2
 Pensions Act 1995 131–2
 Pensions Board 132, 162
 funding 147
 question to 69–70
 People and Data Programme 72
 People System 228, 229
 persecution 17, 34
 Peter Ball case 101, 167, 201, 228
 Peter Farquhar case 87, 96–7, 173
 pews, removal 85–6
 pharmaceutical industry 70–71
 points of order 3
 poverty:
 and impact of austerity 71–2
 and impact of Covid-19 31, 32, 89
 in urban estates 71–2
 power, and abuse 189, 191, 198, 203
 Practice Guidance for Safeguarding 96
 prayer:
 and Covid-19 46
 national call to 53, 60, 78
 and Vision and Strategy 109–111, 125
 Preliminary Motion Procedure 4

presentation, on safeguarding 181–8
 Presidential Presentation 16–29
 Prorogation 254

 Questions 48, 53–105

 racism 18, 113
 radicalism 151, 156, 159, 165
 Readers 90
 and Holy Communion 65
 Redress Scheme 145, 161, 186–7, 188–
 92, 200–201, 208–9
 religious communities, and safeguarding
 172–3, 177–8
 Remote Meetings Measure 2020 4
 Renewal and Reform 91, 152, 154
 repentance, need for 18, 23, 185, 191,
 202, 204
 reporting, mandatory 170, 187, 191,
 199, 201, 206, 208
 reputation, damage to 186, 189, 191–3,
 199
 Ripon Cathedral, governance 134–5

 sacraments, and mission 34
Safe Spaces 182
 safeguarding:
 and accountability 175, 178, 184–6,
 190, 207
 at parish level 75, 202–3, 205
 and cathedrals 137
 and Clergy Register 229, 245–6, 250,
 252
 Code of Practice 130–31, 166–78, 196
 costs 145, 147, 161
 and due regard 130–31, 167, 170,
 173–4
 independent investigation 182–3,
 185–6, 201, 202, 207
 and lawyers 186–7, 197
 and LLF 10, 86–7, 97, 99, 100, 200
 and response to IICSA report 46, 166–
 78, 181–8, 189
 training 76, 94–5, 96–7, 174, 182,
 190, 195, 199, 229

Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline
 Measure 2016 167, 174, 188
 Safeguarding Training and Development
 Framework 95
 Safeguarding Training and Development
 Practice 94–5
 Safer Recruitment policy 96–7
Salt from the Earth 108–9
 Schools Conference 121
 Scripture:
 and doctrine 101–2
 and LLF 24–5
 Seal of the Confessional 199, 201
 secrecy, and core groups 197, 201, 207
 Secretary General, questions to 104–6
 Senior Leadership Pathway 95
Setting God's People Free 82, 111,
 179–80, 231
 sexuality:
 and culture 201
 teaching document *see Living in Love
 and Faith*
 and transparency 19, 87, 97, 191,
 193, 196
 shame:
 and IICSA report 18, 79, 115, 185,
 191, 199–200
 and racism 115
 and treatment of LGBTI people 200
 Shaping Group 124
 Sheldon Hub, Report on CDM 171, 175,
 194
 SIAMS (Statutory Inspection of Anglican
 and Methodist Schools) 223
 silence:
 and abuse 186
 and sexuality and gender 96–9, 192
 simplification 20, 30–31, 108–9, 115–16,
 125, 135, 147, 219, 225
 Simplification Task Group 115
 singleness, and LLF 87
 Social Impact Investment Fund 143
 social media, and safeguarding 173
 Southwark Cathedral 136
 Southwark Cathedral 1937 Measure 136
 Sports Ministry 148
 Standing Orders:
 SO 21(3) 146
 SO 24(1) 42–3
 SO 31 51
 SO 37 142, 227
 SO 38(9) 5, 10
 SO 51 168
 SO 54(2) 220
 SO 60 15
 SO 73 4
 SO 107 181
 Special Standing Orders 3–15
 Standing Orders Committee:
 and Draft Boards of Education
 Measure 214, 220
 and Special Standing Orders 5, 8
 Statistics for Mission 2020 89
 Statutory Instruments Act 1946 253
 Strategic Development Fund (SDF) 77,
 143, 155–6
 and estates evangelism 151
 Strategic Investment Board 77, 179–80
 Strategic Ministry Fund 143, 160
 Strategy and Development Unit 77–8
 survivors of abuse 46, 182–8, 188–209
 apologies to 79, 96, 188–9, 191, 192
 and redress 18, 145, 161, 186–7,
 188–92, 196, 200–201, 205–6
 Survivors' Reference Group (SRG) 183,
 185–6
 Survivors' Voices 183, 185
 Sustainability Funding 102, 144
 Synod Support 178

 teaching document *see* LLF; sexuality
 Team Ministries 231, 232
 technology:
 digital 49, 145, *see a/so* National
 Ministry Register; Zoom
 low-carbon 68–9
 Theological Training Institutions (TEIs)
 funding 147–51, 154–5
 and online learning 148
 and part-time courses 154

theology, and human identity 25, 97–8

TPI see Transition Pathway Initiative
Transformation Fund 143–4

Transforming Effectiveness Group 72,
78, 91–2, 108–9, 145, 150–51, 154,
165

Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI), and
disinvestment 68

transparency:
and leadership 20
and safeguarding 1, 96, 97, 190–91,
201, 207
and sexuality 19, 87, 97, 191, 193,
196

trust, loss of 183–5

trust in God, renewal 20–21, 117

truth and reconciliation process, call for
187, 204, 208

UN Climate Change Conference of the
Parties see COP 26

Under Authority 194

Unite trade union 171, 173

Universal Credit 89

Valuing People with Down's Syndrome
61–2, 88

Vicar-General's Court 73

A Vision for Lay Ministries 59, 90

Vision and Strategy 10, 46, 48, 81–2,
91, 103, 106–126, 144
and children 81, 107
and Christ-centred and Jesus-shaped
Church 108–111, 114–16, 118, 121,
123–5, 191–3
consultations 90–91, 107
and environmental programmes 156
funding 145, 147
and local churches 112–15, 149
resources 125
and safeguarding 192
and simpler, humbler, bolder church
30–31, 115–25, 147
and young people 54, 80–81, 90, 107,

110, 120–21, 122–4

volunteers, and safeguarding 96–9, 169

Vote 1 150, 151, 152–3, 154, 160

Vote 4 162

voting:

by Houses 142, 227

by show of hands 9–12

by whole Synod 8, 14, 33, 44–5, 51–2,
209, 235, 253

electronic 5–6, 10–11, 14–15, 209–
210

see also Zoom

welcomes:

to ecumenical representatives 2–3

to new members 2

WhatsApp groups 49, 52

women:

consecration 50

in ordination training 58

worship, in lockdown 32–6, 98, 145–6

young people:

black and minority ethnic 122–4

and church attendance 89–90

engagement with 80–81, 148

and General Synod 54

and the homeless 110

and study of LLF 29

and Vision and Strategy 54, 80–81,
90, 107, 110, 120–21, 122, 123–4

young vocations officer 58

Youth Council (CEYC) 54, 120

Zoom 4–5, 7–10, 15, 28, 34, 51, 53,
106, 131, 142, 166, 226

blue hand icon 3, 9, 26, 30, 74, 117–
18, 120, 137, 159–60, 168, 175, 179,
182

breakout rooms 106–7, 117, 120

Index created by Meg Davies

