

Report of Proceedings 2022

General Synod July Group of Sessions

Friday 8 July 2022 – Tuesday 12 July 2022

University of York

**Transcribed by
eScribers**

**Central Court, Suite 303, 25 Southampton Buildings, London WC2A 1AL
Tel No: 0330 100 5223 E-mail: uk.transcripts@escribers.net**

Full Synod: First Day Friday 8 July 2022

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell)* took the Chair at 2.02 pm

The Chair. Dear sisters and brothers, as is very well known, it is grim down south, so it is so good to welcome you to the Diocese of York, and to the Province of York and the return of the General Synod to the University of York. I think we are all delighted to be back here. If it is your first time at a group of sessions in York, you may be feeling a bit bewildered by the geography of the place. Please ask some of the old lags who are around, and also there are other staff who are here, many of them giving up their time to be here to assist us. Please can we all help each other to make sense of getting around the campus.

May I also take this opportunity of extending a very warm welcome to those members of Synod who are joining us remotely. We of course look forward to your contributions as we go through our business.

However, before we formally begin I did want to say a word of welcome to the Vice-Chancellor of York University, Charlie Jeffery. The General Synod has been meeting here for a very, very, very long time, but I do not think we have ever invited the Vice-Chancellor to come and speak to us. This is an opportunity for us to thank him and the wider team at the University, who go out of their way to help us and support us, and have done for many, many years. It has been my pleasure to get to know Charlie, the Vice-Chancellor, since I became Archbishop of York. I have got to know some the staff here at the University, particularly Dee Dyas, who is the co-Director of the Centre for the Study of Christianity and Culture, based here, which does amazing work. Charlie, on behalf of the General Synod of the Church of England, we thank you for letting us come here. Would you please pass on our thanks to all your staff.

Professor Charlie Jeffery. Your Grace, thank you very, very much. I will be delighted to pass on that message to Dee, and all our other staff. It really is such a delight to welcome you to the University of York and to see Central Hall, our graduation hall, transformed in this way.

It is a delight I would like to express briefly in three dates. The first of those is 2019, which was the last time you could be here, but something intervened and it really is wonderful that we can move back to something of our regular rhythms.

The second date is 1971, which was the first time the General Synod met here in University Central Hall, brought here by the then Archbishop of York, Donald Coggan.

It is to Archbishop Coggan I return with the third and final of my dates, which is 1963, which was the year this University opened its doors to students. To mark that the then Archbishop Coggan decided to hold a service in the Minster to mark the inauguration of the University and gave a sermon which I think was quite extraordinary in many ways, but especially in the expression of internationalist commitment that he gave. He addressed that to two notional undergraduates of the University, Tom Smith and Betty Jones. He exhorted Tom and Betty to take the openness of outlook that they would acquire at the University of York during their studies into the world once they had graduated. Let me quote what he said, "Tom Smith and Betty Jones, undergraduates, whether they like it or not, are world citizens. Just as isolationism in world politics has proved futile and impossible, so insularity of outlook will prove increasingly useless in the world of the 20th century. Tom and Betty are citizens not only of York, not only of England, or Great Britain, not only of Europe, but the world."

We have heard some views in the recent past that being a citizen of the world is not a good thing to be. But I am with the Archbishop on that point, and I am delighted and proud that openness of outlook was from the outset, and indeed remains, such an important principle of this University.

Recalling that remarkable contribution of Archbishop Coggan takes me to a further foundational feature of this University and that is its civic roots. The University exists because of the extraordinary commitment of leading figures in York, in the Minster, in the Rowntree Trust, in the city council and beyond, and together they carried out a patient campaign to establish this University more or less from the end of the Second World War through to the launch of the University in 1963.

As we welcome you back to the University of York, I would just like to say thanks to you, and thanks to the Minster in its various incarnations, thanks to our Archbishops in York for helping to get us off to such a good start. We really appreciate it and we hope that we are repaying the faith that you invested in us. Thank you very much and welcome.

The Chair: There is an absolutely brilliant chaplain here as well, so it is very good to see our partnership developing. So, without further ado, as we move into the work of this Synod over the coming days, I invite the Synod Chaplain Andrew Hammond to lead us in our opening worship.

WORSHIP

The Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the General Synod): It is very good to be able to be with you. Covid kept me away in February. Our main acts of worship in this room during this Synod will all have a theme, either specific to an issue we are discussing, or based on a fundamental characteristic of our being Christians together. We are beginning now with unity - not to be confused with uniformity. It is not about agreeing with each other about everything but just about us staying together as sisters and brothers in Christ.

The New Testament has a lot to say about this and we will hear passages. We are going to take time in this act of worship to reflect on them in silence, which will also characterise some of the acts of worship. Sometimes our talking has to stop.

I just want to say one more thing before we start which is that the rubrics, which I have tried to make more gentle, are suggestions, not instructions.

The Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the General Synod) led the Synod in an act of worship.

ITEM 1 INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES

The Chair. Andrew, thank you very much indeed. Before I welcome new members of Synod, we have a small bit of choreographed business to attend to. I am going to invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to join me on the platform, please.

Synod, the Pro-Prolocutors of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury and the Deputy Prolocutors of the Convocation of York have been elected and are presented to us now: the Ven. Alastair Cutting, Pro-Prolocutor of Southern Province and The Revd Esther Prior, also Pro-Prolocutor for Southern Province. the Ven. Stewart Fyfe, Deputy Prolocutor for the Convocation of York, and the Revd Canon Andy Salmon, Deputy Prolocutor for the Province of York.

That all went well. Synod, we are off to a great start.

I am now going to read out the names of new members of General Synod who have been elected since the last group of sessions. If you are able, please stand when your name is mentioned and remain standing, and we will give one round of applause at the end.

The new members are: the Rt Revd Michael Beasley, who is the new Bishop of Bath & Wells, replacing the Rt Revd Peter Hancock. We will make a note of that. The Rt Revd Jonathan Frost, Bishop of Portsmouth, replacing the Rt Revd Christopher Foster; the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs, Bishop of Rochester, replacing the Rt Revd James Langstaff. All this is doing is encouraging somebody to ask whether the House of Bishops is quorate. It is quorate but it is looking a bit dodgy. The Rt Revd Stephen Lake, Bishop of Salisbury, replacing the Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam; the Rt Revd Jill Duff, Bishop of Lancaster, Suffragan Bishops, replacing the Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs; the Very Revd Mandy Ford, Dean of Bristol, replacing the Very Revd David Ison; the Rt - sorry, that was a prophetic statement - the Revd Claire McArthur, replacing the Revd Stella Bailey. We are glad somebody decided to turn up. The Revd Howard Stoker, Diocese of Norwich, replacing the Ven. Karen Hutchinson; the Ven. Stephen Dunwoody, Armed Forces, replacing the Ven. Clinton Langston; the Ven. Giles Legood, Armed Forces, replacing the Ven. John

Ellis. It says on my notes, "May we greet them all". We are very glad they are all joining Synod, but we are particularly glad that three of you are here.

Following the February group of sessions the lower houses of both Convocations and the House of Laity have met and formally agreed to the co-option of additional members. It is therefore my great pleasure to welcome the following nine - possibly - co-opted members, and again, if you are able to stand when your name is mentioned we will applaud at the end. So, from the Convocation of Canterbury, the Revd Aneal Appadoo, on Zoom, the Revd Preb. Sandra McCalla, the Revd Sandra Schloss; from the Convocation of York, the Revd Canon Falak Sher; from the House of Laity, Abishaq Leel, David Hermitt, Jesvin John, Kenson Li and Wendy Kasenene. Well, some of you are here, brilliant, thank you so much.

I would also like to welcome the recently appointed Third Church Estates Commissioner, the Revd Flora Winfield, who I think is here somewhere. Flora, we are all so delighted with your appointment. Synod, we are nearly there.

I am now going to read out the names of the bishops who are, possibly, attending this group of sessions under Standing Order 123. The Bishops attending this group of sessions in place of the Diocesan Bishop are the Bishop of Berwick, the Rt Revd Mark Wroe for the Diocese of Newcastle, and the Bishop of Southampton, the Rt Revd Debbie Sellin for the Diocese of Winchester.

I am going to move quickly on. And last, but by no means least, it is always such a pleasure to be joined by sisters and brothers from the Anglican Communion and our ecumenical colleagues. One or two of them have had to pull out because of Covid, and I want to name all of you, dear friends, but I have particularly been asked to welcome two guests from the Anglican Communion, first of all the Most Revd Mark Strange, Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness and Primate of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Most Revd Titre Ande Georges, Archbishop of the Congo and Bishop of Kindu. Could we greet them and welcome them.

Synod, that concludes our introductions and welcomes, and we move to our next item of business with a change to Order Paper I. It did say Item 2 was omitted, but you will be very pleased to hear it is back on. It gives me great pleasure to invite his Grace Archbishop Titre to bring us greetings from the Congo and from his Diocese of Kindu. Your Grace.

ITEM 2

ADDRESS BY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The Archbishop of the Congo (the Most Revd Titre Ande Georges): I want to greet you all in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. My name is Titre Ande. I have been Bishop of Aru for 16 years and now I am the Archbishop of Congo since January of this year. I am

grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York and the organising committee for inviting me to join you to be with you here. May the Lord bless you.

I am from the Congo, and in the Congo we hold our professional Synod once in three years. I have heard that here it is twice every year, but in the Congo it is different because the Congo is a huge country and the transport is a problem, you cannot gather people easily. But when you meet once in three years, it comes with a lot of challenges because after three years you discover a lot of things have changed. So, that is our problem.

And when we meet, we discuss a lot of issues. In the Congo, different churches are more responsible for the lives of people than the government itself. So, we do a lot of things: education, we fight against poverty, health issues, and all these issues are discussed in our Synod, and if we do not do it, probably people will suffer more. And also, we have issues like peace, because, as you have heard on the news, the fighting is still going on in the eastern part of Congo, and we have been working a lot for peace and that also keeps us busy. I would like you to pray for that, because people have been praying for that.

Now, some members do not go to church, because they are saying we have been praying a lot but God is doing nothing. The situation is still going on. As you gather here, you gather here as the Church of God, and I will ask you to pray for peace, for the challenges we are facing in our places.

I know here the context is different and the issues you are discussing are also different. I saw the papers and I am happy to be with you and see how you run your Synod, what issues and challenges you are discussing. But in our province, these days we are busy with mission and evangelism, and, as I said, we also stand for the people, doing a lot on behalf of the government, because if we do not do it, they will suffer. So, we are much involved in education, health and also development. Here, you may talk about poverty, but the meaning is different where we are, and in our places the meaning is also different.

So, thank you for inviting me, I am sure we will learn a lot from you. We are one body and we need to learn each from the other. May the Lord bless you, thank you.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Before we conclude this item, let us pray for Archbishop Titre, for the church in the Congo, and for peace in that land and for our Anglican Communion as the Lambeth Conference approaches.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) led the Synod in prayer.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): That concludes this item.

ITEM 3 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 2.40 pm.

The Chair: I invite the Archbishop of York to deliver a Presidential Address.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): In John Henry Newman's poem, *The Dream of Gerontius*, which will be known to many of you, as Gerontius' soul comes close to the throne of God, his guardian angel says to him, "For one moment thou shalt see thy Lord, but thou knowest not, my child, what thou dost ask. That sight of the most fair will gladden thee, but it will pierce thee too."

Now, setting aside Anglican anxieties about the Roman Catholic view of purgatory, which underpins much of this poem, we note that these lines echo the words that Mary hears from Simeon, that this child, this Jesus, is destined for the falling and rising of many, to be a sign that is opposed, so that the inner thoughts of many will be revealed. And Simeon says to Mary, "A sword will pierce your own heart too". Or, as we may put it, as we reflect upon our Christian discipleship in the world, there is a cost; following Jesus is not easy.

Because of our baptism, and this surely is the heart of missionary discipleship, each of us is called to be a Christ bearer. Those words, spoken by Simeon to Mary, apply to all of us, and although it is, of course, for those of us who are ordained, right and proper that we draw sensible and professional boundaries around the tasks or ministry, it is also true that if we wish to share the huge delights of serving Christ then we must also be prepared to face the sorrows and the failures in the public square.

Our words will often be misunderstood, misinterpreted, misquoted. People will think we are woke, naïve, misguided, too left-wing, too right-wing, too liberal, too conservative. We will be applauded for taking a moral stand and pilloried for getting involved in politics, at the same time on the same issue. But, knowing very well that we will sometimes get it wrong, what we are trying to be is faithful to Jesus. In personal witness, we will sometimes meet scorn, apathy, even hostility. That which means most to us will be considered trivial, laughable, Neanderthal by some.

But when we do share the Gospel, we will find ourselves standing on the holy ground of other people's stories and their pain and often we will not have the words to say, such as when we are ministering to those whose lives are cut short or taking the funeral of a child. Our hearts will be pierced and, like Mary standing at the foot of the cross, our witness will be a silent vigil and the determination to abide. We will carry a towel not a flag. We will issue an invitation, not a summons. We will, wherever possible, roll away stones.

In overseeing and resourcing the Church for ministry, a responsibility that we all share, we will have to make painful and difficult decisions. In facing up to mistakes, we will be

humbled, especially by our failings to safeguard the Church or to root out racism or even just to communicate well and show kindness to each other. In these things, we will be pierced and broken.

Yet, the sight of the most high gladdens and sustains us. For me, that is around the table of the Lord and in the daily slog and diet of prayer, and the comfort of Scripture. And for all of us, laity, priests and bishops, the whole people of God, we must, as our first priority pay and the first call upon our lives, pay attention to those sources of replenishing grace that are given us in word and worship, in sacrament and fellowship, enabling us to persevere, to get better, to make amends, to love one another.

There is a wonderful scene in Peter Weir's film *Gallipoli* depicting the events on the night before thousands of young Australian soldiers were sent over the top, facing almost certain death. The officer in charge at the front line, and who himself will lead the assault in the morning, sits in his office, not much more than a hollow carved out of the mud. And on a wind-up gramophone he listens to a piece of music, nothing is said. The camera lingers on his face, we see him listening intently to the music. We are invited to read his thoughts and for a few moments we get inside what it must be like, not just to be involved in that sort of situation, but to lead others through it.

It is years since I have seen the film, and I cannot remember what the music was, I guess it was a piece of opera, but in my mind, I see him sitting there, contemplating the music, weighing up what lies ahead of him, connecting himself with something beautiful that was beyond and away from the horrors of war.

I suppose you could see this as escapism, a way of avoiding reality, but I saw it differently. Here is a man charged with terrible responsibility, following orders, but at the same time having to deliver costly orders to others. He sees the madness of it, he feels and holds the pain of it, is trapped and constrained by the choices that others have made, knows what he must do, but still looks beyond it. Amid the frightful inhumanity and degradation of trench warfare, he connects himself to a beauty that must have seemed unreachable, and yet at the same time is one of the few things worth seeking. In those few moments of contemplation, he is able to compose himself and discover within himself the resources he needs to lead others. What we see is not the leadership itself, but someone discovering resources to lead others by retreating to a place of stillness and contemplation. In the midst of horror he stops, and in stopping is better able to carry out his responsibilities, drawing on resources outside himself.

Writing to the saintly Bishop King in 1861, his predecessor as Principal of Cuddesdon, H.H. Swinney wrote this on the importance of meditation, contemplation in the Christian life: "We all try to do too much, and do not give enough time to earnest, quiet thought. Somehow, even my prayer and divine service within God's congregation lose much of their reality without this deliberate", and I love this phrase, "bringing of the unseen into sight and basking in the light and warmth of it for a little season". We shall accomplish more, he says, by attempting less.

And Edward King himself persistently maintained that our first priority must be, and I quote, “to secure our individual reunion with God through Christ, nurtured in those times apart, in solitude and silence”. “Blessed are the poor in spirit”, says Jesus, “for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven”.

At the heart of what it means for us to be a Christ-centred church is this renewal of prayer and spirituality, the disciplines of contemplation, the pursuit of holiness, the recognition that we do not have all the answers, a poverty of spirit which is a richness of our need of God’s mercy and redemption, the deliberate bringing of the unseen into sight, that even a so-called vision and strategy is simply a call, a call to God, a call from God to centre our lives in Christ.

And then a few questions that we think are worth addressing, and around which we will order our priorities.

So, how can we grow younger and more diverse? I am so glad that at this Synod, we will at last have time to share together our experiences, insights and ideas on this. How can we create new pathways of belonging for those who do not yet know Jesus as Lord, revitalising the parishes and chaplaincies of our Church and expanding our vision to create new communities of faith and see more people come to faith in Christ and, perhaps most critical of all, how can we learn and learn again to be disciples of Jesus ourselves?

Gladden your hearts with the sight of the most fair, be constantly renewed and resourced by the beauty of Christ, the beauty of worship, the beauty of Scripture. One thing I ask of the Lord, this I seek, to live my life, to find my life in the house of the Lord, to behold God’s fair beauty.

So, dear friends, this is what I say to myself each day as I stumble out of bed, bang my head against the wall and ask myself, “Lord, why have you asked me to be the Archbishop of York?” I say, “Stephen, know your need of God, know that you need resources outside yourself, do not believe your own publicity, own up to your mistakes, do not think you are in charge or that this is your church. It is not. And seek out those places of prayerful contemplation and replenishing where you will know God’s love for you. And accept that a sword will pierce your heart too”. And in this week, of all weeks, don’t we need this sort of leadership in our nation as well as our Church?

So, recently I have to tell you, I had a bad day. Having a bad day, I found myself doing a similar thing to that army officer in the film, because stuff was mounting up, people were asking me for things that I could not give them. Difficult, difficult, painful decisions had to be made, which affected other people’s lives, and I wanted someone else to make them. I did not feel equal to the task, and frankly, I did not want to be the Archbishop of York that day, I just wanted to be Stephen. I was on my way to a meeting, so before getting in the car, I sorted out some music to listen to. This is what I often do. In fact, when I was Bishop of Reading, I discovered that the journey from my house to the Archdeacon’s

house was exactly 18 minutes, which is the time it takes Jessye Norman to sing Strauss's Four Last Songs, and I felt contemplating death was a very good preparation for the meeting.

On this day, however, I needed something to lift my spirits and take me, well, even to a place where I might catch a glimpse of the most high, the most fair God, so I reached for Elgar's setting of the Dream of Gerontius, and listening to the music I reconnected with a beauty that, sisters and brothers, is available to all of us, that is the deepest truth and very echo of the life of God, and, in this beautiful music, also an affirmation of the Christian faith itself.

By the way, did you know that Terry Waite, having been chained to a radiator for more than three years, when the strictures in which he was being kept were relaxed a bit, they gave him a radio. And still chained to the radiator, he found the wonderful World Service – let us thank God and give three cheers - and it was a Prom and it was this music, the Dream of Gerontius. This was the first thing he heard which connected him with the world.

So, I listened to Act 1 going to the meeting and I listened to Act 2 coming from the meeting. Now, those of you know the music will know that Act 2 is quite a bit longer than Act 1, and I realised I was going to be home before the music finished, so I pulled into a layby and I wound back the seat in my car and turned up the volume. My electric car didn't need recharging but, brothers and sisters, I did.

I listened to the final song of the angel singing to the saved soul, softly and gently, "Dearly-ransomed soul, in my most loving arms I now enfold thee, and o'er the penal waters as they roll, I poise thee, and I lower thee, and I hold thee".

Dear General Synod, welcome back to York. And, amazingly, I am going to say may we find here a place of peace and restoration and simply this: as we do our business let us keep remembering it is the business of God and there is a cost, but around us and beneath us and holding us always are the everlasting arms of an ever-loving God. It is this God made known in Jesus Christ we serve, to God that we give account and to God we bend the knee.

I know that was more of a retreat address than a Presidential charge, but I am a preacher man and I thought I would speak about the state of the soul rather than the state of the nation and so I will finish by saying, if you do not mind, Amen.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): It is not a point of order, but I have received a text from David Lamming, late of this place, saying that the live stream is not working and could I please report that and perhaps we can get something done about that. At least I will have done something useful in this Synod.

The Chair: It is not a point of order but we are grateful for the information. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell)* took the Chair at 3.03 pm.

ITEM 4 REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2257)

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. It is good to be back here in York. We move to Item 4, which is the Report of the Business Committee. Members will need GS 2257 for this debate. Please remember that the point of the debate is to debate the Agenda and the Report and I will be listening out for contributions that actually do that. First of all, I am going to invite Robert Hammond, who is the Chair of the Business Committee, to present the Report. Robert, you have up to 10 minutes to do so.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): As has been said before, isn't it good to be back in York. For those of you who have not been here before, I hope you have found the Central Hall. Hopefully, you have found your bedroom. Tomorrow, you will all be sharing stories of the showers, believe me. Later, I hope you will find your dining room. That is really all you need to know. The campus is extensive and complex and so, when you get lost, ask someone for help finding your way to that fringe meeting, group work venue or anywhere else. Please remember that we have not been here for two years and so it may take us all a bit of a while to get back into the York swing of things.

As with the last two groups of sessions in London, this is an in-person Synod with some hybrid elements. We hope this will work well. We have had a great deal of support from the University technicians, Synod Support, Lumi and others, but please bear with us if there are any problems we will try and sort them as quickly as we can. We hope that you found the revised Business Committee Report with its short summary of each item on the agenda and the link to the papers helpful. The Business Committee has listened to and acted on feedback that we have received and we hope this guide to the items gives you a bit more information on them.

We have an extremely full agenda this time and so the Business Committee took the decision to have an evening session on Monday. Some members will recall that it was normal practice in the past to have evening sessions and we are trying it with just one session this time. We have allowed time for a second question time in the hope that more questions will be answered but, of course, we set the time before we know how many questions there are and we have allowed an afternoon for group work on LLF and Vision and Strategy. We have tried to ensure a balanced agenda of business. There is a lot of business which requires legislation this time and can I encourage members to engage fully with those items.

As we did for the CNC elections last year, we are again having a debate on the broadly non-technical policy proposals to change the way Canterbury CNC operates on Saturday

followed by consideration of the amendments to Standing Orders required to implement those proposals on Tuesday. This means the legal team and the Standing Orders Committee have time to consider them, but we can deal with the whole item in one group of sessions. We have the usual debates on the Archbishops' Council budget, consideration of future spending plans and we have found time for a debate on the war in Ukraine.

I am aware that some members thought we should have a debate on the current financial crisis. The Business Committee felt that with several debates about finance, budgets, spending plans for both the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council, there are many opportunities for a wide range of views to be heard on this important matter.

We are already aware that there is quite a lot of amendments for some items of business which will mean they will take longer than the Business Committee had planned for, and at least one item of deemed business has been requested for debate. This means that there will, inevitably, be changes to the agenda of when items are taken. Watch out for any changes which will either be in the orange Order Papers available here in the Central Hall, on the app and sent out by email. There may also be other changes to the agenda I need to propose from time to time.

I did promise in February to give more clarity on the dates of future groups of sessions. It is extremely unlikely that Synod will need to meet in November this year. Next year, although the groups of sessions is still to be finalised, members are requested to hold the narrower date envelope of Monday 6 to Thursday 9 February 2023 free for us to meet in London and the full envelope of 7 to 11 July to meet here again in York. We have scheduled three Diocesan Synod Motions in an attempt to reduce those outstanding on the list. We have important Private Member's Motions on assisted suicide and a debate on resourcing ministerial formation.

The Business Committee is pleased to have been able to schedule time for a debate to affirm the place of disabled people in the life of the Church. It is equally pleased that the work on the Clergy Conduct Implementation Group is ready to come to this group of sessions.

We have also had to schedule voting for the central members of the Crown Nominations Commission. Synod members will recall that this is the first time we have elected CNC members under the new Standing Orders following the decision of this Synod to change the voting process. Lay and clergy members will have the opportunity to meet and discuss with those candidates for election tomorrow evening and, on Sunday evening, during extended Compline here in the Central Hall, we will vote.

Please remember that you will need a method of accessing the Civica voting system, the link for which was emailed to you earlier this afternoon. You may want to use a smartphone, tablet, iPad or laptop for that vote, but if you do not have one there will be some laptops available with assistance downstairs in the foyer.

A few reminders that you may find helpful. If you have not sorted your car park hanger out, please do so straight away or you do risk being fined. Please remember to only eat in the dining room you have been allocated. The lanyard colour indicates which that is. We are all aware that the Covid virus is still around. Please be mindful of each other's requirements and preferences, and the University and staff will operate in keeping with current Government guidelines.

The Business Committee is aware that many of you have great ideas and suggestions for how we can - whilst remembering that General Synod is primarily a legislative body, although it is not the Church's parliament in the way that Westminster is - improve Synod. We are grateful for the many suggestions and proposals that have been made and we look forward to seeing some of you at the Business Committee fringe meeting on Monday evening to hear more of your thoughts and views as we begin to look at this complex matter.

Speaking of fringe events, we have a lot of them at this group of sessions. They are an important although voluntary and additional part of our Synod experience and not part of formal Synod business. I am sorry that we had to change the rooms for some of them. That was simply because the University changed the rooms we had been allocated for some of the meetings, but we have sorted all that out. The online version of the fringe booklet has the up-to-date details of the fringe meetings and the rooms.

Members of Synod, you will know that we have a voluntary code for how we conduct ourselves here at Synod. The Business Committee encourages you to read that and to conduct yourselves within its guidelines. Over the last couple of years, there have been questions and comments about whether that code of conduct should be an enforceable one and whether it should be widened in its scope and its application. The Business Committee will be considering this and the considerable work that would be needed by it, Synod staff and, indeed, by this Synod at its future meetings and we would be very interested in your views on that.

But at this group of sessions, as we live and work alongside each other these next few days, could I urge you to remember the words of Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians: "As it is, there are many parts yet one body. The eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of you' nor again, the head to the feet, 'I have no need of you'. On the contrary, the parts of the body which seem weaker are indispensable. If one member suffers, all suffer together. If one member is honoured, all rejoice together." Please remember that in our discussions and deliberations and questions here at Synod, whether in the chamber, the dining room, in fringe meetings, on social media, in your own private discussions, continue to act in a way that really shows Christian love to everybody.

Finally, can I thank everybody who has helped to ensure that this group of sessions can go ahead: University and staff, my Business Committee colleagues for their work and you the members of General Synod, but especially the staff at Church House, particularly in

Synod Support. Many of the staff who have worked to deliver this group of sessions have not done a York Synod before and so have been learning on the job, as it were. The Synod Support team and other teams we rely heavily on are down on numbers at the moment. We do not have a permanent Clerk to the Synod either. In closing, can I thank all the staff for working above and beyond to enable us to be here. I am not trying to stop the applause but thank you, Chair, I look forward to the debate that will follow. I move the motion standing in my name and let us thank the staff.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. If you wish to contribute, then please stand or indicate. There is a speech limit of five minutes as we open the debate.

Dr Catharine Rhodes (Sheffield): As set out in the Report by the Business Committee, the next agenda item is the Routemap to Net Zero Carbon by 2030. This plan of action follows the February 2020 motion which called upon all parts of the Church of England to urgently examine what would be required to reach net zero emissions by 2030. The General Synod of February 2020 recognised that there is a global climate emergency. I am a new member of Synod and, as a new member, one of many interesting aspects of being in Synod is the variety of roles and life experiences brought by other lay members.

Being a current or, indeed, retired NHS worker is not unusual and I previously worked as a consultant obstetrician and this means that the word "emergency" still stirs up a strong reaction in me. When you work on a labour ward, the clanging cymbal of the emergency buzzer can resound down the corridor at any time of day or night and members of staff who can do so will move as quickly as possible to where help is needed. You do not wait to take action because every second counts because it is an emergency. To get the best outcome, the team works together using all their skills and knowledge. Each person plays a part and has a shared mental model of what outcome they are aiming for, including the timeline that they will work towards. Successful teams have strong leadership, good communication, awareness of what is happening around them and they support each other.

I believe that for this Synod to successfully work together on the climate emergency that it declared, it must practise what it preaches. I am asking the Business Committee to advise how the principles of the Net Zero Routemap and A Rocha Eco Church could be embedded in our practices as this Synod. The principle is that we would ourselves be part of the work that we are asking the wider Church to do in the Routemap to Net Zero. I hope that Eco General Synod plans can be part of the Synod to be held in February 2023. This would align with ongoing discussions with Church House on this topic as they work on their own sustainability and net zero plans. As part of this, Church House, I am delighted to say, is now registered as an Eco Church, is on the A Rocha Map and committed to working towards an award.

The month after the 2020 vote, I took on the voluntary role of Diocesan Environment Officer for Sheffield Diocese having retired from the NHS. When I became DEO one thing that was said to me has stayed in my mind, "No one was ever converted by a pie chart".

What does it take to urge us to move forward with action on the climate emergency? It takes love, the love Jesus commanded us to have for our neighbours. All around the world those living in poverty who did the least to cause this crisis suffer the most, which is why this is also a climate emergency; and the love for our creator God and our beautiful planet home, the earth we share with all living creatures and the love for future generations.

Every person here knows and loves a young person who will live out their lives in the world we leave behind. I have got two children and so it is very emotional for me to think about this, as I am sure it is for many of you. We have got a chance to take the next steps guided by this Routemap and I urge Synod to lead by example and look forward to hearing from the Business Committee about how Eco General Synod can become a reality for all of us.

The Chair. Before I invite Alison to speak, I just need to point out, Synod members, that Standing Order 17(1) requires us to stand if we want to contribute to a debate unless we are unable to stand. It is not a choice as to whether you stand or put your hand up. If you are able to stand, you have to stand. If you do not like that, then we can change Standing Orders, but at the moment you have to do that and so I need to see people standing or indicating if they are unable to stand if you can understand that?

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Thank you, Canon Robert, for reminding us about the code of conduct. I for one will be hoping for this to be reviewed but I am wary about making this enforceable. Brothers and sisters, for that is what we are in the family of Jesus Christ, we have before us four days in the most beautiful sunshine and my son-in-law, and I am sure Archbishop Stephen too, will remind us that we are indeed in God's own County of Yorkshire. It has been so lovely to catch up with many of you already, to share a taxi and lunch and I feel very blessed to be here.

I really hope that this joyous and friendly spirit can continue as we pray together in our opening worship about our unity. Together, we have the potential to make this a life-giving, encouraging and uplifting time together. I am looking out at the most amazing group of people and I am very grateful that we are a little bit more diverse than we were the last time we met. We have each chosen to be here and we can choose now how we want our experience of York 2022 to be. We choose the culture for this Synod as culture is created by our behaviour together. Yes, we are elected to do the work of Synod which can be passionate and adversarial with necessary disagreement that different views bring, but how we live and work together is our choice.

I hope we will not need to have an enforceable code of conduct because if we are followers of Jesus and leaders in his Church, we will choose to love one another. This does not mean we will agree with each other but it does mean that we will listen, treat one another with respect and with great kindness and we will work hard to be a generous and welcoming community. I would love us to take this moment to commit to be this kind

of Synod because we choose this together, rather than because of a code of conduct. I would so love for our journeys home on Tuesday to be full of hope and joy, having done good work together but having made new friends and having had a fresh experience of the love of Christ here in York.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester): I want to thank the Business Committee for again allowing two slots for questions. In February, I made two pleas: that our questions be less confrontational and that those who answer would genuinely engage with our concerns. Thank you, it seemed the questions were gentler and the responders gave fuller, more illuminating answers, yet still we did not get through all the questions. We will not this time.

I have two further pleas. For those of us who ask questions, do we really need a supplementary? Sometimes, of course we do, but not always. Let us make sure the question we originally submit is the question we really want the answer to. Sometimes, our written question is relatively bland. It is really an excuse for a much more pointed supplementary. I have done it myself. I am sorry, I have. For the responders, sometimes the response is simply to bat away the question. I sense that with several questions this time. That positively invites supplementaries.

It would be great if the written answers always engage with the concerns in our questions. In response to supplementaries, really engaging may mean longer answers but not always. Sometimes answers can be brief: not terse, not dismissive, but brief - and others will need longer answers. It would be good if this July we could get through more of the questions. That will happen as we think twice before asking that devastating supplementary and if the responders decide carefully what needs a longer answer and what can be adequately and respectfully answered more briefly.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I am an odd beast - though maybe not in this room - in that I enjoy a good Synod paper, so it was very much like Christmas Day when 64 of them totalling over a thousand pages landed in the inbox. They are of extraordinarily high quality. It is no critique of those. I have helped write papers, I know how much time they take and we are indebted I think to those that have prepared them. As I was basking Boxing Day morning in the joy of all of these reports, a further 181 questions arrived. Nearly all of these papers and questions are important and they are complex and sometimes complexity needs all the words that it can manage, but like a sermon - at least so my parishioners keep reminding me - sometimes shorter is better. On quick calculation, if someone preached an uninterrupted sermon of our papers before us, it would last for somewhere around 83 hours.

In my seven years on Synod, it feels like the number of papers and the length of them has got longer and longer and so I wonder if we can appeal through the Business Committee to authors for maybe a little more brevity or the use of appendices or whatever

it may be and, friends, to us who may ask questions for self-restraint. If the Church grew as rapidly as the number of questions we ask of it, we would be in a very different place indeed. I ask this not because it makes our lives easier - we signed up for this - but to make Synod more accessible to the very people who maybe have not time to listen to the 83-hour sermon; arguably, to pick up Archbishop Stephen's address, the very people we need more of in this Synod.

The Chair. Following Jayne Ozanne, I am going to test your mind, Synod, for a motion of closure of this debate.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): In the parish of St John Henry Newman in Littlemore and I was not planning - forgive me for those of you who are playing Synod bingo - originally to speak in this debate but, having spent over two hours in traffic on the M1, I felt really quite called to stand and talk about the need for a code of conduct.

Whilst I hear what my dear friend, Alison, has said, for those of us who have endured years in Synod waiting for "the" debate on LGBT matters, those of us who have sat through the Shared Conversations, through the debate on the Bishops' Same-Sex Relationships paper which then became the long awaited LLF, we have had to endure years of homophobic abuse. Some of that by members here. Some are clergy and, yes, we can take a Clergy Discipline Measure if we want to, but many others have been lay members. Whilst we have debated many times about a code of conduct for the laity, we have yet to settle on any action. Instead, we constantly appeal for love and understanding and mutual respect, but I am afraid the only people who pay the price for that are those of us who are LGBT and there has never been a clear line. Goodness knows, we need clear lines at the moment in the public square about what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

Synod, I would suggest that there is behaviour that is unacceptable and needs calling out, because what hurts more than the homophobic abuse is the silence - the deafening silence - that comes from both the institution and those in power to speak out and protect those of us who are being hurt and slandered and called out. So I do hope, Chair, that you will consider an implementable code of conduct as we go into the quite difficult discussions in the year or so ahead and I would ask that you would look to table Mrs Barron's Private Member's Motion which has been on the books for nearly as long I have been on Synod, that instead of just engaging with the LLF next steps in February next year we actually have some decisions that are made, but we do so knowing that there are safeguards in place and that there is a code of conduct that we can appeal to if we feel a line has been breached.

The Chair. With a real desire to get on with the business of this Synod, I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 4 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 4 to Synod.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I invite the Chair of the Business Committee Robert Hammond to respond to the debate. Robert, you have up to five minutes if you need it.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Thank you to those who contributed. To Cathy Rhodes, yes, I will engage with the General Synod Environment Group to see how we can make making Synod more environmentally friendly a reality. We would want to put into practice what this Synod preaches. That seems absolutely the right thing to do and we are happy to have those conversations and to see what we can do there.

Alison, a code of conduct, wary of it being enforceable. Thank you for that. We will be considering the code of conduct in more detail and the approaches to it at our next meeting, so thank you for your contribution.

Andrew Cornes, as ever, thank you very much. Your last contribution in February was very well received and today's should be exceptionally well received as well. Fantastic advice, thank you. I hope everybody heard both of those points. Let us have a chat over dinner, Andrew, at some point; I would enjoy that.

Barry Hill on length of papers, I believe if you totalled up the complete number of words in this Synod's mailings it comes to 240,000 words, about a third of the Bible, which is quite a lot of words for us to digest. Authors will have heard those points and the Business Committee will talk to staff around what we can do to make some of that more accessible. As a young Synod member that was one of the things I always banged on about, "Where are the executive summaries?" That was really important to me, and I do not want to let that drop, so thank you for that. Self-restraint over questions, yes, absolutely. Again, I hope Synod members have heard.

Jayne took a different view to the code of conduct and, again, we will be considering that, as I said, at our September meeting. The Business Committee cannot decide on the content of what comes to Synod, so I cannot commit that we will have decisions of the type that you advocated, Jayne, but it is vital that we operate and we work, regardless of whether we have an enforceable code of conduct or a voluntary code of conduct, in a way that does not allow anybody to feel they are being discriminated against in any way, and that must be, as I said in the speech, one of our key guiding principles. I think those are all the points in my response, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Robert. I therefore put Item 4 to the vote that Synod do take note of this Report.

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

The Chair: Thank you very much for the debate. We now move on to the presentation of petitions.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 3.33 pm.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

The Chair: We now come to the presentation of petitions under Standing Order 43, which I am sure you are very familiar with. It says, so it must be true, “The member must, on being so invited, present a petition by stating its purport in a speech of not more than two minutes”. That allows Mr Margrave, who has given notice of a desire to present two petitions, two opportunities to speak for two minutes. He may speak about the substance of the petition but should not descend to the detail.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I present this petition which raises serious allegations and calls for an independent investigation and asks for a report back to this Synod. 2 Timothy 4.1 says that, “a time is coming when people will not endure sound teachings but accumulate teachers to suit their own likings”. Matthew also warns, “Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep’s clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves”. Petitioners highlight research indicating there is gaming of the system and fraudulent behaviour by bishops, DDOs and others. There are weaknesses and a lack of accountability in the vocations process, which is changing Church teaching by stealth, and usurping Synod decision-making.

Petitioners also raise concern conservatives face disadvantage in the vocations, ordination and recruitment process. Petitioners raise concern that ordinands do not reflect their views, or the views in the pews, when you compare the number of political activists or allies versus the number of orthodox candidates being ordained. Petitioners present evidence of entryism and they suggest pulpits are being used for a political platform. Rules, integrity, honesty and transparency matter, so we need an investigation. Whatever the outcome, we need to hear the thoughts and views of the petitioners. I commend this petition and ask for action and pray that petitioners may find truth and justice through this process.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Margrave. I should have said at the beginning that there is no opportunity for debate and that no interruptions will be permitted. Could you now hand up the petition to the Chair. Mr Margrave, your second petition, please.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I present this petition on behalf of those who are unhappy at the treatment of Calvin Robinson and have lost faith in the Church of England. Due to threats and harassment I came offline so that has impacted the circulation of this petition.

Petitioners ask for an independent investigation to look at decisions and treatment that led to Calvin leaving the Church of England and not being part of the one body we spoke of earlier, which includes allegations regarding the involvement of Calvin losing his curacy and his ordination being cancelled. It also raises concern about the disadvantage conservatives face in the vocation, ordination and recruitment process. The petitioners

ask for a report to come back to General Synod outlining any findings. I commend this petition and ask for an independent investigation to take place and a report to come back in due course so the nation can have faith in the Church of England once again.

Finally, I close by asking that we all pray for Fr Calvin Robinson and all those ordained this Petertide, and that by their fruit we will recognise their ministry, and that we will thank God for their service.

The Chair. Thank you Mr Margrave. In accordance with Standing order 43(4) the petitions will be available for inspection by members at the information desk and at the end of this group of sessions the petitions will stand referred to the Business Committee. That concludes this Item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 3.40 pm.

ITEM 5 ROUITEMAP TO NET ZERO CARBON BY 2030 (GS 2258)

The Chair. We come now to Item 5 on the agenda, which is dealing with progress to net zero carbon by 2030. For this you will need three papers: GS 2258, which is the paper itself obviously; you will also need reference to the Fourth Notice Paper, the Financial Memo, since there is obviously financial impact arising from this; and Order Paper I, which deals with the amendments. We will begin with the speech by the mover of the main amendment who is the Bishop of Norwich. I will ask him to speak to and move Item 5, and he may speak for up to 10 minutes. We will then have some debate on the main motion. Then we will move to deal with the amendments and then return to the main motion as amended (or not) according to how we voted at that stage in the process. We will work through in that kind of way. I call upon the Bishop of Norwich to speak to and move Item 5, with a 10-minute speech limit.

The Bishop of Norwich (The Rt Revd Graham Usher): Friends, in 2020, Synod voted for an amended motion to reach net zero carbon by 2030. We made a bold commitment but we had no idea how we would get there. It is my pleasure to present the Routemap that was asked for then. This Routemap is just that, a routemap. It is a positive and voluntary plan to achieve Synod's goal. It is not legislation. I am grateful to the Bishop of Selby and the Net Zero Sub-Committee for working so hard to develop it and all who responded to the consultation. I welcome, too, the Business Committee's commitment earlier to work towards Synod meetings being more net zero.

Synod, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is clear in its latest report that we are at code red for humanity. We are accelerating towards a devastating global tipping point. Every month or year that we delay our progress towards net zero will lead to suffering and death for our human neighbours and the rest of God's creation.

The 2030 target is a hugely ambitious but the process is as important as the target. This work is central to our story with God and creation; central to our story about God and creation. I see it as a key part of our obedience to God's call to be stewards of creation.

The routemap before you has been refined in consultation. It is pragmatic. It is step by step. It charts the territory into an unknown landscape with the best knowledge that we currently have. No doubt it will need to flex and adapt as the picture emerges in the coming years. Its focus first is on those simple steps that every church community can take: changing to LED lighting on a renewable energy tariff, reducing draughts, good maintenance. Each is part of how we live this out, especially for our rural churches, as does heating people rather than the angels carved on our church roof bosses. If we think of reaching net zero as a list of ten things, eight of them are fairly straightforward, and let us work together on the other two.

Finance and permissions will both be crucial. I am grateful to the Church Commissioners for pledging £190 million over the next nine years to support projects across the Church, and to build capacity and practical support for our parishes. The aggregate costs of getting to net zero carbon are not yet fully known, but we have costed examples of where churches and schools have already adapted, and the costs are coming down.

Just think, Synod, of the missional messages that this will send, of what we treasure and what we value, of what we want to repent from and seek justice for; what it is to be part of, not apart from but in communion with, the whole web of creation. Not only are these messages within and from our Church communities, but also from our schools, where, potentially, a million lives will be learning and living net zero from within their classrooms.

But when I look at Norfolk's churches, I see how they have adapted and changed down the centuries, incorporated the latest technology or architectural innovation. Now is the time for our church buildings to speak of our care for God's creation; within their very fabric, the story for salvation. Like you, I suspect, I keep hearing the prophetic voices of the young. We come up all the time with all sorts of excuses to delay their calls. Please hear just one young voice from KwaZulu-Natal, who wrote to me this week, Mandisa Gumede, who has experienced flooding in her own home due to climate change. Mandisa wrote, "The Church of England needs to make sure that carbon emissions are lowered drastically, as they directly impact us here in Africa." Let me share with you some other voices now in this film from some of the 7% of our church buildings that have already reached net zero.

(Video played)

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher): Synod, this is the crucial decade to keep the global temperatures below 2°C. I commend this Routemap to you. We need to scale up and speed up. But we are people of hope: let us take this bold step together in tackling climate change. I move Item 5. Thank you.

The Chair: The motion is now open for debate. The speech limit at this stage is five minutes.

The Revd Canon Dr Martin Gainsborough (Bristol): I tabled the amendment back in February 2020 that led the Church of England to adopt the ambitious net zero 2030 target. I am delighted at the progress that has been made since then. It just shows what we can do if we put our minds to it. I salute those who led the consultation on the Routemap to net zero. It is an excellent piece of work. I particularly want to record my admiration for our DEOs, our parishes, schools and chaplaincies, which have embraced this vision and worked so hard at it.

What I want to do today is something different, to tell the story of February 2020 and what happened immediately afterwards, because it is quite revealing, not always comfortable listening, but revealing nevertheless. What it reveals is a disconnect between how we now like to remember February 2020 and that historic vote as bold and prophetic and the more messy reality of what actually happened. And you never know, we might learn something from this.

When I tabled my amendment there was initially not very much interest in it. Barely enough people stood even for it to be debated, but momentum built. The turning point was when Simon Butler, then Prolocutor of the House of Clergy, stood up to say that he thought he was not going to support my amendment but he changed his mind. Something shifted.

Even then the vote took people by surprise. The Bishop of Manchester commented at the time that many members, not expecting the vote to be so close, were caught in the tea room. The turn-out was indeed low. In what was probably the biggest upset of the last quinquennium the amendment was passed with a majority of just 15.

While some celebrated there was also much crossness at the result. Immediately after the vote, the then Chair of the Business Committee Sue Booy told me how angry various influential people were. This crossness lingered for many months until people finally began to accept the reality of where we were.

What might we learn from this, and particularly what might we learn about the ways of God and the ways of the Church? The story I have told is hardly a ringing endorsement of a bold and prophetic church. It feels to me much more like one of those Old Testament stories where God's purposes are irrevocably being worked out, but where the key characters in the story are, at best, getting in the way and, at worst, pushing in another direction. That this is a biblical phenomenon should perhaps be of reassurance. I suspect if we look back, and perhaps even look forward, to other big historical moments in the life of the Church of England, we will see that it has always been thus.

More broadly, I think we can say this: occasionally - just occasionally - Synod might vote for something audacious and, yes, that will upset those who like to be in charge, but when something like this does happen, might we, might Synod be open to the possibility - just the possibility - that the wind of the Spirit is blowing.

What the last couple of years have shown, notwithstanding a global pandemic, is that we can catch an exciting vision like that of net zero and rise to it, including (and I am really pleased about this) making funding available to support the transition. As GS 2258 says, net zero 2030 is within reach if we work hard. Eighty per cent of what we need to do is easy; 20% is hard. As our very excellent DAC Chair always likes to tell us, it is getting easier all the time. We can do this. Let us do it. Thank you.

The Chair. Che Seabourne for a maiden speech and then Sonia Barron. I am minded then to move to deal with the amendments and we will continue the debate after that.

Revd Che Seabourne (Leeds): Synod, I am a climate hypocrite. It is true. In the words of St Paul in his letter to the church in Rome, I have the desire to do what is good but I cannot carry it out, at least not all of the time. All too often I drive to meetings when I should be taking the bus, I boil more water than I need to, I stay too long in the shower, and worst of all, as my parents would have said when I was growing up, I have left the big light on.

Synod, whatever our individual shortcomings, we have a collective responsibility to uphold the Five Marks of Mission. Not, with respect, because a governance body like the Synod has adopted them - important as that is - but because they are deeply biblical. We are indeed called to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth. Synod, I have a huge degree of respect for our National Church Institutions, the Church Commissioners and the Pension Board, we are incredibly fortunate to have such dedicated people serving the Church, but may I take this opportunity to offer what I hope to be a gentle challenge to fully divest from fossil fuels at the earliest possible opportunity and to head towards net zero investment as quickly as possible, and, likewise, can I encourage any remaining diocesan synods to do the same.

I have had a chance over the past few days to talk to some friends who are members of Christian Climate Action. You may have seen some of them outside. I hope Synod members will talk to them too. You do not have to agree with people about everything in order to engage with them. I cannot, for example, condone deliberate arrestable action, but I appreciate that others may take a different view. Please take some time to listen. It cannot hurt. Indeed, I have always found the opposite to be true.

I was talking to my friend Millie the other day and I can assure you that although she is a former Synod member she has not traipsed up to York with her young son Zeb because she cannot stay away from the rip-roaring excitement of Question Time later on. She is here because she wants her son to have a future and because she wants my son to have a future.

We will be spending a lot of time during this meeting of Synod talking about the global Anglican Communion. I was encouraged this week to read about the Anglican Church of Melanesia and the work between the Melanesian Mission and the University of Southampton. I cannot claim any great expertise, but, from what I have understood, in the Solomon Islands climate change is anything but a distant issue. There are islands that have already vanished. Robert Nicholls, Professor of Coastal Engineering at the University of Southampton, has said that with the rate of sea level rise projected to increase significantly in coming decades, many low-lying islands will face a losing battle to future extreme storm surge and wave events. Islands are disappearing. Synod, do we have the bravery and vision to save their parishes, too? I urge you to vote for the Routemap and to resist any attempts to weaken its impact. Thank you for listening.

The Chair: Next Sonia Barron and then after that I shall be calling Mr Clive Scowen to propose his amendments in order.

Revd Sonia Barron (Lincoln): I stand to speak in favour of this motion, not just because there is a theological underpinning of it, which there is, nor just because of concern for my future on this planet, but because of the responsibility I have for my brothers and sisters in countries that are much more affected by the effects of climate change already than we are in this country. For some of them, they are already at or beyond crisis point. In 2019 our diocese hosted a conference navigating climate change for planetary health, with guests from our link diocese, Polynesia.

These participants were invited to tell the stories of rising tides and severe storms. Before the conference our former Bishop, Christopher Lawson, said water can take life and give it. It is easy for us to lose touch with nature, but the reality is rising tides and tropical storms, combined with drought and falling reservoirs, leaves us with too much water and not enough water. In the UK, we are somewhat shielded from the impact of such threats, but places like Fiji and Tonga, which have endured immense changes in weather patterns, are a wake-up call for all of us.

I remember having an informal conversation with one of the young participants who told us of how, as a young boy, he would play in his uncle's big back garden. But now, as a young man in his early 20s, there is no longer any garden and the sea is not far from his uncle's home.

Another country that is suffering the effects of climate change is Uganda. I spent five years in the south west of that country as a missionary, working on the top of a hill in a little-known village called Muyebe. When I was there, the dry seasons were clearly defined. Friends who I am still in touch with tell me the effects of climate change have turned the seasons round and the country now has shorter or longer rains and harsher droughts, especially in eastern and north-eastern Uganda.

The Diocese of Lincoln has committed to becoming an Eco Diocese, and actively supports churches to sign up to A Rocha's Eco Church as a tool kit for change. Our Diocesan Advisory Committee has produced a raft of wide-ranging suggestions to help parishes make their churches and churchyards more environmentally friendly, many of which are straightforward and of minimal cost. The smallest action taken by many has a cumulative effect, so it is important that we accept this Routemap.

It is clear that taking practical action in our care of creation is no longer a fringe interest but a vital contribution that, as Christians, we must take for the future of this planet that God has given us. I support this motion.

The Chair: As I indicated, I am going to move to the amendments now. They will be taken separately. I call upon Clive Scowen first of all to move Item 57, and we will deal with that and then move on to 58 on your Order Paper after we have dealt with 57. You have five minutes for each.

ITEM 57

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Thank you, very generous. I do not think I shall need it. I am moving both amendments on behalf of the Diocese of London team because they arise from points that were made to us by our diocesan environmental officer. The first one seeks to insert the word "generally" before "endorse". This is not an attempt to water down our support for this, actually it is designed to achieve the opposite. It is designed to maximise support for a document which, on the whole, we believe thoroughly deserves to be supported. It is a lengthy, complex and technical document, and it is inevitable that different individuals may have different issues with particular parts of it, while believing that it generally deserves to be welcomed and adopted.

Now, some people, I suppose - I do not know how you would describe it - have a sort of big-picture mentality that says, oh well, I can live with the bits I do not agree with because of the bigger picture. Other people, of which I confess I am probably one, take a rather more forensic approach and find difficulty voting to endorse something unless I agree with every word of it, and there are probably other people in between. If we want to maximise support for this motion this afternoon, I suggest that inserting "generally" recognises the reality that there will be bits with which many of us do not agree, but nonetheless overall we think it is important to go forward with this document as a whole. On behalf of the diocese, and particularly the concerns raised with us by our environmental officer, I move the first amendment standing in my name.

The Chair: I call upon the Bishop of Norwich to respond.

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher): I would like to thank Mr Scowen for his thoughtful amendment, but I would like to urge Synod to resist it. We really ought to be speaking about the whole motion, the whole issue at hand, that is where we should be putting our time, now there is limited time for this debate, so we can really explore the

mind of Synod about it rather than a minor amendment. This amendment will also - despite what Mr Scowen said - be heard and seen as watering this whole thing down.

Friends, we need to be bold, we need to be prophetic, the Routemap is the response to what was asked of us in 2020, but it is full of words such as “should”, “encourage”, “request”, so there is some flex within it. Young people keep on telling me that we are forever watering down our commitment to this whole area. I think of Rachel Mander, from Young Christian Climate Network, who wrote: “We want to really encourage the Church of England to wholeheartedly adapt the Net Zero Carbon Routemap. The more we choose to delay, the greater the human cost”.

Synod, please resist this amendment, so that we can get on with the detailed discussion before us and be bold and prophetic in what we seek to do to walk more gently on this planet, this single island planet home of ours.

The Chair: As the Bishop does not support the amendment, it will lapse unless 25 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue, and a vote to be taken on the amendment. I therefore now invite members to stand in their places or, if they are unable to do so, otherwise indicate. For those on Zoom, please use the green ticks to indicate if you wish the debate on the amendment to continue. There are 25 plus members, so we will continue with the debate on the amendment now. If you wish to contribute to that part of the debate, please do stand in the usual way.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham): I want to resist Clive Scowen’s amendment and encourage you to do the same. I understand where he is coming from, there is a lot of concern that if the Church of England fails to reach net zero by 2030 the headlines will be that the Church of England has failed and therefore there is an attempt to water this down to avoid that. But actually, we will not have failed. Setting the net zero target by 2030 is a challenge, it is difficult, it is hard, but actually we should congratulate ourselves for trying to do it. If we fail to do it, we will not have failed, we will have succeeded in trying, and that is all we can do. So, I think, as Bishop Graham said, the original proposals, while the commitment has got the “shoulds” and so on, I think we should resist this and get on with trying to do what we can to ease the environmental pressures that we are creating.

The Chair: The next speaker, and then one more short three minutes, the person right at the back there.

Professor Roy Faulkner (Leicester): I would urge Synod to possibly look at this from a slightly different angle. Should we not actually be posing the question about whether GS 2258 is basically naïve, unrealistic and virtue-signalling, and it will cost the Church an

awful lot of money, which we could be spending on more vicars. I say this because there are, as Clive said, a number of areas - I am not saying all of it, because a lot of it is very good - but there are a number of areas where events are catching up with us at the moment.

For example, in Item 3.5, green tariffs are mentioned. You will not get a green tariff anywhere at the moment in the light of the change in the oil price which has changed the whole way in which the electricity generation companies sell their power to us. Probably one of the most fundamental points I want to make in relation to this whole issue - I have not got much time to do any more - is that there is this discussion at section 3.2 of climate justice and ending poverty. Now, these two terms, in my opinion, are completely paradoxical.

If we try to go for climate justice by stopping driving, stopping economic activity, which is a lot of what this proposal makes for us, then essentially we stop industrialising and carrying on with our own industry, which in turn gives taxes which will help us to provide the welfare state so that we can help those people in poverty. I would argue that by going down this very, very green route of stopping all industrial activity, we are in danger of causing more poverty than we are trying to eliminate by going down the original route of climate change. I leave it there, but I think Synod should look at the other side of the argument a lot more seriously.

The Chair: I will take one more speech on this and then we will move, I think, probably, to the next item because we are tight for time.

Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter): I support this amendment, although I would be very happy to see the paper carried and approved whether the amendment is passed or not. I believe there is a lot of really important stuff in here. But I would not want, for the reasons Clive explained, for it to stumble because some of us have issues with one point or the other, that is why I am very happy to support the amendment.

My particular concern is with the section on theological education, which says the national Church will need to make formation criteria by denominations for ministry training and should be a learning outcome of all students. Now, clearly there are things which we expect all our ordinands to believe in the creeds and particular characteristics set down by Scripture and approved through generations, but it is, I think, a great category error to say that a particular view on climate change - I am not aware that anyone is denying climate change within the Church of England but perhaps climate scepticism - should be made a selection criteria or, indeed, a reason for deselection.

These are scientific hypotheses, whether we are looking for stopping it or being more resilient to it, those are scientific issues to be resolved. Our ministers are called to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to encourage people to take their responsibility as stewards of creation, but not to be held to a particular view of what is best in this particular

situation. That is my hesitation with that whole area of the motion and therefore I would like to see this amendment generally endorsed and carried.

The Chair: After the next contribution I propose testing the mind of Synod as to whether we might proceed with dealing with this motion.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): I am standing to support Clive's amendment, and very much for a similar reason to that of the DEO of Southwark Diocese, who has also raised with us a number of issues relating to the Report, and therefore I think that "generally" applies more appropriately. I am wholly supportive of the motion and the direction of travel, and I am really encouraged by the examples that we saw in Bishop Graham's video.

But I do want to just raise a couple of points for the National Environment Team and also for those who are looking at environmental issues at a diocesan level. I think we just need to make sure that we have this programme in context, and I would also just give one or two words of caution.

The Church of England emits something in the order of 0.2 million metric tonnes of CO2 equivalent of greenhouse gas emissions, which represents about 0.04% of the UK's 450 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent GHG emissions. Let us just look at this in context.

Secondly, the majority of our larger emitters within our scope, within the Church, which are obviously churches and schools, are not actually under the direct control of DBFs and our dioceses, and therefore what we can do is encourage and cajole, but we cannot enforce. We need to bear in mind that a number of those churches and schools are currently facing financial challenges.

A third thought is that tomorrow we will be hearing more about the Triennial Funding Review, and I am sure that we will all be very encouraged by the allocation of £190 million of time-limited funding that has been set aside for the carbon net zero ambition, of which £30 million will be spent in 2023-25. However, that is not huge in the context of the Church's real estate portfolio across all of its property, so I think that we need to focus on ensuring that we are getting maximum bang for our buck in terms of where we are investing, in terms of low carbon. We need to look carefully at costs versus benefits and we need to be realistic that we will not be able to eliminate all forms of emissions within the current timeframe.

The Chair: As I indicated, I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 57 has been sufficiently debated, and I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 57.

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

The Chair: I put Item 57 to the vote.

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

ITEM 58

The Chair: I move on to Item 58 and invite Mr Scowen to propose this amendment.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): As members will know, paragraph (b) of the main motion requests every diocesan synod to debate the Routemap as it applies to their structures, parishes and BMOs. We feel that the word “structures” in this context is deeply obscure and ambiguous. Does it refer to physical structures or organisational issues? It is very unclear. So we are suggesting replacing it with the words “buildings and operations”, which makes it absolutely clear that it does mean physical structures but it also means the things that we do and the way that we do them, and so it is a very simple point that does not permit much elaboration. I think we ought to make what we say in this motion as crystal clear as we can, and I suggest that this modest amendment will help us in that.

The Chair: I call upon the Bishop of Norwich to respond.

The Bishop of Norwich (The Rt Revd Graham Usher): Thank you, Mr Scowen, but I am going to resist this amendment as well, because I think “structures” is perfectly good, and we are in danger again of spending time talking about a minor amendment rather than returning to the main issues of the debate. Structures is much broader than buildings and operations: they cover governance, they cover leadership, they cover the way in which we pray and how we are. So, I would ask Synod to resist this amendment so we can return to the main issues of the motion.

The Chair: The Bishop does not support the amendment and so it will lapse unless 25 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue and a vote to be taken on the amendment. I therefore now invite members to stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise to indicate. For those on Zoom please use the green ticks to indicate if you wish the debate on the amendment to continue. There are 25 people standing, so we continue the debate on the amendment. Is there anyone who wishes to contribute to that debate? Luke Appleton.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter): I really support Clive’s amendment. I think we need to be as specific as possible, otherwise things can be ill-defined and especially in the culture war we are in at the moment, and all the different things people talk about, it is really important to say focused on practical things and not get caught up in other things. I think “structures” is too broad, so I would really support what Clive said and I would commend it.

The Chair: After Andrew Nunn, the person there, and then we will see where we go from there.

the Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark): I want to resist this amendment for exactly the opposite reason that we have just heard, because I think the breadth of what is contained in this word will allow us to properly look at all the issues that face the Church, often which are structural, as we all know in this Synod, so I think it is the ideal word. I would encourage Synod to resist this amendment.

Revd Martin Poole (Chichester): I would like to resist the amendment because “structures” does apply to the way we organise ourselves. Our diocese has just decided not to employ someone specifically to look at the environment, I would rather that they had, and I think we should all be employing people to do this. So, our structures need to allow our councils, our committees, our various bodies that need to make decisions about this, to have people who can push forward this agenda. It is not just about buildings, it is about the way we govern ourselves and we need to govern responsibly for the climate.

The Chair: I would now like to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 58 has been sufficiently debated, and so I put the motion for closure on Item 58.

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

The Chair: We are going to vote on Item 58.

The item was put and lost on a show of hands.

The Chair: So, the amendment is not carried and we continue with the debate on the main motion and I call Steven Croft and after Steven Croft, Ruth Newton.

The Bishop of Oxford (the Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft): I welcome this Routemap. We see the consequences of environment catastrophe everywhere in the world, and that is going to accelerate in the coming years, the science tells us. This is an emergency, as was said eloquently earlier. We have only a limited time to take action as the whole of humanity.

I am very privileged to sit on the House of Lords Select Committee on the Environment and Climate Change. Most weeks, with my 12 colleagues, I listen to evidence about what is happening in the world, and what we are doing to combat the environmental disaster. The world is not, at present, on course for net zero emissions by 2050 and limiting global warming to 1.5°. That target is slipping away from us with devastating, devastating consequences.

These issues are currently moving down the global and our national agenda since COP26 because of other events in the world. The climate crisis demands a response from every household and every person. The Climate Change Committee in the United Kingdom estimates that 60% of the change required to get to net zero involves personal behaviour

change by individuals and communities, change focused in the three areas of transport, of heating, and of diet.

We should be in no doubt whatsoever that there is a strong and deep possibility of change. This can be done. Humankind can respond creatively. We know how to be just stewards of the earth and tend the environment. We know how to work together. We know how to work globally as well as locally. But the global climate emergency demands hopeful, positive leadership from every sector of society. From national and local government, from homes, from businesses, we have a huge amount still to do. Please, let this debate reflect the urgency of the situation and the action needed.

Revd Ruth Newton (Leeds): I am the acting Chair of the General Synod Environment Group and I am a member of the Environmental Working Group. In February 2020, we did something unexpected and prophetic - and maybe we did do it by the skin of our teeth but we did it. We asked for a net zero Church of England and we asked for it to happen by 2030. We decided the what, we decided the when and we decided that it could not wait. Today, as a result of extremely hard and creative work on the part of dedicated people, we now have the how.

I invite you to honour this work and congratulate those who undertook it at our request by giving it a ringing endorsement and taking it to your dioceses, parishes and places of work, acting as advocates and champions of it. I came to my environmental commitment as a result of this Synod and, in particular, from hearing representatives of the Anglican Communion describe how for them climate change is not a future threat but a present reality. I asked myself if I could consider myself to be part of the body of Christ and do nothing and I concluded that I could not, and then we concluded that we could not, and we did something. It is easy to talk and make decisions. It is less easy to live them out. We need to coalesce around this document and make it a reality.

The scale of the climate emergency facing us requires us to do things differently and Christians are called to be distinctive. Christians learn how to change in community. We learn through doing things together, each playing their part. This Routemap contains within it not only the potential to decarbonize buildings and structures but to catalyse Christians to learn from the experience and take that learning into their spheres of influence, their workplaces, their lifestyles and their friendships, being the salt and light that we are called to be. We can argue about the finer details of the proposal - and it is very detailed - but I tend to think that, given that the IPC has declared our situation code red for humanity, this is rather like rearranging the chairs on the Titanic. In the face of global heating, we cannot afford to be lukewarm.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): For most of human existence, life has been nasty, brutish and short in an environment which is fundamentally in many ways hostile to human existence. Then came the Industrial Revolution, since when our lives have improved immeasurably in both length and quality and poverty has reduced dramatically around the world. Of course, the Industrial Revolution has been driven by fossil fuels and so I hope

we can all agree that the use of fossil fuels is not in itself a sin. The question is practical consequences.

Our concern has to be only in relation to the practical consequences and so I ask whether we have actually done a cost benefit analysis of what is proposed. What is the quantifiable benefit of the Church - just the Church of England specifically - following this net zero pathway? What will be the effect on global temperatures if that is achieved? I can understand the argument is made that if we all do a little it will all add up, but the truth is that if we all do a little it will all add up to a little because this is fundamentally a technological problem. Fortunately, technology is moving on and when the technology is such that it becomes cheap and efficient to use non-carbon emitting forms of energy, then that is what everybody will do. Meanwhile, the Church is under enormous financial pressure. Many dioceses are effectively insolvent. Parishes are struggling. I would ask this Synod just to stop and consider whether this is what we should be doing until we have considered that it is actually the best use of our resources.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): To Martin Gainsborough, I confess I may have been one of those people who felt a bit cross in February 2020. But, please, do not be confused, I have never ever felt that I am in charge, I can assure you. I am here to serve and sometimes when you see more priorities being asked of you than you think you can financially accommodate, you worry. I commend the Environment Group for the brilliant work they have done in creating this Routemap because it does not just set out the how, it creates a vehicle for the transfer of ownership because this work will only ever be completed if we create a Church-wide movement. This can never be driven by General Synod alone, so well done for that.

I just ask you for patience. Never confuse the sense of emergency from the pace it will take to properly spend money. Of the £190 million that has been allocated, £30 million of which is for the next triennium, it will take time to mobilise an investment programme of this scale and an action programme. If we come back in a year's time, or two years' time indeed, and you are worried that the money is not really going out as quickly as you hoped, please be patient with those who will seek to do, Prudence, just what you want: to ensure that the funds are spent well, to achieve the goal that you ask of it and in the best possible way.

Mrs Fiona Norris (Salisbury): I just wanted to respond to the concerns about the 2030 deadline being unrealistic and the suggestion that it would be pragmatic to potentially push it back and allow time for costs to come down. The truth is that the costs are really hard to predict. New technology tends to get cheaper over time, of course, but if fossil fuel prices and other sources of inflation stay high, that might not happen. Solar panels have got hugely cheaper over the last ten years, but last year solar panel prices started to rise as part of global inflation. In particular, heat pumps, which are probably the biggest technological investment we need, are fairly new in the UK but the technology is quite mature. It has been well used in Scandinavia for many years and scope for getting

cheaper is limited. Much of the price reduction will be due to economies of scale as more get manufactured.

However, if we all wait for everyone else to move, we will never get off the starting line. A lot of the costs are labour rather than tech. For example, to put solar on a church roof, the cost of buying the panels is less than half of the cost of the installation. The biggest cost is the installers and the scaffolding and those are not likely to get cheaper if we wait longer. On the other hand, the savings to be made from decarbonizing are higher than ever before and likely to stay high for several years if gas and oil prices remain high, which is likely. Therefore, delaying action until the upfront costs are cheaper could well cost us more not less. It simply does not make sense from a financial point of view to delay.

Let us not forget, as has been said before today, that this is an emergency. It really does not get any more urgent than this. The decade up to 2030 has been called the "decisive decade" because the decisions and actions that we take now will determine whether we can limit warming to 2°. Every fraction of a degree of warming has a devastating impact and every delay a human consequence for our brothers and sisters around the world. I would urge you to vote in favour of this Routemap.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 5 has been sufficiently debated. I have to pause the meeting for a moment and to ask the people of the Christian Climate Action to remove themselves from the chamber.

Revd Robert Thompson (London): Point of order. The point of order is this: that Christian Climate Action do an absolutely wonderful job in drawing attention ---

The Chair: I have to ask you to stop.

Revd Robert Thompson (London): But the point of order is can I ask you to suspend the Standing Orders so that a member of Christian Climate Action can address the Synod?

The Chair: Please stop speaking at this point. I am going to adjourn the sitting of Synod for 10 minutes.

(Short adjournment)

The Chair: We will resume our business where we left off, which was the motion for closure. Before we do that, may I just remind you of the relevant regulations about interruptions from the public. Members of the public are admitted to sittings of the Synod under the terms of its Standing Orders. The Standing Orders require that members of the public remain silent while in the hall.

I, therefore, remind people in the gallery that they must not interrupt or disturb the proceedings of the Synod. If the interruptions continue, I will not hesitate to use my

powers to order one or more individuals to leave the public gallery. Let us continue with the business. The business was that I was in the process of putting a motion for closure on the debate and so I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 5 has been sufficiently debated and I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 5.

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

The Chair: The motion is clearly carried. Therefore, I invite the Bishop of Norwich to sum up for us. You have five minutes.

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher): Thank you to all of the Synod members who have spoken in this debate and contributed from your rich knowledge and experience. I am particularly pleased that we heard some profound stories from the wider Anglican Communion where people are already impacted in their daily lives by climate change.

Martin Gainsborough, thank you for endorsing the Routemap saying that you were delighted with the progress. You asked this Synod in your amendment in 2020 to take a much bolder stand, moving from 2045 to 2030. What that did was certainly increase this whole area to the top of our agenda at the start of this crucial decade.

Che Seaborne and Sonia Barron, thank you very much for your contributions reminding us of the Five Marks of Mission and the experience of people in Fiji, Tonga and Uganda. In the preparation Zoom calls with bishops from around the Anglican Communion preparing for the Lambeth Conference, the thing that I have been most struck by and most deeply moved by are the stories of my sister and brother bishops around the Anglican Communion who are already faced with these deep challenges of climate change. To hear their voices in this debate through Sonia's and Che's words have been really important because many island states are disappearing.

But we also have the problem of rising sea levels in our own nation. Some of our own dioceses may well shrink in the future, including my own. The Norfolk Broads are under threat. Many of our churches there, our parishes, certainly need saving from being drowned and I fear that Great Yarmouth Minster could become the municipal swimming pool. Thank you to Bishop Steven for reminding us that the target is slipping away and the personal behaviour changes that we need to make.

Ruth Newton, I know you are a fantastic advocate for this work in the Diocese of Leeds, your own parish of St John's Sharow receiving a Silver A Rocha Eco Church Award. That gives me a moment just to thank A Rocha for all that they do in partnership with us with Eco Church and Eco Diocese. We heard in the amendment debate about clergy training. I think we are preparing clergy and lay ministers to minister in a world impacted by climate change. To be able to speak theologically about that is important. Also, my hope is that the triennium funding will provide expert support in dioceses to enable us to move to net zero.

Thank you, John Spence, for all that you do as the man with the till and for all the support that you are personally giving to this piece of work. Thank you also to Fiona Norris for reminding us about the costs and savings that mean that we should not be delaying.

Prudence Dailey, you reminded us of the Industrial Revolution. At that time, parts per million carbon dioxide in the world's atmosphere stood at 280 as it had consistently for millennia, since the last Ice Age. In the Ice Age the amount of carbon in the atmosphere dipped to around 180 parts per million. As we came out of the Ice Age, it went up to around 280. We are now at 400 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere. The world has not seen that level of CO₂ in the atmosphere for probably six million years. A hundred parts per million of that increase has happened in the last ten years.

Synod, we are entering into a global experiment that we do not know what the results will be. 66% of our emissions from our churches come from the 20% largest churches. That is where our focus needs to be. I hope that this Routemap will really help the whole Church to find a way through to the future to a net zero future for us all that will speak prophetically, particularly for the world's poorest people, the people who are not able to adapt and cannot make the changes that are impacted already now and will be impacted even more in the future. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: We come now to the vote on the motion. I invite all those in favour of the main motion to please show. All those against please show.

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

The Chair: Thank you, that is clearly carried. We now move on to the next item of business on the agenda, which is Item 6, the war in Ukraine.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 5.00 pm.

ITEM 6 WAR IN UKRAINE

The Chair: Members of Synod, we now come to Item 6, the war in Ukraine. For this you will need GS 2259 and also the yellow Order Paper. You will see from that that there are three amendments and that questions start no later than 5.45 pm. Once the Bishop of Leeds has given his opening speech, I will indicate how I intend to proceed on this item. Bishop, over to you.

The Bishop of Leeds (the Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): Chair, I am grateful to the Business Committee for making time for this topical debate, which opens up a number of challenging questions, and calls the Church to prayer, listening and action. It is important for the Synod to debate this as, first, the conflict is impacting the whole world: energy

resources, economics, migrations and humanitarian catastrophes, food security and so on.

Secondly, there is an unavoidable church element to the conflict, if you look at the Moscow Patriarch's uncritical support of Putin's ideological vision and nationalist dogma. I could also speak about the impact on chaplaincies in the Diocese in Europe and our partner churches, directly impacted.

This is also about politics and politics is about people, the right ordering of society and the distribution of power, all issues that go to the heart of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures and tradition. There might be disagreement as to the specificity of particular policy recommendations, but that should not discourage us from a necessary engagement with matters of people and place that sit at the heart of any incarnational obligation. The Church exists for the sake of the world, not the other way round.

For the sake of this debate, our understanding of neighbour is both local, those affected in our own congregations by the effects of this war, such as the immigration of Ukrainian refugees, high energy bills, food shortages, for example; and global, including those fighting on the frontline in the Donbas, or seeking safety in a makeshift air-raid shelter in Kyiv, or Russians seeking respite from and truthful understanding of President Putin's authoritarian regime.

We have a responsibility to provide generous refuge to those displaced by this conflict. I hope we hear more about this remarkable work in the debate that follows. We must also engage with the causes of their displacement, both the immediate Russian aggression and the more long-term, including wider missteps in the West's relations with Russia since the end of the Cold War.

We also have a responsibility to think through how this war affects those in other parts of the world. Tens of millions of people are now at risk of famine in parts of Africa and Asia, even though they are not party to the conflict. Against this background, the decision to cut Britain's overseas development budget continues to look short-sighted. The cutting of numbers in our army raises other questions too.

Beyond the humanitarian fallout, we are all conscious that the risks of strategic miscalculation are very real, threatening not only human life on a scale unimaginable a few months ago but also the very integrity of God's creation.

This war requires us to rethink what it means to be peacemakers in an age of global disorder. The conceptual frameworks of the 70-year post-war global settlement have fallen apart in a very short time, and the world is now a different place. It requires us to use all the resources at our disposal, and that includes our relations with the Russian Orthodox Church, to try to navigate a way through this crisis.

In an age when many politicians appear to have lost their moral compass it is important that we not doubt the reason why issues like this matter and why we get involved in the way we do.

Our starting point is our obedience to God. It is very different from that of Governments and others. It leads us to take a much wider and a theologically searching moral view. Given this, it is perhaps not surprising that we sometimes find ourselves at odds with Government. To do otherwise, to take a different starting point, is to run the risk of Archbishops and bishops becoming the altar boys to this and future Governments, a charge that others have made of the Russian Orthodox Church's relations with the Russian Government.

Synod, the briefing paper that accompanies this debate attempts to help us think through the war in Ukraine in a serious and integrated way from Christian foundations. Contrary to what you may have read in the press recently, the paper produced by the newly formed Faith in Public Life Division does not articulate a fixed position. What it does do is raise from first principles questions that need to be grappled with and the consequences that need to be considered. In doing so, it recognises that it is the politician not the bishop who has to make decisions and to bear responsibility for the consequences. Loosely put, the questions mirror those that arise from the set of criteria known as the "just war" principles.

To avoid confusion or uncertainty, let me be crystal clear: Russia's invasion of Ukraine constitutes an act of evil that cannot go unchallenged. Ukraine has a legitimate right to self-defence and a right to seek assistance from others in doing so. The Government and the wider international community must stand with Ukraine and provide financial, humanitarian, military and diplomatic support as part of its broader efforts to uphold international law and the norms underpinning the international community. Yet, as the MoD suggested last week, such support cannot realistically be unlimited and this war cannot be waged without restraint.

The focus of our efforts must be on bringing this conflict to an end in a way that respects Ukraine's independent sovereign status. This objective risks being thwarted by the lack of clarity among states as to whether the aim of Western actions is the upholding of Ukraine's territorial integrity, weakening Russia, or even regime change in Moscow. Such ambiguity invites mission creep and increases the risks of strategic miscalculation.

It is these broader objectives that risk Britain becoming embroiled in a protracted and proxy war in Ukraine. It is for Ukraine to decide if, how and when the war might be ended, and on what terms. It would be morally problematic to oppose a conclusion to the war that would save Ukraine from further devastation in the hope that we might secure wider geostrategic advantage, if Ukraine so decides.

Military force has utility, but it does not follow that military force alone will be sufficient to reverse the territorial gains that Russia has secured since February 2022, or even 2014,

when Putin's money was flowing through the sewers of London. The risks of this conflict spreading beyond its current borders are real. It is therefore reassuring that the armaments that the UK has provided are of a defensive rather than offensive nature. Britain's support must remain proportionate to the ends we are seeking and those owned by Ukraine itself. We know that atrocities have been committed in this conflict, the full horrors of which will probably only be known well after this war ends.

It is incumbent on all parties in the conflict to uphold the principles of discrimination and non-combatant immunity. Where atrocities have been committed, these should be documented and those responsible held accountable, even if that is at a much, much later date. It should not be forgotten that earlier this year the International Criminal Court opened its trial against those considered responsible for war crimes committed in Darfur over two decades ago.

The principles of discrimination and non-combatant immunity, whether we like it or not, invite questions as to the efficacy of the sanctions regime assembled against Russia. It is clear that Russians have limited access to truthful media and are subject to authoritarian propaganda, which is why many politicians and commentators have been clear to distinguish between Russia and Putin's Government. We should not be so naïve as to think that sanctions as a form of political invention do not cause serious human damage and therefore do not also raise pressing ethical questions. If we conclude that they are morally justifiable, whether securing appropriate ends or not, then we must also be open-eyed about their costs and consequences.

Russia's invasion of Ukraine has descended into a brutal war of attrition, with outstanding questions over how long Ukraine's forces can continue to resist Russian advances. The geopolitical and security implications of the conflict for Europe have already been profound, from German militarisation, to accelerated NATO expansion, and these will continue. Global ramifications will only become known over the long term.

In conclusion, Synod, in a world which looks more dangerous and unstable, we need to look again at what it means to work for the reconciliation of humanity to God. We do so with prayer and humility. I suspect that this will not be the last time we reflect on this conflict and the issues arising from it. I look forward to the debate.

The Chair: Thank you. We have had 12 requests to speak. I am afraid I will not be able to call on everyone who would like to speak in this debate. To hear as many people as we can, I will be imposing a three-minute speech limit from the outset. I propose to hear a few speeches before we head to the amendments. We will deal with the amendments and come back to the main motion, possibly as amended. Please can I start with Jane Evans followed by Stephen Maxfield.

Canon Jane Evans (Leeds): Many years ago, a very long time ago now, I studied Russian language and literature at university. Then for the last 15 years of my working life, much more recently, I worked for World Vision, one of the large humanitarian aid agencies, and

a member of the DEC. Both of these experiences give me a frame of reference which acknowledges that the current situation between Russia and Ukraine is complex, delicate, and not as black and white as we might like to think, or are led to believe it is. Think Northern Ireland rather than Adolf Hitler.

Professor Paul Rogers, emeritus Professor of Peace Studies at Bradford University, speaking at the Bradford Literature Festival last weekend said that this is, classically, a war that neither side can win and neither side can lose. He went on, "This war has to end, at some stage, by negotiation". That is a very hard thing to swallow, he said, but it has to happen.

At its March Synod the Diocese of Leeds debated an emergency motion on Ukraine. We started by wanting to call for the overthrow of the Putin regime, but acknowledged that this might not be the best approach, for a number of reasons. So, after a robust discussion about the language, we passed a more moderate resolution condemning Russia's actions and calling on Governments to work for peace and justice for all. We need to be aware of taking a stance and using language that makes us feel better, but is not the right solution either for ultimate resolution of the war or for the humanitarian needs of the people.

At the moment it is hard to see how this war will end. It is going to need a negotiated settlement like Northern Ireland. If Putin is to be diverted from applying extreme solutions, Ukraine and the West must not back him into a corner, but offer solutions that allow him to see a future where peace is possible, but without rewarding him for his aggression. We may feel good about imposing sanctions on Russia. We may be horrified at the idea of sacrificing any portion of Ukrainian territory, but who knows what may turn out to be the only solution for the rest of Ukraine, for Europe and for the rest of the world. Let us hope and pray that a different solution may be found. I support the motion.

Fr Stephen Maxfield (Ecumenical Representatives): If you can refer to Appendix 1, the central question is whether the Church and people of Ukraine are, or are not, part of the Church and the people of Russia. I want to add one or two things that have not been mentioned here. The first is that Ukrainians speak a different language to Russians. There are three different vowel letters. There is also an extra consonant letter, and in the past, when Russians and Ukrainians have been speaking to each other, they have needed interpreters.

I would also point out that Ukraine was one of the signatories of the UN Charter in 1946, as was Russia. If international law and rules are not to be trampled over again and again, this charter needs to make sense, and people need to live by it. Even if the things that the Russians are saying about the Ukrainians, that they are Nazis and so on, and there are Nazis in Britain too, nothing - absolutely nothing - justifies in any way this war.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I first want to say thank you to Bishop Nick for a superb and magisterial opening speech, with which I

agree entirely, and, therefore, I shall cut back significantly on what I was going to say, which is rare.

Peace-making we need to remember is one of the Beatitudes. Peace-making is of the character of God, which is why peacemakers are called God's children. They are a chip off the old block. Peace-making requires humility and sacrifice. We see this in Jesus setting his face towards Jerusalem. It needs confrontation, as he showed with those opposing him. It is the pattern for all humanity. At times peace-making is as hard as a diamond. At others it is the glory of the crucified God, the conquest of evil through self-emptying.

Yesterday, we saw both, as we had the privilege at Lambeth Palace of a visit from Patriarch Epiphany of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which was given Autocephaly through a Tomos of the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew in 2019. It had been under the oversight of the Russian Orthodox Church since 1684. In addition to a previous online call I had with Patriarch Kirill, the Metropolitan Hilarion, in February, we are seeking opportunities to meet further with the Russian Orthodox Church, but that has not been possible to date.

Yesterday, over the course of three and a half hours of prayer and discussion, we heard the most heart-breaking stories of atrocities against civilians and against Orthodox clergy in occupied territory. Yet amidst it all, the Patriarch spoke of love for all, especially enemies. Of course, like all Ukrainians, he feels passionately about the terrors and horrors visited on his country, the lies told and the remorseless fear and attack, but the passion is not showing itself in hatred, nor is it showing itself in weakness, but in faith and determination, and a plea for support for the Church in its humanitarian work, and for Ukraine.

Let us give that support as a Church as best we can. Let us also be determined in seeking peace. We are asking the Government to return the funding of the unit in the Foreign Office which has been so seriously cut back and was set up at Church urging three years ago to specialise in mediation and peacebuilding. Let us also pray for and support our armed forces. Nick mentioned they were being cut back. And particularly pray for the chaplains. The Armed Forces Synod is represented here. Thank you.

Fr Stephen Platt (Ecumenical Representatives): I am very grateful to the Bishop of Leeds and the authors of GS 2259 for an extremely sensitive and nuanced and detailed appraisal of the situation following the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February. This is a war which we find to be atrocious, unjustifiable, and please remember that what you will hear in the news coming from Orthodox in Russia does not represent the whole picture. As has been pointed out already, clearly in a number of places the picture is far more complex. It is not for me to comment on the politics of the situation, but one might simply recall the words of Pope Francis in an interview recently when he said, "We do not see the whole drama behind the war, which was perhaps somehow either provoked or not prevented".

What we do see as Orthodox is the need for peace-making. Those of you who know the Orthodox will know that we are, first and foremost, eucharistic and liturgical creatures. The Orthodox liturgy, after an opening invocation to bless the Kingdom of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (that is a Kingdom which is not of this world) goes on to pray for peace; for the peace of the whole world, the stability of the Holy Churches of God and for the union of all. In fact, in many churches on the Sunday eucharist we would go on to pray in the words of Psalm 146, "Put not your trust in princes, or in any child of man, in whom there can be no salvation".

We are extremely grateful for the channels that remain open for dialogue, for discussion, for listening and for help. I would ask you not to close these channels. It is not the first time in history that there have been tensions or a shutdown in relations between countries of the world. In the 19th century, the Russian priest in London Fr James de Smirnoff, at the time of the Napoleonic War, remained as the only voice and channel of communication and worked for peace between Britain and Russia. The Church, in being first and foremost an agency for peace and for listening, has a great role to play, and we thank you for what you are doing.

The Chair. Mr Scowen, please may I invite you to speak to both your amendments, amendment 59 and amendment 61 - you have no more than four minutes - and then to move Item 59, please?

ITEM 59

Mr Clive Scowen (London): The author of Psalm 85 in his vision of God's salvation says that righteousness and peace kiss each other. In God's purposes, righteousness and peace/peace and justice go together. They are two sides of the same coin. Yet the world has not generally understood this, so history repeats itself. It has to, because we do not listen.

In 1919, an unjust peace imposed by the victors after the Great War led directly to the rise of Nazism. In 1938, Neville Chamberlain agreed to Hitler's annexation of a chunk of Czechoslovakia and called it "peace with honour". It was of course nothing of the sort. It was an unjust peace, which merely encouraged the aggressor and, as a result, lasted barely a year.

Peace without justice is no peace at all, and it does not last. A negotiated peace maybe can lead to a good outcome, but a negotiated peace which gave away chunks of Ukraine to Russia would not be just. It would encourage further aggression by Russia, and possibly by China and others as well, and it almost certainly would not last. Ultimately, it is for the Ukrainian nation to decide on what basis it may be willing to end the conflict, but our country must not pressurise them into settling the conflict by accepting an enduring injustice.

The resolution that we pass today should be clear. The peace for which we pray, and for which we ask our Government to work, is peace founded on justice. That is why I ask Synod to add the word “justly” in paragraph (b) so that we are praying for the war in Ukraine to be ended justly, and to replace the word “negotiated” with “just” in paragraph (d), so that we call on the Government to work to secure a just peace that provides for the flourishing of relations in Ukraine and so on.

Chair, I move Item 59, the amendment of paragraph (b), and in due course will do the same for Item 61, when invited to do so.

The Chair. There will be an opportunity for more speeches on the main debate later. At the moment we are just debating Item 59. If you wish to speak, please stand. I have to call the Bishop of Leeds. Do you support this, please?

The Bishop of Leeds (the Rt Revd Nick Baines): It is hard to argue against justice but as a linguist I would want to press you on this, Clive, and say what equals a just solution, particularly given the realities of the situation there, and who decides? But I am not going to resist the amendment, because you cannot argue against justice.

May I tackle the second one as he raised it now, to save me doing it later? The emphasis on negotiation is not that negotiation might lead to some poor compromise. The emphasis is on the fact that negotiation has to happen. Even if one side thrashes the other into non-existence, you still have to have negotiated diplomacy afterwards to establish what the peace will look like, or whatever that arrangement is, given the reality that for the next 100 years the seeds of subsequent violence are already going to be there. You have to negotiate. That is what the emphasis of that was. But I am not going to resist either of them.

The Chair. Item 59 is open for debate.

Revd Shaun Morris (Lichfield): Five weeks ago, our personal lives changed forever. A mum and two teenaged children came to live us with having fled Kharkiv and shelling. Dad remains behind. Their story is one of devastation, burnt out tanks and dead bodies at the end of their road. War is the most terrible thing our new friend tells me repeatedly. Of course I knew that, but I now realise that I did not really.

Clive, thank you for that amendment. I think you are absolutely right: a just settlement, peace-making - that word again - yes, that is rightly our starting point because peace-making is the heart of the Gospel, God reconciling us to himself through the Cross. But here is the point. In God's economy, there can be no reconciliation without forgiveness and no forgiveness without repentance just as personally there can be no lasting peace without repentance. It is difficult to see how repentance will not involve Russia leaving the Donbas and the Crimea and other territories they have occupied, substantial reparations and prosecutions.

In decades to come, maybe Ukraine may find it in her heart to forgive and there may be real peace, but not if she is bullied into submission by military might, not if she is guilt-tripped by surrounding nations affected by world food and oil crises, and not if she is forced into a negotiated settlement that does not have some tangible expression of Russian repentance. A just settlement is the right wording.

The Bishop of Coventry (the Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Much has been said about the nuclear dimension to this conflict even if on the face of it nuclear deterrence seems to have played out exactly as expected, certainly to Putin's advantage, somewhat to NATO's advantage and to Ukraine's catastrophic disadvantage. "If only Ukraine had kept its nuclear weapons", many say. Others say nuclear weapons have saved the world from World War III. Under the logic, though, of "more nuclear weapons will make us safer", the conclusion many have drawn, we assume that their acquisition by any state is a straightforward affair and that other countries can simply buy for themselves a slice of the supposed ultimate security which some states have enjoyed for decades.

We speak of nuclear weapons as a kind of oven-ready deterrent. In thinking about security in this way, we conflate the possession of nuclear weapons per se with the determined and responsible efforts by states until recently to bring about strategic stability to reduce risks, engage in dialogue, commit to arms control and disarmament and resolutely uphold the principle of non-proliferation. A world that fails to appreciate the precariousness of our security and which gives up on the principle of non-proliferation will not be safer for anyone. Nuclear weapons are unique in the existential risk they pose. Some states may go to unprecedented lengths simply to counter the possibility of another state acquiring them. Add to that the inherent risk and instability of nuclear deterrence itself.

Because of this war, therefore, Christians need to help reinvigorate the commitment to disarmament and non-proliferation, which is not a fringe pacifist concern but is enshrined in the Non-Proliferation Treaty to which 191 states are party, including all nuclear arms states. Where there is a danger of sleepwalking into a volatile new world, which there is, we have a duty to draw attention to reality and to wake people up. Professor Neil Ferguson said last week that if we are, indeed, facing Cold War II, he would much rather skip the Cuban Missile Crisis and go straight to detente. Because God has not constrained us to a history bound to repeat itself, Ferguson's hope can be our urgent mission, holding ourselves to account on our commitment to non-nuclear proliferation in the face of this war, which again relies on the commitment to nuclear elimination, is a good place to start.

The Chair: I now would like to test the mind of Synod on ending this item.

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

The Chair: I therefore put Item 59 to the vote.

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

ITEM 60

The Chair: That moves us on to Item 60. I call on Jack Shepherd to move his amendment. He has up to three minutes.

Revd Jack Shepherd (Liverpool): I want to express clear support for the original motion but I feel it does not go far enough and so, if this amendment was not accepted, I would be voting in support with reservations about this original motion. My problem is that I think it will be possible to interpret three falsehoods into this original motion. The first is that someone else will do it. It will be possible to pass the buck on to other Churches or centralised structures that are perceived as having more time and money.

My belief in the integrity and the beauty of the parish system shows me that it is possible for each parish to be involved as well as dioceses in this way. Providing support for refugees, including those from Ukraine, is something that every parish can do. People in any part of the UK can host people from Ukraine. People from any parish can take part in Community Sponsorship, a refugee resettlement programme that allows communities to welcome refugees to their neighbourhoods. Also, any parish should be ready if new accommodation is decided to be used in their local area, such as in hotels.

The second falsehood is that refuge could be understood in the narrow sense of the physical accommodation or shelter, which is insufficient. The word used for hospitality in Hebrews 13.2 is "philoxenia": love, warmth or friendliness towards strangers. By this, some of us have entertained angels unawares. I think this highlights that the blessing is too directional. We are able to receive the blessing as we become a more diverse Church. Thirdly is the recognition that not all refugees are fleeing conflict. This is not a desire to weaken the focus of the motion, but to recognise that refugees are fleeing all kinds of situations such as persecution and violation of human rights and we must not let these experiences and voices be forgotten.

I am not wanting to dilute or reduce the focus on Ukraine. It is an issue that weighs heavily on my heart having visited Ukraine many years ago and served children in a town called Cherkasy in a place called Komsomolsk. However, I think we must not lose the focus, particularly as this original motion widens it, to refugees who are not just fleeing Ukraine but other conflicts - I would say other forms of danger as well. I would ask for this motion to be accepted. I ask for Item 60 to be moved.

The Chair: Bishop, do you support this amendment?

The Bishop of Leeds (the Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): Again, you cannot argue against hospitality any more than you can argue against justice and so I am not going to resist that. I would just want to say though, that I know that the Church has been overwhelmed by parishes and dioceses, if they do not comprise parishes, what do they comprise? I

think these are really slightly unnecessary, but I will not resist them. I would simply leave a question: if we are to be so generous, particularly in relation to hospitality, why were we not with the Afghans?

The Chair: Item 60 is open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Revd Canon Dr Martin Gainsborough (Bristol): We are naturally talking about language and the importance of language with reference to these amendments and I would like to make some points of a similar nature. The paper GS 2259 talks about the bifurcation of the world into two hostile, competing camps: of the western led rules-based order governed by democratic norms on the one hand, and an authoritarian antidemocratic camp crystallized in the Russian-China alliance on the other.

My previous life as a Professor of Politics leads me to say, take care. What is this rules-based order governed by democratic norms of which the paper speaks? And what complexity lies behind the rather too easy use of the term "authoritarian"? It is not difficult to see ways in which our commitment, including this country, to a rules-based order is looking a little threadbare. Think of some of the fallout from the UK's departure from the European Union. Equally, we know that political liberalism on which our politics is based is in some serious difficulty with concerns raised in perfectly respectable quarters that we are witnessing a slide into autocracy and significant displays of illiberalism.

Then, what about the use of the term "authoritarian"? I spent some 20 years living and working in the one-party communist state that is Vietnam. What my research taught me is that there is a lot more going on beneath the surface of the label "authoritarian", more points of view, more scope for civil society and more political pluralism, even if certain things will land you in trouble with the state or the security forces. Why does this matter? Why does being careful with our language matter? If the Church wishes to play its part in building long-term peace and security, it is important that our language encourages us away from seeing the world as two hostile, competing camps.

We know deep down that considerable complexity lies beneath the construct of a rules-based liberal democracy or the label of an authoritarian state. At best, they are shorthands which conceal as much as they reveal. Paying attention to this complexity as the Church, even if politicians may not, is important so we find points of connection and common ground between peoples on which peace and security in Europe would be based.

The Chair: Members of Synod, because of the earlier disruption curtailing this debate and also timed business of Questions next, I will need to adjourn this debate which means that the Business Committee will find time to finish it later in the agenda. We now move to Item 7.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Dr Rose Hudson-Wilkin)* took the Chair at 5.48 pm.

ITEM 7 QUESTIONS

The Chair. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. We come now to Item 7, Questions. Members, you have been sent the full Questions Notice Paper by email and it may be helpful to refer to it during this item. It includes notes for members on supplementary questions, indicating that the supplementary questions be strictly relevant to the original question or the answer given to that question. Your questions should be about facts and not be asking for an expression of opinion or be accusatory. Members, you have already heard that we have had the highest number of questions, over 180. I ask you to work with me as we try to get through as many as possible. Therefore, please, no speeches. Just concise questions and answers, please.

You are aware we have people in the Zoom room and so I will be looking for supplementary questions from both those on Zoom as well as here in the hall. This may well mean the pace of question time is slower to ensure a wide range of members can be invited to ask supplementary questions. If you are in the hall, please approach one of the podiums as soon as called. For those on Zoom, indicate that you would like to ask a supplementary question by raising your hand and the staff will unmute you. Questions 1 to 84 are to the House of Bishops.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

1. *Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In recent years matters that are handled at diocesan level, and accountable there, have had a considerable impact on the national Church, not least on its reputation. The media and general public understandably do not differentiate dioceses from the national Church. How do the House of Bishops go about bringing accountability to the constituent dioceses on such issues as well as to the whole of the national Church?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as *Chair of the House of Bishops*: Until the 21st century there had been very little sense of mutual accountability between Dioceses. That sense of autonomy increased the further back in history one went, at least until the Norman Conquest. Diocesan Bishops were Barons, with independent feudal obligations to the monarch.

In recent years that has begun to change. Members of the House of Bishops are conscious of their responsibility, as shepherds and pastors, for mutual accountability in their leadership of the Church. Many of the discussions in the House bear on this mutual accountability, relating to many aspects of national and diocesan church life.

Canon Peter Adams: Thank you, Archbishop, for your encouraging answer. This week has shown us the importance of honesty, accountability and integrity in leadership in our nation. Will he ask the House to consider how the accountability you speak of can, on diocesan issues, be brought to bear upon our national life and, thus, our reputation as the Church, how mutual accountability and, thus, shared responsibility can be further extended to General Synod which shares with the bishops the governance of our Church?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Yes.

Canon Peter Adams: Thank you.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): In relation to the question that has been asked, if we are episcopally led and synodically governed, what role does Synod play in resolving the issues raised in the question and has the House of Bishops considered the role of Synod?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: That is two questions, Sam, but I am sure the Chair will allow me to answer both of them. First of all, we are not episcopally led and synodically governed. This is a myth and it always has been a myth. That is completely what we are not. To quote Lord Chartres, we are led by bishops in Synod, and that is a very, very different thing indeed. I dispute the terms of the question, but I will still try and answer it if I can remember what it was now. The trouble is you get brain fog and I have just had pneumonia and I am very foggy. It was a very good question. Could someone just remind me what it was.

The Chair: Would you repeat it very briefly.

Mr Sam Margrave: Archbishop, I get brain fog too and so I understand.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you.

Mr Sam Margrave: It is just to ask if the House of Bishops has considered the role of Synod within this national accountability issue that was raised?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Ah, thank you. Yes frequently, almost interminably, we have considered the role of Synod and, in terms of accountability, may I recommend the fringe meeting - where has Robert, the head of the Business Committee, disappeared? Nod at me because I am sure you are not allowed to say anything, but Monday evening, the fringe meeting?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Yes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I commend the fringe meeting to you on Monday evening of the Business Committee, at which, among others, I will be putting forward some ideas about significantly improving accountability. It is a very good question and thank you.

2. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What consideration has the House of Bishops given to the ways in which the desire to be “simpler, humbler and bolder” might be expressed in norms of episcopal dress?

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: No consideration has been given by the House of Bishops on this matter.

Miss Debbie Buggs: Archbishop, thank you for your response. Given that different forms of dress are understood to have no particular theological significance and given that most of what is currently worn is historically un-Anglican, is there a theological reason not to immediately adopt a less ostentatious style?

The Archbishop of York: Thank you for the question. I happen to be one of those people for whom one of the main motivations for getting ordained - and not what you think - was actually never ever having to think again about what to put on in the morning. It is a great advantage. Actually, I think some of the things that we wear - and one person's ostentation is somebody else's - speak of the living tradition of which we are a part. I thought some visual aids may help. I want to say to you, what could be more simple and more profound than the Cross of Christ? What could be more humble than a simple shepherd's staff? And what could be bolder than ... As I say to children when I go to the school, a bishop wears on her or his head the fire of the spirit. There may be more.

3. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Please can you tell us how many cases have been referred to the Independent Safeguarding Board for their review and the dates of those referrals?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: One case has been referred. The date of referral was 08 April 2022.

4. *Mr Clive Billenness (Europe)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Paper GS 2263 (Update on Safeguarding) states at Paragraph 18 that the Independent Safeguarding Board can “scrutinise or review how the Church has handled a particular case...if it decides to after a case has been referred to it“. Have criteria and procedures been published about such referrals of cases - e.g., who may refer a case, in what circumstances, and on what basis will the ISB decide what cases to scrutinise?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Review activity by the Independent Safeguarding Board will vary in different cases. Referrals to the ISB could come from a range of possible sources, including individuals; parish or diocesan safeguarding bodies; the NST; clergy, or the NCIs. Its remit is to bring forward lessons and to recommend and promote best practice. Decisions are reached on a case-by-case basis after consideration as to

whether the ISB's remit covers what is requested. The ISB will decide on whether the Board should undertake a review, and if so, what its nature should be.

This approach is comparable to that seen in case review sub-committees of safeguarding partnerships or boards in wider society, where a range of actions may or may not follow their deliberations.

Mr Clive Billenness: Chair, I just start, having heard your introductory remarks, by ensuring you this is a question and not a speech. Bishop, thank you for your answer which clearly shows some evolution of the role of the Independent Safeguarding Board from February 2022, when in our paper GS 2244 it was declared that the ISB is not a re-investigation body and it does not have powers to sanction, direct, regulate or insist, to the answer now that it can perform review activity to bring forward lessons and this is not unwelcome. I am mindful of Canon Simon Butler's words in February when he said on the adjournment debate that when we have debates in General Synod ---

The Chair: Can we have the question, please?

Mr Clive Billenness: I am sorry, yes, I will. The question I have is that, normally, we expect to have papers that are properly prepared and proposed. My question is, therefore, when the paper GS 2263 is considered tomorrow afternoon, will you please be prepared to provide Synod with full information about the extent of this not unwelcome evolution of the Independent Safeguarding Board, including when the extension of its role will be brought to Synod for approval?

The Bishop of Rochester: Thank you very much, Clive, for your question. The name Independent Safeguarding Board means what it says and it is the ISB who set their own terms of reference. What we will have tomorrow afternoon from Maggie Atkinson and her colleagues is a presentation on and update on the work of the ISB. You have got the paper in front of you. There will be an opportunity for questions as well. I hope I am not stealing too much of Maggie's thunder because you will also hear from her tomorrow that the independent website of the ISB will be launched next week on which a great deal of this information will be available. But the whole point is it is a work in progress and the responsibility rests with the ISB and not with us for setting its terms of reference, for instance.

5. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When interviewed by the BBC Sunday programme about the refusal of victim Matt Ineson to co-operate with the review into his own case, Public Inquiry Specialist and regulatory expert Kate Blackwell QC identified the necessary features of best practice for such a review as follows:

1. It must be search for the truth to shed light on what has gone wrong;
2. Scrutiny of complex issues should be done through a panel of independent experts each bringing levels of excellence from various perspectives;

3. It goes without saying that the panel must have complete independence from any party; and

4. It must engender complete faith in the survivors.

She publicly opined that the Devamanikkam Review did not meet those standards and the victim has refused to participate.

Did the Archbishops' Council specifically consider each of these principles before determining that the Independent Safeguarding Board was the optimal forum in which to address the various complaints of Dr Martyn Percy that for four years, he has been the victim of institutional bullying within the Christ Church Foundation in which several Oxford clergy and Diocesan advisors are alleged to have participated?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The ISB exists to provide independent scrutiny and oversight of the Church's safeguarding activity, to hold the Church to account for our actions as part of the ISB's remit to learn lessons from safeguarding matters. Given its remit the ISB's view was that there were likely to be lessons to be learned, the Archbishops' Council and the Diocese of Oxford referred to the ISB the Church's safeguarding activities in the last two years with respect to Dr Martyn Percy and Christ Church Oxford. They considered that it would be within the ISB's remit and the expertise of its members. They did not specifically consider the contents of the interview by Dr Blackwell. This is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all the issues around Christ Church. That would go well beyond the remit of the ISB. It is not, nor intended to be, a public inquiry.

Mr Martin Sewell: Just following on from that, in February we are a scoping ISB. In April, we suddenly seem to be a fully functional, able to create and implement a review ISB. What I think has been missed out in between is the ---

The Chair: Can we have the question, please?

Mr Martin Sewell: Well, here is the question. What happened to the intermediary stage where this body scrutinised what was happening? What is the mechanism by which we can properly, respectfully and effectively call the ISB to account for process inadequacy that is becoming increasingly apparent?

The Bishop of Rochester: Tomorrow, as I have said, Martin, the ISB will be giving a presentation and there will be an opportunity for questions. The alternative, of course, to the ISB being able to continue with its work, (a) reflecting its independence and (b) so that it can move forward, is precisely that it has carried on evolving and doing its work and defining that the terms of its work, is that we have to wait until we have had the chance for someone at Synod to ask the question. There is an opportunity for questions, it is an evolving work and it is independent.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): The Independent Safeguarding Board is presumably independent of all vested interests, including the interests of this Synod if we are going to have a fully independent safeguarding system. Could you confirm that is the case?

The Bishop of Rochester: Absolutely. On the other hand, Simon, it is perfectly reasonable that members of Synod should have the opportunity to ask questions of the ISB and the ISB, I know, will take those into account in making its independent decisions. Chair, I was not quite sure if that was another supplementary on 4 or 5, but there we are, thank you.

6. *Revd Nicki Pennington (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What empirical research has been undertaken in relation to concerns about the adequate resourcing of the revised safeguarding measures ensuring parity of effective implementation between different dioceses and between different parishes?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: All new safeguarding guidance is extensively consulted on before approval. It is based on recognised and evidence-based standards of good safeguarding practice, including those used in other voluntary sector organisations. It is important that such standards are the basis for the Church's safeguarding guidance so that it does not set itself lower expectations than others. It is recognised that different dioceses have different priorities and allocate different amounts to safeguarding. This will result in geographical variation in, for example, the support provided for the victims and survivors of Church abuse. As part of the implementation of Recommendations 1 and 8 of the 2020 IICSA Report on Child Sexual Abuse in the Church, a work stream will be initiated to develop a consistent methodology for dioceses to use to calculate the resources need to provide a good standard of safeguarding arrangements. This will help dioceses with their longer-term financial planning.

7. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How does the NST differentiate between the investigation of alleged perpetrators of abuse and those seen to have made safeguarding process errors, and are there any plans to change this?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The current policy for responding to safeguarding allegations does not differentiate between different types of allegations, or different types of Church officer. This policy is in the process of being revised and will take into account these differences. It is hoped that the new draft policy will be consulted on later this year with a view to approval of a final version in 2023. However in practice, any safeguarding core group would make the distinction, particularly when considering the management of any ongoing risk.

Mr Nigel Bacon: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Bishop, for the welcome content of your answer. Pending the proposed policy changes, has any specific guidance been provided that will encourage and guide those involved in handling allegations and managing ongoing risk so that due differentiation is made in the future between the different types of allegations and, if not, could such guidance be issued, please?

The Bishop of Rochester: I regret very much the delay in publishing the new guidance. That has been, sadly, due to the long-term absence of a member of staff. I can assure you that that is very central to the new guidance. Of course, there has been a process of consultation and discussion with others and every time we have had the opportunity to speak about this, whether individually or privately or publicly, we have affirmed the importance of making that distinction.

8. *Mrs Jane Rosam (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can you please provide an up-to-date status report on all outstanding inquiries and reviews setting out:

- a) the date when they were commissioned;
- b) when they were due to report initially;
- c) when are they currently expected to deliver their reports?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There are two ongoing independent learning lesson reviews commissioned by the NST:

The Makin Review into John Smyth –

- a) The review was formally announced in August 2019.
- b) At the time of announcement of the review no precise publication was stated.
- c) Autumn 2022, however this is dependent on what is expected to be a highly complex representations process.

The Humphrey Review into Trevor Devamanikkam –

- a) Jane Humphrey's appointment was announced in November 2019. However, the review was formally announced in August 2019, objections were received to the original reviewer and the process was therefore delayed.
- b) The original intention was to complete and publish during 2020 however the process was seriously hampered by the Covid pandemic and due to concerns raised by a key person in the review, the ISB reviewed the process and recommended that the review proceed.
- c) The intention is to publish before the end of this year.

9. *Mrs Jane Rosam (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: For the benefit of new members of General Synod can you please briefly identify and explain the various kinds of review and inquiry that Archbishops' Council can commission, and the differences between them e.g., in terms of scope, potential outcomes et cetera, to explain why one is chosen rather than the other?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: In relation to safeguarding reviews, Section 9.2 of 'Responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers' outlines the types of Learning Lesson Reviews (LLR). The terms of reference for each individual review will outline the scope of the review. The purpose of a LLR is to identify learning to improve safeguarding practice, not to apportion blame. Any individual failings will be addressed by the relevant HR process. The ISB also provides independent scrutiny and oversight of the Church's safeguarding activity and has a review function.

Mrs Jane Rosam: Thank you, Bishop, for your answer in which you tell us that any individual failings will be addressed by the relevant HR process. Could you, please, tell us what HR process exists to address the issue of a failing or negligent bishop?

The Bishop of Rochester: The importance of accountability of bishops is a subject that this Synod has touched on in many different ways at different times and I recognise that. In particular, Jane, I am looking forward very much to working with you in the Diocese of Rochester and to being held accountable for my role as Bishop of Rochester in the Synod thereof. You will be well aware, of course, that bishops are not employees. We are officeholders. The processes for holding bishops to account, at the moment those are in terms of the development of the Clergy Discipline Measure primarily rather than HR processes. That Measure itself, of course, is under review at the moment. I am quite convinced of the importance of us working through together and what it means to be mutually accountable for our ministry, whether as lay people, as clergy or as bishops.

10. *Mr Peter Barrett (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When will the safeguarding reviews into John Smyth and Trevor Devamanikkam be published and what have been the reasons for the delay?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Both independent reviewers intend to complete their work by the autumn. There have been delays, which are reflected in updates on the website, and COVID restrictions have played their part. However, in the Smyth review the delay has primarily been due to the vast volume of information. The TD review has been delayed significantly due to a key person in the review raising concerns. This was referred to the Independent Safeguarding Board, ISB, which reviewed the process and recommended that the review should continue.

Mr Peter Barrett: Given the Makin Review was due to finish in May 2020 and is now 24 months late, can you tell me when in the autumn something will be published and what that will look like and, given the delays, what credibility do you lend to that date?

The Bishop of Rochester: We all deeply regret the delay in this. It has been made clear in our answers that this is very largely due - apart from, of course, the knock-on effects of

the pandemic - to the huge amount of information that has come forward and been presented to the review. In order to move things forward, I can tell you that the staff team of the review has been increased to four and there is someone who is specifically designated to take on the work in order to expedite things. It is independent. We are in the hands of the reviewer. We are putting in as much resource as we can and as they ask for to bring that forward. It is hoped that we will have an initial sight of the review early in the autumn. I am thinking September. But there will then be a process of what is called Maxwellisation of representation whereby people are given the chance to respond. How long that process takes is in the hands of the reviewer, but we are putting in extra resources to make sure that this happens as soon as possible. We deeply regret the delays. We recognise the impact of that in particular on victims and survivors but, of course, it is vitally important that this is done as thoroughly as possible.

The Chair. Before I call the next question, can I just remind us to exercise self-discipline and stick to one supplementary question, please.

11. *Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can you please identify the last six safeguarding reviews/inquiries commissioned by the Archbishops' Council and in each case tell us what have been the periods between the commencement and the conclusion of the process known as "Maxwellisation"?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The last six learning lesson reviews relate to: William Scott Farrell, Graham Gregory, Bishop Whitsey, Bishop George Bell, Bishop Peter Ball and the Elliott Review. In all of the reviews except Farrell the representation or Maxwellisation process was conducted by the independent reviewers and the reports were presented when this was completed. In the Farrell Review the representation process was conducted by the NST and took approximately four weeks.

12. *Mr Paul Waddell (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: A retrospective change to the Terms of Reference for the Interim Support Scheme means that from November 2021 the support provided to survivors of church abuse ends after six, or in exceptional cases, twelve months. For many survivors this period of support will end long before the promised redress scheme is in place. What arrangements are in place to ensure the welfare of distressed survivors who are dependent on the Interim Support Scheme, but whose eligibility will expire before they receive the redress we owe them?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Interim Support Scheme (ISS) began as a pilot in 2020 in response to urgent survivor needs. In September 2021, the Archbishops' Council approved the Terms of Reference that specified the criteria and scope of support. As this was a pilot scheme, a review was conducted, and in response to feedback in May 2022, the Archbishops' Council agreed to extend the Scheme's provision of professional therapy until the Redress Scheme is in place. This is intended to sustain the benefits

resulting from the provision of urgent and immediate assistance provided over the six- or twelve-month support period. The Terms of Reference are being updated to reflect this. Further work is also being done to assess whether support other than therapy might also be extended beyond 12 months in exceptional cases.

13. *Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In October 2020 the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding said in a BBC interview that he expected the church to have a redress scheme for survivors of church abuse in place within “15 to 18 months”. Does he still expect to meet this timetable, and if not, why not, and what is now the anticipated date for first payments?

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Lead Bishop’s comments were made before the Redress project team had been fully installed, which wasn’t until April 2021. The comments were made based on information known to him at the time. The project team have researched the standard time for the creation of other schemes of a similar scale (Ireland, Australia, Scotland) and these took up to three years to design and set up.

It is now considered that the process for setting up the scheme will include a procurement process and/or legislation which could take final completion of the project into 2024 or 2025. The project team is currently looking into whether it is possible to launch a pilot phase sooner. In the meantime, payments for urgent and immediate needs are available from the Interim Support Scheme.

14. *Revd Mark Wallace (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: It was announced in 2021 that the House of Bishops would be establishing a Standing Commission to monitor the way the Five Guiding Principles are being applied in the Church. Can any more now be said about the plans for its work?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied as Chair of the Standing Commission on the House of Bishops’ Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles: Since this question was submitted, the House of Bishops has announced the membership of the Standing Commission. The press release can be found here: [Standing Commission on the House of Bishops’ Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles | The Church of England](#).

The Standing Commission is due to hold its first meeting during the July Synod and will follow that with a second meeting in the late summer/early autumn 2022 to agree the aims for its first year.

Dr Felicity Cooke (Ely): This is a supplementary to the real question 14 which is digitally available but is not printed in the yellow sheets. It is about the Standing Commission.

The Bishop of Rochester: Sorry, I have got the printed one.

Dr Felicity Cooke: There was a duplication of two questions from Nicki Pennington on the questions paper and question 14 gives ---

The Chair: I am sorry, can I suggest that we come back to that tomorrow if it is not there.

Dr Felicity Cooke: Well, it is digitally available. It is on the digital paper. It is not a complicated question.

The Bishop of Rochester: Chair, if I may, I have been working from this paper. We had been in touch with the Synod office and would confirm that 14 was just a duplication and so I am awfully sorry I have not been prepared to give an answer to that. If we could have time, then we will look further at that and be able to respond to in due course.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr Felicity Cooke: Tomorrow?

The Bishop of Rochester: Someone will respond tomorrow but we need to make sure we have got the details.

Dr Felicity Cooke: Okay, yes. It is a shame it happened like that.

The Bishop of Rochester: Apologies.

The Chair: Sorry about that.

15. *Mr Jonathan Baird (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In its triennial budget announcement, the Church envisages spending £190 million over the next nine years in its attempt to achieve net zero by 2030. By way of example, the Diocese of Oxford estimates that, at current prices, it will cost £30 million to make its parsonages alone more energy efficient (but not carbon neutral).

What is the aggregate estimate of the cost of the Church's net zero ambition? And what impact will that have on other areas of its finances?

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: No national estimate of the likely total cost is yet available because costs of different solutions and exact spend profile will react to changing technology and external factors such as government subsidies.

£190m of triennium funding has been allocated over nine years to support the transition to Net Zero Carbon by NCIs, dioceses, parishes and schools, but not to fully fund capital works. £30m of this has been released for 2023-25. Decisions will be taken later this year and into 2023 about how this will be allocated.

Capital works will be funded mostly by the entity with operational responsibility. Financial impacts will include both outlay (equipment and works) but also reductions in running costs. Fundraising efforts will be supported by the national Environment Programme through training and specialist advice. Potential costs vary enormously, depending on factors like building type and energy usage. Dioceses are still developing costed plans.

Mr Jonathan Baird: A reasonable aggregate estimate of the cost is north of £4 billion, from where is the money going to come?

The Bishop of Norwich: Thank you for that question. I do not know that that is a correct figure that you are announcing today and I think you are actually asking me a matter of opinion about where money is coming from. As with any work in parishes, a lot of the funding will be raised locally in conjunction with the funding that is being made available through the Church Commissioners. There will also, we hope, be funding available through grant schemes which we are actively looking at.

16. *Miss Rosemary Wilson (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The February meeting changed the initial deadline for achieving Carbon Net Zero from 2045 to 2030 so it is a more ambitious target - will there be guidance/financial assistance to help Parishes achieve the targets within the Routemap?

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Extensive guidance to support churches engage with net-zero carbon is available on the Church of England website.
<https://www.churchofengland.org/environment>

This includes the existing short guidance note the “Practical Path to Net Zero Carbon for Churches”, which helps churches engage for the first time, alongside a whole range of webinars, specific guidance on subjects including heating, lighting and solar PV, and case studies.

There is also a section on environmental fundraising, offering guidance on how to apply, plus directories of potential funders.

Parishes can get additional assistance from Parish Buying, who offer centrally-procured green energy, energy audits, solar panels, and low carbon heating such as pew heaters. The energy audits are centrally subsidised, and are a great starting point for parishes.

See also the answer to question 143 from Cathy Rhodes.

17. *Miss Rosemary Wilson (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The February meeting changed the initial deadline for achieving Carbon Net Zero from 2045

to 2030 so it is a more ambitious target - and if targets aren't met, would there potentially be "penalties"?

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There will be no penalties. The Routemap is not legislation; it is a positive plan to help parishes and others work towards Synod's target from February 2020.

The Routemap and other guidance are intended to support the Church on the route to net-zero carbon and to give a framework that will help on the journey. The Routemap highlights ways to use energy efficiently, measures that are no/low cost, and measures which pay back over time.

There is some reputational risk with the target should it not be met. The key is to make significant real reductions in energy use year-on-year and get our energy from "green" sources, in order both to reduce our climate impact and to reduce the need for offsetting.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Can you tell us the number of individuals on the Committee who have previously spoken against the provision given in the Five Guiding Principles? Sorry, my apologies, I cannot read.

18. *Revd Mark Wallace (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: It was announced in 2021 that the House of Bishops would be establishing a Standing Commission to monitor the way the Five Guiding Principles are being applied in the Church. Can any more now be said about the plans for its work?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since this question was submitted, the House of Bishops has announced the membership of the Standing Commission. The press release can be found here: [Standing Commission on the House of Bishops' Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles | The Church of England](#)

The Standing Commission is due to hold its first meeting during the July Synod and will follow that with a second meeting in the late summer/early autumn 2022 to agree the aims for its first year.

Revd Mark Wallace: Thank you, Bishop Michael, both for your answer and for your willingness to Chair this Standing Commission. While I hope we can agree that the Revd Charlie Skrine is a wise and experienced priest, he serves on the Standing Commission only until the appointment of a new Bishop of Ebbsfleet. When he steps down, presumably in only a few months' time, the number of traditionalist parish priests on the Standing Commission will be precisely zero, zilch. My question is, was this intentional?

The Bishop of Lichfield: Thank you for the question. I am aware of that dimension of the membership. We were seeking to achieve a balance between the three Houses of Bishops, Clergy and Laity, and between those who are supportive of the ministry of ordained women and those who are not, and between the Provinces of Canterbury and York. To try to include people to match all those various diversities, that was the result. I am aware that there are no members of the House of Clergy who are opposed to the ordination of women. Could I just take the opportunity also to thank those members who have agreed to serve on this Commission. I am really grateful.

Revd Mark Wallace: Of course, thank you.

The Chair: Can I just check, Felicity, was this the subject matter you wanted to ask a question on?

Dr Felicity Cooke (Ely): It was not, but I could actually ask the question. I assure you it is relevant because my question relates to the press release that is quoted in both the answers.

The Chair: Okay, if you could quickly ask your question.

Dr Felicity Cooke: I will ask the question very quickly. The press release refers to the remit for the Standing Commission. One of those is to receive and disseminate good practice in relation to the implementation of the Five Guiding Principles. I would just like to ask whether the Standing Commission will also be ready to receive and reflect on bad practice in relation to the implementation of the Five Guiding Principles?

The Bishop of Lichfield: Thank you for the question. I think we will be looking at the operation of the Five Guiding Principles in all its effectiveness and also where it needs to be improved. I would also say that the work of the Standing Commission - which is at a very early stage of formation, our first meeting is the day after tomorrow - complements the work of the Independent Reviewer, who I guess would be looking at particular cases where some might feel things were not working out well.

19. *Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What support does the House of Bishops give to people wishing to engage in dialogue in the dioceses about mutual flourishing?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The role of the House of Bishops' Standing Commission on the House of Bishops' Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles, whose membership has recently been announced, includes:

- To receive and disseminate good practice in relation to the implementation of the House of Bishops Declaration at all levels within the Church;

- To consider how effectively the Declaration, including the Five Guiding Principles, is being promoted throughout the Church;
- To receive and comment on reports published by the independent reviewer; and,
- To provide an annual report to the House of Bishops.

The Standing Commission welcomes any correspondence from those wishing to engage in dialogue around mutual flourishing and will offer assistance and support where it is able.

Mr Richard Denno: Thank you, Bishop, for your most helpful answer and our prayers are for you and the whole team as you begin the work. My supplementary refers to an obvious objection for those who are of a complementarian viewpoint, that they are in the minority and that a minority viewpoint is too small a matter to discuss, so what good practice could you suggest when that is an objection to entering dialogue in a diocese?

The Bishop of Norwich: I take it that is a question about the composition of the Commission in terms of how it reflects majority and minority views?

Mr Richard Denno: No, sorry, Bishop, I am not being clear.

The Bishop of Lichfield: I am sorry, I have misunderstood the question.

Mr Richard Denno: My question is about how you would support dialogue in the dioceses.

The Bishop of Lichfield: Ah, sorry.

Mr Richard Denno: That was the original question. The supplementary then is, given the obvious objection, oh, this is a minority interest and, therefore, we have not got time for dialogue, what is the example of good practice you would give to overcome that objection?

The Bishop of Lichfield: Well, thank you for the question which I think just maps out some of the ground that the Commission will need to be looking at. As I say, we are at a very early stage of formation and have not yet met, but I think those are just the kinds of questions that we would be looking to explore.

20. *Mrs Valerie Hallard (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Please provide an update on the work that was being undertaken by the Working Group convened by the House of Bishops (GS Misc 1291 para 7) to consider the administration of Holy Communion - when can General Synod expect to receive a report on this matter?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Working Group intends to submit its report to the House

of Bishops, exploring the various matters entrusted to it in its Terms of Reference (shared with Synod in July 2021), by the end of 2022.

Mrs Valerie Hallard: Chair, I ask this question on behalf of a deanery synod to whom I report General Synod business and I suspect they might feel that they have not had an answer. Is it at the discretion of the House of Bishops as to whether Synod receives any report back on the work of the Group?

The Bishop of Lichfield: The Working Group is a House of Bishops' Working Group and so, in principle, yes. What I can say is that the Working Group has focused, as members of Synod are probably all too well aware, on particular issues around the administration of the sacrament and the use or not use of individual cups. I anticipate that our work over the rest of this year will particularly focus on the celebration of Holy Communion on digital media and to what extent people can participate, in what sense people can participate in the eucharist online, and the meaning of spiritual communion, those kinds of issues. I hope that fills out the ---

Mrs Valerie Hallard: And General Synod will receive some feedback?

The Chair: You only have opportunity for one question, I am sorry.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Will General Synod receive a copy of this report?

The Bishop of Lichfield: I know that the report will go in the first place to the House of Bishops which will then consider what its destination should be.

21. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House of Bishops issue guidance encouraging the restoration of the Common Cup throughout the Church of England?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Covid-19 guidance for opening and managing church buildings, updated on 3 May 2022, clarifies that unless there are clear and objective reasons not to do so, Holy Communion should be offered in both kinds to all communicants. It is important that no pressure is placed on members of the congregation to receive the sacrament if they feel unable to do so. If individual communicants are unable to drink from the common cup, they may receive communion in one kind, or the president may dip the consecrated bread in the wine before giving it to the communicant.

Miss Prudence Dailey: Whilst absolutely acknowledging that no communicant should be under any kind of pressure in relation to receiving the sacrament, does the guidance make it clear that the method by which the sacrament should be offered in both kinds should be by means of the common cup and, if it does not, could it?

The Bishop of Lichfield: The current guidance makes clear that Holy Communion should be administered in both kinds unless there is a clear and objective reason why that should not be the case and offers the common cup and also what we have called simultaneous administration, which is the intinction by the ministrant - usually the president of the eucharist - of the consecrated bread in the common cup.

Revd Jack Shepherd (Liverpool): Can I just ask what changed in between the February Synod, when it was responded in answer to a question that I asked that people were experimenting with communion in that season and that there was no desire to oversee the way in which communion was taking place in terms of the common cup and individual cups, and 3 May, which is a period of about 80 days? I would like to know what happened then and was it something to do with the pandemic?

The Bishop of Lichfield: Well, clearly, during that period there was a change in the public health situation and, therefore, in the assessments which churches would have made of the safety of different methods of administration. There has not been a change in the principles of the guidance that the House of Bishops have issued.

22. *Mrs Sandra Turner (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In order to monitor the effectiveness of the Five Guiding Principles, what arrangements have been put in place to record the number of those appointed to senior appointments (bishops and archdeacons) who hold to a traditional complementarian theology?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The appointment of bishops is coordinated centrally by the office of the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments. All candidates considered for episcopal office are invited to complete a diversity monitoring questionnaire, which includes a question on church tradition.

The process for Archdeacon appointments is managed by individual Dioceses. The launch of the new People System and greater use of the Pathways recruitment system should result in better quality diversity data for these appointments in the future.

Mrs Sandra Turner: Thank you, Bishop, for your answer. Is it possible that we can have this information centrally collated and generally available so that complementarian parishes can have confidence that mutual flourishing is working?

The Bishop of Chester: My honest answer is I do not know but, personally speaking, that sounds like a very sensible idea.

23. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can the House confirm that public dissent from the claim that the Church of England is institutionally racist is no barrier to ordination?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Yes.

24. *Revd Chris Collins (Leicester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the Ordination Service focuses on doctrinal fidelity to the Anglican formularies rather than social/political beliefs, can there ever be a basis for particular social or political views being a barrier for clergy or ordinands ministering in the C of E, where these views do not contradict Scripture?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Ordinal and the Canons set further requirements on those to be ordained, for example that they “be of godly life” and “be of virtuous conversation and good repute and such as to be a wholesome example and pattern to the flock of Christ”. Similarly, clergy “shall not give [themselves] to such occupations, habits, or recreations as do not befit [their] sacred calling, or may be detrimental to the performance of the duties of [their] office, or tend to be a just cause of offence to others”.

The 39 Articles also make plain that while Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation and the Church may not require anything contrary to Scripture, the Church may make decisions on matters pertaining to its life which are not settled by Scripture. Of course, the great majority of social and political views are in no way incompatible with the Church of England’s requirements.

25. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What proportion of time in meetings of the House of Bishops is spent on co-ordinated strategic planning of future deployment of clergy?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Deployment of clergy is primarily a matter for dioceses. The House of Bishops discusses and discerns the wider picture in order that, together, we can attend to the wellbeing of clergy, resource and enable the outcomes of the Vision and Strategy, and ensure an appropriate pipeline of ordinands and clergy. This it does regularly as a matter of priority, especially recently as the Vision and Strategy has been emerging. No formal assessment of time allocation in meetings has been made.

Miss Debbie Buggs: Given the wide disparity between the approaches in different dioceses, and given the lack of coherence between the various diocesan approaches and the need for a national strategy for deployment, at what point will the House of Bishops begin to co-ordinate their different strategies?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Debbie. Again, I am afraid the answer is I do not know. If my response though in my written answer implies that we do none of that, I think I have inadvertently misled you because that is not what I am trying to say. It is simply, as the House, we try to balance our shared responsibility with the responsibility that each

diocese has. It is a continually evolving conversation and the House of Bishops seeks to be corporately responsible in it.

26. *Revd Jeremy Moodey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Notwithstanding any possible moves to amend Canon C 4 in relation to the ordination of those who have been divorced and whose former spouse is still living, or those who are married to a person who has been previously married and whose former spouse is still living, what plans does the House have to review and update its 2010 guidelines in relation to applications for faculties under Canon C 4, particularly relating to the requirement that the current marriage needs to be at least three years old before a faculty application will normally be entertained?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Faculties under Canon C 4 are currently in the early stages of review and the extent of the work has yet to be fully scoped. If the Archbishops wish this aspect of the guidance to be reviewed it will be possible for this to be included in the scope of the planned review. It is likely that such a review will include updating the 2010 House of Bishops Guidelines.

Revd Jeremy Moodey: Thank you, Bishop, for your reply. In your answer to my and, indeed, to another question on the C 4 Faculty guidance, you refer to the early stages of a review into this guidance and this is to be welcomed. But could you confirm, please, who is undertaking this review and also whether the reviewers will be open to receiving representations from those with an interest in the C 4 Faculty process and how such representations might be made?

The Bishop of Chester: The honest answer is I just cannot because I really do not know. I am looking at Mark, who is advising me, but I do not think he is able to give an answer to that response. I imagine that they will be open to representations but I honestly do not know. The thing I would say is that it is the Archbishop's advice and, therefore, the matter rests with the Archbishop's office. Am I able - I do not know the answer to this, sorry, this is the first time I have given answers - to provide a written answer later, is that something I can do?

The Chair: Yes, that is possible.

The Bishop of Chester: In which case, I will commit to trying to do that.

Revd Jeremy Moodey: Thank you very much.

The Revd Canon Mark Bennet (Oxford): The answer refers to early stages of review, does that encompass also review of the Canon? I am thinking about the timescales involved in doing that when, as my colleague Jeremy addresses, some urgent action could be taken?

The Bishop of Chester: I told my colleagues I was going to feel a bit of a wally standing up here. I have been Chair of Ministry Council for precisely one week. My answer to that is, again, I do not know, but given that I have committed to give some written answer to our friend over here, how about I include a written answer to that in that as well?

The Revd Canon Mark Bennet: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

27. *Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What plans does the House of Bishops have to spotlight best practice in the dioceses to include adults with learning difficulties?

The Bishop of Carlisle (the Rt Revd James Newcome) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops has not addressed this question as a House. However, the inclusion of people with learning disabilities falls within the remit of the Committee for Ministry among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) which is Chaired by the Bishop of Bedford.

CMDDP is engaged in a comprehensive exploration of best practices, and of the changes the Church should make to ensure full inclusion. The first fruits of this work have come to this Group of Sessions in GS 2070 and actions to enhance the inclusion of people with learning disabilities will, CMDDP hopes, be part of future work which comes to Synod in due course.

Revd Mark Wallace (Chelmsford): I hope I am not about to make your evening worse. 1992 is, even by the standards of the Church of England, quite a long time ago. Given the proliferation of recent reforms and reorganisations, might the House of Bishops be willing to consider whether its current practice continues to act within the limits of the Pastoral Measure and the Code of Conduct?

The Bishop of Chester: Well, we certainly might and I am very willing to ask the Presidents if they think we should. My own view is that, in the Diocese of Chester at least, we work very warmly with our patrons and, having been a patron a number of times in previous incarnations in my life, I think patrons are a really important part of the life of the Church of England and so I am very willing to ask the Presidents if we should do that. I do not think I can commit the House to that on their behalf.

28. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the commitment in the 6 bold outcomes of the Vision & Strategy to an expansion of lay ministries, and the availability of additional funding through the work of the Triennial Funding Working Group, please provide an update on the progress that has been made towards the simplification of the Lay Ministry Canons (as requested by the House of Bishops) to enable this expansion to take place, including any issues still to be addressed and the likely timing of amending legislation?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The simplification of the Lay Ministry Canons (E 4-8) and clarification of the Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry remain a priority within the Lay Ministry Advisory Group (LMAG) under the oversight of the House of Bishops. The spending plans of the National Church Institutions (as set out in GS 2262), include plans for a much more significant investment in lay ministry development which will be developed in detail in the coming months. LMAG recognises the impetus this adds but is yet to address the implications the funding announcement has for the Group's work, especially with regard to any legislative changes for effectively enabling lay ministry within the Vision and Strategy. It is, therefore, too early to provide likely timings for amending legislation or to indicate issues to be addressed. LMAG will address these themes at its next meeting in September 2022, with further updates to follow. Please also see the response to Question 61 from Mr Scowen.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Thank you, Bishop Mark, and congratulations on being elected as Chair of the Ministry Council. Thank you for your reply. There are, indeed, several issues to be resolved if we are to achieve the goal of a simplified single Canon for lay ministries which embraces a wider range than currently is the case, including children and youth workers. Some of these issues have been raised with the House of Bishops already. Please can you ensure that there is a full response in time for the Lay Ministries Advisory Group meeting on 8 and 9 September so we can move forward. I am a member of that group.

The Bishop of Chester: I do not know if I can ensure that but I can assure you that lay ministry remains an absolute priority personally and will do for the Ministry Council, and I will do my best.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I wonder if the Bishop could clarify the status of the Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry: are they Regulations which are binding on bishops in dioceses?

The Chair: I am afraid that is a legal question and so it is out of order. I am sorry.

Mr Clive Scowen: I am asking a question of fact, actually, about the nature of the Regulations.

The Chair: It is a legal question, I am advised. I am sorry.

29. *Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In 1998 Parliament approved the "Working as One Body" proposals which created the National Institutions Measure and the report of the debates in the General Synod, the Ecclesiastical Committee and in Parliament show the challenges of reoccurring priorities, cost saving, prevention of duplication, simplification of structure. Given "Working as One Body" and the NCIs Measure were not implemented in full, what

steps have been taken to ensure the Vision and Strategy, Transforming Effectiveness, Simpler NCIs and Governance Review don't suffer from partial implementation?

The Bishop of Manchester (the Rt Revd David Walker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Emerging Church Steering Group, chaired by the Bishop of Manchester manages this risk, steering the work on Vision and Strategy, Transforming Effectiveness (including Simpler NCIs) and Governance Review.

Representatives of the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners and House of Bishops work with participant observers on significant risks and issues in implementation, including cross-organisational challenges and difficulties applying vision in practice. This is prayerfully considered, reflecting on Scripture at each meeting.

This group has no formal decision-making power but may make recommendations for consideration by governing bodies. It advocates for expertise in implementation such as the Synod advisory group for Governance work. The use of project management disciplines ensures work is carefully scoped and planned.

That Turnbull was not implemented in full was the decision, rightly or wrongly, of the then Synod. Such legislative proposals as emerge from the present working groups will similarly be subject to synodical scrutiny and debate.

Mrs Rebecca Chapman: Thank you, Bishop, for your helpful and informative written response. You noted in your reply that the Emerging Church Steering Group may make recommendations for consideration by governing bodies. Please could you tell Synod what recommendations, if any, has the Group made to date and have they been acted on?

The Bishop of Manchester: We have made many recommendations to the various governing bodies, the Archbishops' Council and the Board of Governors of the Church Commissioners, and they appear to have been acted on. I think this is one of the most effective little cross-cutting groups that I have ever been part of in my time in the Church of England and the way it surrounds its work in prayer and includes a wide range of people in its deliberations I think is exemplary.

30. *the Ven. Malcolm Chamberlain (Sheffield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Over the five years from 2016/17 to 2020/21 the number of emergency food parcels issued by Trussell Trust food banks more than doubled, and independent food banks have reported similar increases. There is substantial evidence that these trends are being driven by failings in the social security system, with benefit increases falling significantly behind rises in the cost of living, and the situation is getting worse as a result of current high inflation. Responding to the call and example of Jesus, many churches, including Church of England churches, play a major role in food bank provision. Even so, most would also agree with the Trussell Trust that "no one should have to turn to charity to afford the essentials needed to survive". What consideration

has the House of Bishops given to this growing problem, and to the necessity for HM Government to review the adequacy of social security provision?

The Bishop of Manchester (the Rt Revd David Walker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: This issue has been of serious concern, and the Lords Spiritual have worked with staff from the FPL Division on briefings and interventions. This includes analysis (drawing on evidence from parish-based projects) and responses welcoming recent government interventions.

The Bishop of Durham, as lead bishop on welfare, has consistently raised awareness of increases in foodbank use and called for benefits to be uprated in line with inflation. A particular focus has been on the two-child limit (a significant driver of poverty amongst larger families). The Church has worked with the Child Poverty Action Group to highlight this policy's effects. Bishop Paul has introduced a Private Members' Bill in the House of Lords to remove the limit.

Energy bills are a key driver of the cost of living crisis, which emphasises the importance of the environmental programme. The interventions needed to reduce household bills are the same interventions needed to reduce carbon.

31. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: I understand the post of National Youth Evangelism Officer has been made redundant in the "Transforming Effectiveness" restructure, only 6 years after it was first created, possibly in a drive for generalists rather than specialists in various positions. Perhaps this reflects a refocus on families and schools (usually at a younger age). Going forward what is the strategy for support and investment in youth ministry (11 –18 years) and who will be taking on the work and network building previously undertaken by the current incumbent of the redundant post?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Vision and Strategy team embodies a shift to shared ownership of all our priorities right across the team. Nowhere is this more important than in our focus on young people, which is at the heart of all that we seek to do. Building on knowledge within the team, our way of working will be to work closely with partners, organisations and networks with expertise in the area of youth ministry. Examples are learning from work in Blackburn, St Albans and London on starting youth work afresh, and working with partners in ministry with youth in our most deprived contexts. We plan to expand digital engagement with youth, building on pilot work with "The Way". The Growing Faith Foundation gives equal priority to youth and children's ministry across the intersection of home, church and school. The new Ministry Development team and the future funding streams will also prioritise youth ministry.

Mr Chris Gill: Given that those involved in children's ministry and youth ministry are seldom the same people, were any approaches made to both sets of those workers to explore the type of support and network building that they would find most beneficial?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I am standing here not as the Chair of Ministry Council - from a week ago. I am very happy to address these questions though. The whole process that we began when we started the Transforming Effectiveness programme in the autumn of 2020 involved widespread consultation, including with a whole range of different forms of ministries, such as youth and children's, out of which the pattern that we have got has emerged. What is now going on is that process continuing now with the staff who are in place to ensure that we do address these matters and are enabling and responding to the needs of parishes and dioceses with the expertise drawn from across the Church rather than housed in one particular place. So, yes and yes into the future.

32. *Mrs Clare Williams (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The restructuring of the NCIs meant the loss of two jobs connected to children and youth ministry: The National Going for Growth (Children's and Youth) Adviser role was cut and the National Youth Evangelism Officer, Jimmy Dale, was moved to the Church and Networks team with a wider remit.

Which element of the Vision and Strategy (which includes the imperative to "grow younger and more diverse") has influenced this restructuring?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Transforming Effectiveness programme, following an extensive scoping exercise across the Church in Autumn 2020, prioritised being simpler and humbler, better to serve the local church. The aim was both cutting costs and changing ways of working, with teams realigned to work more effectively together and new ways of working relying less on expertise in the NCIs and more on recognising and affirming expertise across the Church and beyond, and developing a culture of networking and learning across the Church.

As a result of this, roles in the NCIs changed significantly. The priorities of the Vision and Strategy are central. There are new posts in the new Growing Faith Foundation led by Lucy Moore. In the Vision and Strategy team, every person has younger and more diverse as a priority in their job description. The Ministry Development team are also making this a priority throughout their work.

33. *Mrs Catherine Butcher (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the recent independent review of Lowest Income Communities Funding and Strategic Development Funding commissioned by the Strategic Investment Board, one of the recommendations (Page 48, recommendation 21) was that: "SDU staff members should be appointed as Subject Matter Experts with cross cutting responsibility for critical missional challenges and traditions (for example youth, ethnic minorities, rural, deprived estates, et cetera) and work with relevant champions from the House of Bishops and other networks".

It seems to me that the Vision and Strategy team has not taken this advice, but rather has made its specialists redundant, notably in the area of youth, the first recommendation on the list. Can you please explain this?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: In scoping Transforming Effectiveness, feedback was sought from across the Church about the sort of support sought from the NCIs. This feedback indicated strongly that we move, where possible, from subject specialists to a wider understanding of expertise and learning, where staff in the NCIs supporting the local church identify and learn from expertise across the Church wherever it exists, partnering with networks and organisations rather than always adding to central costs.

Affirming the presence of expertise across the Church, and beyond, the Vision and Strategy team will invest in enabling learning and sharing through formal and informal networks from subject matter expertise that exists in dioceses, networks, and para-church organisations, capturing and making this knowledge more accessible, as well as drawing from the expertise that resides within the team across the critical missional challenges.

34. *Revd Lindsay Llewellyn-MacDuff (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the Archbishops' Council has stated its evangelism priorities include "resources for Life Events and bereavement issues", can the Chair explain how this is in keeping with disbanding the Life Events Team, which has been such a significant resource to so many parishes?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Although this means there will no longer be dedicated expertise working exclusively around Life Events, the fruit of this work, and in particular the extensive research findings, have been shared widely across the Church over the past 14 years. Local churches will continue to be able to draw on these findings and enhance their response in baptism, wedding and funeral ministries. The Church is hugely grateful for the work of the team. The insights and resources that the team have developed remain available as a significant resource to parishes through the Church of England website, Church Support hub and Life Events diary.

This change has come about as part of the Transforming Effectiveness programme. We sought to identify £2 million annualised savings through changed ways of working, to reduce the financial burden on dioceses. Inevitably, this involves prioritising, and stopping some work.

35. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the Simplifying the NCIs strand of Transforming Effectiveness how many posts in total have been cut across all the National Church Institutions in the last 2 years, how many of these involved redundancy or a negotiated compromise agreement, and what were the total costs of such settlements to the NCIs as a whole?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since January 2020, a total 27.6 NCI posts have been removed due to restructuring. Fifteen staff left the NCIs due to their post being made redundant across various restructures. Within this total, 12.6 full time equivalent (FTE) vacant posts were removed during Transforming Effectiveness, whilst 6 staff were made redundant as part of TE. These redundancies represent 8% of all leavers during this period. Termination payments to these 15 staff were made in line with the NCIs' redundancy policy, with some agreements on pre-2006 terms, some post-2006 terms. Six involved settlement agreements, all complying with the NCIs' new policy. These payments for the 15 staff totalled £714,111.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): Bishop Martin, would you please explain how the actual redundancies, rather than the elimination of vacant posts you set out in your answer, can be reconciled with the figures provided in the answer to question 168 which, excluding the National Society and the Archbishops' staff, show a 21 post or 4.3% increase in NCI headcount between 2020 and 2021 and a further 30 post or 6.2% budgeted increase in 2022?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I am going to need to give you a written response but the short answer is there are certain areas, like for instance in the National Society, where there has been a significant increase in posts that are funded by the DfE and those are included in that headcount. There has also been an increase in posts in relation to safeguarding. There are areas that were outwith the remit of Transforming Effectiveness where we have seen that increase, but those increases are either of the particular necessity that we have in relation to safeguarding or they are of necessity but externally funded.

36. *Canon Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many NCI staff have left their positions since the implementation of the Transforming Effectiveness workstream, and what assessment has been made of the impact of these losses of staff upon the effectiveness of the service provided by the national Church to dioceses and parishes?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Across the affected teams, 12.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) vacant posts were removed during Transforming Effectiveness, whilst 6 staff were made redundant as part of TE.

These reductions followed an extensive scoping exercise across the Church in Autumn 2020. The new structures resulting have prioritised being simpler and humbler, better to serve the local church by reducing costs and changing ways of working – to improve the effectiveness of the service provided by the national Church to dioceses and parishes.

We plan to assess the impact of the totality of the Transforming Effectiveness changes on effectiveness of the service provided by the national Church to dioceses and parishes later in 2022, seeking feedback from those with whom we work.

37. *the Very Revd Michael Keirle (Channel Islands)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the Chair of the House of Bishops advise Synod when it is planned to revise the Canons of the Church of England to include gender neutral language?

The Bishop in Europe (the Rt Revd Dr Robert Innes) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: In recent years the Legal Office has adopted the practice of inclusive language drafting in all new or amending legislation, including all amendments to the Canons. So, this change is already taking place. A full set of amendments to ensure that all language in the Canons is inclusive is certainly possible, if legislative time at Synod can be made available for the purpose. The House of Bishops recognises the importance of language and of the Canons needing to reflect the reality that both men and women are ordained as ministers, and the Episcopal Reference Group of the Faith and Order Commission will give the matter additional thought.

38. *Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Recognising the close and historic links that all Dioceses and Cathedrals have with the Armed Forces, Regiments and Service Chaplains – what practical steps (such as the provision of appropriate resource materials) does the House intend to take to encourage more Dioceses and Cathedrals to celebrate Armed Forces Week?

The Bishop of Exeter (the Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: For some years now, the Church of England has presented prayers for the Armed Forces on the Topical Prayers page of its website, which include prayers for HM Forces at home and abroad and for their families, and a form of intercession for their needs. These prayers can be added to forms of service of all kinds.

Canon Peter Bruinvels: Whilst acknowledging that the Church of England has such resources available for prayers for Her Majesty's Forces at home and abroad, can he encourage more dioceses to celebrate Armed Forces Week and Day by using such resources as both Guildford and Exeter Dioceses and their Cathedrals do?

The Bishop of Exeter: Thank you, Peter, for your supplementary. Speaking as Chair of the Liturgical Commission, these resources are here. We stand ready to help in any way. If they are considered to be inadequate, we would be only too glad to provide some additional material to dioceses.

Speaking as the Bishop of Exeter, we have a significant military presence in our diocese and we have certainly signed up to the Covenant, because we have Plymouth, which is obviously a centre for the Royal Navy, as is Portsmouth, but we also have in Exeter the Rifles and the headquarters for the Royal Marines. Most recently we had parades in both Plymouth and in Exeter, and I can assure you that both the cathedral and churches were

really involved in that. I am sure I could speak on other dioceses which have significant military establishments. I think that would be good practice which I would be glad to commend, otherwise I would suggest having a conversation with the Bishop for the Forces. I am sure we would together take it forward.

39. *Rebecca Hunt (Portsmouth)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the Church of England's position on abortion, the recent decision by the UK Government to make pills by post permanent, and the recent news from the United States that *Roe v Wade* is overturned what steps will the Church be taking in the near future to work towards making the womb a safer place for the unborn child in the UK?

The Bishop of Carlisle (the Rt Revd James Newcombe) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Every abortion is a tragedy but, in a fallen world, tragedies occur and society's obligations to both the unborn child and to the women who seek abortions must be balanced carefully.

We have argued strongly against making permanent the provisions for home abortions that were introduced as a compromise when Covid added grave risks to in-person visits to hospitals. We believe that making those provisions permanent, now that the Covid risk has receded, puts women at risk and also reduces the opportunities for them to discuss their decisions carefully with doctors.

We will continue to argue this point, although the Government's decision has, unfortunately, now been enacted.

40. *The Revd Jack Shepherd (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What steps is the House of Bishops taking, at the national level, to align the authority of Diocesan Advisory Committees with diocesan strategies for growth, as well as to ensure membership of these are supportive of Christian values and mission?

The Bishop of Bristol (the Rt Revd Vivienne Faull) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops is not directly engaged on this issue, although bishops are individually responsible for making appointments to DACs. The Church Buildings Council has responsibility for guidance on operation of the Faculty System, and is clear that supporting buildings to be used for Christian mission is fundamental to the work of Diocesan Advisory Committees. The Council encourages dioceses to put structures in place at diocesan level to engage the DAC, through its Chair and Secretary, with diocesan strategies and to bring these to the committee.

The nature of DAC work will sometimes require careful balancing with the requirements placed on it by the State, especially regarding heritage, and the wishes of a PCC. The purpose of running our own regulatory system is precisely so the purpose of churches as centres of worship and mission can be taken into account in decision making.

41. *Mr Gabriel Chiu (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What representations are being or will be made to secure an ethical exemption for churches

from any requirement to provide acknowledgment or publicity for the National Lottery on receipt of National Lottery Heritage Fund grants, given that facilitating the advancement of gambling is frequently likely to be contrary to the legal function of the PCC in “promoting in the parish the whole mission of the Church, pastoral, evangelistic, social and ecumenical”?

The Bishop of Bristol (the Rt Revd Vivienne Faull) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: No representations are being made; if churches have conscientious objections to taking funds derived from gambling they should consider applying to other funders: for example, the available funds from Historic England for Heritage At Risk. Churches that choose to apply for and accept funding of any kind should expect to abide by the terms of that grant, including acknowledgement of the funder.

42. *Mr Richard Brown (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Bearing in mind the imagery of the rainbow, as described in Genesis 9, as being the sign that God will never again destroy the world He has created, what steps do the House of Bishops intend to take to discourage the use of the rainbow in any political context being displayed on cathedrals and church buildings?

The Bishop of Bristol (the Rt Revd Vivienne Faull) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The rainbow is a powerful symbol of hope within the Judeo-Christian tradition. As such, it is used in a number of “secular” contexts: to symbolise support and gratitude for the NHS; to herald the post-apartheid era of the Republic of South Africa as a “rainbow nation”; as well as a symbol of support for the gay pride movement. Given its multivalence, the House of Bishops does not have any plans at present to take steps to discourage the displaying of the rainbow on cathedrals and church buildings.

The Revd Richard Thompson (London): There is a discrepancy again between what is printed on the paper and what is in the digital version. In the longer digital version, Vivienne tells us the rainbow is a powerful symbol of hope within the Judeo-Christian tradition. I want to ask a question about why we have used the term “Judeo-Christian tradition”, which is deemed in academic circles to be anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic, and also it undoes the whole fact that both Jewish and Christian traditions are different and plural.

Mr Richard Brown: Supplementary.

The Bishop of Bristol: I think I would quite like to answer one supplementary at a time. I am grateful for the point you have made and I apologise if I have caused any offence.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Has the House of Bishops considered the agenda of the rainbow Pride flag and its consistency, or inconsistency, with the Christian faith?

The Bishop of Bristol: Sam, thank you for your question. No, it has not.

Mr Richard Brown: I was simply going to ask why therefore is the Gay Pride flag, which features a prominent rainbow upon it, being shown over a number of cathedrals in defiance of the law of the land, when only the flag of St George and the Union flag are allowed?

The Chair: I think your question is argumentative so I am going to put a stop to that. I am sorry.

Mr Richard Brown: I was quoting fact there.

43. *Mr Alexander Berry (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops has rightly publicly declared that the Church is institutionally racist. Will the House of Bishops now begin a similar process - possibly including a report - to discern whether the Church is institutionally homophobic?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As you know, questions of sexuality are being considered by the Church - including the House of Bishops and members of General Synod - by means of the LLF process. Were a process similar to the Racial Justice Commission to be initiated, that would need to emerge as an outcome of the discernment and decision-making stage of the LLF process which begins in September 2022 and will come to a clear sense of direction in February 2023.

Mr Alexander Berry: Given the evidence of the Diocese of London's Report into the events surrounding Alan Griffin's death and the urgency it implied, and the much wider scope of LLF, will the House now consider the problem of institutional homophobia before the conclusion of the LLF process?

The Bishop of London: I am very conscious in this week that we ought to remember in our prayers the soul of Fr Alan, as well as his family and friends, and those affected by his death.

In the response that I made to the independent report, I made absolutely clear there is no place for homophobia not just in the Diocese of London but also more widely. There is a sense in which the environment in which homophobia operates is one of culture that has built up over a long period of time. Therefore, we have to take seriously changing that culture. It will not happen overnight. I hope that in Living in Love and Faith we will begin to address it. I think one of the points earlier on in the day was around homophobia is about negative action. I think we need to create safe environments where we can both talk about what that looks like and how that attitude is changed.

44. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What practical steps have been taken by the House of Bishops to define and combat homophobia in the Church of England since the Archbishop of Canterbury's response to my supplementary

question at the 2016 July Synod, where he warmly welcomed the distinction between the “perception and reception” of homophobia?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Practical steps to define and combat homophobia in a way that distinguishes between what is perceived as homophobia and what is received and experienced as homophobia include the publication and churchwide promotion of engaging with

1. the Pastoral Principles;
2. the LLF guidance, “Braver and safer: creating spaces for learning together well”;
3. the LLF resources;
4. the Difference Course.

The “Braver and Safer” guidance quotes and commends the Methodist Church’s definition of homophobia and gives examples of perceived and experienced homophobia.

Dioceses have also been encouraged to continue to promote and offer safeguarding and unconscious bias training.

Having said that, there is always room for improvement. The Church must not be complacent and needs to continue to combat both perceived and experienced homophobia in all aspects of its life together.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Thank you for your answer just now, Bishop Sarah. Given the clear evidence that we witness, even in this chamber, of homophobia, those of us who are experiencing it right now as well as in the past, would you consider giving a clear ---

A Speaker: Point of order. “In this chamber” is an imputation of members of this chamber and is out of order.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: I rest my case.

The Chair: I will accept your point of order and reject that.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: And I rest my case.

45. *Dr Janette Allotey (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the current composition of the Reference Group which will be “accompanying the bishops” during the discernment phase of Living in Love and Faith?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The names of the members of the Reference Group can be found on the Church of England website: <https://www.churchofengland.org/resources/living-love-and-faith/living-love-and-faith-journey#na>.

Mrs Sandra Turner (Chelmsford): My question is very simple: the people on the Reference Group, is it a requirement they are practising Christians?

The Bishop of London: All of them have chosen to be involved in this process because as a Church we are looking together at these issues. They all have a faith. Whether it has been a requirement, I do not know. What I do know is that they have a faith, and they want to offer their time, and explore with us the difficult issues that we are exploring.

46. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: According to the detailed roadmap of the LLF “journey” two documents will be produced in September 2022: (1) the findings of the “Listening to the Whole Church” process and (2) the resource “The Gift of the Church”. Who has been tasked with writing each of these documents, by whom, and what instructions have been given as to what these documents are to contain?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

1. The report of responses to LLF draws on the work of Brendan Research, Church Army Research Unit, and ASD Arts and Education Ltd - experts in quantitative and qualitative research and in the gathering and curating of creative work - who were tasked with gathering responses through the questionnaire, focus groups and offering a creative response. The report is being drawn together by the LLF Coordinator, overseen by the Next Steps Group.
2. The “Gift of the Church” is a collaboration between the Faith and Order Commission and the Next Steps Group. It is overseen by the House of Bishops and is being drafted by people with appropriate theological expertise and some diversity of perspectives and lived experience. Chaired by the Bishop of Coventry it comprises Joshua Hordern, Rachel Mann (FAOC members), Carlton Turner, Guido de Graaff, Isabelle Hamley and Eeva John.

Further details about purpose and brief can be supplied.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr: Many thanks for the detailed response. As regards the kind offer, yes please. My supplementary is as follows. By whom were the Faith and Order Commission and the Next Steps Group tasked with producing the “Gift of the Church”?

The Bishop of London: Part of the process for the Next Steps Group has been to think about the resources that the bishops will require in their discernment. We have done that with a wider Reference Group and we have done it with the House of Bishops. In a sense, that material came out of that conversation. It is one of a whole set of tools that are open to us in our discernment process, so it is one of many. The truth is it evolved out of a

conversation between the House of Bishops and the Next Steps Group and the Faith and Order Commission. The nature of discernment is one always of exploration, and so it is one part that came out of that. I would take the opportunity, in fact, to encourage all members of this House to visit the installation that is up and also the installation at York Minster because part of that is exploring in a creative way in this question of discernment.

47. *Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What percentage of those engaging with the LLF process have had their feedback and insights recorded?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: All feedback from people who have engaged with LLF has been read and recorded, and will be reported in September 2022. People have offered feedback by completing the LLF questionnaire, by taking part in a focus group, by submitting a creative response and by emailing the LLF team.

Over 6,400 people responded via the questionnaire. Every questionnaire has been read and included in the analysis of responses.

Not everyone who has engaged with LLF has offered feedback and it is not possible to know how many people in total have engaged with LLF together with others.

Mr Luke Appleton: Considering the relatively low level of engagement with LLF surveys and feedback, are there other mechanisms the bishops can use to measure the mind of the Church during their discernment process in the autumn?

The Bishop of London: I think we should be encouraged by the level of engagement. I would like to thank all the members of this House who have encouraged people to be engaged. In terms of the exploration of the feedback and how that is then presented, not just to the House of Bishops, but the way it is here, the way it is a mirror we reflect back, three research groups involved with us feel it is a really high level of response and it is a representative response. Actually, we should be encouraged by the feedback that we have had. I would encourage people to use these couple of days to involve themselves into the exhibition as well as the installation at York Minster.

48. *The Revd Fraser Oates (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the Diocese of Worcester circa 240 people have engaged with LLF material and activities, which equates to only 2% of those on church electoral rolls in the diocese. What evidence does the LLF team have as to the actual level of engagement with the LLF materials and activities across the country?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: We are not able to say how many people engaged with the LLF materials. However, we do have over 6,400 responses via the LLF questionnaire, including responses from every diocese.

We know that far more people than this engaged with LLF, through anecdotal evidence from the diocesan LLF Advocates and through some of the focus group conversations. Together with the LLF Advocates, we considered asking deaneries to tell us how many church communities in their area had engaged with the process. However, this was felt to undermine the invitational culture within which we wanted people to engage with LLF. We are also aware that many people are still engaging and planning to engage this year.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Was data collected that provides information as to the relationship of the respondent to the Church?

The Bishop of London: Thank you, Sam, for your question. Yes.

49. *Professor Helen King (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In June 2021 the Next Steps Group discussed taking forward a proposal to form a working group on gender identity and transition. Is this work still scheduled to take place, and if so, who are the members of the working group and what are their terms of reference?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: This work has been paused for the time being. No working group has yet been formed and the terms of reference have not been written.

50. *Mr Alexander Berry (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The advice from the House of Bishops is that clergy in same sex civil marriages cannot be ordained or be granted a new license. What is the House of Bishops doing to ensure that its advice is being applied across dioceses in a consistent way?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops has agreed to form a Pastoral Consultative Group. The membership and Terms of Reference of this group are in the process of being agreed. However, one of its tasks will be to provide clarity and encourage consistency of practice across dioceses in situations like these. This is especially helpful during this period when the bishops are about to embark on a process of discernment and decision-making about a range of matters raised by the LLF process. However, it is likely to continue to be needed as the Church faces ever more complex pastoral situations.

51. *The Revd Sam Maginnis (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House now issue a further statement confirming the distinction and different expectations between ordained and lay ministry, and establishing a consistent national policy on lay ministry and same sex marriage?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The question of the distinct expectations regarding

same-sex marriage for lay and ordained people has been raised on numerous occasions - by “Issues in Human Sexuality” and the Pilling Report, for example, but no national guidance has been given regarding lay ministries. Furthermore, there is a wide variety of roles encompassed under the umbrella of “lay ministry”, and decisions about vocation to and suitability for lay ministry are taken locally at parochial and diocesan level.

It is possible that this is one of the questions that the LLF process may address in its discernment and decision-making.

The Revd Sam Maginnis: Bishop Sarah, I feel compelled to ask a supplementary because my question as accepted was not actually printed in full on the question paper either digitally or on paper, therefore, I feel you did not have the opportunity to consider the full context in which I was asking about a national policy on lay ministry and same-sex marriages. To be clear, I was not asking about the umbrella variety of lay ministry. I was asking specifically about licensed lay ministry and the situation which I know other members of Synod have been made aware of, where people who have been selected for training, or have been exercising their ministry as licensed lay ministers, move to a new diocese where licences are not given to people in same-sex marriages and therefore have their validly discerned ministry thwarted simply by a change in geographical location.

Given that, my supplementary is that you answered that it is possible that the development of a national policy may be addressed by the LLF process. Given what people have been experiencing, I ask now will it be so addressed, and will the House of Bishops take a lead on this and produce a policy now, one way or the other, to bring this cruel and arbitrary treatment to an end?

The Bishop of London: We will consider it as part of the process.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): This may overlap, but my question really was provoked by the reference to the diversity of lay ministry. My question is as to whether the House of Bishops will now consider whether people holding a bishop’s licence or commission or permission, as happens in some dioceses, should be expected to observe the same constraints on their conduct as are expected on the clergy?

The Bishop of London: I think as part of the process of LLF it is one of the questions. It is interesting because there is a question in itself about what is the nature of licensing authorization, what is the nature of this whole range of ministry. In a sense that is one question and then the other question is around issues of consistency. It absolutely will be explored, I do believe that, as part of LLF.

52. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Global Interfaith Commission on LGBT+ Lives conference was sponsored by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office in March 2022, and involved bishops and Primates from across the Communion. It agreed on six Safeguarding Principles to Protect LGBT+ Lives. Will the Bishops be advocating their use within the Church of England?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you for drawing attention to this important conference and its Six Principles. I will ask the Next Steps Group to consider whether the House of Bishops should be asked to advocate the use of the six Safeguarding Principles to Protect LGBT+ Lives.

53. *The Revd Fraser Oates (Worcester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Bible, and the New Testament in particular, address the subject of true and false teaching. The questions that are likely to be raised as LLF moves forward are first-order issues, so how is it possible to accommodate paradoxical teaching on them?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: One of the areas that the LLF resources explore is the question of the interpretation of the Bible's teaching in relation to identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage, and how this relates to the Christian understanding of salvation and holiness. While there are deep disagreements among ourselves, "none of us holds the whole picture, and all of us can grow in understanding", as GS Misc 1158 noted. That is why the resources explain how Christians come to different conclusions. They invite the Church to learn, reflect and pray together in the light of these different and seemingly incompatible convictions and perspectives. They hold out the hope that the Spirit will lead us into deeper understanding of the truth and a way forward regarding teachings that appear to be "paradoxical".

This discernment will be the particular task of the bishops as they exercise their responsibility as teachers and guardians of the faith.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): I will resist the opportunity to say we have a fringe tomorrow but that addresses 52. On question 53, I wonder whether the Bishop is aware of the response the Bishop of Norwich gave to a question I asked on just this point in 2017, where he stated the teaching of the House of Bishops is that sexual orientation has no bearing upon a person's salvation and then the Bishop of Coventry in February 2018 went on to explain and draw on the Faith and Order Commission's Report.

The Chair: Can we have a question, please?

Ms Jayne Ozanne: I am asking is she aware of that and perhaps she would like to draw on that in her response.

The Bishop of London: I was not aware of those two points. Thank you, Jayne.

54. *The Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* There is increasing media promotion of "The Case for Polyamory" (e.g., BBC R4 12 April 2022, Channel 4 "Open House, the great sex experiment" 26 March 2022). The 2022 Methodist Conference agenda states (section 27 on Marriage and Relationships, para 3.g): "Both

of these patterns of relating (polygamy and polyamory), which potentially involve long-term committed sexual relationships with more than one partner at the same time, merit further theological attention”.

The LLF book commented briefly on Anglicans & Polygamy (pp346-7).

Does the House of Bishops consider that Polyamory merits further theological attention, and will this be considered by the LLF Next Steps group?

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Questions about polyamory certainly merit theological attention - as do all areas of human experience and existence! Some theological work is being done in this area by others. However, this is not currently being considered by the LLF Next Steps Group. In that sense, the work of LLF - which will need to come to clear conclusions about ways forward about some questions - will need to continue in some form as the Church faces the constantly changing context in which we are called to bear the light of Christ.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

55. *Mr Paul Waddell (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: In February 2020 John Spence told Synod that “This is not about affordability, it is about justice ... The funds for redress will be found.” How much money has been budgeted for redress payments to survivors of church abuse, and where does it appear in our budgets for the coming year?

Canon John Spence replied as Chair of the Finance Committee: That commitment stands but the speed of progress is dependent on numerous factors. The redress scheme must be survivor focused and not limited by existing budget lines.

Appropriate responsibility for redress needs to be taken at every level of the Church. On the subsidiarity principle, costs should be met by the most appropriate body and all responsibility should not fall on the national Church.

The National Church future spending plans include an allowance towards redress scheme costs, but a formal budget has not yet been set. The matter of where redress scheme payments will be included in future budgets and the budget level will be considered as the work on developing the redress scheme is progressed.

The costs of the project to develop a redress scheme are within the safeguarding line of the Archbishops’ Council’s budget. This work is being overseen by a Project Board which includes survivor representatives.

Mr Paul Waddell: Thank you to Canon Spence for your kind reply. Being concerned at the level of subsidy suggested with regard to redress payments, can I ask what efforts

will be made to ensure that financially imperilled dioceses, cathedrals and colleges will not be sunk by future claims? What efforts will be made to prevent charities law forcing those less financially secure organisations to defend themselves in court against known survivors of church abuse; survivors who would then be subject to lengthy and painful additional processes from which some might not survive?

Canon John Spence: As we have already heard today, we are one body and we operate in unity. There is a track record whereby if a diocese is in difficulty the Church centrally seeks to provide help. It would be counter to the spirit of what is going on here if we were not to try to do the same. One cannot guarantee it will be the same in every situation, but the goal would certainly be that justice is done regardless of the financial status of the responsible organisation.

MINISTRY COUNCIL

56. *Mrs Katia D’Arcy-Cumber (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many full-time stipendiary clergy have made use of the Access to Work scheme in the last five years to enable those with more complex disabilities to engage the additional support they need to fulfil their role?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: We do not have this information, as clergy make the applications themselves (in some cases with the support of the Diocese, especially where plant and machinery are involved) and do not inform the NCIs. We have recently drafted guidance to dioceses on supporting clergy who make Access to Work applications. We are consulting diocesan disability advisers and diocesan HR advisers on the draft guidance and hope to issue it later this year.

57. *The Revd Jo Winn-Smith (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Has the Ministry Council undertaken research into the prevalence and impact of differing diocesan policies as to part-time curacies on groups such as females with children or single parents?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Some research has been undertaken, but there is limited capacity at the NCIs for monitoring areas that are matters of diocesan discretion. The most recent research can be found in the 2016 report on experiences of curacy. This highlighted some of the challenges faced by part-time curates including the difficulties with trying complete part-time curacies in three years, whilst managing workload alongside other jobs and family life. The Ministry Development Team are currently working on guidance for dioceses on best practice for those who hold office on a part time basis, whether curates or other ministers.

58. *The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given that Central Church has issued a minimum standard for parental leave that not all

dioceses are financially able to deliver on, how will the Church Commissioners be supporting those dioceses to ensure women and the newly ordained aren't left vulnerable and unsupported?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Supporting clergy who are parents is right and good, and is an investment in their long-term ministry. The Church of England website suggests a minimum level of provision to support clergy office holders that should apply in all cases whether or not someone is eligible for Statutory Maternity, Adoption and Paternity Pay. The cost of training ordinands is pooled, effectively sharing costs between dioceses (including continued payment of a means-tested maintenance grant for up to a year during a period of parental or adoption related absence). The level of support for others (for example those in authorized ministry or DBF employees) is properly handled at diocesan level.

The Revd Chantal Noppen: Bishop, I was really encouraged to hear that you agree supporting new parents is right and good, and that any financial support should be considered an investment in their ministry in the long term that will pay off. However, as some dioceses have said and are saying that it is too expensive to comply with these agreed recommendations, why are such policies being made if not all dioceses can afford them and there is not actually a central commitment to ensure they are delivered?.

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you and it is very nice to see you again, Chantal. I meant what I said in my written answer, it is right and good and proper that we should support parents, and indeed it is an investment in the Church and in them. We are constantly playing this balance game between being a national Church and being a diocesan Church, and I am not going to pretend there are always easy answers to that. On our website there are family-friendly policies for the whole Church, and we encourage dioceses to fit in with them wherever possible.

The Revd Miranda Threlfall-Holmes (Liverpool): Please could we have a page on the Church of England website that sets out what maternity and parental leave payments are made and policies are in place for each dioceses, so that people are not inadvertently disadvantaged when they consider moving diocese by the current postcode lottery?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Miranda. It is nice to see you again. It is a north-east regathering. Again, I am afraid the answer is I do not know, but I will gladly ask the question because it seems to me perfectly reasonable.

The Chair: Question 59. The questioner is the Revd Mark Miller. He is on Zoom so he will be unmuted. While that is happening, can I just ask those of you who are interested in asking supplementary questions, especially if you are much further away from the podium, could you begin to move so that we know and we do not waste much time.

59. *The Revd Mark Miller (Durham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: While welcoming the significant increase in the Recommended Expenditure Guidelines

2022/2023 for the fuel, light and power costs borne by married or partnered ordinands, the reality is that the figure recommended for 2021/2022 (£1,388 per annum) did not reflect the actual costs borne by ordinands this past year. Recognising that £3million was made available by the Church Commissioners for the support of clergy struggling as a result of rising fuel costs, what equivalent support is there for ordinands who are facing personal financial hardship through paying substantially bigger bills than those allowed for in their budget?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Dioceses are responsible for the amount of maintenance they pay to ordinands, and the recommended guidelines are just that, though they do limit what may be included in the national pooling system. Dioceses may therefore make additional payments to candidates if they choose. There are also various charitable funds which offer financial support to ordinands. There has been no national initiative to provide additional funding specifically for these purposes. The clergy scheme took into account the fact that stipends would not increase until next spring, while the new ordinand maintenance guideline amounts apply from September.

The Revd Mark Miller: Bishop Mark, it is good to see you again in the Durham and north-east reunion. Thank you for your answer to my last question. Whilst recognising the support of charitable organisations, in answer to an earlier question we were able read the Trussell Trust note that no one should rely on charity to meet basic needs, so, therefore, what should ordinands do when their dioceses have refused to increase or make additional payments to account for the significant increases in fuel, light and power costs, please?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Mark. It is also good to see you again. My honest advice would be to write to the bishop. We are by and large, I think, very caring individuals. That is partly why we end up in this kind of ministry. It is really hard when we do not know. Each case is individual. So write to the bishop. I think the bishop in the diocese will respond as appropriately as she or he possibly can.

60. *The Revd Mark Miller (Durham) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* The Recommended Expenditure Guidelines 2022/2023 for married/partnered ordinands includes a 70% increase in fuel, light and power costs and 4% increase in food costs. Given that Ofgem are predicting a further rise in the energy cap in October of £800, and food inflation is predicted to reach 10% by the summer, what provision is there for a mid-review of ordinands' budgets so that their maintenance grant reflects the real costs borne for heating their homes and feeding their families?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: There has not been a practice of reviewing the Guidelines mid-year, though it would be open to the Council to undertake such a review should it believe that to be appropriate (for example, should it be clear that the dioceses would favour such a review). Responsibility for the pastoral care of ordinands belongs to their bishop and budgets are

agreed by the ordinand with their diocese: it is open to dioceses to agree to a mid-year revision to the budget, though the Guidelines limit the amount that may be included in the national pooling system.

The Revd Mark Miller: Again thanks for your answer, Bishop Mark. To whom should responsibility for requesting dioceses review budgets mid-year fall? For example, is one ordinand requesting such a review sufficient?

The Bishop of Chester: I want to give you three different bits of answer to that. First, again, write to the bishop. That is really helpful. If we know we can often do something about it. Secondly, as noted in GS 2271, one of the main aims of the RMF Review is to review maintenance provision. I am sorry to those in the chamber. I am looking down at Mark who is here on the screen if you think I am being rude to you.

The third is I would encourage ordinands to work together, so when there is an issue affecting many of them, we can hear and know because sometimes when things come in piecemeal, we simply do not know how large or small the problem is. However, every individual situation matters, so please be in contact through the bishop.

61. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Since the answer to my question in April 2021, what progress has been made in the development of proposals by the Lay Ministries Advisory Group for a new national framework for lay ministry and for the simplification of the Canons on Lay Ministry, and in particular in reviewing the House of Bishops' regulations relating to the ministry of Readers/Licensed Lay Ministers in order to put such lay ministers on a par with clergy with regard to the renewal of the licences once they reach the age of 70?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Plans to review the Lay Ministry Canons remain a commitment of the House of Bishops and the Lay Ministries Advisory Group (LMAG), both of which continue to work together to this end. We hope to bring the proposals to Synod as they are developed. The House of Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry are currently undergoing review within by LMAG as part of a wider development of Lay Ministries in line with the Vision and Strategy.

Implementation of the existing age criteria continues to vary by diocese, with some opting to make no distinction whatsoever. Others treat all Readers/LLMs the same irrespective of whether they hold license or PTO.

See also the response to Question 28 from Mr Greenwood.

Mr Clive Scowen: Can we infer that the House of Bishops is content for diocesan bishops in their discretion to grant Readers and licensed lay ministers over the age of 70 a licence on the same basis as clergy?

The Bishop of Chester: That is very interesting. That is not a supplementary I anticipated you might ask, Clive. I think we probably can infer that. Certainly my own experience of moving between dioceses is the practice is very different in different dioceses. I think we probably can. If I am wrong, I will write to you.

62. *The Revd Mae Christie (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: When and by what mechanism was Issues in Human Sexuality formally written into the Selection Criterion of the Church of England?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: We do not have a record of the date or the mechanism by which “Issues in Human Sexuality” was formally written into the former Selection Criteria. Unfortunately, since the information is not readily available it could not be obtained within the time-frame available for responding to Synod questions.

The Revd Mae Christie: Thank you for your reply to me. If it cannot be established that “Issues in Human Sexuality” was inserted into the discernment process, having been ordered so by the House of Bishops, and is therefore in place illegitimately, will the House of Bishops, in co-ordination with the Ministry Division, consider removing it from the shared discernment process with immediate effect?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Mae.

The Chair: May I stop you? I have been advised that is a hypothetical question.

The Revd Mae Christie: Is it?

The Chair: If it can be proved ---

The Revd Mae Christie: Do you know what my first question was?

The Chair: I have to go with the advice that I am being given. I would like to go with the advice I am being given at the moment. I am sorry.

63. *The Revd Robert Thompson (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What advice has the Ministry Council given to dioceses on the interpretation of “Issues in Human Sexuality” in relation to the licensing of LGBTQIA+ people as LLMs?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: There is no national guidance offered to dioceses to advise on interpretation of “Issues in Human Sexuality” in relation to Lay Ministries, including LLM.

The Revd Robert Thompson: The printed version again differs from the version online. Question 63 refers to LLMs in particular. Thank you for your answer, Mark, which I think

online said that there was no national advice given to dioceses. Given that, and referring back to Sam Maginnis' question of how this is a question of equity in relation to those particularly in same-sex marriages, what steps have the Ministry Council done in order to collate which dioceses will/which will not, license same-sex people to licensed lay ministry, and make those public?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you. I think I would just like to say that Mae and I are working on issues she is raising outside the room, just to assure Synod that the question is not being ignored and, Mae, I will continue to do that.

In terms of your question, thank you, and my personal apologies that your questions were muddled. It was not me who put them together but I did point it out at least, so we noticed.

In terms of collating it, I do not think we have done any work in collation but that would not be a bad thing for us to do. You will not be surprised to hear that there are all manner of things which we are waiting to see where we get to with LLF. I personally am in an interesting place with this question because my former diocesan bishop chaired the Pastoral Advisory Group and she was asked a question by my predecessor as Bishop of Chester about exactly about this and the answer came back, "We don't feel we can give advice until such time as LLF has done its work". The Ministry Council certainly could do work on collation. I think I would just want to size up how big the task is before I definitely commit to doing that, if that is all right.

64. *The Revd Robert Thompson (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What advice has the Ministry Council given to dioceses on how "Issues in Human Sexuality" relates to the eligibility of people to serve as House Group leaders within our parishes?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: As with the answer to question 63, there is no national guidance offered to dioceses to advise on interpretation of "Issues in Human Sexuality" in relation to Lay Ministries, including House Group Leaders. Decisions are taken locally at parochial level.

The Revd Robert Thompson: This question of course is different in that it relates to house group leaders. I know that some parishes argue that house group leaders have to fall under the clerical prescriptions of "Issues in Human Sexuality" because they share in the teaching ministry of the vicar. What ecclesiological work and what work on the theology of ordained ministry has the Ministry Council done in this area?

The Bishop of Chester: I think I get much more leery here because of our basic Anglican principle of subsidiarity, i.e., things are decided as locally as we possibly can. The problem with any definitive and shared answer to that question is there would be no one agreed definition of what a house group leader was. However, where I think we are going and need to continue to go is to consider the breadth of lay ministries, in which category this would clearly fall. So there is work being done in the area, but in terms of a very precise response to your question I am not sure I can give it here.

65. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given the underlying commitment in the 6 bold outcomes of the Vision and Strategy to work with children, young people and families, what accredited courses exist across the country to enable those called to Christian children's, youth and family work to qualify for licensed and commissioned ministry in the Church of England?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Decisions about requirements for licensing or commissioning the ministry of those called to Christian children's, youth, and family work are taken by each diocese. There is no national requirement for completion of accredited courses or minimum qualifications. However, qualifications (from foundation to postgraduate level) in Christian children's, youth, and family work are available through TEIs, mission partners (e.g., CYM, CMS), and in local or regional training pathways. We are aware that in previous years, provision for such courses and pathways has declined. This will need to be taken into account in our plans as together we work towards being a younger and more diverse Church.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Following the restructuring, where within the NCIs will sit the responsibility for increasing the number of suitably trained new children's, youth and family workers, which will be needed to achieve the Six Bold Outcomes? Will it be, I hope, within the Ministry Development Team and Council?

The Bishop of Chester: I imagine, in fact with a fairly educated guess, it will sit within the Ministry Development Team. If I am wrong I will write to you and tell you. It could be one of the many ways in which I am sure I am wrong.

66. *The Revd Joy Mawdesley (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What are the theological or ecclesiological reasons for our current situation of not having a common ordination training syllabus for those who will be ordained in the same church, with the same ordinal, and taking the same ordination vows?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The Church of England has common expectations of the qualities of those who are to be ordained, and curriculum design and approval processes ensure core disciplines and areas are taught. This is reviewed for each TEI in the regular PER cycle. However, within these common expectations, the formation of candidates may be achieved in different ways. This respects the diversity within the one body of Christ in which St Paul rejoices, enables contextual mission, creative partnership, and the sharing of local academic expertise in TEIs. This diversity includes both the diversity of the candidates themselves and the diversity of the Church which they are called to serve. As paper GS 2271 notes, the Ministry Council will be keeping the Church's proper expectations for curriculum content under review.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Mark, thank you for your answer, but I confess to be puzzled by it. I wonder if you could give me an example of a type of

candidate who would need to know less about Scripture than others, a type of missional context where the doctrine of the Church would not need to be understood or a type of church context where ignorance of the doctrine of the Church of England would be acceptable?

The Revd Mae Christie: Point of order: it is hypothetical.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul: Not at all. I am asking about specific examples the Bishop has in mind that he has referred to in his answer.

The Chair: Could you please pause for a moment, sir. I am advised that it is not hypothetical. Can I ask that you keep it simple and ask one question, please.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul: Please give me examples of diversity of situations referred to where there are bits of knowledge around Scripture or doctrine that are not necessary?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Ian. Synod may or may not be aware that you and I have a difference of opinion about whether there should be a common curriculum. The point that I would want to make is a common curriculum is not an answer to making sure everybody has biblical teaching in the syllabus that they take part in. Can I give you an example of where people need less biblical knowledge? Of course not. You know I cannot. However, I do not think the answer is a common curriculum for all sorts of reasons that have been rehearsed before between you and me and I could go into here - but we probably do not have time.

67. *Mrs Zoe Ham (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many are not ordained from training and how many of these are because they cannot assent to the doctrine of the Church of England?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Candidates in training are the responsibility of their sponsoring bishop, and so there are no nationally available data for the reasons why any candidates who begin training are not subsequently ordained. We would in most instances expect such issues to surface during the discernment process or earlier in training rather than at its end. To give an indication of the numbers who begin training but are not ordained, of the 587 ordinands who began training in 2018, we are aware of nine who withdrew during the course of training before ordination.

Mrs Zoe Ham: Thank you for your answer. The small numbers suggest that few, if any, ordinands learn anything in their training which suggests a divergence between their views and the doctrine of the Church. Given the actual divergence of views among clergy, is this in line with the expectations of the Ministry Council?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Zoe. I hope I have understood your question correctly, and if I have not please feel free to follow up with me in conversation afterwards,

because I am not meaning to dodge the issue. I think I would be surprised if people came in to start training for ordained ministry with such a fundamental misunderstanding of the doctrine of the Church of England that it meant that when they had further theological education they then discovered that they disagreed with it. I am not really sure I see the question about which you are asking is one that should be a problem. As I say, if I am misunderstanding the question please let us talk further outside this context.

The Chair. Synod, we are approaching 7 pm so I would like now to draw this item to a close. We will pick up tomorrow with question 68 when we come to Questions. May I invite Synod to join us for a closing worship which will be led ---

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Point of order. Can I request your permission to change the order of business for tomorrow morning?

The Chair. You have my permission. Please come forward. Thank you.

VARIATION

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): You will all be aware that we ---

The Chair. Synod members, can you pause for a moment, please?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): I would suggest this could be important for your planning for tomorrow. I have to do this formally. You will be aware that time is extremely short at this group of sessions. As Synod will see from the agenda for tomorrow, there is an awful lot of business that we have to get through, and we have a considerable number of amendments for Synod to debate.

As a consequence of that, I would like to suggest the following changes are made to the current order of business. Items 8 to 12, the See of Canterbury CNC, to be extended until 11 am tomorrow. Item 13, the review of the Lowest Income Communities Strategic Development Funding presentation and questions to take place until 11.30 tomorrow. Item 14, the take note debate on the review of the Lowest Income Communities and Strategic Development Funding to be deferred until tomorrow afternoon. This is to ensure that Item 15, the important debate on the spending plans, can take place tomorrow morning. I would like to suggest that this be timed business to start by 11.30.

The Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2022 and the Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2022 have been undeemed, and I would like to suggest that that debate takes place tomorrow afternoon after Item 500.

To provide time for this, I would also like to move the Lincoln Diocesan Synod Motion to Monday morning and to put Item 14, the take note debate on the Lowest Income Communities and Strategic Development Funding Review after the legal fees item.

To ensure there is still some time for Questions, I would like to ask that Item 17 Questions become timed business starting no later than 6 pm tomorrow. I am aware that there are a lot of changes, so if Synod (through you, Chair) agrees them, it will mean that tomorrow's Order Paper can be produced reflecting all those changes that should make life simple for us. No doubt I will have to be before you again to move further changes as things move around, not least to find time for the resumption of the debate on the war in Ukraine. Chair, I hope you will accept those changes.

The Chair. Thank you. I propose these changes be made. Does that have the general consent of the Synod? Can I see a show of hands, please? I believe we do. Thank you very much.

For those of you who are remaining for worship, the Chaplain will be leading us in worship. Following the closing worship, the Archbishop of York will dismiss the Synod with a blessing. If you are leaving, will you do so quietly and quickly, thank you.

The Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the General Synod) led the Synod in an act of worship.

Full Synod: Second Day Saturday 9 July 2022

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 9.00 am.

OPENING WORSHIP

The Revd Canon Tim Bull (St Albans) led the Synod in an act of worship.

SEE OF CANTERBURY CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2260)

The Chair. Good morning, everyone. I hope you have your wits about you because this is going to be procedurally a little bit complicated. We are now dealing with the item on the See of Canterbury Crown Nominations Commission issue. Members will need GS 2260. You will also need the Fourth Notice Paper, the Financial Memo, because there is a financial impact on this. If you are looking through the Fourth Notice Paper, it is paragraph 11 that you are looking for. You will also, vitally, need Order Paper II because if you do not have sight of Order Paper II you will have difficulty in following the business. It is conceivable you will find difficulty following the business if you have Order Paper II, but at least Order Paper II will give you a head start.

I need to explain how we are going to proceed and, if necessary, I will re-explain it as we go through. First of all, it is important to bear in mind that Items 8 to 12, although they are under one heading, actually count as separate items, and each will be conducted as

its own separate debate. So the full procedure will be gone through for each of those items. Some of those items have proposed amendments. It will be a normal structured debate with handling amendments partway through. The consequence of that is that I would ask members of Synod when making contributions to this debate, insofar as it is humanly possible, to speak to the particular item that is being debated. I appreciate that it is actually difficult to draw very hard boundaries around each of these items because they are interconnected. Nonetheless, we do have to deal with them as separate items so it really would be helpful to target your comments as far as is possible. If you wander too far off into another item I might have to call you to order. I will exercise, I hope, a little bit of humanity on that, recognising that the issues are not easily separable in all cases.

I also would like to remind you that we do come back to this issue again on Tuesday. This is not the last word on the Canterbury CNC. After this discussion this morning, which is substantially an in-principle debate with proposals for amendments, we will come back on Tuesday with actual wording. On Tuesday it is actual wording that we will be considering and you will have actual wording with amendments (if we have passed any) embedded in that wording. You will be dealing with the nitty-gritty of actual wording on Tuesday, not today. We are not drafting anything collectively today. We are putting down the substance and the lawyers will deal with that between now and Tuesday. You will have all the details in your Order Paper when it comes to Tuesday, and you will get me back in the Chair as well, to tie it all up.

The way we are going to proceed, as I understand it in a conversation that I have had with Jamie Harrison, is that he is going to speak for up to 10 minutes in the first instance, first of all encompassing some of the general principles and issues, and eventually honing in at the end of that 10 minutes on Item 8, which will be the first of our debates. We will deal with Item 8 and all associated business and he will wind up that debate and then we will start all over again with Item 9. You will not hear Jamie speaking for 10 minutes on each of those items because he will have done some of his general remarks at the very beginning. His introduction to each of the Items 9, 10, 11 and 12 will be that little bit shorter, but the structure will be a series of separate debates. I am afraid it will feel heavily procedural but there is not a way around that, I am afraid. With that cheery thought, I am going to ask Jamie to come forward and make his first speech to us. You have up to 10 minutes, Jamie.

ITEM 8

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thank you, Madam Chair, and good morning, Synod members. It is indeed good to be here this morning looking beyond ourselves through the Diocese of Canterbury and to the wider Anglican Communion. Whatever the outcome of our deliberations on these five motions before us, we can celebrate our partnerships in the Gospel across the Communion. I am reminded of my visit some years ago to Durham's linked diocese of Lesotho looking at medical work which we shared with our Gospel partners in Lesotho. It is great that we had our wonderful friends from the Communion here giving us their wise input yesterday.

We are also looking to our friends in Canterbury to consider their request that the See of Dover should be utilised in the form of a Crown Nominations Commission to find that bishop. It is a package of proposals from the Archbishops' Council. As the Chair has mentioned, I am going to speak to the whole of the five motions, and as time goes on try to speak briefly to each item and to the amendments.

We will remember the take note debate from February of this year on the consultation process that began around the membership of the See of Canterbury CNC, the Crown Nominations Commission. The Archbishops' Council reviewed the consultation feedback and amended the proposals as you see them this morning. Of course, the Diocese of Canterbury itself offered generously to consider reducing its number on its Canterbury CNC with the hope of establishing a CNC for Dover.

This gives us a great opportunity to look beyond ourselves, to beyond the structures, to say, "how can we together join with the Communion to see how to nominate the Archbishop of Canterbury?"

Let us look at the motions in turn. Item 8 is our first. This is quite simple in one sense: to decrease the number of Canterbury diocesan representatives on the CNC from six to three. That was the original offer from the diocese. Many responses to the consultation said if that is what the diocese is saying in the context of Dover, then please let us go with that. It is remarkable and generous to reduce their representation on their CNC for the diocesan bishop and the Archbishop. It relinquishes some control and also allows others into a very vital discernment process, as I said, also with a view to seeing Dover as a CNC process too.

The amendment from Andrew Atherstone offers Synod another option, which is not to send those representatives beyond the shores of England but rather to stay in England. I will be resisting that obviously, as you can see, but it is good that Andrew has been in conversation with me. The question I think is how much we want to look outwards, outwards even beyond Canterbury and certainly beyond England, to gain wisdom and insight from a particular view or views across the globe. Whether we have gained that deeper understanding of the past in the current Archbishop is also being challenged and I am going to refute that too with some comments in relation to the amendment from Mae.

We have seen the support from the Primates and from the Anglican Consultative Council. They want to strengthen the Communion's participation in this discernment process. That has been the view over many years. If you go back 20 years to the Perry Report *Working with the Spirit: Choosing Diocesan Bishops*, Lady Perry was quite clear she thought there should be greater participation for voting members from the Communion. That was not accepted, but we are here today, I hope, to fulfil Baroness Perry's hopes. I would ask that you would vote for Item 8 unamended.

Item 9 can still be debated whether or not we accept Item 8 because, in a sense, it is not

consequent. It still gives us an opportunity to enrich our discernment process, adding four Communion voting members to the one who is already there. This is not a new idea. It is the extension of a current idea, perhaps to regularise the process to say we know there is one Communion rep voting and another Communion person in attendance via the Secretary, so let us go for this bigger picture. We are saying a total maybe of five. Simon Butler's amendment offers the possibility of a total of three, with two added.

We know that the average Anglican is a woman, under the age of 40, living in sub-Saharan Africa, living on less than \$4 a day, quite possibly facing persecution for her faith. I do not think she is going to be terribly aware of our conversation this morning, she has far too many other important things to do, but the Archbishop of Canterbury does have a particular concern for who she is and where she is, and how the world is affecting her. His visit a couple of years ago to the DRC reminds us of how much that was appreciated: his welcome and the way he engaged in the midst of an Ebola outbreak; a very profound moment for the Communion.

The Archbishop remains a vital instrument of Communion and a focus for unity. We have heard that in the consultation process. Responses from official representatives of the Communion, whether they be Primates or clergy or laity, all sorts of backgrounds were very clear: the Archbishop is vital to the running and leadership of the Communion. We will be seeing that quite soon at the Lambeth Conference.

If we go back to Lord Hurd's Report *To Lead and to Serve* on the role of the Archbishop back in 2001, he also made the point that he saw the role of the Archbishop increasing over time. I will make reference to another report more recently, in responding to Mae about how that is the case.

We ourselves are part of this whole process, as members of the Synod. We see the Archbishop playing his vital role, facing injustice, seeking to find common mind across the world. That is good for us as much as, it is hoped for, for them.

Moving to Items 10 and 11 which follow Item 9, there is more detail on the Anglican Communion representation. We have, bizarrely perhaps, all this in our Standing Orders. This Commission is part of us. It is almost a sub-committee of the Synod. We need to be clear in our Standing Orders, but I believe not to be too prescriptive. We do not legislate over who can be a member of the Synod CNC, a rep or diocesan member, other than to say they should be clergy or laity, but we may want to go beyond that, which the amendments help us to think about. Item 10 proposes a geographical diversity to enable one Anglican Communion rep from each of the five regions of the Communion. This is a little change from the original proposals only in relation to the British Isles, bringing in the other provinces of the British Isles, I think quite rightly.

Then to Item 11, recognising, as we do here that any of our sub-committees or Commissions would be entirely a mixture of the three Houses: Clergy, Laity and Bishops or Primates. That is again what Item 11 focuses on.

Finally, and most importantly, is Item 12. When we go back to the original proposals from Canterbury, it is very clear that they would like very much to see the See of Dover as part of a CNC process, a full process. It acknowledges the differences, if you like, within Canterbury compared to other dioceses of how the diocese operates, where the Bishop of Dover is, effectively, the diocesan bishop, as well as being a very welcome *ex officio* member of the House of Bishops. This is very different from anywhere else in the Church of England.

Item 12 tries to regularise that by saying this should be a formal CNC process. Baroness Perry was clear against that because she felt that would reduce the powers of the Archbishop of Canterbury in respect of having a veto over the process. The Archbishop graciously says he is willing to go with a CNC process fully for Dover. That is a really important point to make, I think.

Would it be wrong to have two CNCs within one diocese? Maybe yes, maybe no. No, if they are exactly the same for the same purpose but yes, as here, where we are making a very clear distinction between the role of Canterbury and the role of the See of Dover. It is great we have the Bishop with us today, who is a wonderful Chair of the Synod. Thank you, Bishop.

So, we are focusing, in an odd way, on a very special area of the Church of England. On the one hand the role of the Bishop of Dover, on the other the particular provincial, national and international role of the Archbishop.

So, where does that leave us? I believe these opportunities are with us in a unique way to build on what we already have. We know there is a principle that the CNC for Canterbury should have voting membership from the Communion. We want to expand that and extend it to regularise the process. We are being asked to do that in a very clear way and I hope you can support it. There are one or two amendments that may help us to clarify what we believe and, as the Chair has reminded us, we come back on Tuesday to confirm the actual Standing Order changes.

Is all this being rushed? Well, we have already had a take note debate and a widespread consultation across the Communion as well as within the Church of England. We have got time today, more time than we imagined, sadly for some of you, if we come back this afternoon in detail, I hope we can really get to grips with this, but we have more time. And, as I say, there is a debate on Tuesday.

I want us to decide today one way or the other, not least because this is a request from Canterbury Diocese, particularly in relation to Dover. They have asked us to act and I always want to respond to the requests of dioceses. I very much look forward to the debate, I very much hope you will support the proposals and think hard about the amendments. In the first instance, Madam Chair, I beg to move Item 8 standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Item 8 is now open for debate, and in view of the ground that we have to cover and the necessary procedural complexity in doing so, I am going to set the speech limit at three minutes from the outset. So, if anyone wishes to speak on Item 8, please do stand to indicate your wish to do so. I see no one standing. I do see someone standing.

The Revd Canon David Bruce Bryant-Scott (Europe): I am rising simply to oppose this motion and to ask a series of questions. I spoke in February, so I will not say again necessarily what I said then. But the reason I oppose this motion is fundamentally because I am not sure we have really had the serious Communion-wide discussion and consultation. The brief quality of consultations with the Anglican Consultative Council and with the Primates, I do not think went deep into the Anglican Communion, into the General Synods or General Conventions across our Communion. And I do not think that the ordinary person, whether she is a member of the church in sub-Saharan Africa or a Māori in New Zealand, have had the opportunity to speak to these issues.

Questions I would pose are such like these. First of all, is this actually not, perhaps, an example of mission creep? Over a hundred years ago when the first Lambeth Conference gathered together the Archbishop of Canterbury worked as a convenor, no more and no less. Since then, of course, we have had things like the ACC come along, but, of course, he is merely the president of that, he is not the Chair and the control and leadership of that organisation is broadly dispersed among clergy, laity and bishops.

I think the Primates' meeting is so recent that, again, he provides a convening leadership role in all of that, but the query needs to be asked, is this a necessary thing that that office be the one that does those kinds of things? Will we perhaps, in 20 or 30 years, be looking at another model of leadership within with Anglican Communion?

I think the second question I would ask is whether or not this does not perpetuate a form of colonial paternalism that goes back decades and centuries within the Anglican Communion, and I suggest that the fact that we have in some respects politicised the position means that whoever is in the position gets attacked by some and is loved by others, and most people within the Communion do not have a thought one way or the other.

Finally, again, I worry about this, because some of you may remember the recent visit by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge to Jamaica, and I think we can say with some certainty that that did not go quite as well as it might.

The Chair: I am afraid you have hit the time limit.

The Revd Canon David Bruce Bryant-Scott (Europe): Thank you.

The Chair: After the next speaker, I am tempted to move on to consider the amendment before we proceed with the debate.

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter): I would like to speak in support of Item 8. I think that the role of Archbishop of Canterbury is a very special role, and I think it is often said that in England we cannot have nice things, we seem to tear down things that are exceptional. It is an exceptional role and history is why it is an exceptional role, but I think look at all the good that it does and it holds the Communion together. I know some people might argue with that, but it does.

I think that this cements it as a global role as well, because it is not just about the Church of England, it is about our shared history, and it is reductionist to just put it down as it is completely bad because it was tied up with empire. I think we have a shared history, the Archbishop of Canterbury unites people all around the world and these changes I would support, especially Item 8, because I think it gives it a bit more credibility on the global level.

The Chair: I do not see anybody else standing, but in any case, there is clearly not a huge pressure to speak on this item, so I am going to move to take the amendment. I invite Andrew Atherstone to move his amendment, please. You have up to five minutes.

The Revd Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): I bring my amendment to establish for us this morning the basic principle that future Archbishops of Canterbury should be chosen by the Church of England, not by members of other churches. Handing out these three spare spaces around the Anglican Communion is not only highly complicated, as we might see later, not only likely to degenerate into Anglican politicking, but also in principle is the wrong thing to do.

In effect, I want to suggest to us that these proposals are like an English land grab. It does not actually relinquish control, as Jamie has hinted, in fact it assumes more English control over the Communion. My amendment simply invites the Archbishops' Council to bring back proposals at a future date, maybe next February, about how these three spaces might be redistributed, but across the wider Church of England. There are many creative ways in which that might be done to make the Canterbury CNC younger and more diverse, and my amendment simply establishes that sort of direction of travel, that those three spaces should be redistributed in the Church of England and not around the globe.

I think there is common cause in this right across the floor of Synod. I am grateful for David's speech a moment ago. We might come at this question from very different theological and political perspectives about the nature and the future of Anglicanism - we are a very diverse bunch here in the room, we disagree on all sorts of things - but on this point we are agreed; that we do not have Anglican popes, we do not have a monolithic worldwide Anglican Church, but lots of local, national and regional expressions of the Anglican faith.

And, therefore, it is wrong in principle for future Archbishops of Canterbury, which is an English See, to be chosen by the world. It is actually a major shift in the nature of our Anglican ecclesiology if we go ahead with this, and that is why I will be supporting Mae Christie's amendment later on. We do need a comprehensive review of these questions before we go any further.

English Christians need to learn to lay down our global ambitions, not to be adding to them. I come to this conclusion not through a blinkered Little England mentality but on the contrary through the light in the global Anglican Communion of which we are a part. One of the best things about being Anglican today is being part of that worldwide Anglican family, now much more extensive and more dynamic and diverse than ever before.

My eyes have been opened to this partly through experience on the Anglican Consultative Council, one of those instruments of Communion. Just look at the number of new Anglican provinces we have been celebrating just in the last few years. Now Sudan and Chile, Alexandria, Mozambique and Angola, and very soon, we hope, Ceylon. English Anglicans, that is us represented in this room, English Anglicans who are members of a worshipping community are a tiny proportion of the global Anglican family, less than 2%, something like that. So why do we still harbour these global ambitions for England always to be first, to raise our status in the Communion even higher than it is already, which these proposals seem to do? We should be talking today about equality across the Anglican world not about bolstering further our primacy.

Archbishop Justin's ministry has been remarkable and is remarkable and I want to salute that today. His very personal work in strengthening the bonds of the Anglican family around the world means it is no surprise that the See of Canterbury is held in very high esteem, and rightly so, and Archbishop Justin has brought great honour to that office.

But we are thinking about the future now, we are thinking about the next Archbishop and the one after that and the one after that, over the next 20 or 30 years, and let us be careful, Synod, before we institutionalise England's global status by requisitioning these votes from other continents and churches. Why is it that the English think the future belongs to us, just because by historical accident the first Anglican church plant happened to be a little village in Kent?

So, the CNC proposals before us today, though well-meaning, I want to suggest they are misguided. They have the appearance of humility, but actually they are the opposite. True humility admits and acknowledges that the Church of England is a local church, it is a national Church, we do not rule the globe, and therefore our bishops should be chosen nationally, not globally. Let us be thinking about the long-term consequences of what we are doing today. It is going to run into the 2040s, the 2050s, let us think ahead, and please support my amendment.

The Chair: I call upon Jamie Harrison to speak to Synod to indicate whether he accepts or resists the proposal. I realise he has already given prior indication in his speech, but he needs to do so formally.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): My good friend Andrew is very persuasive, he speaks very well and from a very good heart, but I want to resist, for a number of reasons. I think the implication of what he is saying is we should remove the one person who actually sits on the current CNC, and whether we should bring that as an amendment - I wonder - to our Standing Orders. I hope not. We have got a very deep relationship, which is already fleshed out through the process we have. I think we are trying to regularise what is already the situation. Okay, the future is important, but we are actually trying to say what is the situation today and in the foreseeable future.

Each Archbishop will of course define their ministry in relation to Communion, that is quite right, but I cannot see a huge change, and certainly there has been no planning from previous conversations where we have had reports. I think the Primates have very clearly said in their consultation how much they support this, so are we going to go against their desires and ideas? I do worry about this English for the English, I am not saying that Andrew is saying that, he said he was not, but I think that is the signal that will come from this if we decide to use these three out of 16 places for England.

It does seem at this particular political time that is not a good signal, for me anyway. You are to decide. And, of course, the wider Church is listening to this debate. We will have 12 English voices if we do this, and remember there is already an independent Chair who is English, plus the nine, is that not enough to give a voice to the future Archbishop?

Archbishop Justin reminds me of the Archbishop of Armagh, Richard Clarke's, recent work on the Gift, Call and Challenge of Communion which very clearly does look at the role of the Archbishop, and is deeply supportive of it, so I very much hope you resist this. If you do resist this, great, if you do not, we can still move to Items 9, 10 and 11. This is not going to kill this whole thing off, and Andrew is very clear on that, but it does put us in a difficult position, it would extend the size if we go for three or five additional or two or four additional. I hope you will resist and that we can move on to really grapple with inclusion and width and breadth and globalisation, if that is the right word, in this context.

The Chair: As you heard, the amendment is resisted, and so it will lapse unless 25 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue and a vote to be taken on the amendment. Do I see 25 members standing? And the green ticks on Zoom, of course, we have some people on Zoom. There are 25 members standing plus green ticks on Zoom, so we continue the debate on the amendment, amendment 62, and I call upon Rachel Mann and then Jayne Ozanne. The speech limit remains at three minutes.

The Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): When I was a newly ordained deacon, collar too tight and a little too sure I was going to change the Church of England for the

better, my wise old training incumbent said “Remember, Rachel, ordained ministry is an impossible job. Listen to and respond to God and you will find your own way to inhabit it”. If ministry is tough full stop, I cannot begin to imagine the mess and complexity, the riches and frustrations of an Archbishop, let alone the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Perhaps it is a truly impossible job, with its tightrope of constitutional realities and mysteries, the national and international and Communion expectations. When I first saw the proposed changes to the Canterbury CNC, I instinctively kicked against them. What? A reduction in the number of reps, and the Archbishop’s own *de jure* diocese? More, that the number of representatives from the Anglican Communion were to be pumped up from one to five. I thought this is a recipe for deeper muddle, an archbishop of everywhere and nowhere all at once.

And it fed my febrile anxiety about this limiting the chance of a woman ever being Archbishop or of the Archbishop being able to chaplain to an increasingly inclusive nation. Will we end up with a cut-price pope wearing a Canterbury cap rather than a zucchetto, I asked. Well, I have changed my mind and I ask you to resist my friend Andrew’s amendment.

The Archbishop of Canterbury’s role is impossible, however, the proposals as they stand can only aid him, her, one day them, inhabit the impossible with a greater attentiveness to the God who calls us into ever deeper communion. The Archbishop is one of four Anglican instruments of Communion, the role is intimately entwined with the other three. These proposals take that reality seriously. An expanded Communion presence honours the truth of the Archbishop’s ministry and the decision of the Canterbury Diocese and Synod to reduce the number of reps is a work of humility. To increase the Communion’s representation would not only signal trust in the Spirit’s prompting of the Church, as the Archbishop’s role moves into exciting post-colonial possibilities, but also count as a token of our call in Communion towards in-dwelling fellowship.

The Chair: Since the Archbishop of York has indicated that he wishes to speak, I am prepared to give him priority over Jayne Ozanne, unless she wishes to give way to him. Strictly speaking it should be the Archbishop of York next, and then Archbishop Titre.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): I hope Jayne does get a chance to speak. Synod, I also urge you to resist this amendment and indeed I think most of the amendments. I wonder if it is helpful just to have a very brief little bit of a reality check of where we are in the Anglican Communion. We do indeed need discussion about the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we absolutely do, and thank goodness we have been doing it for the last 20 years, but we seem to have forgotten that we have done it.

We had the Perry Report 20 years ago, which set us off down this track and Anglican Communion representation was brought in to the Canterbury CNC. We crossed that Rubicon, that has already happened, and it happened because we spent a lot of time

thinking and praying about it. Then only two years ago we had the Anglican Communion Report from our own theological advisory group looking into the gift, the call and the challenge of Communion, looking particularly at the relationship between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other instruments of Communion.

Now, I realise most of us do not know that, but, Andrew, my dear brother, you are a member of the ACC, you do know this, you do know that the discussions you and others are saying should happen first, have happened. And now we are beginning to work out what that means for us in the Church of England and for the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Also, like Rachel, I applaud the humility and bravery of the Canterbury Diocese to recognise that that leaves them in a different place, and at the moment it is neither one thing or the other.

This will resolve that, giving them a clear process for the appointment of the Bishop of Dover and enabling the Archbishop of Canterbury to fulfil their purposes within our Church of England. Indeed my own appointment was also based upon this 20-year trajectory of, “we need to look at how Archbishops function within our Church and therefore within the Anglican Communion”. Are we really going to vote against something which has been voted on clearly and unanimously by the Canterbury Diocese, clearly and unanimously by the Archbishops’ Council, clearly and unanimously by the ACC itself, clearly and unanimously by the Primates’ meeting of the Anglican Communion? They all saw that this is not about, kind of, England taking over the world, it is actually humbly inviting the world into the room.

One last point, because I know I have to stop, which I think we could easily forget here. The reason that the Archbishop of Canterbury has such a say in the affairs, not of the Church, not of England, but of the world, is because of the Anglican Communion. You know, we need a bit of humility here. Our Church has been in decline for a long while and I hope later today we will start turning corners to change that.

It is because the Archbishop of Canterbury is an instrument of Communion for the whole Communion, and therefore the whole Communion must have, some say, a greater say in how that person is elected, that we continue to have a say on the globe. If we resist this, I think we are in a bad place.

The Chair: There is a time issue. I have been mildly lenient, but even Archbishops have to be called to order eventually. I call upon Jayne Ozanne to speak for three minutes, and then Archbishop Titre indicated a wish to speak, and so I will let him speak, and then I think we may need to move to dealing with the amendment.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Far be it from me to disagree with the Archbishop and indeed with my friend Rachel, but I stand to support Andrew in this amendment, and indeed I will be supporting Mae’s amendment. The reason we are debating this, Archbishop, is because we, Synod, have our own concerns and our own responsibilities that we need to ensure are heard in this decision. Now, I was part of the Archbishops’ Council back in

1998 when we commissioned the Perry Report and I think the job of the Archbishop of Canterbury is probably the most difficult in the world, and I put that above even our Prime Minister's job right now. I think the number of conflicting responsibilities is huge.

But, ultimately, we here in England have got our challenges ahead of us right now. We are, whether we like it or not, at war with each other, it feels at times. I hope and pray that we will find a way through in the years ahead, but that is going to require us to put extra measures in place to ensure that everyone feels heard and understood. There is one topic which has not really been named so far this morning, which is our concerns over sexuality and who is going to have what say around that table, and that we have measures in place to ensure that different groups feel that they are represented and understood. And that is why I am standing to support someone who naturally I perhaps would have very different theological points of view from, because I believe it is important that at this time in the Church of England's history, we look to England and we look to ensure that the concerns that many of us hold are recognised and that people are put in place to ensure their voices are heard.

So, Synod, look to your conscience as you will, do not just feel you have to vote because others have already said they want to support this, and think about where we are at this moment in the Church of England's history and where we hope we will be in the years to come, and what are the best mechanisms to ensure that we can get there. I pray that the Spirit will move us either way.

The Chair: Archbishop Titre.

The Archbishop of the Congo (the Most Revd Titre Ande Georges): I would like first to underline that the Church of England is not only the Church of England but it is also a member of the Anglican Communion. And also what I want to say is that you have a historical responsibility. It is not a matter of mother church or the colonial issue, but there is a link. It means that whatever you decide here may affect other Churches, the Anglican Church, throughout the world, positively or negatively. I would like us to be more careful when we decide. It seems to me you prefer to see your own interests. We have challenges here in England, but there is also the Anglican Church out there and we are looking to that.

When the Primates met in April, they were happy to have one member per region, so we made five members, and all regions may be represented. That is very important, because the Archbishop of Canterbury is not only the symbol. There are other instruments, there are committees, there are meetings, but the Archbishop of Canterbury is a human being, he can move, talk to people and solve issues. When he went to Congo, he helped a lot, and people heard him, even the government officials, when the Archbishop of Canterbury said something, they listened to it. When the former Archbishop came to Bunia, the President had to send someone to meet him to welcome him.

So, it is not only the issue of the Archbishop here, it is also the issue of the Archbishop in the Anglican Communion where he plays a big role. We have been working with the current Archbishop on the issues of peace, reconciliation and even going to South Sudan to support the peace process there. So, you have that responsibility as the Church of England. We have that historical link. You are not like other Churches, so do not only see what is here, but see a bit further too, because that is your historical role.

Why did you start the Anglican Church here and why did you take the Gospel to other places if you do not like to assume that responsibility? And now you are saying we want to see only our interests now. You are a member of the Anglican Communion and together let us ---

The Chair: Thank you. At this point, and mindful of the amount of business still to be gone through, I would like to test the mind of Synod as to whether Synod feels that there has been sufficient debate on the amendment and so I would wish to invite a show of hands in favour of closure on the amendment.

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

The Chair: We are now in a position, therefore, since that was passed very clearly, to vote on the amendment.

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

The Chair: In view of the discussions that we have had, I am inclined to think that we could draw Item 8 to a close. If I could test the mind of Synod on whether that is acceptable.

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

The Chair: We can then move to bringing Item 8 to a close and I invite Jamie Harrison to make a statement there. Strictly, you have up to five minutes but please do not use five minutes. We have not really got enough time for five minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am grateful for all the speakers. I think what is striking is the sincerity of the speeches and the commitment to the Gospel of the speeches. What we are finding is just a different perspective on how the Gospel will increase both here and across the world. Bruce, of course, with a historical background in Canada, now in Crete, is more exotic than many of us and so thank you, Bruce, for your intervention and for Luke, too, in response to that.

We have dealt with Andrew's amendment. I think there were some very helpful speeches around that. Rachel Mann, changing her mind; Jayne, again as always clear in her thinking and expressing that; and particularly to the Archbishop of the Congo who is such a wonderful person to be with us. We are so grateful you are able to be with us and really saying that fundamental question: why take the Gospel to other places if we do not then

also take the responsibility of that taking? I very much hope you will vote for Item 8 unamended.

The Chair: We can vote by show of hands.

A Speaker: Point of order. Can we have a vote by Houses?

The Chair: We can have a vote by Houses, that is in order. If you wish to have a vote by Houses, I would need to see 25 people standing or green ticks on the Zoom. I am constantly being reminded about green ticks on the Zoom. I am sorry, Zoom people. It is difficult to look at everything at once. We have the sufficient number for us to have a counted vote by Houses. We will, please, go through that procedure. You will need your voting cards. You will need your little machine in order to stick your cards into it and the Registrar will make the appropriate announcements. Synod, there seems to be a glitch with the people who are on Zoom doing the voting. We have a point of order through Zoom which may well be to do with this issue. We will take it and see what it says.

The Revd Mark Miller (Durham): It was two points of order, please. One is to do with the voting. As I think you have already picked up, several of my colleagues are using green ticks rather than the Lumi platform. Also, one of my colleagues online, 159 London, Amatu, was calling for a point of order and I think probably was not aware that we have to type in to the chat, "point of order". We have to write "point of order". So there are a couple of Zoom sort of etiquette matters that might be worth clarifying. I wonder if I can raise one other thing, which is those in the chamber who are calling for a point of order unless they go to a microphone we cannot hear them and just an encouragement to do that, please.

The Chair: That is really helpful. I am sorry that there has been the problem, but the points that you have raised are really helpful reminders when we are doing a hybrid meeting. I need to be advised as to where that leaves us with the voting on the legalities of it. Okay, members, we are going to run the vote again. We hope that this will resolve matters, but who knows. I am ordering a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 8: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 27, against none, with one recorded abstention. In the House of Clergy, 129 in favour, 30 against, with 10 recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 118 in favour, 49 against, with 11 recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

ITEM 9

The Chair: We move now then to Item 9 on the agenda and I call upon Jamie Harrison to move Item 9. You have, strictly speaking, up to 10 minutes, but we think you have already covered a substantial part of the ground and so I hope you will not need 10 minutes or we will never get done.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Yes, lunch is coming soon, do not worry. I think we have had a really good discussion about the principle, which in fact has moved into the principle of do we hold these places or do we send them, in a sense, out more widely? Item 9 is basically saying we should increase from one to five the number of representatives from the Anglican Communion. There are five regions. As the Archbishop of Congo reminds us, that is a very helpful way of thinking about it. We are suggesting that that would be how we want to approach it. This is to increase the size of the CNC by four from the Communion. Obviously, we have lost three, as it were, from Canterbury, so we have got minus three plus four and so we actually add one to the total size, if my mathematics is correct, which would make it 17. I beg to move Item 9.

The Chair: Item 9 is now open for debate. The speech limit is still three minutes.

Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells): This proposal looks quite radical, enlarging the Canterbury CNC and drawing in representatives from across the Anglican Communion. It is deceptive. It is not at all radical. We are not reviewing the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the question of which bishop or Archbishop should be, in a sense, the senior bishop, the instrument of Communion. We are assuming that will always be the Archbishop of Canterbury. The probability of a highly gifted bishop or Archbishop from Asia or America wishing to come to be the bishop of a diocese in South East England in order to be the senior bishop and instrument of Communion is most unlikely.

Because we limit that role to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we are limiting it in effect. We cannot draw from the talent of the whole Anglican Communion and perhaps in some ways that is not a bad thing because if the Archbishop of Canterbury were from Asia or Latin America they would not be eligible to sit in the House of Lords and we would get in a nice old constitutional muddle. There has been consultation on this specific proposal, but I have not seen any evidence - maybe I am wrong - that there has been consultation more widely about whether there ought to be a division of the roles of the current Archbishop of Canterbury so that somebody else, possibly in another part of the world, could be that instrument of Communion and senior bishop.

This is a post-Colonial age, but it is a Colonial amendment. It will always be from England. Please, colleagues, let us think a bit more deeply about this. Let us not make a hasty decision now which will probably mean it does not come back to this Synod for many years. Let us think a bit more radically and a bit more widely. Does our senior bishop, our instrument of Communion, have to be from Kent or could they be from Korea or Chile? Not with the present system they could not. Please reject this amendment and let us have a far more radical discussion about the whole principle.

The Revd Dr Tom Woolford (Blackburn): Central to our Anglican ecclesiology is that a diocesan bishop is *primus inter pares*, first among equals, among the college of his or her fellow presbyters, and that an Archbishop is *primus inter pares* among his or her fellow diocesan bishops, and that an Archbishop of Canterbury is *primus inter pares* among his or her fellow Primates. Therefore, a bishop needs to be more like a normal priest not

less. An Archbishop needs to be more like a normal diocesan bishop not less. The Archbishop of Canterbury needs to be more like a normal Primate not less. This motion makes the Archbishop of Canterbury more different from the fellow Primates. To the extent that Anglicanism is an "ism", this move seems to be a departure from it and so I shall urge Synod to vote against the motion.

ITEM 63

The Chair. I am going to move to bring forward the amendment now because of the immense pressure of time that we are under. I call upon Mae Christie to move the amendment standing in her name, Item 63. She will have up to five minutes but I hope will not take five.

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): Good morning. You can say it back, good morning. First, I want to thank the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and, indeed, the Archbishops' Council for being bold in thinking about how we select future Archbishops of Canterbury. Real change is seldom straightforward or easy and I think that we are all very aware of that.

As I looked over the proposal in more detail, I thought about that average Anglican that Jamie mentioned. She is a woman. She lives in Africa. She is under the age of 30. Most likely, she lives on a lower wage than most of us here today. So what matters to her? What matters to her in her faith in Jesus Christ? And how does she relate to the Anglican Communion and, indeed, how might she relate to the Archbishop of Canterbury? Then, what about the millions of Anglicans living here in the United Kingdom? Maybe she actually shares experiences and maybe she shares values and hopes with them.

It is so good to hear that the Archbishop of Canterbury has her in mind - and, of course, that is no surprise - but maybe we should make more of an effort to understand what she actually thinks by listening to her and her community. I would query whether or not widespread consultation of the Communion could be conducted in such a short timeframe by primarily speaking with the Anglican Consultative Council, bishops and Primates and whether we should have done so a bit more fully here at home.

Maybe this hypothetical woman, who I sound a bit obsessed with, maybe she and a working class 28 year old man working a night shift at Tesco before serving at the Sunday morning service at his church would have a lot in common, or maybe not. The thing is we do not know because we have not asked them, and we have not had enough time to ask open-ended questions about how we should comprise the group of people who select our Archbishop of Canterbury.

This amendment seeks to give us time to conduct a wider process alongside, and not just deliver to our Communion partners as well as folks here at home, who are indeed the primary care of our Archbishop of Canterbury. We need time to understand the implications of changing the way that we select someone who has a prophetic voice in

British society, who prays for the nation and for the world, who is a member of the House of Lords and, fundamentally, has the cure of souls for our Province as all of his or her Primate colleagues do in their regions. We need to much more deeply and openly ask questions of power and representation to our Anglican Communion brothers and sisters, be open to their views without asking leading questions and being vulnerable to their answers, otherwise we are just giving the impression of sharing power and that is window dressing.

Let us honour the importance of this decision and how it might impact the next few decades of the life of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion with a lot more listening, a lot more open listening at home and, indeed, very much so abroad. You might not be surprised to hear I have a dog in that hunt. I would be very interested in that conversation. This amendment gives us the opportunity to be brave and to be bold and take our time to conduct a truly open process which might possibly result in a very different Archbishop of Canterbury CNC.

We need to perhaps pump the brakes just a little bit. I am not for interminable processes personally, but just a bit. Perhaps, if we do so, that CNC will be younger and more diverse. Maybe our average Anglican abroad and our average Anglican here at home will have more of a voice, or, even better, maybe they will have a seat at the table. Now is the time, as it is written in the Book of Revelation, to listen to how the Spirit is speaking to the Church. Friends, please, please, please vote for this amendment and let us pray for a thoughtful and, indeed, powerful result.

A Speaker: Point of order. I am not entirely sure if I am doing this the right way, but I would like to move that we move straight to a vote on this amendment without any further debate. Am I allowed to give reasons?

The Chair: I am advised that that is not a point of order.

A Speaker: Oh, sorry.

The Chair: That is a motion for closure.

A Speaker: Can I make a motion for closure?

The Chair: You might say taking a broad hint from the Chair. That has my consent. I would like to test the mind of Synod on this. The proposal for a closure has been made.

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

The Chair: We therefore can proceed directly to vote on Item 63.

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): Point of order. Pardon, I am still new but can we do the Houses thing? I would like to call for a vote by Houses. Thank you, sister.

The Chair: I am advised that we have got ourselves in a legal tangle and I do apologise for that. I cannot call the closure as quickly as that because I need to do the 25 members standing. No, I am sorry, I am in a complete muddle here.

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): I only want the motion for the vote by Houses on my amendment if we do close on the amendment. That is what I meant, pardon me.

The Chair: We have not quite got there yet.

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): Oh, I am so sorry.

The Chair: I call upon Jamie Harrison to speak to the amendment and to indicate whether he accepts or rejects the amendment.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Don't you just love procedure! It is great, isn't it? Like Andrew, Mae is very persuasive, but I am going to resist. We have had an interesting conversation already about how much the Communion has engaged in this process and how much it has not. We have heard from the Archbishop of York in relation to a significant piece of work done by the Archbishop of Armagh looking at certain of these issues. Most of us, including me, are ignorant of that, but I have been informed and it is an important piece of work. Perhaps we should have commented on it before. Similarly, our friend from The Congo, reminds us this is very much supported by the Primates.

There has been a wide consultation. It perhaps was not picked up as much as it might have been but we know that is the way of consultations. Have you thought if we took this consultation to our PCCs how much feedback we would actually get. I just worry with Mae's comments about taking, as she says, a comprehensive review with our Anglican Communion partners, that is over 40 provinces across the world, 70-odd million people: do we really think they are going to be able to give us the valuable information which she quite rightly asks for? I am not convinced we would get it.

I think there has been consultation. We have had very clear steers from the ACC, the Anglican Consultative Council, and from the Primates that they would like this to happen. It gives them a stake in this process which they are very much part of and want to be part of. I think now is the time to do it.

We are in a situation at the moment - praise God - that we have both a Bishop of Dover and an Archbishop of Canterbury. We cannot make decisions in a vacant See. We have to sort these rules out before. I would argue that by doing this it actually opens the door to the ability to do this wider consultation because we are signalling to the Communion that we want them to be more involved, and by giving that signal we can draw them into the next stage of review and consideration. If we close the door, effectively, by putting out a very widespread and slow and possibly expensive

consultation, I fear the long grass comes into play. I am not suggesting that is Mae's intention, but I think that is what would happen.

I would be very concerned about what that signals. We have already agreed that we will remove or reduce the number of Canterbury CNC reps from six to three, opening a door now not to England but beyond, but then we might be saying with this amendment, "Oh but we won't do it for X years", however long it takes. We know how long these sorts of processes can take.

I am grateful to Mae for raising this because it is an important point, but, as I say, I very much want to resist it and trust you will resist it too.

The Chair. Thank you. Jamie has indicated that he resists this, so this amendment will lapse unless I see 25 people standing or otherwise indicating that they wish the debate to continue. Including the Zoom people, and we must never leave them out, there are 25 people wishing to continue.

A Speaker. Point of order. I propose a motion of closure on this debate. Shall I come to the microphone?

The Chair. I think that would be nice because we have been asked that you do that by the people on Zoom because they cannot hear otherwise.

A Speaker. I am proposing a motion for closure because we have had it very nicely explained how we have thought about these things already. We have better things to think about. I think there are better people to think about the details of this. We have passed the substantive motion. I think we need to close this, vote on it and move on.

The Chair. Are there 25 members standing in support of the motion for closure?

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): A point of order. I am so sorry if I am out of order, but can I not speak against the closure of my own amendment?

The Chair. No, simply you cannot. That is very clear. I am happy to accept the motion for closure since there was some indication previously.

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

The Chair. We now vote on Item 63, that is the amendment.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order. Would you consider ordering a count by Houses, please?

The Chair. I would so consider. Are there 25 people in support of a vote by Houses? I see 25. I am dispensing with the bell, but this is a counted vote by Houses on Item 63.

The vote on Item 63: In the House of Bishops, those in favour two, against 25, with one recorded abstention. In the House of Clergy, 54 in favour, 104 against, with one recorded abstention. In the House of Laity, 78 in favour, 86 against, with 10 recorded abstentions.

The motion was put and lost.

ITEM 64

The Chair. You will see that since Item 63 was not carried then we proceed immediately to the consequential Item 64. I call upon Simon Butler to move as an amendment Item 64.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): This is a pragmatic and process amendment rather than a principled one. The purpose is to offer Synod a wider range of options than those on the Order Paper. Any of the options available today, the one under the name of Jamie Harrison, those tabled as amendments, delay through possible adjournment, which we might see later, the status quo, all have positive and negative elements. Indeed, part of the difficulty of this whole process, which I was involved in at an earlier stage, is that it touches on deeply and personally held commitments about what it means to be an Anglican and a member of the Church of England.

In a way, this modest set of proposals that Jamie has brought forward, which to my mind are eminently sensible and reasonable, have become freighted with anxiety about the nature of the Church and Communion, of which we are all part, anxiety about where power lies, and who exercises it, and fear about unintended consequences about the way we appoint the Archbishop of Canterbury, and how that will affect our deeply held concerns about live issues in the Church at the moment, most notably race and human sexuality.

I confess I am slightly disappointed by the accusations of colonialism that have gone Jamie's way today. I think that can cut both ways. My eyebrows have been raised when I hear concerns about involving larger numbers of non-English members on the Canterbury CNC from those who on other occasions might have been in the forefront of challenging us about racism and colonialism. Not having any overseas members on the CNC seems to me to be worthy of the accusation of colonialism as well, so let us not bandy the c-word about too much.

My amendment simply reduces the number of Communion voting members from five to three. It seems to me almost unbelievable that the *primus inter pares* is still chosen almost exclusively by members of the Church of England, but this sort of change sometimes requires smaller steps to build confidence, especially when lack of trust and, to my mind, false perceptions of centralism are the prevailing narrative among us at the moment.

The downside of my amendment, which I readily admit, is that three Communion voting members will inevitably exclude some parts of the Communion from being as present as others, which I accept, and I will vote for the main motion, if my amendment is defeated, with happiness. It may be that a combination of real politick and gradualism is the mood of this Synod, and so I offer my amendment in that spirit of a middle way.

What I think is incontestably true, however, is that the role of the See of Canterbury has evolved and will continue to do so. I am extremely grateful for the opportunity we have to evolve the way we discern the candidate to fill the See is being addressed before there is a vacancy. I invite Synod, either through this amendment, or through Dr Harrison's motion, to decide how it would like to proceed. I move the motion standing at Item 64.

The Chair: Thank you. I call upon Jamie Harrison to indicate whether he wishes to accept or resist this amendment. You have two minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): As ever, Simon is very tempting, is he not, to follow him. I note his caution about some of the drawbacks. I am going to resist this. I suggest we move forward firmly and clearly. We have a very clear mandate for five. Please vote for five and not this amendment.

The Chair: As Jamie Harrison does not support this amendment, it will lapse unless 25 members stand in their places, or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate to continue and a vote to be taken on the amendment. I now invite members to stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate. For those on Zoom, please use the green ticks to indicate if you wish the debate on the amendment to continue. Thank you. There are 25 members so we continue with the debate on the amendment.

The Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I need to declare an interest. I heard a call to orders at St George's Cathedral in Cape Town. I trained to be a priest in Imbali Township in KwaZulu-Natal and was ordained in St Boniface Cathedral, Germiston, by Bishop Simeon Nkoane.

It is important that we recognise the nature of our whole Communion body and I support that there are members of the wider Communion at the CNC. My concern and why I support Fr Simon's amendment here is that the balance of the CNC in terms of the numbers around the table is always a challenge, and the more we put on the table the more noise happens and the less discernment.

There will be a challenge about how we choose three rather than five. My suggestion later would be that we choose them from amongst the Anglican Consultative Council. To have three keeps the CNC at the same size as it is at the moment and allows closer listening rather than more noise.

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter): I am opposed to the amendment. I think we have already backed in principle what this is aiming to do and I think it is important that we do not end

up with death by a thousand amendments. We have heard, obviously, from the Archbishop of the Congo. I really cannot see how it can be negative if we are trying to be a more diverse and global Church to have five. We have backed the concept of it. I think we should not water it down.

The Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester): I think this is altogether offering crumbs to our global heritage majority people, so at least let us offer more crumbs. Please resist this amendment.

The Chair: I am minded to test the mind of Synod. There is somebody standing, but I really think that we need to go for closure, so I am going to test the mind of Synod on closure here. I put the motion for closure on this particular amendment, that is to say amendment 64.

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

The Chair: We are debating, amongst other things, what we are doing about timing simultaneously, as it were. We go now for voting on the amendment, which is Item 64.

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

The Chair: Let me just consult on where we are going from here. I realise we are still dealing with Item 9, but in the light of possible adjournment I need to take further advice. I have sorted myself out. Is there anyone still wishing to debate Item 9? No? In that case, I call upon Jamie Harrison to respond to Item 9.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I will be quick. Christina, thank you for making some points around the nature of the Archbishop's role. I would point out it is not just the English. We have had a Welshman who was the Archbishop and I think we can look beyond England if we need to. Tom made a point about the ecclesiology of the Archbishop and I think that is worth noting. We have dealt with Mae's amendment and Simon's amendment, which I think clarified a number of issues further. Just looking at the last vote, I sense the desire to move forward, hopefully at some pace. I am very grateful to those who have contributed and trust you will vote very positively for Item 9 as it is unamended.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Can we have a vote by Houses on this item, please?

The Chair: I am happy to put that to the house. Are there 25 people who are in favour of voting by Houses on this topic, including people on Zoom, who should use their green ticks? We will have a vote by Houses therefore. This is a counted vote by Houses on Item 9. I will dispense with the bell.

The vote on Item 9: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 22, against none, with 4 recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 118 in favour, 37 against, with 8 recorded

abstentions. In the House of Laity, 101 favour, 61 against, with 11 recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The Chair: At this moment, in view of the pressure of business, this debate is adjourned.

THE CHAIR *Canon Izzy McDonald-Booth (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 11.01 am.

ITEM 13

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND LOWEST INCOME COMMUNITIES FUNDING (GS 2261)

The Chair: Good morning, Synod. We come to Item 13. As you will have heard before, there is a slight change in the order of business, Items 13 and 14 have been split, so Item 14 will be taken this afternoon. For this item of business you will need GS 2261. This item gives members the opportunity to engage with the independent review of SDF and LInC funding which reported in March 2022. There will be a short presentation and there will be, afterwards, a short time for questions. I would like to call on Sir Robert Chote to give his presentation.

Sir Robert Chote: Good morning, everybody. It is a great pleasure to be here and to have the opportunity to take you through the highlights of our review. We were asked to look at the performance of LInC and SDF over their first five years and to offer some thoughts on how they might contribute to the Church's mission in future. I was joined on the review team by Busola Sodeinde, Sarah Clark, the Bishop of Jarrow, and Stephen Smith. Busola and Stephen are here today to help with any questions you may have.

As many of you will know, LInC supports ministry and social action in the lowest income communities and is distributed to dioceses by formula based on their population, average income and the number of people on very low incomes. Around £100 million is set to be distributed during the current triennium period. SDF supports, and I quote, "major change programmes or activities which fit with dioceses' strategic plans and which are intended to make a significant difference to their mission and financial strength". In 2021 the Archbishops' Council said that the SDF should focus on large, urban areas and younger, ethnic minority and deprived communities, with the aim of delivering growth in numbers, discipleship and social action. Funding there is expected to total around £60 million over the same triennium.

In addition to ploughing through lots of paperwork and spreadsheets, in conducting the review we spoke to numerous stakeholders and conducted a survey of diocesan officials, but the highlights for us were visits to projects in the Manchester and Exeter dioceses. We came away full of admiration for those delivering and supporting mission and ministry in often challenging circumstances. Even at this relatively early stage of the SDF's life, the projects we saw demonstrate that by intentionally doing something different, funding of this sort can provide opportunities for growth, so decline is not inevitable.

Our recommendations were not to throw either fund away and start again, but rather to build on learning and successes to date and to make some specific adjustments. Let me summarise our thinking in three parts: first, context, second, impact and third, recommendations. Let me begin with context, some of the background factors which we felt helped affect how the schemes operate and are perceived to operate.

First, both schemes engage multiple layers of the Church, national, diocesan and individual parishes and projects, each with different perspectives, and the central role of dioceses in this process seemed to us somewhat underappreciated.

Second, the money involved is substantial in absolute terms, and as a proportion of the Commissioners' largesse, hence the importance of transparency and accountability, but they are still small compared to the Church's overall spending.

Third, both schemes are designed to encourage attendance and discipleship but they operate against a longstanding trend of declining physical attendance that Covid is likely to have accelerated and on a realistic estimate of impact-per-pound spent they could not be expected to reverse this on their own.

Fourth, the pandemic has significantly disrupted the schemes in terms of the projects already in operation, the deployment of new funding and the gathering of data and reporting on existing projects.

Fifth, Covid has weakened the finances of many dioceses, and therefore their ability to fund or co-fund this sort of activity. Most told us in our survey that they did not expect to be in a financially sustainable position until 2024-26.

Sixth, reflection on the future of the funding streams coincides with the Vision and Strategy exercise which may, of course, alter some of the objectives to which they might be hoped to contribute. But most dioceses told us that they did not anticipate making significant changes to their own strategies in response to vision and strategy.

Seventh, LInC and SDF form part of a broader suite of funding through which the national Church provides financial support to diocese. Plans to simplify this and to restructure the Strategic Development Unit at Church House as part of a larger unit in support of Vision and Strategy are welcome and already underway, but changes of this type typically cause short-term disruption and loss of capacity as they bed in.

Finally, many stakeholders told us that LInC and SDF provide valuable, sometimes essential support for mission and ministry, but that distribution by type of project and Church tradition is predictably contentious, especially for SDF. We expected to hear this, but we were still struck by a pervasive lack of trust and unity of purpose.

Let me now turn to impact. As we all know, people's journeys to faith can be lengthy and subject to fits and starts. So, there is a limit to what we can say definitively about impact even after five years, and especially when that period has been disrupted by Covid. The full impact of these projects will only be seen over a much longer period.

That said, LInC is sustaining ministry in many poor communities that would probably otherwise lose it. It is supporting at least 1,700 parishes and many of them would not have stipendiary clergy without it. The funding is also being used with greater focus and intentionality. The amount going to the 25% poorest communities has risen significantly.

The impact of SDF can be seen first in some parishes revitalised, new worshipping communities created and 530 additional ordained and lay posts. Projects have extended and developed mission in dozens of towns and cities across England with a focus, as intended, on relatively deprived urban areas.

Second, in improved strategic and project management capability within dioceses. This has benefited not just the projects, but wider diocesan activity. Dioceses and projects speak highly of how the SDU and its consultants work with them. They say that the rigour of the process has enhanced missional outcomes, although it does place significant burdens on them.

Third, the creation of new disciples and social action in communities. Both are very hard to measure accurately and consistently, but many people do appear to have been brought to faith by these projects through different types of interventions. Monitoring and evaluation has focused to date on individual projects with different ways of measuring being used to judge success, so it is hard to comment on the total impact of the programme. Given the need for stakeholders across the Church to see proper accountability for the money spent, work to develop common measures of impact should be a priority.

Not surprisingly, much attention focuses on the headline estimates of disciples created and expected from SDF that the Strategic Investment Board uses in its reports. Unfortunately, these metrics do not give an accurate picture of the impact of the programme and the methodology needs improving, as the national Church was hoping to do pre-Covid. Some suggest that these figures simply show that SDF projects are failing in their suggested outcomes, but it is important to remember that the projects should not be expected to have achieved all their outcomes midway through their duration. There will be more new disciples as these projects mature, albeit with a risk of shortfalls against the initial aspirations that form the basis of the published forecasts.

In terms of recommendations, let me mention seven. First, the future of SDF and LInC needs to be considered as part of a package to help deliver mission and strategy. Support for the schemes and their effectiveness is affected by the lack of trust and unity of purpose for which SDF in particular seems to serve as a lightning rod, and Vision and Strategy is a fresh chance to address this cultural issue.

Second, we think that LInC should continue to support ministry in deprived communities that would otherwise lose it or never have it. We recommended at least maintaining current levels of funding, adjusted for clergy costs, and were cautious about changing the distribution formula again. Missional impact could also be enhanced by greater use of funding to retrain or move on less effective clergy.

Third, SDF projects deliver valuable outcomes in their own right but their contribution to broader missional challenges could be enhanced. Innovation funding should be used to trial new ideas at modest scale to address unsolved missional challenges, while the SDF scales-up promising ideas, helps roll out the more proven concepts, as well as developing and adapting them in new contexts. But dioceses should probably bear more of the cost of proven concepts as they mature and the risk of failure is reduced. Low current take-up of innovation funding highlights a need to seek new partners and solutions. To help learn lessons and apply them elsewhere, we suggested creating subject matter champions within the SDU to sharpen focus on target groups and missional challenges, documenting best practice with associated training and better dissemination through diocesan and other networks. To foster its own learning, the Strategic Investment Board should commission feedback from dioceses and project leaders annually and independently of the SDU, publishing the findings in its response. The diocesan peer review process, for which we heard little enthusiasm, should be re-examined.

Fourth, without weakening the evaluation criteria for SDF and innovation funding, we argued that the NCIs should balance their responsiveness to diocesan requests with greater intentionality in deploying support across the full range of traditions and contexts and across diocesan borders. This could help traditions and networks with less track record in supporting mission and growth to build capacity and raise their game, and to provide shared services, and that should help ensure that SDF is valued more widely.

Fifth, the SIB says it is focusing resources on young, urban, ethnic minority and deprived communities, but we felt that it could also address social class more explicitly as well as ensuring that these groups are better represented among project leaders. The emphasis on ethnic minority communities could be reflected better in the allocation of funds and in the make-up of those guiding and implementing the programme, and as there remains an urgent need to identify sustainable models for rural ministry, national funding, we thought, should be available to help achieve that.

Sixth, one major achievement of the SDF has been to spur improvements in strategic and project management capacity in dioceses. This creates an opportunity to move further from a largely project-based approach to grant allocation, to a more strategic relationship. All national funding streams could be considered as part of one conversation, rather than a series of separate ones specific to each project and funding stream, but it would be important to support all dioceses on this journey rather than leave some behind.

Finally, the effectiveness of LInC funding and SDF project support in achieving their objectives is always going to depend to a significant degree on action that the Church is or is not taking in other areas. Key among them is supporting high quality in education and training for ministry and ongoing support for missional leaders.

Let me leave it there. We have much enjoyed working together on the report and meeting so many inspirational leaders around the country. We have also been gratified by the spirit in which SIB and others have received the findings. The new funding settlements announced since we finished our work clearly offer greater potential for investment and innovation and we look forward very much to seeing how it is deployed in pursuit of the Church's goals.

The Chair: There will be a short time for questions. I would remind Synod members that there will be more opportunity to debate this item, or a related item, this afternoon, but we do have a short time for questions, and I will take those in threes. Questions can be to Sir Robert, John Spence, Stephen Smith and Busola Sodeinde.

Mr Clive Billenness (Europe): Sir Robert, I shall be very brief. I am speaking this afternoon but you will not be here to hear me say the words "thank you" to you and your team for what I consider one of the most excellent pieces of work I have seen in many a year. Thank you, Sir, and thank you to the team.

The Revd Marcus Walker (London): I would also like to thank you for this excellent Report, although I would not like to echo the optimism with which you have delivered it. £176 million earmarked, 89,000 new witness disciples hoped for, fewer than 13,000 new witness disciples delivered, all of this vast expenditure occurring at the same time as dioceses are cutting and cutting and cutting stipendiary priests.

The Chair: Could you focus on your question, please?

The Revd Marcus Walker (London): Would this money not have been better spent targeted directly at funding stipendiary ministry?

The Bishop of Oxford (the Rt Revd Stephen Croft): I declare an interest as part of the working groups which established some of these funding streams. Thank you for an excellent Report, I really appreciated it. Could I ask you whether you have any insights about the balance between emergence of projects on the ground and the tension between that and predicting how things are going to go.

Over 13 years as Bishop in two diocese, I reflect that many of the projects that I hoped would be fruitful, it has not worked out like that, and many of the things which were marginal have proved extremely fruitful, and much better than expected. There is always a tension in constructing bids, how to accommodate that sense of things emerging on the ground and continually being adjusted. I feel it is a really important lesson, as we embark on new rounds of funding, to get the emergence element right.

The Chair: Sir Robert, would you like to respond?

Sir Robert Chote: First of all, thank you very much for the thank you, that it is much appreciated, we enjoyed very much doing the work. In terms of the allocation of resources and the alternative allocation of resources, obviously we were tasked with looking at how these particular programmes performed against the objectives that were had for them, rather than saying, well, of all the many other things that the Church does, where could the resources go?

I think one issue that you highlight, you get back to this point about this is a lot of money and at the same time not a lot of money. It is a lot of money and therefore in terms of the accountability and the need for transparency is important, and for thinking carefully about what you regard as value for money out of that, but distributing it much more widely without the focus and the intentionality, there would then be questions about how effectively that would be used, so as I say I think the challenge there of much wider allocation of that is whether you would get the same level of impact.

As regards adjustment and progress as things move along the line, there are obviously processes for these projects to be re-examined, to look at how they are proceeding, to re-examine progress, clearly prediction and measurement are hard in this area. I was an economic forecaster for many years, that is tricky enough, predicting in this sort of area is much more so. One of the things we felt is that, in setting out for accountability reasons what you expect to achieve from this, you need to reflect the fact of how projects are performing, whether they are delivering, what the experience is to date - and at the moment the metrics do not capture that. You are stuck with essentially the initial predictions not taking sufficient account, perhaps, of the way in which your understanding of how it is going, the fact that you may be tilting the emphasis of the programme and it may shift from the position you started out with.

The Chair: We have a question from somebody on Zoom. Matthew Beer, would you like to put your question?

The Revd Matthew Beer (Lichfield): I would really like to thank you for the presentation that you gave on the Strategic Development Fund and those bids going into those communities. I must declare an interest as a leader of a Strategic Development Funded project here in Telford in the West Midlands. It is quite often that those who are going into these projects suffer quite a deal of voracious contempt from fellow clergy and other members of the deanery, even though they have moved into difficult parts of the country and into fairly difficult areas. How can we improve the communication from the Strategic Development Unit to those project leaders and to those projects, but also to the diocesan synods, the parish levels and to the deaneries to help them to understand the weight of responsibility of these projects?

The Chair: Any other questions?

Mrs Emma Joy Gregory (Bath & Wells): In terms of making new disciples and monitoring where new disciples have come and putting numbers to that, to what extent was it considered whether people are Christians from other denominations and are coming over into the Church of England, or indeed are Christians who already worship in one parish church and have come over to a different type of church under this project? How much was that considered?

The Bishop of Burnley (the Rt Revd Philip North): This Report compares apples and pears. The apples is LInC, which is long-term, reliable, no-strings attached and empowers the local church. The pears are SDF which is short-term, heavily output-driven and evaluated and which holds power to a central committee. Which do you think is the more missionally effective of those two paths? In other words, how are we best off investing limited resource?

The Chair: Would you like to answer?

Sir Robert Chote: Thank you very much indeed for those. On communication, we did identify the issue of trying to do more to pull together an understanding, first of all, of how the decisions are taken, how the processes for allocating resources work and the importance, for example, at the diocesan level, given that decisions at diocesan level are more key than I think many people that we spoke to had appreciated. There was some sense that with the SDF, it is something that the national Church does to, or does in, localities without putting it in that context.

So, there is, I think, a bigger communication job to be done around exactly how this works, where the responsibilities for decisions are, but also pulling together a sense of not only what has been achieved but what has been learned, and some of those learnings may be things that do or do not work as well. That challenge of pulling all of that together, for example, even undertaking the review, looking at the web presence, the various information, the reporting on these schemes, pulling it together into a sort of coherent sense of what is being achieved, what is being aimed for, is not as easy as it might be.

The issue of where are new disciples coming from, so the questions of transfer growth, which, as you say, can be about people worshipping from one part of the Church of England to another, but also from other denominations, et cetera, there have been studies of that in particular contexts, around resource churches, Fresh Expressions, et cetera, where you do find quite a large amount of transfer growth, not that that is necessarily a bad thing but you want to be taking it into account when you are interpreting the metrics.

In most cases, the numbers that are being reported, people are being asked to report them taking that into account. The evidence would suggest, for example, where you do see quite large transfer growth into resource churches, it is not necessarily coming from the geographically closest churches to the new entity, the transferring may be coming from elsewhere. Again, I think in terms of the accountability and the measurement,

moving ahead with the work on having a common impact programme, a common way of measuring this so people are looking at things in a way that allows you to compare across, that was underway but the Covid pandemic essentially got in the way of that. Returning to that agenda as a matter of some urgency seems quite important.

As for Bishop Philip's question on the relative value of the two programmes, again, it is beyond our remit to decide quite how much should be in one or the other. I think the clear question in both cases is that there are successes and less successful examples of the money being spent in each of those categories. I think coming back to an earlier point on innovation, you do not want to be in a world where you are only going to support new innovation that you are 100% sure is going to work, because some degree of failure ought to be built in to that sort of experimentation process or otherwise you are not trying hard enough.

On the LInC side we certainly reached the conclusion that this was delivering ministry, supporting ministry in places that would clearly lose it, but one concern that came back was that LInC was also continuing to support ineffective ministry in some places as well as effective ministry in some places, and therefore thinking about how you allocate and use that money, I think Bishop Philip said this is no-strings attached, well there has been an attempt to get greater intentionality, greater explanation of where this money is being deployed and how it is being deployed, and that, I think, will help you get to this question in some cases. Some will work, some will not. In neither case would you only be wanting to put money into things that are 100% certain to work, that is not how innovation works.

The Chair: We only have time for one more question I am afraid.

the Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): You said that in the course of writing your paper that the diocesan peer review scheme was not very popular and it needs to be re-examined. Do you think there should be a diocesan peer review scheme, and what would make it better?

The Chair: That was the last question, so if you would like to sum up.

Sir Robert Chote: I think the number of people that we spoke to who had been involved in those, as I say, the sense we got was not a great deal of enthusiasm for the effectiveness of that. One issue is around the value that this has in sharing expertise and learning. Another was the element of accountability that is involved in that process. I think the sense we most got was that it had not proved a hugely effective way of sharing the learning.

Therefore, thinking about, more broadly, how you pull together the lessons of what works and what does not, how you think about where that can best be applied in new and different contexts, where it is sensible to continue to roll things out or not, that should be considered in the way you are pulling in learning at the national level and also how you

think about the discussions between dioceses, between peers in coming up with that exercise.

But it comes back in part, I think, to this issue about the role of the diocese is absolutely central to the choice of the suite of projects that are being applied for, about putting that into the strategy. We did get the sense that that particular mechanism of those discussions, it seemed a bit formulaic, it was not getting to some of those issues, so whether taking more of those discussions at more of a national level, pulling in people with interests in common missional challenges across very different parts of the country might be a more effective way of going about that.

The Chair: Okay, that concludes this item of business. I would like to thank Sir Robert for his presentation, and thank you for your questions. We now move to the next item.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 11.30 am.

ITEM 15 SPENDING PLANS OF THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS AND ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2262)

The Chair: We now move to Item 15, Spending Plans of the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council. This item is focused on the spending plans of the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council for financial distributions over 2023-2025 and indicative distributions for the subsequent six years. These are plans developed in the light of Vision and Strategy.

For this item, members will need GS 2262. Members will also need the Fourth Notice Paper, Financial Memo - see paragraph 12. The way I am going to deal with this debate is that, following the Archbishop's speech, I am going to invite two people to speak for up to five minutes. I am then going to call Fr Benfield to move his amendment and we will deal with that as appropriate and then we will come back to the main motion. First of all, I invite the Archbishop of York to speak for no more than 10 minutes.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Chair, thank you very much. Let us be clear, Synod, things have moved on. Learning from the Chote Review we have just heard about, SDF money and how it was distributed in the past, this triennium as we move forward will be simpler, more responsive to dioceses and more accountable about how we distribute money across the whole ecosystem of the Church, rural and urban, all Church traditions with the single purpose of making Christ known and building God's Kingdom in the world.

Our focus on missionary discipleship, children and young people, diversity and new pathways into knowing Christ will help us revitalise our parishes and, if you want to use that language, save them.

Here is a short video setting the scene for our spending plans for the next triennium and beyond, though please note the really significant change here is not necessarily the money. It will be about how it is distributed and this is a massive and much needed and unprecedented injection of resource into the Church, but the real difference may be the duration. We are deliberately giving more time to develop ideas and initiatives that this money will facilitate.

(Video played)

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Let us get down to some detail. £190 million over nine years will support the Church of England in its transition to net zero. As we noted in yesterday's debate, this is a big ask but if we get it right, and the money will help, not only will this be good for the planet, it may be, Synod, the most significant thing we have done for evangelism in decades because the world will sit up and see that this Christian faith of ours really does shape the way we live. It is a Christ-shaped ambition.

£20 million will go to racial justice and other areas of diversity and social justice. This is very welcome, particularly as the Racial Justice Commission brings forward its recommendations adding to the priorities of *From Lament to Action*. I look forward, I must say, to Monday's debate on Affirming and Including Disabled People in the Whole Life of the Church. £0.4 billion - let me just repeat that, £0.4 billion - over the next three years will go towards achieving the bold outcomes and strategic priorities that flow from our vision to be a Christ-centred Church and be realised across local communities through investing in local ministry as part of diocesan strategies. These are substantial sums of money. They can make a difference. We are putting our money where our missional mouth is. By the way, it is this General Synod's missional ambition I am referring to.

Although agreed by a gathering of every bishop and Diocesan Secretary in the Church of England and shaped by a wide-ranging discussion involving many younger and more diverse voices, these priorities and the bold outcomes that flow from them were quite intentionally built on decisions and undertakings made by this Synod and this has not been properly understood. In 2018, GS 2142 overwhelmingly encouraged every parish and diocese to be part of a movement to form new congregations - what we now call mixed ecology - and asked for a progress report by July last year. That is where 10,000 new communities comes from, though this General Synod actually asked for more. GS 2122, brought by the amazing Estates Group, called for a serving, loving, worshipping Christian community on every housing estate in the country. We want at least 2,000 of these to be in our most deprived parishes.

In 2019, GS 2145 called on the Archbishops' Council to make *Setting God's People Free*, what we now call Everyday Faith and Missionary Disciples, a priority for the next quinquennium. It was this Synod that set our ambitious environmental targets, this Synod that has consistently over decades called for more emphasis to be given to children,

families and young people, most recently in February 2020 and, of course, *From Lament to Action* highlighted a great list of unfulfilled recommendations by us on racial justice.

Therefore, I believe that paper GS 2262 should fill us with hope, not because we have got everything right, not because there will not be bumps in the road, not because things will not change as we move along - they will - but because this money distributed in this way can help and support the renewal of our Church, enabling more people to know Jesus and to make a difference in our world. It builds, as does the whole Vision and Strategy, on the decisions of this Synod over many years. I am grateful for the continued provision to support bishops' ministry. Lowest Income Communities Funding and Cathedral Grants are massively important and I am glad they are inflation proofed. We continue to prioritise safeguarding and other areas of national Church following the Transforming Effectiveness Review.

Synod, on your behalf, I want to thank the Church Commissioners' Investment Team whose astonishing returns make this possible. But, actually, this debate is not about money. Making disciples does not need great wads of cash. It needs mustard seeds of faith. But the money is important because the money expresses our missional ambition and we trust the dioceses to make good decisions about how to spend it and we will work with them. This investment will enable us to try new things, both sustainability and growth. It is about revitalising parishes and planting new ones. It is rural and urban. It is chaplaincy and parish; social justice and evangelism; prophecy and pastoral care; maintenance and mission; digital and in person, a Church for everyone everywhere and the means to try and find out the best ways of doing this in a rapidly changing world and particularly with an emphasis to the poorest communities in our land. It is a holistic vision for a Church that is shaped by Christ. Synod, with delight, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: The matter is open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Revd Vincent Whitworth (Manchester): I welcome the excellent work of the Church Commissioners in their shrewd investments, which has enabled us to consider today how we plan to invest £1.3 billion to support the work and ministry of the Church. But, actually, I wish to reluctantly stand against this motion because there seems to be a bit of a disconnect between our discussions today as a national Church in how we spend large sums of money compared to discussions on a diocesan level about where a number of dioceses across our country, including my own, are looking at large deficits and, of course, as a result, having to cut large numbers of stipendiary clergy and impose very different models of ministry.

Compare this to discussions on a parish level where many parishes are still recovering from the pandemic and dealing with the cost of living crisis and struggling to maintain levels of parish share. In my own town of Bolton, I have seen for myself the significant

impact of national Church investment as I serve on the SDF project bid of Children Changing Places where we have seen hundreds of children and young people begin or continue on their discipleship journey as we work with Church schools. Praise God for that good news, but actually in the next couple of years in Bolton we are also losing five stipendiary clergy in Bolton alone. Actually, that will significantly impact how the local Church responds and supports these young Christians who are coming to faith.

This is my plea. Can we have a more balanced and co-ordinated approach to national spending plans and investments which supports our national growth and vision agenda but also supports local churches in investing in nurturing and growing the number of stipendiary clergy across our churches so that, actually, we can be a growing Christian presence at the heart of every country in our land.

The Chair. I neglected to say that was a maiden speech.

The Bishop of Burnley (the Rt Revd Philip North): This is not a maiden speech. This winter is going to be a desperate one for millions of people across our nation who live in poverty and destitution as the full impact of the cost of living crisis becomes clear. In the past, some people have had to choose between food and fuel. This winter, there will be many who can afford neither. The income squeeze is having a huge impact on our urban churches and this, in the aftermath of Covid and the restructuring plans being played out in some dioceses, is putting huge pressure on urban churches just at the time when they are most needed. Therefore, much as I welcome this Report and the vision behind it, and the excellent news of the increased overall release of funds from the Church Commissioners into the Church's economy, it is dispiriting that, though that increase is 30%, 30% more money from the Commissioners going into the economy as a whole, Lowest Income Communities Funding is frozen at its current level.

Moreover, whilst there is much in this Report about deprived communities, none of these good intentions are backed up with firm data promises. If we want a nation renewed under Christ, it will come from our poorest areas. If we want Church of England presence in those areas, what is required is reliable, sustainable, long-term financial support which is exactly what LInC funding offers. Short-term projects may look good in annual reports, but what happens when the money runs out? Moreover, I am increasingly concerned at the pressure that such projects place on urban church leaders because the money comes with more strings attached than a mophead.

The other issue is dioceses and the capacity of dioceses to go on submitting complex applications and project managing complex projects. I want to make three requests. Request 1 is that LICF be increased by 30% in line with the overall expenditure increase with a concomitant increase in the number of dioceses who receive such funds. Request 2 is that a disproportionate percentage, say 40%, of the £240 million set aside for dioceses' own strategy be restricted to parishes that serve the 20% most deprived communities. Request 3 is that the newly minted Strategic Investment Board have at least two lay or ordained practitioners on ministering to and living on an income deprived

community so that they can advise from direct experience. At the start of their work, I wrote to the members of the Triennium Funding Working Group to ask in what way their recommendations would be good news for the poor. I am simply still not quite sure of the answer to that question.

ITEM 69

The Chair. I am going to now call Fr Benfield to speak to and move Item 69 because I think it is helpful if we deal with this probably expeditiously and then get back to the main motion.

The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): Chair, this simple amendment replaces the word "welcome" with the word "note". This Synod can note the Spending Plans of the Church Commissioners and Archbishops' Council, but it should not welcome them. The plans come from the Triennium Funding Working Group, a group of just 11 people who have decided how £1.2 billion should be spent in the period 2023-25. The Group should consist of 15 people appointed five each by the Church Commissioners, the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops, but four of them are on the Group wearing more than one hat so that the actual number on the Group is just 11. What representation does Synod have? At first sight, quite a lot. Eight of the members of the Group are members of this Synod, but they are not elected members of the Synod, they are *ex officio* by reason of being diocesan bishops or on the Archbishops' Council. The only cleric not in episcopal orders on the Group was Stephen Lake, then Dean of Gloucester and now Bishop of Salisbury.

Where are the ordinary clergy who are at the coalface of the mission of the Church of England in the parishes? There are none. There could have been parish clergy even within the structure of the 15 members of the Group as set up, for there are ordinary parish priests on both the Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners, but for whatever reason no-one came on as ordinary parish clergy. There is something of a representational deficit on the Group and there is something of a democratic deficit on the Group given that there are no elected members of General Synod serving on it. That would not be so bad if the plans were such that we could wholeheartedly endorse them, but can we?

The Lowest Income Communities Funding is not going where it should. The independent review, GS 2261, states: "There is concern among some stakeholders that some dioceses do not use LICF funding as intentionally as they could to support ministry in the poorest communities but, rather, use a significant proportion elsewhere". I quote again: "Some dioceses take off a top slice to fund diocese-wide spending, but some dioceses treat LICF income more as part of general resources". In the answer to my question 109, we read that only 60% of LICF funding actually went to the poorest parishes. The Commissioners and Archbishops' Council should have ensured that the money went to where it was intended and not top-sliced to fund diocese-wide spending or put into general funds. It is meant for parishes, yet it goes to dioceses. Why can it not go direct? As the review points out, there are pockets of deprivation in what are otherwise prosperous

areas. Dioceses with a relatively high average income receive no LICF funding, yet they may still have pockets of deprivation.

I looked at the Church Urban Fund data and found the parishes of Tuffley and Matson in the City of Gloucester, for example, two of the most deprived parishes in the country and yet no LICF money goes to Gloucester at all. There can also, of course, be deprivation in rural areas where no LICF money is received. We then turn to SDF funding. It very often goes to large projects. I accept that with Covid it is difficult to assess the success or otherwise of some of the more recent grants, but Transforming Wigan in Liverpool had its funding awarded as long ago as 2014. Where can we see the evidence of the dramatic change promised? We have not seen it.

When questions are asked in Parliament about Wigan, they are not answered, yet the Diocese of Liverpool has been awarded a further £4.6 million of SDF money for its *Fit for Mission* programme. This proposes turning deaneries into super parishes staffed by a team of clergy and lay workers, but the report, *From Anecdote to Evidence* on church growth, states: "Multi-Church amalgamations and teams are less likely to grow. Churches are more likely to grow when there is one leader for one community". The review of the Mission and Pastoral Measure, GS 2222, states: "The data leans towards the parishes in the non-teams having a better trend of attendance change than team parishes". I quote again: "Anecdotal evidence from Wales suggests that a super parish type model has not worked well".

The SDF money in Liverpool and elsewhere is to be used in a model which does not work and it is being forced on communities which do not want it. In the St Helens deanery in Liverpool, one of the trial deaneries for their *Fit for Mission* project, six of the 18 parishes have voted against it, but the project is going ahead because the money has been awarded.

The Chair. I call on the Archbishop of York to respond.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Brothers and sisters, you will not be surprised to hear that I do not accept the amendment. I do, however, want to say that I think Fr Benfield makes some really important points that we need to work on. I understand what he is saying entirely but, as I hoped I had made clear, the reason I hope we will decide to resist this amendment and welcome this paper is for four reasons, chiefly. The first one is that we have listened very carefully to the Chote Report and invite you and others to provide the scrutiny that will be needed to make sure that we learn from what has happened in the first phase of this kind of funding. That really is my main point. We are not voting on carrying on doing what we are doing. We are voting on learning from what we have done and doing it better.

Secondly, it is enabling us to do the things that we, this Synod, have asked to do. Thirdly, it is about doing it through the dioceses and it is doing it in ways that particularly will include the rural. I know this is not the time for me to comment in any detail on the points

that have already been made in the debate, but again I think it is worth mentioning that - and I will make more detailed comments at the close of the debate - more than 40% of SDF funding does go to deprived communities and so it is not just the LInC money. But I am hoping that what we have before us here is a much needed investment of resource to enable us to revitalise the parishes of our Church and, of course, we need to work together on how to do that best. I think it is something that we should be welcoming and then getting together to work out how to take forward.

The Chair: As the Archbishop does not support the amendment, it will lapse unless 25 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate to continue and a vote to be taken on the amendment. Of course, those on Zoom will have to use the green ticks. Well, I can see 25 people standing, even not allowing for the people on Zoom, and so the debate on the amendment continues.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Andrew Orange (Winchester): With apologies to the Archbishop, I urge you to support the amendment to note rather than to welcome the spending plans. Let me explain in two points. First of all, it is essential that the Church of England focuses on what it has to do that we bring people to faith. The way to do that is to have vicars on the ground and yet, as my colleague Mr Whitworth pointed out earlier, we keep hearing of dioceses where they are laying them off because we cannot afford to pay them. The financial situation out and about in the Church of England - not in the centre but out and about - is very tight.

How then can we welcome the proposed spending of £190 million on net zero and £20 million on racial equality as proposed in GS 2262? Please be clear, I am talking about the amount of money, not those causes which are obviously deserving. I am a chartered accountant who has spent 40 years in finance and so, of course, I get out my calculator. I find that the spending of £210 million over nine years is equivalent to the cost of employing, wait for it, 450 vicars over the same nine years. Have we taken leave of our senses? Really? How can we possibly dissipate this money away when we so badly need it for promoting the word of Christ? Of course, let us urge our Government to do the right things on crunch issues like net zero, but let us not try to be the Government ourselves.

My second point comes from the strange words in clause 12. I am going to read them out and see if you can understand what is written there. It says we have "... an expanded understanding of intergenerational equity principles to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative measures". In plain English, I think that means we are no longer going to follow just the advice of the actuaries and we are going to run down the real value of the fund by spending more.

I put it to you that the General Synod of the year 2050 will not thank us for having spent their money for them today. In summary, I feel this is lashing out money that we cannot afford and it is also drawing off funds that are needed for the future. Synod is not being

given the opportunity to reject this budget, so please, enthusiastically vote for the amendment and just “note” rather than “welcome” the proposals.

The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham): For my maiden speech, I guess. Here we go. I am an ordained lead for a Community of Hope in the Diocese of Durham, so I guess that is a vested interest, or whatever the proper way of saying that is.

To me the words “take note” feel just too passive aggressive, and we have too much of that, in my opinion, in the Church. The commitment of money to poorer communities through the two funds I find encouraging. I love creativity, I love innovation, I love the bolder stuff, but we need to be thinking broader. We need to be thinking both more radically and more simply. We need to have more robust ways of tracking our funds and being held accountable. I agree with what Bishop Philip North was saying.

As a parish priest whose nine years or ordained ministry has been in deprived urban estates, I am on that coalface. I can tell you hand on heart the single thing that would change my life, my parish, my ministry, my deanery, more than anything else, is administrative support. I do not do this because I am gifted or called to administrative abilities. What I want, to be a better priest and have greater capacity to serve my people, to preach teach and offer the sacraments, is people to help me dot those T’s and cross those I’s because, you know what, it is boring and it is not what I am called to do, and I am not as good at it as I should be.

I want to see funding rolled out more explicitly to support and address that repeated desire that I have heard throughout my ministry: training in governance, with clear expectations and parameters, where we are allowed to ask questions simply because we just want to know we are doing it right or wrong and then be able to address it. I want to see a radical rethinking of what ministry is, and the diversity of gifts we have, which we should be growing and supporting and empowering. Why do we have this obsession with the role of leading which is based on priestly ministry by any other name, but just doing it without a collar because we do not have enough priests. Actually, lay people use so many other gifts that lots of priests do not have. Why do we not have respect and appreciation for that? We need to think bigger and more basic, get rid of that box and look at what the Kingdom possibilities are.

You want simpler, admin support. You want humbler, I need help, and I am telling you that. You want bolder, you know what, I am up for that, and you can probably tell that, but even an apparently confident raging extrovert like myself, I need support, I need affirmation that what I am doing is worth something and valued. I do not think I am perfect all the time. You want younger? The longer we debate this stuff, the older even I am getting.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): There are excellent points being made and I wish we could be in a less formal format to discuss them. Paul Benfield made some super points I would love to debate with you.

I would ask you to welcome this. Why? First, because it is long term in nature. A nine-year funding ability is so much different to anything we have ever been able to do before. It does not run down the real value of the Church Commissioners' money. It is about vicars, church leaders, youth leaders and workers, lay workers and lay ministers, and, if need be, administrative support on the ground rather than projects, because the whole point is each diocese will work with its parishes to develop its mission plan. It will bring that to us and we will discuss it, and not in a head office versus diocese sense. We are there to support you. We are already changing the way in which all our people work to do this. Through conversation and discourse we will see a mission plan that you will bring forward as soon as possible to bring the people on the ground that will bring the people to Christ, that will revitalise the parishes, that will see greater investment to low income communities.

Philip, I am so with you but LInC funding should not be the limitation. It should be the base from which we start because we should be spending far more in those areas. I would hope that every diocesan and missional plan would be very clear on what funding was going into those low-income communities within it, whether they get LInC funding or not. What funding is going to be working with young people, if we are really going to triple the number of young people in this community? How we are going to work with our diverse communities from global ethnic majorities or different things of sexuality or whatever. All of those will be in your mission plans that you will create with your dioceses. We will listen to you, work with you and provide the funding over and above that which you cannot afford.

It is about an intentionality that is driven from the ground up. I hate saying that phrase, but you know what I mean. It should start with the local community and the parish, go through the deanery and diocese. We should be there saying, "Wow, that is a great plan, have you thought about A, B, C?" in a simplified, permissive, engaging way. The sooner we can get on with this and the sooner we can start spending this money, the better. My greatest worry is that it will take so long to develop we will not have spent enough in the first few years. The sooner we can get on with this, the sooner we can address so many of the issues that have been raised today.

Synod, you through your dioceses and through your diocesan synods are in control of the spending of this money and the rate at which it will be spent. I urge you to welcome this Report, and to get on with it.

The Chair: I am going to take a contribution from Zoom from Charlie Houston. You have up to three minutes.

Mr Charles Houston (Hereford): I speak as a solar installer. I have been in the business for 12 years and I am managing director of Solar for Schools Limited. I would love to welcome this Report but there needs to be a little bit of reality in the numbers, which Jonathan Baird touched on yesterday.

I have done a quick Google on the number of clergy and therefore the number of parsonages in the country. It is about 11,700 or thereabouts. To equip these properties with both heat pumps and solar PV of about 4 kilowatt per building will cost about £145 million. Out of a budget of 190 you can see where this is going, and we have not even touched on schools, training premises, offices, churches or cathedrals.

I am very sorry to pour cold water on this Report with these numbers, but no, we cannot rely on central Government grants; they have been withdrawn. We cannot really rely wholeheartedly on local fundraising. I am ashamed to say we cannot also rely on the prices coming down. That has happened in solar which are about 25% of what they were from when I started, but the line has plateaued, and therefore I am afraid I cannot support the motion.

The Chair: We are still debating the amendment but I now wish to test the mind of the Synod as to whether Item 69 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 69.

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

The Chair: We now vote on Item 69.

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

The Chair: We go back to the main motion. We are debating the motion as unamended. You have three minutes.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): My reason for wanting to speak this morning is very similar to the first speaker in the debate and the increasing concerns I have between the disconnect in the financial position between the central Church and the Church Commissioners who are wealthy, and the many dioceses that sadly are not.

It is relevant to the Archbishop of York's comment in a speech last year that we are a "rich Church acting like a poor Church". What I do not want to do this afternoon is apportion blame or complain, though. I enthusiastically support all three parts of this motion and I thank the Church Commissioners who continue to do an excellent job managing our finances, a job which most investment managers could only dream of doing.

Let me tell you of a recent experience. Twelve days ago I went with a couple of clients to a county championship cricket match at New Road, Worcester. We went into the pavilion simply to get a score card and walked straight into an angry meeting with supporters berating the board for the recent poor performance of the one-day team. "Sack the coach," said one person. "No, sack the team," said another. "No, we need to sack the board". For cricket clubs perhaps substitute the Church of England. Loads of criticism but no positive solutions.

Frankly, they remind me of the two old men in the box in “The Muppet Show”. I do not want to be like Statler and Waldorf, as I think the measures before us this afternoon are helpful and are trying to address coherently our challenges. Yet what they do not fully do, and cannot really address is some of the diocesan funding issues, which lead to fewer priests in parishes and longer and longer interregnums. If I was a Diocesan Secretary or chair of a Board of Finance, however, I would do the same, as you cannot use monies which you do not have. Yet our parish and diocesan structures have one major issue: we jealously value our independence, which is good, but what good is that independence if you do not have the finances to flourish?

At the interesting Church Commissioners’ presentation yesterday evening a vicar from Burnley spoke of the immense pressures of the energy increases which will probably stop most other things his church is doing. I am for a combination of reimagining ministry while preserving the parish structures. These spending plans are thoughtful, focused and forward thinking but, please, can we as a Church deal properly with the national, diocesan and parish financial pressures rather than be the old men in the box on “The Muppet Show”?

the Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark): Thank you for calling me. What I wanted to do was just to say how important the Cathedral Sustainability Fund and grants have been to cathedrals, and to welcome the inclusion and continuation of that in this Report. You will see more of that in paragraph 29.

I want to pay tribute to two people, Michael Minta and Carol Fletcher, who have been enormously supportive of cathedrals.

When you look at cathedrals it looks as though we are awash with resources and money and all the rest of it, but I think many of you will know that the pandemic created a huge hiatus in the life of many of our cathedrals. The implications of that are still being worked through. What the Sustainability Fund and grants have been enabling us to do is to put in place through some short-term funding those kinds of members of staff who can really help us out of the situation and into a better future. Without the money that is coming in this way from the Commissioners we simply would not be able to dig ourselves out of the hole that we found ourselves in. I welcome that and I look forward to the ways in which cathedrals will imaginatively use the resources that are being made available to us over the next few years.

The Revd Jane Palmer (Salisbury): Thank you so much for this paper, which I felt was a real long-term commitment to hope and sharing the Gospel and enabling the Kingdom of God to flourish. So often in discussions regarding ministry and the future of the Church of England we hear the voice of anxiety at a time of great change. Of course, this is a challenging time. One of the things I find very frustrating as a priest is the constant discussions about clergy and stipends as the only option for future growth. I often feel like a commodity in these debates, but I am not the possession of a parish or a diocese.

I am a gift, albeit an imperfect gift, to my benefice, to my diocese, to the Church of England and to the global Church, as we work together for the glory of God. We are a kingdom of priests. Ordained priests are distinctive. We are not the only option.

Have we rested on our laurels of privilege and wealth too long that we have forgotten how most of the country live, to cut our cloth, to use our resources of all people well? The whole Church of God is called to be enabled and to be a gift to our communities. Welcoming this paper feels to me a prophetic act, saying yes to all but most especially those for whom God's heart most aches: the poor, the hidden, the lonely, those feeling weak. Our local communities know those people best. As a priest I am prepared to be humbler and share that privileged place, enabling the whole people of God. I think the question actually is: are you willing to join in, to share this calling to be simpler, humbler and bolder? Do we have the faith that Jesus calls us to have just the size of a tiny mustard seed, to dare to believe in the hope of this Vision and Strategy, and that God can do great things through us who obey him?

the Ven. Nicola Groark (Worcester): I welcome the longer-term approach of these funding plans where an action plan is in place. In the Diocese of Worcester we have benefited from SDF grants over the past few years. One has enabled a resource church in Dudley, an area of deprivation and multiple needs. It is growing and attracting many local people of all sorts. It is welcoming and inclusive. Many are coming to faith. However, the leaders of this church talk constantly of the cliff edge when SDF money runs out and they need to be self-sustaining. In deprived areas it takes longer than five years for sustainable giving to be built up, especially after a pandemic and as we face a recession. Longer-term grant funding looking further ahead will mean projects such as these can focus on mission without being crippled by anxiety. Funding for longer-term projects across a diocese where a wider plan is in place will have a longer-term impact. Change takes time and I welcome the advances in thinking longer term that these latest plans are offering.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): I want to welcome this paper and the spending plans because I particularly welcome the increase in distribution, and particularly not just for one triennium but for three. This is not stealing or suspending the family silver or depriving future generations. The best thing we can do for future generations is to give them a vibrant Church which is lively and growing. The alternative to that is you end up having lots of money in the bank and nobody in the pews and that is not going to help future generations one jot to find the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

I want to welcome particularly the emphasis on putting strategic funding towards helping dioceses fulfil their own strategic plans for growth rather than on top-down one-size-fits-all models. Blackburn Diocese is committed to maintaining its clergy numbers and the national strategic funding is helping us to do that, helping us to be strategic. The LICF funding is directed entirely to those parishes that qualify as LICF. We have taken that away from being spread to other parishes, to direct it to where it is most needed. That is being seen in us being able to maintain parish share and ministry in our most deprived parishes.

I have one question about the process going forward. It is looking at the annexe which gives the membership of the Triennium Funding Working Party. As Paul Benfield has pointed out, five bishops and six lay people. Please may I ask that the next Triennium Funding Working Party includes two parish clergy on the principle of “nothing about us without us”.

the Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I thought I would respond to what Fr Paul Benfield said in his speech on the amendment and tell you a little more about Wigan and *Fit for Mission* in Liverpool. In Wigan, there has been a real tough challenge and during the pandemic the clergy of Wigan really came together and the authority in Wigan really respected the work of the Church in social action. We have grown lots of new congregations and leaders of them. We are still halfway through that transformation of Wigan for which we received money.

The aim of *Fit for Mission* is to introduce more people to Jesus, to deepen the discipleship of those who already know Jesus, to develop Christian leaders, and to have more justice initiatives across our diocese. We have been speaking to parishes and deaneries and inviting them to be part of it. St Helen’s deanery that Fr Paul talked about and West Derby, which he did not talk about, were the first two deaneries who said they wanted to go on this journey, and in West Derby deanery all of them apart from one.

Part of the funding is to coach people in how to work in a new way. Part of the funding is to develop ‘Cultivate’, which is a training course to raise up and develop the vocations of our lay people. *Fit for Mission* was predicated by a year of consultation, where we spoke to people right across the diocese. One of the things they said is the structures are inhibiting. They are not super parishes. They are larger parishes and they will be led by a rector. There will be other clergy there and lay people as part of the leadership team.

We are trying to do both. We are trying not only to grow the Church numerically and spiritually, but we are also trying to remove the barriers which inhibit that which most people would say.

Finally, I would like to say to Chantal Noppen if you would like to come and work in Liverpool Diocese, we would love to have you.

I welcome this motion because we are on a journey of learning and we want to discover. We want to do what we have not done before, to see something that we have not seen before, and that is more people knowing Jesus, which in my book is a really good thing.

Mrs Clare Williams (Norwich): I wanted to raise two short areas of concern relating to children and youth ministry. This is such an important priority but I am uncertain about certain strategic decisions that have been made around it. First, the national post supporting youth and children’s ministry, Mary Hawes’ role, has been cut. While I understand the restructuring process means having younger and more diverse within

everyone's job role, and this is an excellent brief, this does however seem to negate the need for specific focused ministry for children and young people with a national remit. Younger can mean all sorts of things in our churches where the average age can often be somewhere north of 40. Diversity itself is a wide remit. How can we expect a number of job posts to have this breadth of focus? Spending on specific focused ministry with children and young people is so greatly needed, now more than ever.

My second point is the investment in time-limited projects mentioned in relation to the People & Partnerships funding in paragraph 20. Time-limited projects do not work in children and youth ministry. They need significant long-term investment which includes permanent paid posts, posts with that specific remit at a national, diocesan and a local level. I will struggle to support this motion with this lack of understanding around the best ways to increase the engagement with children and young people.

The Chair: Because of the time I am going to have to test the mind of Synod as to whether Item 15 has been sufficiently debated. Therefore I put the motion for closure on Item 15.

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

The Chair: I call on the Archbishop of York to reply to the debate. He has no more than five minutes.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you very much for a really rich and encouraging debate. First of all, I want to say to everybody without exception who has expressed anxieties and misgivings, I get it, not least because we have been learning so much in this first season. Please come to the fringe meeting at lunchtime, because we are still working out how best to move this forward and we need all the voices of all the Church around the table to do the very best that we can. No priest is an object. I did not get your name down and I am sorry if sometimes it feels like that in these debates.

I remember a priest in a parish where I served in a previous diocese and we were wanting to give them a curate. She said to me, "Yeah, I would love a curate but what I would really love is a youth worker; could we use the money for that?" Please do not misunderstand me. I want there to be more priests in parishes. That is what I want. Let me also say that as a diocesan bishop when you cannot balance the books, and when you are facing a deficit, this is staying awake at night territory. We are responsible for paying the stipends of the clergy and sometimes we do not know how we are going to do it. It is really, really hard.

I know we are facing really, really difficult challenges in the Church of England, but let us be honest and clear with each other. We want to put priests into parishes but the choice here is not, "shall we put priests into parishes or shall we spend money on something else?" We are saying, "how can we revitalise the whole of our Church so the whole of the Church starts to grow, wherever it is, and therefore we will be able to put more priests

into more parishes because the Church will be growing". Let us be real with ourselves. We have been in decline for a long while. Are we really saying that carrying on doing what we have been doing for the last 50 years is the answer? No, it is not. We need to try new things, but we need all voices around the table, and that is perhaps where we have not been as good as we should have been in recent years.

I accept the recommendations about having parish clergy better represented on these things. I absolutely think that is a good idea. We need to look at that. Just for the record, the Triennium Funding Working Group only makes recommendations. It does not make the decisions. Those decisions are made by Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners' boards, where there are parish clergy represented.

There is loads more I could say, but I just want to say one point of detail to my good friend Philip, who I think knows I agree with him. Speaking personally, yes, would it not be good if we could put more money into LInC. That is a debate that will go on. Actually, you said 20% going to poorer. In the last one 40% went, so yes, absolutely, let us push on that. I also like the idea of two people coming on to the board. Let us feed these ideas in so that we can hold each other accountable to spend this money wisely for the revitalisation of all our dioceses and all our parishes. I thought Mark Ireland put his finger on it. What we are trying to do in this next triennium is enable dioceses and parishes, working together in their contexts, to fulfil their missional ambition. We are not getting people to conform to central ideas. We want there to be a learning community in the way that Robert Chote suggested so that where we discover things work and work well, we are able to offer that learning to other dioceses so that we may all benefit.

Synod, even if you have some misgivings, I do not think there is a single person here who does not long to see our Church grow, does not long to see more people come to faith in Jesus Christ, does not long to see every parish thrive. Let us try to work better together to make this happen. I believe we have learned, we are learning and this money spent in this way will help us over a longer duration be the church that God wants us to be.

The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): Point of order. Will you order a vote by Houses?

The Chair: I think the people online cannot hear it unless you speak in the microphone.

The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I am requesting that you order a vote by Houses so that we have an accurate record of what the real feeling of Synod is.

The Chair: I am told, Fr Benfield, I can order a counted vote of the Synod at this stage. Is that what you would like?

The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): Yes.

The Chair: Do 25 members wish there to be a counted vote by Houses? We will have a counted vote by Houses. May I crave the indulgence of Synod in that I can see from my

watch we are going beyond the time allotted, so I think we need to extend the time of the sitting for as long as it takes to have this counted vote, probably no more than 10 minutes. Can we have an extension of sitting by 10 minutes?

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

The Chair. We will proceed to the counted vote.

The vote on Item 15: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 28, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 108 in favour, 16 against, with 13 recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, 96 in favour, 41 against, with 16 recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The Chair. That concludes this item of business and we go for lunch.

THE CHAIR *the Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 2.00 pm.

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. I hope you have all had a lovely lunch. Before we begin the items for this afternoon's session, I am going to call on the Chair of the Business Committee, Robert Hammond, to give us some notices, please, Robert.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): A couple of housekeeping points and then something around our business. For those who are online, can I reassure you that the voting platform is working correctly and all the votes that have been recorded have been recorded successfully and that is all working fine. Members online have been sent an email this morning again that includes the link to the voting platform. Our strong suggestion is that you have the link open in a browser on whatever device you are working on alongside your Zoom view of this meeting. That means that whenever a vote is called, you are logged in, you are ready to go and you can perform that vote straight away. But, again, just to confirm for those at home or not with us here in the chamber that the voting system is working well.

For those in the chamber, can I just remind you - and it does not seem to be too much of a problem right now - that the non-voting area, which is between the barriers with the two signs primarily, is for staff to sit in. It is non-voting. That also means that you cannot contribute from there. You cannot actually even vote with a hand and so when we were doing some of that 25 members this morning, anybody who was in that area and standing would not count. So, please, do not use that space if you are a Synod member. Let us keep that for staff and other invited guests.

Finally, I would like to propose a change in our order of business this afternoon. I fear that you are going to get very used to me and those words. I would like to propose that we resume the Canterbury CNC debate at Item 10 of that debate after Item 17 today and so that is at the end of the safeguarding item. We will then continue through the Order Paper with questions starting as timed business at 6 o'clock.

ITEM 16

SAFEGUARDING AND INDEPENDENCE: UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS (GS 2263 and GS MISC 1320)

The Chair: We move to Safeguarding and Independence Update and Next Steps. Members will need GS 2263 and GS Misc 1320 for this item and I would also like to refer you to the Fourth Notice Paper which has a Financial Memo on it as this item has a financial impact. We are going to start with a presentation under Standing Order 107 and I invite the Bishop of Rochester to introduce the presentation, please.

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs): Well, it is and it is not because I am delighted simply to introduce the four members of the Independent Safeguarding Board and the National Safeguarding Panel and they are going to be delivering the presentation, and I am not on the stage because they are independent.

Ms Meg Munn: That has to be one of the best introductions I have ever had. Good afternoon, everybody. It is a real pleasure to be here, not just to have the opportunity to be with you and to update you on the work of the National Safeguarding Panel but also because this was my University and, in my memory, the summer days were always just like this and so it is wonderful to share my old University with you in such wonderful weather.

Today's discussion will primarily be about the Independent Safeguarding Board, but it is really important, particularly because I know there are a number of members of Synod who have been elected since the last time I was here, to understand the contribution that the National Safeguarding Panel makes to independence. The panel has existed since 2014 but at that time, while the members of the panel came from other organisations outside of the Church and there were victim and survivor representatives, the Chair was the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding. I was recruited as that first element of independence and it is a very, very part-time role.

The Independent Safeguarding Board is part-time, but compared to them I am really part-time. It is up to 30 days a year and the panel only meets every two months. Nonetheless, we make I think a really important contribution to the aspects of policy and procedure. We look in-depth at each of our meetings, a little bit like a select committee, at one of the issues. Some issues come back time and time again. If you are interested to know more, then I do a blog and you can find that if you put "Meg Munn, Chair National Safeguarding Panel" into your search engine, that will come up and tell you more about what we do.

For me, it is really important that as we take forward this conversation about what the Independent Safeguarding Board does and what it might do in Phase 2 that we do not lose that aspect of independence and policy and procedure. I have heard from a number of people who have come before us, some of whom are in this room, to talk about what

they are doing within the Church that that engagement, that discussion, those perspectives that come from other people really help them to think through the policy, procedure and practice of the Church in relation to safeguarding. What we do not do is look at anything to do with individual cases and that has been clear from the outset. There is a range of activity which I would want to see in whatever form continue to go forward. I think that is really all I want to say in relation to that.

One other thing I want to say is that this has to be a conversation. There is a real dilemma about how do you get independence into safeguarding while the Church takes responsibility for its own safeguarding. Unless you have it effectively, the phrase goes, in your DNA - it is something you do constantly, it is something that you think about - then you will not be a safe Church. We can help bring perspectives and we can help bring different ideas, but you have to do that as well. This is a really difficult complex conversation, but I am delighted to say that we had a really effective fringe earlier.

The Independent Safeguarding Board has put together some options for Phase 2 and during this discussion we were looking at four broad options and at least two more popped up. Some really good ideas. It is not going to be easy but although they are independent, as Jonathan Gibbs said yesterday, it is your Church and you need to be engaged in looking at how that agenda of independence goes forward and works to help make you a safer Church. I am now going to hand over to Maggie Atkinson.

Professor Maggie Atkinson: Synod, thank you very much for engaging in this session. I am going to speak as briefly as possible. I am hoping that somewhere on a slide there is going to be our new website in a minute because I forwarded that and it will launch next week and, once it is launched, if you Google it, you should find it. I do not even have a web address yet but it is in formation. On it, you will find things like our terms of reference and a lot more besides. All three of us are going to speak this afternoon and so I want to be as brief as possible.

If you look at paragraph 8 of your paper you will see the framework for our Independent email addresses. There is a contact at box to which if you have got ideas about Phase 2 and independence and what it should look like, we invited fringe attendees to send material to us on that email address and we invite you to do the same. We looked at all sorts of things in that fringe: should it be a regulator, an inspector, an ombudsman, should it be new relationships between DSOs, DSAPs, the NST and the Church itself with a board above it? Should it be ACAS with an ombudsman? Lots and lots of ideas, including some new ones. If you have notions of what it might look like, we will put all the fringe materials, the slides that we could not show because tech did not get to us and the papers that people discussed, onto that website so that you have starters. You will also see the framework for how you write to us by name. It is our first names and our second names with a dot between, @independent-safeguarding.org. We are as busy as we could possibly be as an organisation that is six months and a week old in terms of launch dates.

When I came to you at Synod we were about 12 days old in February. The remit that we had then is the remit that we have now. We are an assurance review and give or withhold our affirmation to the standards and quality of the work of safeguarding across the NCIs and elsewhere. Where we have a referral in of a case that has previously been reviewed, we are not a first place of recourse organisation. We are not resourced, staffed, empowered or remitted to be so. But where something is referred in, we may, if we consider it stands within our remit, undertake a review of what has already been done and come back with the broad lessons learned that are coming from that piece of work. We are also here, and that is very firmly within the policy paper on which we were grounded, to give advice back to the Church on how better to deal with very broad big whole-Church issues of safeguarding and both Steve and Jasvinder are going to talk to you about two of those elements.

Our first formally published report, which will be written in our house style, with our front cover and nobody else has editorial control over a word of it, will be Jasvinder's Report on her conversations with around 60 safeguarding victims and/or survivors, and some people who have had allegations of abuse against them, and the work of the NST and the pressures under which sometimes its staff also work. I am not going to steal her thunder. She will be the closing speaker of the ISB slot in this session.

Steve has been talking already to Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers and Officers and to DSAPs and will want to give you some fairly trenchant feedback about what those conversations are already revealing and where he considers there is a need for some trenchant action. I look forward to hearing him say that. That is a fairly new piece of work and it is ongoing but it will be the Board's second published report later this year. We intend to go into the public domain with feedback that we give to you as a system unless doing so would reveal identities that we ought to be keeping confidential.

The other thing that we talked about this afternoon in the fringe is a diagram I have talked about a lot and it is in your papers. It is this piece of beautifulness, which is not a structure - I just thought I would say that. What it does is encapsulate where the governance sits at the moment and what we will want to try and help each other to do - and that is all of you in this room and those you represent as well as the organisations on this stage - is to get us to a point where the governance of safeguarding looking forward from Phase 2 onwards is captured well and preferably lines not only of linkage but of authority are encapsulated in any diagram that then results.

That is going to be a fairly tall order in such a distributed organisation as the Church of England. But we feel that, with the will of everybody both in this room and far beyond it, it can and should be achievable. Whether it will be with any of the faces that are on this stage at the moment, we cannot know and neither can you because one assumes it would all have to be recast, remade, renumbered and remembered. We are endeavouring to do all we possibly can within our current remit whilst helping you to shape a new remit for Phase 2 which none of us can know what that will look like. We have had some amazing ideas in that fringe. I was so enlivened and engaged and empowered by what you all

came to talk about and I think that is the spirit in which we need to take this forward. I am going to hand straight to Steve Reeves, who is our independent member, who is going to talk a bit about the work he has been doing. He will hand to Jasvinder to close our session. Thank you for your attention.

Mr Steve Reeves: Good afternoon, Synod, and thank you for the opportunity to come and talk to you about the work of the ISB and some of the early learning that we have identified about the challenges of safeguarding and the Church. As some of you will know, I am the newest member of the ISB. I started I think two or three months later than Jasvinder and Maggie and so I count myself as the new boy. As any responsible new boy, I have been reading as much as I can about the debates and the opinions of people who are contributing to the debate about safeguarding and the Church.

I have been listening to those with responsibility for delivering safeguarding on the ground and I have been asking those sorts of probing, innocent questions that are so befitting of the new boy in any organisation. I have to tell you it has been illuminating. Part of my first few months, as Maggie said, has involved conversations with DSAs, diocesan safeguarding advisory panel members, members of clergy, lay members of the Church, members of congregation, members of the public and others. There are many more conversations to come, but there are some very early learning that we should share with you.

I know Jasvinder is going to be speaking much more extensively in a moment about the views of survivors and victims of Church-based abuse and so I will not dwell on that too much but I would, however, recognise the contribution that some people are making to ensuring that the Church's future is far better than its past. This is incredibly difficult work for those individuals and we know that it happens at great personal cost and that the road to improvement sometimes feels very bumpy and hard.

What it is worth saying is that safety in organisations, in communities and in faith groups is regrettably not the default position. Safeguarding or safe churches, safe youth clubs and safe schools do not happen by accident. They are the result of huge amounts of leadership, energy, resource and wisdom. I should tell you that my initial learning has been that the Church delivers considerably more powerfully in some of these areas than others. It is probably unnecessary with the limited time we have to rehearse those areas where the Church needs to improve more generally. Synod members will be well aware of those. While acknowledging that there has been some progress on some major projects, there is obviously much more to do.

What is really evident when you speak to people responsible for delivering safeguarding on the ground is that there is this very wide funnel of well-resourced national initiatives that filter down into relatively small and not very well-resourced diocesan safeguarding teams for delivery. Diocesan safeguarding advisory panels and DSAs themselves are working hard on raising standards, increasing levels of trust and improving the safeguarding culture in their areas. DSAPs need more support and guidance with their

oversight responsibilities. Those teams, in turn, are supporting parish safeguarding officers who have even less time and resource, if they exist at all. What is really clear is there are some well-resourced and supported safeguarding teams at diocesan level. They are very well-placed to succeed, but there are others who are working in places where resource is scarce and leadership feels distant.

Regardless of your levels of energy and wisdom, the absence of leadership and resource will always make progress falter. Being a leader is about action. It requires drive and direction. Sometimes it involves sacrifice. Those in leadership roles must manifest their verbal commitment with practical action. Actions must match rhetoric. There are areas of the Church struggling to adequately resource safeguarding to an acceptable standard. In these areas, standards of safeguarding are maintained solely by professionals and others working excessively long hours over prolonged periods. This is neither safe nor fair. It does not deliver the best safeguarding to children, vulnerable adults or those wanting to get it right. The impact on safe practice and survivor services is evident but professionals are not immune to the impact of this. Some report trauma symptoms. Some are clearly burnt out. Some must wrestle with the moral distress involved in supporting survivors knowing that they cannot provide everything that that individual needs, but also knowing that if their abuse happened elsewhere in the country that survivor would get more. This is not right.

You will see from the Synod Report before you that some work is taking place to highlight these issues and challenges in greater depth and I hope we will be able to join you at some point in the future to share that learning. The complexity of the Church's governance and finances are clearly challenging and, as the new boy, I accept that but there are standards below which no church or Church body should be allowed to fall. The obligation to ensure that has to be shared, but if resource sits in relative abundance in some places and in scarcity in others there will always be an unacceptable disparity. As the new boy, I accept there are complex and historic challenges about the way the Church operates and allocates its resources. That is inevitable. But where there is a will there is a way and, if you cannot find a way, do not be surprised if people doubt your will.

Ms Jasvinder Sanghera: Good afternoon. I am going to start by echoing the words yesterday of the Archbishop of York, actually, in your speech. The point you made very clearly was actually how our hearts will be pierced, that in the safeguarding world we will be broken and humbled and that it is our responsibility to bring to the fore the unseen into the present. I will start there because you will hear me today and in the words of Maya Angelou, "If you forget what I say, that is okay, but I hope you do not forget how I make you feel". That is what matters because that is ultimately a compassion within you that you need in order to respond to this issue.

My first question to you, I suppose, as a survivor advocate is this. What type of a relationship do you have with victims and survivors? I put that to you. You think about that. How does this feel, this relationship with victims and survivors? Whatever it is, it will inform how you treat them. It will inform what is acceptable and what is not

acceptable. Any survivor at the receiving end of that will feel that. In my role in the last four and a half months I have been speaking to a number of people, those who have been harmed, those who respond, those who are responsible for policy and practice and those in positions of leadership. I also understand that many of you are at the receiving end of victim and survivors' pain and that can translate as criticism and that can translate in a number of feelings, even of helplessness sometimes. That is how it can feel. It is on both sides. This pain and hurt can lead to wanting to protect yourself very quickly on both sides. It can even lead to a sense of feeling defensive.

In my view, it is time to redefine this relationship, but in order to redefine this relationship there has to be honesty and that is what victims and survivors are asking for. Manage their expectations. Be realistic. Tell us what you can do but, equally, tell us what you cannot do. It is okay to do that, actually. Nobody wants to remember their trauma. Please never forget that for a victim and survivor coming forward it will always require courage, be it non-recent or recent, and we must not diminish the experience of those with non-recent abuse. It is as if it were happening right now and what many victims and survivors tell me is that some of those who respond forget the child and forget the person it has happened to. They want you to see and hear that person as if it were now. One of the things I do understand about trauma - and, yes, let us use that word "trauma" because survivors walk with trauma and they carry the narrative - is their life does not just flow in and out. It stops and starts. It sometimes can be paralysed by that trauma and sometimes they can feel stuck. Coming to you is very often in trauma. They live side by side with a ruinous, ever-present past. That is what I am hearing.

I asked every victim or survivor I spoke with, "How do you think the Church perceives you?" Every one of them gave me a list of things, but the consistent response was, "As an irritant". Is it not time to change that view? I appreciate the safeguarding work that is going on, but one of the things that victims and survivors are telling me - and actually it is to their credit that they feel this - is they want to work with you. They still want to engage on the whole agenda of safeguarding. To their credit, they want to do this and it is important that they come to the table, and I say it is time to drop your guard to move forward. It is time to reverse the patterns of self-protection and the shame of the past, because victims and survivors are wanting to be in that space to move forward with you.

I am going to conclude in saying this. This new shared understanding - that is required on both sides, I have to say - needs to be at a starting point to understand the relationship honestly between victims and survivors and the Church of England. If you say you are going to do something, do it. If you cannot do something, explain why you cannot do that. Victims and survivors need agency. They need to feel in charge. They need to feel that at the core of what you are saying they understand. They need to understand the what, why and why not. But so do you. It works on both sides. I am talking about boundaries.

My Report talks about boundaries and it is very clear that the need for that needs to happen on both sides. If you do not do that, what will continue from what I am hearing from those who are responding to victims and survivors is that they will keep on feeling

depleted, helpless and this feeling of mistrust on both sides will keep on continuing. Managing expectations is what I am talking about and the need to be consistent in that space. Who is doing what, when and why is important for both.

My Report when you read it will speak to this. It will speak to the heart of how all are expected to be treated. I am a survivor myself and I have to say I feel a weight of responsibility in this role as Survivor Advocate for the Independent Safeguarding Board. I came here to make a difference and, for the first time in my campaigning life or my journey of working with survivors for over three decades, I have been criticised by victims and survivors. I have been told, "Jasvinder, what can you do? You are employed by them". There is this "them and us" understanding. I have never felt that before and that makes me more determined to stay here because I believe what you have started in terms of the safeguarding agenda is authentic. It is real. But what I think you need to also consider is how you bring victims and survivors to that table and how you think about those honest conversations, the ones you do not want to have.

If I give you one example before I end. One of the questions I asked on my Report was to look at the two areas of policy that are so significant to victims and survivors. One, the Interim Support Scheme. It is a very good scheme, everyone would admit. It really is helping us. Those who are a part of that scheme and responding say, "Jasvinder, what if the Interim Support Scheme becomes overwhelmed, then what?" Well, I put it to you - answer that question, have that conversation, or else how are you going to expand your reach to those who are potentially harmed? Is that not what we need to do and for that uncomfortable question? I would say so. The other one is the Clergy Discipline Measure. We welcome as an ISB that it is being reviewed. More importantly, victims and survivors welcome that it is being reviewed. It is a significant policy area that is impacting on the lives of victims and survivors and also those who are alleged. There is a need to have real conversations.

On my journey in conversations, that CDM policy area was being consulted on. I listened to victims and survivors saying how they were given one week's notice to consult on such a significant area of policy. How did that leave them feeling? I will quote, "It left us feeling that the Church of England are not really committed to us". The point I am making is that you are on the right path here, but there is a need to listen to victims and survivors and engage them in the process because I will say it again: to their credit, they have not given up on you. So, please, let us have those honest conversations and keep moving forward and I will keep standing here.

The Chair: Thank you, Meg, Maggie, Jasvinder and Steve for that. We now, Synod, have the opportunity for a few questions, although there is not a huge amount of time and so we really do need questions, please, rather than speeches. I am going to be looking for three questions to be asked and we will see how we do for time. If you want to ask a question, could you stand, please, or otherwise indicate.

Professor Helen King (Oxford): Thank you for that really interesting presentation. My question is really simple. Is there any way that the ISB can hold anyone guilty of misconduct meaningfully to account? I noticed that when you were talking in the GS 2263 section 28, there was a reference there to, "Promises about remedial action, too often still partially or not delivered, or delayed ..." and remedial action in some cases can mean holding someone to account and I am not at all sure where that rests in the Church of England's structures at the moment and I am wondering if it rests with you.

The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs): We have had a number of safeguarding reports and reviews, the Gibb Report on Peter Ball, IICSA and the most recent one on Fr Griffin which just came out a few days ago. All those reports make a connection between the Church's attitudes towards homosexuality and being a less safe Church and I wonder if you as a panel have views on that.

Professor Maggie Atkinson: Chair, thank you and thank you for the questions. I am going to take the first question and Meg is going to come forward and answer the second, because this is in collegium. Do we have holding to account powers? No, we do not. We are not judicial or quasi-judicial. Our role is to make such - and I promise there will be, and you have heard a flavour - trenchant and insistent recommendations so that they cannot be ignored and to hold to account if they are not, and that is in our terms of reference as well. To do that cyclical you said you would, did you? Are you sure? Can you prove it? Show us. Okay, we will ask you again because how long have you been asking yourselves? But, no, we do not have holding to account powers, no, we do not. Meg is going to take the one that was asked about safety or otherwise if you are homosexual or an LGBTQ person, LGBTQIA and so on.

Ms Meg Munn: Thank you, Maggie. The reason I volunteered among us to answer this one is because it sounds to me like this is a policy type question and, as I said at the outset, one of the things that the National Safeguarding Panel does is look into issues of policy, procedure and process. Looking at some of the issues that come out, including practice, of those reviews is the kind of scanning of the horizon that I would do with the panel when we are determining the kinds of issues that we might look at. That issue has not been one that has been discussed by us to date. It could well be one that we would discuss.

The National Safeguarding Panel currently only meets six times a year. Well, in fact, we meet five times a year and one of our sessions we use for good practice workshops and to discuss issues of importance. I will certainly take that issue into our discussions. One of the things I tried to do is to make sure that we have our discussions when they are going to have an impact. If we know that policy procedure is being reviewed or due to be reviewed, then we will choose those kind of subjects.

But we also try to and look at issues which we think are important and that the Church is not taking enough notice of - I mean the Church as a whole not just the National Safeguarding Team. For example, in the past we have put issues like prevention on our

agenda and we have put issues like adult safeguarding on our agenda because we felt that they were not getting enough focus. This could well be an issue that we might look at in the future but, to date, the National Safeguarding Panel has not looked specifically at that.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): I want to ask you about the speed at which you have taken on a review and I am not going to go into detail of the matter. I am concerned that we gave you a bit of a hospital pass with that one, that that has arrived and you have had to invent on the hoof and that is a very difficult task and you can easily make mistakes and I am not going to criticise you for that. But what I want to know is I want to probe a little bit about whether we actually did our proper due diligence here at General Synod before giving you that task and whether we have actually got you as independent as we think you should be. I am going to ask you one question, which you can help me with: supposing somebody wishes to sue the ISB for its work, can you tell me which is the legal entity that will accept that responsibility. Are they covered by their own insurance? Would the litigation costs and any damages be met by you, your insurers, the Church Commissioners and, if not the Church Commissioners, then who?

the Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): At our DSAP meeting in Liverpool on Wednesday, our independent members expressed once again frustration at the delay in the publication of PCR2 and I wondered whether the ISB had received similar frustrations from victims and survivors? The feeling is that the continued delay smacks of dragging feet and hiding things.

Professor Maggie Atkinson: To answer Martin's question, you would not expect me to go into something that is already in progress, and I will not, and I would not want to hypothesise on what might happen were there to be a legal challenge. But my expectation would be that, were the issue referred to us by one of the National Church Institutions, we would resile to them for cover. Thank you, Martin. Were it our mistake and our error, my assumption would also be, although I would need to take legal counsel on this, that because we are contractors our insurers would be called on. But I do not know for certain because I have not taken legal advice on the matter yet because it has not yet arisen, and I do not expect it to because I do not expect us to do something for which we could be sued.

In terms of the PCR, we have not been involved in or received materials on the PCRs because we are not a diocese. It is not our material. We were not involved in the reviews and, therefore, we have no factors in it. Were something to be amiss, that would be the point at which I would expect it to be referred to me through the NST's mechanisms and potentially through your diocesan safeguarding partnership if you consider that that is where the issue lies. My advice, however, is that your main route for discussions is between your DSAP and those in the NST and elsewhere who have run the PCR process because we will be held in reserve to give or withhold assurance that things have been done right or not. That is our role. Meg is going to come in on that.

Ms Meg Munn: The reason I am standing up to respond also to this is not because it is the responsibility of the National Safeguarding Panel, but the PCR2 process is something that the panel has looked at in-depth and I can say that some of the members of the panel are also equally frustrated about the timescale. I can also say that because as Chair of the panel, although I am independent, I am a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group which has oversight of this process and that group met this week. Nobody is trying to hide anything. Nobody is delaying for any reason other than it is important to get this right. The process has been incredibly complex.

I do not know how long your report was in Liverpool. I know some reports are 80 to 100 pages long and the national report is an overview report bringing together all that information - 42 dioceses with really a lot of information and some of that coming in quite late. But, more importantly, from my perspective as the independent Chair of the National Safeguarding Panel, what is coming out of that has to be put into recommendations that are going to make a difference and recommendations that are going to improve safeguarding. When we looked at it in the National Safeguarding Panel in-depth, what chairs of diocesan safeguarding advisory partnerships - DSAPs in the jargon - told us was that this was a massive quality assurance process and that within those dioceses they were learning a lot. From that needs to come actions throughout the Church which respond to those issues that are coming up and which, to get back to my earlier point, make the Church safer.

This is a real opportunity. Yes, it is frustrating and, yes, this is what it always happens. I used to be a Member of Parliament and a Government Minister and when the Department of Health used to produce something and say, "We'll respond to the consultation in the autumn", autumn used to go on for a long time. People get frustrated about these things. Often, people overpromise on how quick they are going to do it. But my reassurance as an independent person is this is being taken incredibly seriously and I am in there pushing for the recommendations that I want to see. I do not want that report to come out until what I think should happen as a result of what people have found in the dioceses, until those recommendations that I think are really important, are properly written and properly produced. That is going to take more time than anybody would like, but let us get it right and let us really all work together to make the Church safer.

ITEM 17

The Chair: We are very grateful to you for that presentation. We are now going to move, Synod, to Item 17 and the motion which stands in the name of the Bishop of Rochester. Bishop, you have up to 10 minutes to speak to this item.

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs): Synod, I would like to begin on behalf of all of us here today by thanking Meg Munn and the members of the ISB - Maggie, Steve and Jasvinder - for their presentation and for all they are doing to hold the Church to account in respect of safeguarding. Thank you very much indeed. I am running out of time. Please keep on challenging us, as I know you will. I would also like to thank

all of you, members of Synod, for your engagement with safeguarding matters as well as that of your colleagues in dioceses, cathedrals and parishes and other Church communities up and down this country. Thank you for all that you and your colleagues are doing.

Most of all, however, I would like to start by acknowledging the impact of our safeguarding failures over the years on the lives of victims and survivors and to thank them, as we have heard already, for their willingness to go on engaging with us and challenging us to put things right from the past and to get things right for the future.

Synod, my intention in framing the motion as it stands before you today at Item 17 is to help us understand more fully the context in which we find ourselves in regard to safeguarding and then to try to reframe the discussion in a way that can enable us to move forward together as constructively and as quickly as possible. If you look at GS Misc 1320, you will see that I sought to address four questions in my introduction to the NST's Report. These were: Where have we come from? Where are trying to get to? Why does everything seem so difficult? How can we best move forward? I would like to say a little about each of these before turning to the detail of the motion before you at Item 17.

Firstly, where have we come from? We have to begin, as does today's motion, with a frank acknowledgment of our past failures. Terrible things have happened far too often across our Church and there was a collective failure to recognise and respond adequately even when abuse was disclosed. We still have a long way to go to put these things right, including through the establishment of a comprehensive redress scheme and, Synod, I need you to keep on pushing to make sure these things happen as soon as possible. At the same time, it is also right for us to acknowledge the significant changes there have been nationally in dioceses and in parishes in recent years, including improvements in safeguarding procedures and training. In many ways, we have come a long way and I want to say a big thank you to everyone who has made that possible. Thank you again for all that you and your colleagues are doing.

Secondly, in the midst of all the difficulties and challenges that we face, it is important to remind ourselves where we are trying to get to. Our shared goal is to make our Church communities the safest and healthiest places for all people that they can be, places where every single person is protected and nurtured and supported. That must include providing appropriate redress financially, as well as in other ways, to those who have been abused as soon as possible.

Synod, these things are what all of us who are engaged in the work of safeguarding are committed to and yet sometimes we seem collectively to lose sight of that. Our safeguarding colleagues, whether in our dioceses or in the national Church, can at times become a lightning conductor for people's anger and frustration. Sometimes that is because they have got things wrong and sometimes it is simply because they are standing

in the breach on our behalf. We need to remember that. We need to look after them as well as being ready to hold them to account when things go wrong.

At this point, I would like to say a huge thank you to Zena Marshall behind me here for stepping into the role of Interim National Director over the last 18 months. Zena has been an outstanding colleague and has provided great leadership to the National Safeguarding Team. We are delighted that she will be staying on as a member of the team as Alex Kubeyinje joins us as the new National Director in September. Zena, thank you to you.

That brings me to my third question: why does everything seem so difficult? Synod, we need to recognise, as we all know, that there is a lot of pain and hurt and anger around because of all that has happened and, yes, in some cases not yet happened because people's experience of how we respond is still not consistently and universally as good as it should be, and because we have not yet adequately addressed the past by providing appropriate redress both financially and in other ways. But we also need to recognise that the experience of those who are the subject of allegations or concerns is also not as consistently good as it should be and we know that also can be deeply traumatising for those who are affected. These are some of the reasons why the whole subject of safeguarding can be so fraught and so difficult. We need to acknowledge that and we need to do all we can to address the reasons for that.

We come to my final question: how can we best move forward? Synod, I wonder whether it may help if we could recognise more fully the incredibly difficult situation we have been and are facing around safeguarding. The revelations of the last few years have hit us like an earthquake and we are still living through the aftershocks of that, coming to terms with what has happened and working out how to rebuild in new and safer ways for the future.

After the initial response to IICSA and the greatly increased focus on safeguarding over the last few years, we are now going through a time both of much needed change and, yes, of anger and disillusionment about the pace and depth of that change. This can be incredibly frustrating at times and a source of anger, especially for victims and survivors. I personally have been deeply frustrated that we have not got further during my term as Lead Bishop. If I am honest, I simply had not realised how complex and difficult it would be and is still proving to be to bring about deep and lasting change across the Church of England.

But, Synod, I am convinced that it is happening and that we need to persevere. We need to press forward and make sure the resources are there to see this through as quickly and as effectively as possible. That applies especially to finding ways of making redress happen even before we jump through all the legislative hoops and even though in the end that may be required.

We need, if necessary, to throw the kitchen sink at this because getting this right is fundamental to the integrity and credibility of the Church in this nation and that is what the motion before you today is about. It acknowledges past failures and the need to work

especially with victims and survivors to put things right from the past and to get things right in the future. It recognises the challenges involved in bringing about change across such a diverse and dispersed institution as the Church of England. It urges the Archbishops' Council to ensure that IICSA's recommendations, including for redress, are fully implemented as soon as possible.

It affirms and reinforces Synod's role in holding the Archbishops' Council and the wider Church to account, particularly around strengthening independent accountability and oversight of safeguarding across the Church of England. Synod, we know we have not always got things right and there is still much more to be done, but I hope you will put your weight behind this motion and affirm your commitment to making the Church of England ever more fully a reflection of Jesus' reign of justice and peace and healing for all. Thank you very much.

The Chair. Synod, this item is now open for debate. Initially, there will be a five minute speech limit.

The Revd Timothy Bateman (Birmingham): This is my maiden speech. This is not necessarily what I thought I would be speaking on, but I do appreciate that this is a really important thing for the Church to get right. I wanted to speak particularly on point 17(b) on this yellow piece of paper - or golden - and I wanted to discuss particularly changing the culture and practice of safeguarding across the Church of England. I am a clergy person and I hope that the contributions I make will be helpful, not just for my clergy colleagues but for the Church as a whole.

Firstly, I just wanted to thank the Bishop of Rochester and the Safeguarding Team and the panel for all the work that you have done. I wanted to talk in this debate particularly on some of those things that I would consider some of the more grey areas in safeguarding in clergy performing their duties on a day-to-day basis and almost just here to ask for help of the next steps of how we might be able to do this as has been proposed here. Some of those grey areas that we encounter day-to-day as clergy people is these grey areas between pastoral concerns and safeguarding concerns, of those grey areas between safeguarding and GDPR, and the potential grey area of how clergy report and take notes of things for safeguarding concerns that are outside our parish and Church context and how we best do that.

As a clergy who has been trained in safeguarding, I know that we need to prioritise safeguarding over these other things and we are told to spot things that could become safeguarding concerns. I guess my question, the headline, is how do we report things and how do we take note of things. I just wanted to throw a few examples in there, a bit like a diocesan safeguarding training, a few hypothetical scenarios which might be rooted in reality for some here. The first scenario is that a student approaches me from my church saying they have got a mental health problem, how do I respond to that? Do please cut me off if this is not appropriate to the debate. One trajectory with mental health problems here is that, on the one hand, it could be part of a much bigger picture of this

person experiencing some very harmful things to themselves. On the other trajectory it might just be a student who wants to share things, who just wants prayer and wants some support as they navigate that particular situation.

That current example is not strictly safeguarding but it might have possible implications for safeguarding and it could have implications for their protection. I guess the question is - because this is a daily thing that I go through - what is the appropriate way to take safeguarding notes on this? Is it appropriate to do that? How do we record pastoral meetings in general and situations of this kind that happen all the time? How do we navigate and respect a person's desire for their mental health concern to not be documented on record? How is this something worthy of note-taking as a safeguarding concern and how is it not?

Just because of time, I am going to jump to my third hypothetical scenario which is around a clergy's obligation to report safeguarding concerns happening in an area that is not the area that I am serving in as clergy. To give an example, I am in Birmingham and I go up to my friend in Edinburgh and I hear from them a particular disclosure from them about something that is happening in their area. Under the Clergy Discipline Measure, what is my responsibility to report that with my Church and safeguarding files and what responsibility is it to do it elsewhere? It would be really helpful for clarity on this particular matter of how I act in that situation.

What I am requesting is if there could be some really clear safeguarding advice, particularly with these more grey areas, from the national team. It would be really helpful to the diocesan safeguarding team, particularly on these areas: pastoral meetings, low-level potential safeguarding concerns, concerns raised that are not in our geographical area or context or within our parish. Another area which would be helpful is historic adult disclosures where we do not have consent to take notes of this from the person who is sharing; how we navigate those things being compliant with all these different laws and regulations. Thank you so much for your time.

The Bishop of Blackburn (the Rt Revd Julian Henderson): I am sure we all want to add to thanks already expressed to Jonathan for his time as Lead Bishop and note his intention to step down in 2023. I suspect it will be hard to find as capable a successor. Thank you very much, Jonathan. You have thanked others, but we want to thank you for all you have given in that period of time, as well as the national team and all their crucial work.

Report GS Misc 1320 paragraph 1.5 asks why the provision of safeguarding seems so difficult and claims that the experience of those who disclose abuse and safeguarding concerns is still not always what it should be, and compounds the traumas of victims and survivors. I am sure we all agree.

I also want to say that some who have not themselves been abused but have blown a whistle and made a complaint about breaches of safeguarding protocol have then

themselves become victims of a rather different kind, not from an abuser but from the processes we follow as an institution. Further work is needed here.

From personal experience in the Diocese of Blackburn, I can confirm that safeguarding complaints made under the CDM sometimes take far too long before they are brought to a conclusion - recently, one took up to a year - and without adequate support for either complainant or respondent, and others involved in the process. In fact, so traumatic has that process been for the complainant that they have given me permission to quote from their letter of resignation from their clerical post, saying they have no choice but to leave it if they are to maintain their personal integrity and ensure their well-being and that of their family, because of the failings of the system. It is a huge sadness to lose this person's and gifts in the cause of making Jesus more widely known.

The biggest weakness in our systems in the Church of England is our inability to deal with certain levels of abuse. Too often an offence fails to reach the bar for discipline under the CDM and is not serious enough to warrant an arrest or investigation by the police, but is still inappropriate behaviour by a person in holy orders. What causes a Deputy Chief Whip to resign and be suspended in Government is, I am afraid, allowed to continue in the Church without any sanctions. Victims continue to suffer.

The only option left to us is a risk assessment. Even when a risk investment reports that an individual is not safe to be in public Christian ministry, and it is contested by that individual, the bishop and the Church have no authority to prevent their ongoing ministry. Serious work needs to be done to give teeth to independent risk assessments and for intervention to be possible. Yes, if that were to be in place there would rightly be, on grounds of justice, a right of appeal on the decision of the bishop, but at least then a risk assessment would have a purpose, be worth the cost of doing it and be a useful tool in making our churches safe for children and vulnerable adults. Until that happens, I see there is little or no point in initiating any further risk assessments.

Finally, I am not clear why proposals to deal with this have not been forthcoming. It is a gaping hole in our safeguarding provision and has been known and evident for a number of years and yet without any action or initiatives. I sincerely hope and urge, as I say a final plea, that something will be done in the very near future to sort this and so make our Church a safer place for all.

The Chair: Following the next speech I am going to reduce the speech limit to three minutes.

The Revd Claire Lording (Worcester): Can I echo my thanks to all who have presented under this item? In the light of events this week in the world of politics, I have been giving thanks that we as a Church have a safeguarding policy and process that values every individual as blessed and loved by God, and which does its very best to be robust in that policy and process.

I give thanks for the change of culture that I have witnessed during my years as a parish priest and entirely support the need for safeguarding, like we all do, to be at the heart of our entire Church culture.

I also recognise the challenges that present themselves when parishes and people are asked to undertake robust safeguarding training and to think of survivors and victims above everything else. Church officers speak of struggling with the safeguarding training and completing a safeguarding workbook. But the same people have given thanks that there are those around them, in parishes and the dioceses, who have helped them to realise that safeguarding is actually more embedded in their faith and Christian witness than they first realised, and they can share that.

I also remember years ago volunteers struggling completely with the CRB process, but now I give thanks for the safeguarding dashboard that has enabled corporate responsibility to become the most natural way of engaging with safeguarding. The work of safeguarding is vital and absolutely necessary to who we are as a community of faith, as a Church that longs to be a safer Church, that reaches out with integrity and unconditional love, as a community of faith that asks often for forgiveness, where we have collectively failed those who have been treated as less than being made wonderfully in God's image.

As a parish priest I want to serve in a Church that does better; better in building positive relationships between survivors and those who have no suffered abuse. I am grateful, and we should all be grateful, for the support and process at every level of the Church that enables this to become more of a reality and for the collective commitment to always do better with safeguarding. I entirely support this motion. Thank you.

Mr Gavin Drake (Southall & Nottingham): I want to thank Bishop Jonathan for bringing this motion for debate today. I would endorse the motion and encourage you all to support it. When my following motion on safeguarding in February was procedurally cut short, I received comments from a number of victims and survivors who felt they had been stabbed in the back. It was another attempt by the Church to silence them, they said.

I had considered amending this motion in two parts. I did not because I have just moved house and I do not have the internet so I could not forward them on. I will not be seeking the permission of the Chair to move the amendments, but I just want to talk about them very briefly.

In paragraph (a) I was going to propose an amendment that we “acknowledge and deeply regret the continuing safeguarding failures of the Church of England”, because there is a tendency within the Church for us to talk about our past failings. Bishop Jonathan used that phrase several times in his speech about the lessons of the past. We need to learn the lessons of today because we are still failing victims and survivors today. As Bishop Julian said, there are very many issues with our current system and processes that need to be dealt with.

An example very briefly, and I do have the permission of the person, and I am not going to be naming names. A victim who I am supporting, I had to inform the diocesan safeguarding team and her Bishop that she was in crisis. The time for a prohibition of a priest who had abused her was coming to an end and she was suicidal. She had a 24-hour referral to a consultant psychologist. Mental health nurses were visiting her three times a week. Two weeks later she received an email from the diocesan safeguarding adviser with four questions. One of them was, "Is it possible for you to think about forgiving the respondent? What led you to this decision?" Any attempt that she was trying to do to overcome that trauma disappeared on receipt of that email.

The second amendment that I was going to do was to propose a new paragraph (e) calling for a Measure to introduce a national body with the authority to intervene in dioceses. Because we heard from the presentation that neither the panel nor the ISB, nor anybody else, has the ability to intervene and say to a bishop or say to a diocese, "You are doing this wrong". I have got nothing against bishops - most of them - but bishops get it wrong, because they are people. And when they get it wrong in safeguarding, it can be catastrophic. Because of the hierarchical nature of the Church of England, they are untouchable. Some of them do not listen when they are told, "You have got this wrong". So we need a national body.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): I, too, want to thank Bishop Jonathan, Meg, the team, and indeed even Bishop Peter, who I would like to remember in this debate for taking us to where we are today.

I am myself a victim of abuse and I have been through what was a very arcane CDM process which was more traumatic than the abuse. However, I fear we have a long way still to go. I do want to recall for us that safeguarding is not just a matter of child sexual abuse or adult sexual abuse, it is a matter that impacts many people, and you will not be surprised at me wanting to talk about the LGBT community.

In a survey we did last year among LGBT Christians, over 750 of them, only a third stated that they felt safe to be themselves in their church. Indeed that tied with research that we have also done on conversion therapy that shows that so many have in the recent past experienced that within religious settings in our churches. I have been terribly concerned by the responses I have been given both by diocesan bishops, when we sent that research, to be assured it is not happening in their dioceses today; and indeed, dare I say, by the response we have just heard from Meg to Judith Maltby's, I think, correct question about the need to look at the link between sexual abuse and the Church of England's attitude to sexuality.

These are matters that impact our discussions right now, particularly as we look to discuss LLF and our decisions going forward. I would urge the Independent Safeguarding Board

and the panel to look at safeguarding measures to protect the LGBT community, perhaps even in our discussions tomorrow. We have some real difficult decisions to make. As I have already said in this group of sessions, sadly, it is many of us who bear the brunt of that. I would ask that we would look to put in place safeguarding measures across each of our dioceses that can protect all our members in our churches.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I have just been reflecting on what we heard a little earlier from the ISB, and particularly Jasvinder's contribution. I am aware that the way she spoke to us was challenging and thought provoking and strangely encouraging in some way or another.

I am particularly grateful to hear from the Bishop of Rochester about how the Church is going to receive and hear that independent voice. I can imagine, having been around the Archbishops' Council for a while, that one way that will happen is through the National Safeguarding Steering Group, and it is right that it should, but it strikes me the way Jasvinder was speaking, and indeed the way the whole Board will speak to us, is not just to the centre; it is to the whole Church. We need to give some thought to how as a Church we hear at the local level the voices of the Independent Safeguarding Board, because much of what we are hearing is about changing the way people behave in relationship to victims and survivors, and alleged perpetrators as well. That will only happen when we are prepared to be careful and thoughtful and accountable at a local level - clergy, bishops, lay leaders - and be able to hear what we are being told by the Independent Safeguarding Board. I can envisage a situation where we will get lots of central information about this, but it seems to me that whilst that is always useful, what we really need to do is be spoken to to our hearts, as Jasvinder said, so that genuine change can happen at the local level.

My plea is that is not just an institutional response, but we give some thought as a Church, as Synod, as Council, to the way the Church receives what we are told by our independent friends.

the Ven. Alastair Cutting (Southwark): Thank you very much indeed to the team for some inspiring and challenging encouragement to us in how we have been dealing with this, and thank you for helping us with our learning.

I have been helped by a number of the comments from people who have come forward already. Tim Bateman raised some helpful questions about some of the grey areas and some of the questions where we could do with some more help. I would like to raise a couple of those as well, please. There are times when there are issues about behaviour. Sometimes it is clergy behaviour and sometimes it is lay behaviour that can be an issue.

Quite often safeguarding is the trigger that is used in trying to engage with this. However, sometimes it is not really a safeguarding issue. It does not quite reach the threshold, and therefore it is dismissed as that, and it is moved on from. Rather than just say, "It has not reached our threshold, it is nothing to do with us", there are some areas where we need

to find out how we can best engage with those, because there are people who feel that they are very much under pressure for other reasons, even if it is not reaching a safeguarding threshold. Where are the places we need to have those discussions?

Another area that comes a bit close to this is the fairly new area, as far as definitions are concerned, of spiritual abuse. I am aware that some of the definitions of spiritual abuse are about the number of times an incident has happened. If it has not happened a number of times, that is not enough to trigger a spiritual abuse implication, and yet there is sometimes something bubbling under. There is something about reaching those thresholds. Can you help us, please, as we try to explore some of these and work around the interstices of things so things do not fall between stools?

The Chair. After the next speaker I am going to be testing your mind, Synod, as to a motion for closure on this debate.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): I want to thank Bishop Jonathan and also the voices we have heard from the members of the Independent Safeguarding Board, and echo what Simon Butler just called us to as to how we hear those voices.

I would add some more voices in that we will have over the autumn lessons learned reviews relating to John Spires' abuse, Trevor Devamanikkam's abuse (however you say the name) and others. They all have implications for a wide part of the Church. That is why they are what they are. They are going to produce conversation. They are going to produce questions.

I asked yesterday in a question for that process of accountability, transparency, honesty and integrity that Archbishop Justin spoke about very encouragingly as going on, the conversations happening in the House of Bishops, to be extended. We know there is friction when these issues come up in this place. Actually, I think so much of that friction would be dealt with if we could provide a context, a frank, honest, loving Christian conversation and learning around these things.

IICSA called the Church to deal with deference, particularly deference towards our bishops. It called us also to a change in culture. Part of that culture change is how we have a conversation around these things. I think that will help us move forward a lot.

The Chair. Synod, I am now going to test your mind as to whether we have debated this sufficiently.

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

The Chair. I invite the Bishop of Rochester to respond to the debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Rochester (the Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs): Thank you very much indeed.

May I begin by thanking all the speakers for some really helpful contributions. I will do my best to respond. Tim Bateman, thank you very much. You raised some important questions and helpful feedback. The answer in a safeguarding context is always talk to your DSA, but there are some really important points there we could explore further as we develop our training. Of course, there has been a significant move over the last few years in training from focusing on process, which is always important, to looking at culture, which I will come back to later. Thank you for that. We will pick up those points.

Bishop Julian, thank you for your challenges there with regard to responding to allegations and support for complainants. This is a whole area that is under development. I recognise this at the moment. It is support for complainants. It is support for respondents. I think we need to recognise we have not always put these things in place as we need to, and I think it is because we have not recognised the complexity and the sensitivity of these issues, so thank you for that.

Claire Lording, thank you so much for your comments, in particular your affirmation of the safeguarding dashboard. I know that has been extremely well received right across the dioceses. I have heard some really positive comments about that and we are very grateful indeed for the work that has gone into that. Absolutely, we all want to serve in a Church that does better in the area of safeguarding.

Gavin Drake, thank you for your comments. Absolutely, I recognise there are continuing failures in the way in which the Church goes about its work of safeguarding. I hope that was written into the warp and weft of my speech today, and I certainly acknowledge that. Certainly there are some challenging issues there about an extremely unfortunate response to a mental health case. I think we should be all concerned about that and I hope that has been acted upon.

With regard to a national body with an ability to intervene in dioceses, this is a wider question than safeguarding. It is about the structure of the Church of England and the wider issue of accountability. We have faced that and that is certainly at the heart of this question. How are we accountable to one another in the way we behave? That is at the heart of what it means to grow a safer Church.

Jayne, thank you so much for your contribution and for highlighting those questions with regard to members of the LGBTQ+ community not feeling safe. That is a matter of concern to us all. I can assure you with regard to the work of the NST, and of course we were hearing an answer from the NSP, we have a staff member there, Deborah McGovern, who is working very closely with LLF on those issues and, yes absolutely, our concern is to protect all the members of our churches.

Simon Butler, thank you for your comments, very helpful there. Absolutely we want to hear the voices of the people at the local level and voices of the heart, not only the head. We are looking at how we can do that, how we can translate what we have heard today

into communication in different ways, at the local level. That is part of the developing ongoing work of the ISB.

Alastair Cutting, thank you very much, issues of behaviour here. Yes, how do we deal with those issues? This is about growing healthy churches. You raised some questions about spiritual abuse and reaching the threshold. Some of you will have done the spiritual abuse course. Of course, there are distinctions in there. There is a traffic light system as to when something is good behaviour, when it is unhelpful behaviour and when it is shading into abuse, so different responses apply in different contexts. I think we need to be clearer about those and how we respond and make sure people understand.

Peter Adams, thank you so much. Transparency, honesty, integrity, yes absolutely, recognising the friction and the difficulty of having these conversations and back to the business of changing culture. I want to tell you we have two small groups working together trying to join some of this up at the moment. One is working on safeguarding and culture in our Church and the other is looking at the theology of safeguarding.

Only yesterday I was able to have a conversation with Eeva John about how can we join that up with LLF and following on from LLF, because that is all about the agenda of growing safer, healthier churches for all. Thank you for that challenge. Yes, it is sometimes about having conversations before we have the difficult conversations so we create the environment and the space for trust. I want to affirm that.

Thank you so much, everybody, for your contributions to the debate. Thank you again to the team who led our presentation today and thank you all and your colleagues in the dioceses for all you are doing. I urge you please, Synod, heartily to support this motion not only in word but in deed, as we go from this place. Thank you very much indeed.

The Chair. We move to the vote on Item 17. May I just remind those in the non-voting area that means you cannot vote. If you want to vote, you have to move out of the non-voting area. I put to Synod the motion at Item 17 on the Order Paper.

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

The Chair. That is very clearly carried. We now move to the next item of business which is a resumption of the debate on the Canterbury CNC.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 3.29 pm.

SEE OF CANTERBURY CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2260) (RESUMED)

The Chair. Synod, we now resume business that was adjourned from this morning. It is the See of Canterbury Crown Nominations Commission business. Just to remind you

that you will for this business need GS 2260, the Fourth Notice Paper at paragraph 11 and, certainly, Order Paper II from this morning, otherwise you will not follow the business. The Order Papers are available in hard copy down in the information area as you come into this hall and it is also on the App, so you can easily get hold of it either of those two ways, but you will need it.

Could I just also ask - because again we are pressured for time because this is being dealt with as an adjournment from this morning and so it is an insertion into this afternoon - if you are intending to speak on any of the remaining items of this piece of business, that is to say Items 10, 11, 12 and associated amendments that are on the paper, if you are intending to speak would you please be sure to sit as near to the speaking podiums as you possibly can. That will speed up the process quite considerably and so we would be grateful if you would kindly do that.

ITEM 10

The Chair: We resume our business with Item 10 on this morning's Order Paper and so I call upon Jamie Harrison to present Item 10 to us, bearing in mind that he gave us the general overview and the broader picture this morning when we began this item of business and so I hope he will be able to reasonably brief in introducing Item 10 to us now.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to remind ourselves, Groundhog Day, we passed 8 and we passed 9 both unamended. This is 10. The CNC we are working on now has the following constitution. It will be 17 people in total. Six will come from one of the six pairs. Six will come from the central Church. Three will now come from the Diocese of Canterbury. There will be one independent Chair. There will be two bishops which may be one Archbishop and one bishop or two bishops. There will be five from the Anglican Communion, one from each region, making a total of 17. I hope you are keeping up with the mathematics.

What I want to do is very quickly tell you where we are going with the rest of the debate, which I hope will move reasonably quickly. Item 10 is now restating one from each of the five regions. Simon Butler, I gather, will not move his amendment because it is no longer required. It would have fitted if his amendment earlier had carried and so Item 65 I think will not be moved. We then move to Item 11 - I am not moving these, by the way, Chair - which again reminds us of the variety of persons. I would then be supporting Item 66 from Nic Tall and supporting Item 67 from Andrew Cornes and also supporting, obviously, Item 12. I hope that will give you a shape of where we are moving to and, in the light of that, Madam Chair, I move Item 10.

The Chair: Thank you. Just to confirm that it has been formally noted that Item 65 is not going to be moved by Simon Butler and so, unless someone else wishes to move it, this item will lapse. But, of course, as Jamie explained, it is consequential and so that is anticipated to lapse. We can, therefore, go straight into debating Item 10 and I invite

anyone who wishes to make a contribution to Item 10's debate, please, to stand. I see no speakers standing. Since there are no speakers standing, there is no debate for Jamie to respond to since he can hardly respond to himself. We can, therefore, proceed to vote on Item 10.

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

ITEM 11

The Chair: I now call upon Jamie Harrison to move Item 11.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): As agreed by my previous statement, I am in favour of Item 11. It makes it clear that we have, as we do here, a mix of at least one Primate, one deacon, one priest and one lay person within the five and, as I say, I am supportive of both amendments and I move Item 11, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you. Our normal process would be now to have one or two speeches on Item 11. Do I see anyone standing? I think not.

ITEM 66

The Chair: In that case, we can move directly to the amendment to be proposed by Nic Tall which is Item 66 on the Order Paper.

Mr Nic Tall (Bath & Wells): This amendment takes nothing away from the original proposals but seeks to add a gender balance to the additional members of the Canterbury CNC. The addition of extra members from the wider Anglican Communion has been described in the paperwork as a gift from the Church of England to the Communion. As the givers of that gift, it is up to us to decide what it is we are offering.

The original motion is seeking to allow greater representation among those whom the Archbishop ministers to and includes limitations to get the balance of representation right. It requires members to be geographically representative from different parts of the world. It also shapes the gift by requiring a balance of lay, ordained and episcopal representation. This amendment recognises that the Anglican Communion is made up of women and men and that our gift should also include a balance of representation according to gender.

As we have heard a few times already, the average Anglican today is a woman living in Africa. I hope through this amendment that she has every chance to be included on the next Canterbury CNC. Of course, perfect representation is impossible. Five people cannot adequately represent the full diversity of 85-plus million Anglicans in the world. But just adding gender to the requirements alongside geography and ordained status makes a big stride forward and, crucially, it is very easy to do. The language in the

amendment, I accept, is a little convoluted, numbers rounded down and so forth, because I recognise that Synod could change the number of Communion representatives that it seeks but, as we are looking for five, this amendment effectively says at least two should be men and at least two should be women.

The amendment also makes sense should Synod choose to include or exclude any other criteria. I think it is also important to recognise that, since the last time the Canterbury CNC met in 2012, the Church of England has changed its whole approach to episcopal appointments. Back then, only men could be appointed as bishops. The next time the Canterbury CNC meets will be the first occasion that women could be called for interview and could be considered for nomination as the next Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Church of England strives to ensure women and men can serve equally and alongside each other at all levels in the Church and in all of its processes. We are all male and female created in the image of God and this needs to be reflected in the Church of England's gift to the Communion. I, therefore, encourage you to support this amendment and I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair. Jamie has already indicated his position but I call upon him formally to respond.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very grateful to Nic for this. I did comment earlier that I do not want it to be prescriptive in the Standing Orders, but I think this is a very helpful statement from him and I am very supportive.

The Chair. So we can now proceed to a debate on this amendment. Do I see anyone standing?

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter): I think, obviously, everybody would agree that it is advantageous to have a gender balance, but I would just say that when I was a student I was a member of Exeter Labour Students and we regularly could not send people to the Student Labour Conference because there was a requirement that it had to be 50/50 and if you could not meet that requirement you could not send anybody. So I am very hesitant to support this in case you end up in a situation - and it can happen - where you just do not have a minimum of two and how do you handle that. I actually think that there is probably enough sensible heads to think that they will aim for this gender balance anyway without the need to prescribe it in this way, which could cause unforeseen problems.

The Revd Canon Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities & TEs): The debate around the Canterbury CNC has made clear for me the need to develop a good understanding of both Anglican Communion as well as the Church of England. By the way, it is also very deeply instructive to the wider CNC process. Therefore, I fully support the amendment and also the wider proposal that Jamie has brought.

I have been to a fantastic fringe event this lunchtime, put up by USPG on the future of global theological education. The debate not only reiterated the need for a closer scrutiny of what we mean by the church in the Church of England or the communion in the Communion, it also seeks a fresh look at the representation within the CNC not only for Canterbury but beyond. Just as we cannot reduce the complexity of the Church of England, we cannot for the Communion.

I welcome what is being proposed, but my suggestion is that we should not lose sight of what was suggested early on in the meeting and the debate, that there should be a wider consultation within the Communion with regards to the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury and also what the Church of England can learn from the Communion. Therefore, they need to be a mutual learning experience and Canterbury can open up a real learning experience for the wider CNC process within the Church of England.

Ms Fiona MacMillan (London): Responding to Luke Appleton's point just now about aiming for balance rather than requiring balance, in my experience unless you require things they simply do not happen. It gives people an additional incentive if you require a balance and so I would resist that point.

The Chair: I see no one else standing and, therefore, I call upon Jamie to respond.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I support the amendment.

The Chair: So we can do a vote by a show of hands.

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

ITEM 67

The Chair: We now move on to Item 67. I call upon the Revd Canon Andrew Cornes to move the amendment at Item 67.

The Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester): My amendment is very simple. It calls for a majority of the Communion representatives to come from a global majority heritage background. I have had the privilege of serving as an incumbent in TAC, the US Episcopal Church, have spent some extensive time in the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, the Church of South India and the Dioceses of Singapore and Cameroon. It is hard to overestimate the deep-seated attachment within the Communion to Canterbury and its Archbishop. If you have lived and worked only in England, you may be unaware of the depth of feeling.

With the Archbishop spending 25% of his time on Anglican Communion matters and with people from all over the Communion, the change to more Communion representation, which we have already agreed, is frankly overdue. But those who are chosen must be representative of the Communion. Last time, the one Communion representative was the

Archbishop of Wales. I am sure he did his job very conscientiously but the resulting CNC hardly represented the whole Communion, yet it is perfectly possible without this amendment that most regions would choose a white man. In many of the regions - although actually perhaps not quite, I should say a white person in the light of the previous amendment - the most powerful and the richest countries are predominantly white.

Even in the region of Africa it would be possible for a wealthy white South African, for example, to be the one with the time and the influence to get himself elected. If this seems fanciful, I ask you again to remember who was the Communion's choice last time. The Church should not be one of the slowest to put right the inequalities of the past. We should be at the forefront. Opening these five places to members of the Communion would give many provinces encouragement and hope, but those hopes would be dashed if the resultant group reminded our sisters and brothers more of their Colonial past than of their vibrantly varied present. This amendment would make sure that the five representatives and the resultant CNC will be genuinely diverse, more like the reality in our worldwide Church. I move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair: The amendment at Item 67 is open for debate.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I have already said I am going to support it, Chair.

The Chair: Yes, you have.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): But I will say something, since I am here. I mentioned before the issue around how prescriptive Standing Orders should be, but I was welcoming the previous one from Nic and I also welcome this one from Andrew. I think we have had a fantastic experience in the House of Laity, particularly over the last few months, of being able to co-opt five wonderful people from a global majority heritage. It has been inspiring, encouraging and delightful and I really want to bring Andrew's proposal to us, his amendment. I hope we will support it thoroughly.

The Chair: It is now open for debate.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I must say I am starting to be slightly uneasy about this simply on the grounds that the more demographic criteria we apply to this the harder it becomes to choose the person on the basis of their personal characteristics. We have already, quite rightly, got geographical criteria. We have now got criteria on the basis of male or female. I would hope that, given the geographical criteria, the majority of those selected would be of global majority heritage because of the areas that they come from. I completely accept the point that it might be that, say, a white person could come from a region of Africa, but what if there were reasons why that person was the best person for the job and that they particularly wanted that person? Having these kinds of criteria could then rule that out and it just worries me that it could actually be too restrictive and in most cases not necessary because the geographical criteria would in most cases already achieve that.

The Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester): I refer to my comments about crumbs. I believe we need to pass this amendment.

Mr David Hermitt (Chester): I would like to move to support this amendment. I think it is very important that we are very specific about wanting to include those people who have not been included in the past in decision-making. That is all I want to say.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): I also want to support the amendment, but I am becoming a little bit uncomfortable because we are making restrictions for the Anglican Communion that we do not have ourselves. For our own members, we do not state anything about gender or background and so I am just conscious of that and I wanted to bring that to Synod and say, if these things are important, perhaps we should be making those restrictions for our home members as well.

The Chair: I am conscious of the time. I think this has been well aired, but we will see whether anyone else wishes to speak.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Just wanting to respond really to what Alison has just said and also, unusually, to disagree with my friend, Prudence Dailey. I think it is important that we do this in this context. If the Communion were in a position to have regional elections to decide in each region who they wanted to send, none of these constraints would be necessary or appropriate. The reason it is appropriate is that somebody else, a group of people who are not necessarily representative of the people they are then appointing, are having to making this decision. For that reason, I think it is, exceptionally, appropriate to insist that a majority should be of global majority heritage and also on the gender balance. This is completely different from our own domestic process which is an electoral process.

The Chair: If there are no other members standing, then we will proceed to vote on the amendment which is Item 67, "... that a majority of them must be Global Majority Heritage", and I put this to the vote.

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

The Chair: The amendment is clearly carried.

The Chair: We can now return to the main debate. I see no one standing, so I invite Jamie Harrison to respond to the debate that we have had on Item 11 on the Order Paper.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thank you for your continued engagement in this important debate and for some of the interesting realities that came out at the end, which in a sense drew us into a slightly different conversation from the one we had started within Item 11. Nic and Andrew, I am very grateful for your amendments which have clarified the issues we need to have in the Standing Orders. Of course, what happens from today

is that we have made decisions in the sense of in principle and they need to come back having been drafted and redrafted in terms of the Standing Orders Committee and our legal folk to come back on Tuesday morning to confirm the changes we have agreed through this process.

I hope you found it a helpful process of trying to discern the key principles so that we can then come back for, hopefully, a fairly quick debate to confirm the changes to the Standing Orders. We have had a number of comments about how we manage how people come into the process in terms of representation and how a committee or a combined committee will be making the decisions across the Communion. Perhaps picking up Clive's point at the end there about how that committee will have to operate within these constraints appreciating that that is what we are asking them to do, I am sure we will be giving them guidelines and advice about how that would be put into practice. You have heard a number of very good speeches. I do not think I shall quote them other than to thank David Hermit, one of our newest members, co-opted only very recently to the House of Laity in his first maiden speech just confirming his view of the value of contributions from those of a global majority heritage. So, please, support Item 11 and then we can move to Item 12.

The Chair. Thank you. Item 11, as amended by Items 66 and 67 on your Order Paper, is now going to be put to the vote by a show of hands.

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

The Chair. Item 11, as amended by Items 66 and 67, is clearly carried.

ITEM 12

The Chair. We move to Item 12 and I call upon Jamie Harrison to move Item 12.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Synod, the end is in sight. We can see the finishing line coming, hopefully, rapidly towards us. In a way, this is where we began with Canterbury Diocese's request to us to allow a change in the Standing Orders such that vacancies in the See of Dover will be considered by a full CNC process. You may be aware that when the current Bishop was appointed or was nominated, it was done in a quasi-CNC way. A number of the methodologies of the CNC process were utilised but, of course, it had no standing as such and, in the end, the decision would rest with the Archbishop of Canterbury. He is graciously offering to us as well his willingness to allow this to be done through a whole CNC process where he is but part of that process and the nomination would go to the Queen, as it would do through any other CNC process.

As I commented earlier in my speech there are those who might think this is rather odd, but I think there are such differences between the two roles that it is not unreasonable to call them both Crown Nominations Commission processes. We have heard in the speech in February from a lay member of Canterbury how important this was to them and my

own view, if we possibly can, is to support dioceses in their requests and be very, very careful when we turn them down. I hope you will support Item 12 and we can move quickly on to a vote.

The Chair: Item 12 is now open for debate. I would like to remind people that we are still on the rules that were in operation earlier in this debate in that we are on a three minute speech limit.

The Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I must declare an interest. I was on the working party which produced the Report, Discerning in Obedience. I welcome this motion, I think. I am still not quite sure whether I will vote for it, which is the measure of my confusion I think. I have some reservations about anything which makes Canterbury and Dover, effectively, two diocesan bishops. We heard in our Report and noted in our Report the value which the Diocese of Canterbury puts on having the Archbishop of Canterbury as their diocesan, although per force he cannot be as attentive to every need of the diocese as he would be if he was Bishop of Rochester or the Bishop of Chichester - and I am sure they are very attentive.

The present proposal from Canterbury Diocese - because it is from the diocese and I agree with Jamie very much that their need needs to be welcomed and respected - I regret that it is going to be full CNC rather than that it would lie in the discretion of the Archbishop of Canterbury because it runs the risk that you would get somebody who perhaps would not have been the Archbishop of Canterbury's choice. Unlikely but possible, and so perhaps I would have preferred guidelines - and we know guidelines are not just suggestions - along CNC lines for selection than what we have now.

I have picked up from many of the worries about other aspects of this motion that the idea of a Pope in Canterbury or something similar does not meet with a great deal of popularity and I imagine not least of all from the present Archbishop. I hope also that this whole Measure will relieve the Archbishop of Canterbury of some of the pressure on an impossible job. We have dealt with something from Canterbury about Dover that we need to look after the Archbishop of Canterbury present, future, whatever gender and whatever ethnic background, because we ask of them a huge amount and I do hope that by having a strengthened position in the Canterbury Diocese of the Bishop of Dover, the ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury will be enabled and made a little more gentle.

The Revd Rachel Webbley (Canterbury): I would like to thank the Archbishops' Council for not losing sight of the first half of the motion that came from Canterbury Diocese all those years ago, even though it is the very last to be debated today and so I will be brief. This motion captures the simple request that the local diocese has a guaranteed voice in its de facto local episcopal leadership held by the Bishop of Dover. It was kind of the Archbishop of Canterbury to allow a CNC process for the appointment of Bishop Rose. It shows that a CNC process for the See of Dover is both welcome and effective and we in Canterbury would like to ensure that this continues in the future regardless of the other decisions regarding the process of appointment to the See of Canterbury.

We are confident that the mature and professional Christian relationships would be expected and continue between these two senior colleagues, as there is today. There is widespread support in Canterbury Diocesan Synod for the other changes to the Standing Orders that we have heard about today. Our diocese is open to the world, symbolised by the Compass Rose at the heart of our Cathedral and lived out practically as we host delegates to the Lambeth Conference shortly and support the refugees that arrive on our shores or who are held in detention centres. At the same time, please do not forget, Synod, that the priority for us locally remains the request to extend the functions of the Crown Nominations Commission so that its duty to consider any vacancy in a diocesan bishopric include the See of Dover.

Following the interesting and intense discussions that we have heard today, I would ask Synod - and, hopefully, even Fr Thomas - to vote for Item 12 as it stands and that the Standing Orders be changed without further delay to provide for vacancies in the See of Dover to be considered by the CNC as if it were a diocesan see.

The Revd Canon John Dunnett (Chelmsford): Declare an interest in that I am a current central member of the CNC. I am not against the proposal at Item 12 per se, but I have some concerns that might cause me to resist it for the moment. Firstly, I think as tabled there is an assumption about a degree of clarity and agreement about the respective and relative responsibilities and roles of the Sees of Dover and Canterbury and there is nothing in GS 2260 that commends itself to me in that regard.

Secondly, the phrase "as if it were" could be unhelpful going forwards. Dover is not a diocesan see and it would be unhelpful if this language led, particularly at ground level, to generate any confusion about, for example, the exercise of the ordinary jurisdiction, the various charring and governance responsibilities of the two roles, safeguarding or other matters. Confusion is unhelpful because it sometimes leads to unintended consequences.

Thirdly, the provision being requested already exists and was used, as we have heard several times by Archbishop Justin, in the nomination of the current Bishop of Dover and so I need to be yet convinced of the necessity of amending Standing Orders to that effect.

Reluctantly, and particularly noting and acknowledging the speaker prior to myself and what she helpfully said from a Canterbury perspective, I would ask Synod to consider resisting this proposal and, if not resisting it, to at least ensure that the concerns I have expressed are addressed going forwards.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I will be very brief. I suppose I have a kind of romantic attachment to the idea that the Archbishop of Canterbury is the diocesan bishop for the Diocese of Canterbury because I grew up in the Diocese of Canterbury and, indeed, I had the privilege to be confirmed by the then Archbishop Donald Coggan - that ages me, does it not? I have the same kind of reservations and discomfort that some others have

expressed. I am not exactly against this and at the moment I think I might abstain, actually, but I think just think it is important that we do not lose sight of the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury is the diocesan bishop for the See of Canterbury.

The Chair: I was going to ask Bishop Rose next, but I see that the Archbishop of Canterbury has indicated a wish to speak and I am afraid he trumps Bishop Rose in this context. We will still hear from Bishop Rose after the Archbishop.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Two and a bit years of experience tell me that nobody trumps Bishop Rose. I will be very brief. I can speak to this, as I have not done so far today, because this is something that it might fall to me to apply. There is no question in this of a change in the idea that the Archbishop of Canterbury is the diocesan bishop of the See of Canterbury. It is this amendment, as I understand it, and it will be brought out in the drafting of Standing Orders, I am sure, by our excellent legal team very clearly indeed, picking up John Dunnett's very helpful comments and will simply ensure that the Diocese of Canterbury gets inevitably and invariably fully consulted.

It is possible to imagine a situation if it was only a guideline where a megalomaniac Archbishop of Canterbury - which, of course, in 1,465 years, we have never yet had - who fancied, almost certainly, himself in this case a Pope might decide that he was going to ignore the guidelines. I am using "he" very carefully here because it would inevitably be a "he" I suspect. For that reason, I think this is really helpful to the See of Canterbury. It has got nothing in here about the allocation of tasks and quite rightly because that is sorted out at the time. That is why I very happily agreed to this because in practice it is something that I would seek to follow anyway. But thank you very much for asking me to speak, Madam Chair.

The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin): Other things have been said that I would have said, but I just want to be very brief and be very clear. We have a diocesan bishop of Canterbury. There is no vacancy in that role. I am there to serve the Archbishop in my role as Bishop of Dover and, frankly, anyone carrying the responsibilities of the Bishop of Dover ought to be tested in the same way that diocesan bishops are tested. At my interview I was asked the question whether I would be upset if the Archbishop arrived and turned up, he has not done the work and he turns and he gets the limelight. He is the Archbishop of Canterbury and he is the diocesan bishop of Canterbury. I guess what I am saying to us all is that there is no testosterone going on here. I am there to serve the Archbishop and to serve the Diocese of Canterbury. Let us get that clear.

The Chair: I see no one else standing and, therefore, I call upon Jamie Harrison to respond to the debate.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Well, as the Archbishop said, it is very difficult to follow Bishop Rose. We have had a little area of people just feeling their way a bit. Fr

Thomas was sort of not quite sure. I think John Dunnett raised some questions which we need to follow up. Particularly when we draft the Standing Orders, I think it is really important to just get the drafting right and it will be right because it always is.

Rachel, thank you so much for the voice of Canterbury which we have been waiting for however many hours and has now arrived in great style. Prudence, yes, he or she in the future will still be your diocesan bishop. As Archbishop Justin says, he is very committed to this and he wants it to be enshrined, if you like, in the Standing Orders. I very much would like to encourage you to vote for Item 12. It is absolutely integral to the whole business of today. It started in Canterbury Diocese. In some ways, although they have come at the end, hopefully is a triumphant ending which we can support, so I ask you to vote very firmly for Item 12.

The Chair. I put Item 12 to the vote.

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

The Chair. That concludes this item of business and we will proceed to whatever it was that the reordered business declared was going to happen next. I am sorry, I do not have that note in front of me.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 4.15 pm.

SPECIAL AGENDA I LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS ITEM 500

CHURCH OF ENGLAND PENSIONS (APPLICATION OF CAPITAL FUNDS) MEASURE (GS 2264)

The Chair. We now come to 500, the draft Church of England Pensions (Application of Capital Funds) Measure, which is before Synod for First Consideration. For this, members will need the draft Measure, GS 2264; the Explanatory Note, GS 2264X1; the Policy Note, GS 2264P; and the Fourth Notice Paper giving the financial implications at paragraph 14. I call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, Ms Busola Sodeinde, to move Item 500, please. She has up to 10 minutes.

Ms Busola Sodeinde (London): Chair, and members of Synod, before I start to move the motion I would like to say that I am a woman of African heritage and I have felt warmly welcomed by the Synod and now it is a privilege to be passing my first Measure - even though it is a bit boring, but I am taking the stage today. But thank you all. Before I proceed further, I would like to declare my interest as a Church Commissioner, but this draft Measure is of interest to us all. It has an effect on two Measures in that it would amend the Church Commissioners Measure 1947 and the Church of England Pensions Measure 2018 and it is very straightforward. As you can see at section 1 of GS 2264, it

will simply amend the year 2032 for 2025 and I will explain why this change is being proposed.

The Church Commissioners have a power to spend capital in order to meet their obligations to pay clergy pensions that have been accrued in service up to the end of 1997 as well as staff pensions for service until the end of the last millennium. However, this is a time-limited power which under current legislation would cease at the end of 2025. This power was first granted in 1997 and has been renewed on three occasions. This legislation would extend the power for a further seven years, the same period as on previous renewals.

Members may wonder if the renewal is really needed as the Church Commissioners have not had responsibility for taking your pension liabilities for almost 25 years. However, the annual expenditure on pensions only started to reduce in 2019. It was just over £120 million last year and it is forecast to remain above £100 million for a further ten years or so, depending on the level of inflation as well as the longevity of pensioners. The power to spend capital on pensions gives the Commissioners much greater flexibility in their asset allocation policy enabling them to invest in a broad range of asset classes, including those where most or in some cases all of the return comes from capital rather than income distributions. This power has a crucial enabling factor in the strong returns generated by the Church's endowment managed by the Commissioners. The purpose of those returns are to feed through to the increased support for the Church's mission and ministry we heard about earlier today.

Members can learn more about the Church Commissioners' Annual Report and Accounts, which is available on the publication section of the Church of England website. As all investment managers and advisers would remind us, past performance is no guarantee of future performance, but a further renewal of the power will maintain the Commissioners' ability to make investment decisions with regards to the prospective overall return in the very long term rather than focus on targeting a specific income level. The renewal will, God willing, help the Commissioners to not only maintain but grow their ongoing support for the Church's mission and ministry across the country. I commend the draft Measure to Synod.

The Chair: Item 500 is now open for debate.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): I am fully in support of this Measure. It just occurred to me though that, given the very cogent arguments given as to why it is a good idea to give discretion to be able to spend the capital, why it is actually necessary at all to have a sort of sunset time associated with it because I cannot imagine an occasion when it would not always be a very strong argument to say that we should renew this. My comment is just is it possible that we could get away with a need to keep on renewing it and just have it that it is available for all time?

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): I am a member of the Legislative Reform Committee. This is a dull but very important piece of legislation and also rather technical in nature - right up my street. It has already been mentioned that the Church Commissioners are responsible for meeting the costs of clergy pensions payable in respect of service before 1 January 1998, after which the Church of England funded pension scheme came in to meet this obligation. Since that date, the Church Commissioners have been able to use capital to meet this liability and for some years have done so to the fullest extent. Passing this Measure would enable them to continue to do so. This is technical but very important.

The Church Commissioners have adopted total return accounting which enables the distribution of income and capital gains on their endowments over a retained level of base investment which is retained at real value, which means that the base investment has an amount added to it each year which enables it to keep pace with inflation. At the moment, we are, you may have noticed, experiencing high inflation, unprecedented in the past couple of decades, which means more of the income and capital gains earned by the Church Commissioners' funds will need to be used for the purpose of topping up that base investment, which in turn means there is less available for the distribution to support the work of the Church and so it is doubly important this time that this Measure is passed.

Each time the power to use capital for the pension liability is renewed, it is for seven years. It is probably fair that Parliament requires this. It enables them to review what is going on within the endowments. But the Church Commissioners need this power to meet their pension liability out of capital which is planned and decreasing over time, otherwise this will also reduce the amount the Church Commissioners can distribute. Together with the inflationary transfer, that would result in a very negative double whammy. We do not want that. Technical but vital. I urge Synod to send this Measure on its way to do its important job. Please, anyone, if you want to understand about total return accounting, which dioceses can use too, do stop me and ask. It is one of my very favourite topics.

The Chair: I can see no one else standing and so I call on Ms Sodeinde to reply, please.

Ms Busola Sodeinde (London): I will start, first, actually, the other way round. I want to thank Julie for supporting the motion and explaining quite clearly the intent behind this Measure. John, just to respond that there is a sunset time because it was expected from us or stipulated by Parliament. Some of the capital came from them and they gave the orders that we would just come and renew every seven years and it helps with accountability as well and so that is fine. As long as we are not changing anything and all we are doing is rolling forward the same Measure over seven years, I think that should be absolutely fine. So I would like to commend the Synod to please approve this motion and let us get with the revision order.

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

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

The Chair. The draft Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than half past 5 on Friday 9 September. That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 4.28 pm.

SPECIAL AGENDA I LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 505

LEGAL OFFICERS (ANNUAL FEES) ORDER 2022 (GS 2278)

The Chair. Synod, we now move to Item 505, the Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2022. Members will need the paper, GS 2278, and the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 2279, and 2279X. I invite the Chair of the Fees Advisory Commission, the Ven. Bob Cooper, to move Item 505. He has up to 10 minutes.

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham): Members of Synod, it has been requested that the Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2022 be debated and I, accordingly, now move that motion, in effect, standing in my name. May I, first of all, acknowledge that there have been some concerns raised around the level of fees which the Commission has recommended and I am grateful for this opportunity for this debate which allows me to explain something of the Commission's thinking. Increases on legal fees are never popular even when they are fair. As a brand-new Commission member with the vast experience of one meeting's attendance, I sympathise with anyone who finds this subject very technical and it may help if I summarise the approach which the Synod has endorsed previously.

The main purpose of an Order of this kind made under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 is to prescribe the fee (or retainer) payable annually to the registrar for professional services specified in Schedule 2 to the Order. The Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Orders effectively limit what each registrar can lawfully charge in respect of the bulk of the legal advice and services he or she provides to the bishop and the diocese.

It is crucial to understand that in the absence of an Order, the fees charged by diocesan registrars would be left to be negotiated at the marketplace. The statutory annual fee imposed by the Fees Order is therefore of considerable financial advantage to DBFs and to the Church Commissioners. The introduction of a fee limited by statute is acceptable only, however, if the fee is a fair one, especially when that fee is below market rate. That principle has informed the Commission's approach in arriving at its recommendations as embodied in the Order.

In 2014, after an independent review and consultation with both users and providers of

legal services, the Commission proposed a new approach to the remuneration of diocesan registrars through the retainer.

The primary aim of the change was to promote a more effective dialogue and a sharper focus on value for money between dioceses as users and registrars as providers of legal services. This was to be achieved in two ways. First, through an annual review of the size and shape of each registrar's workload involving the diocesan bishop and/or senior diocesan officials; secondly, through the introduction of a more transparent methodology for calculating the retainer.

The secondary aim of the 2018 reforms was to begin to redress the substantial longstanding and potentially damaging underpayment of registrars by introducing a staged uplift in the value of retainers over the period of five years to 2019. We started from a low base. In 2012, registrars were being paid on average for only about 50% of the true cost of the work actually done by them.

Following Synod's approval, the retainers of individual diocesan registrars are calculated by reference to a formula. This formula takes into account the cost of the work actually done in previous years and also the size of the registrar's diocese, assessed by reference to the number of open churches and the clergy of incumbent status. Full details can be found in GS 1938-9X.

Since then, annual movements in the national cost of the retainer have been driven both by changes in the reported hours worked and median charge-out rates as required by the new basic formula. General Synod agreed exceptional phased uplifts over the transitional five-year period 2015-2019, in order to achieve a level of remuneration for registrars comparable to wider legal rates, but with a 30% charitable discount.

In 2019, the Commission concluded that a charitable discount as high as 30% was continuing to cause undue financial penalties for registrars and was not justified in today's circumstances. Persuaded by the reasoning in GS 2147X, Synod approved a reduction in the discount from 30% to 10% over a period. Circumstances enabled it to make an immediate reduction of 30% to 20% for the year 2020, but with the understanding that the further reduction to 10% would be spread over the following five years. This approach was followed for the 2021 and 2022 retainers in which the charitable discount was reduced to 18%, and then to 16%. These two factors have resulted in improved income levels. In 2020, registrars were, on average, being paid for 70% of the work done by them.

Against that background, the Commission came to its task this year in circumstances in which the amount of work done by registrars and the market level for legal fees had both risen, driven by factors such as the pandemic. That meant in 2021 we were back to a position where registrars were, on average, being paid for 65% of the work actually done. The Commission does not consider it acceptable for that situation to continue.

Its starting point is consistency of approach and fairness. The Commission unanimously remains of the view that the broad principles underlying the formula which Synod approved in 2014 are well accepted and provide the most suitable basis for the calculation of the annual retainer.

Applying that established formula and making no further move to reduce the charitable discount would still lead to an increase in the average national retainer of 12%. Synod will note what goes up can come down and if amount of work and/or median rates for the retainer fall then so will the retainer. Admitting any phased uplift around this time would simply postpone the problem and result in higher uplifts at a later date. Accordingly, the Commission considers it right to maintain some momentum in the reduction of a charitable discount, and proposes a further reduction in the charitable discount from 16% in 2022 to 14% in 2023. This meets the aspiration set out last year and in previous years and leads to the average national increase of 14% which we recommend.

The Commission of course recognises the financial difficulties of the Church. But what was true in 2014 remains true now. The Church rightly values the providers of its legal services and should recognise that they ought to be remunerated fairly and reasonably for the work that they do. Annual retainers are a good way of achieving that end whilst putting in place a clear limit to fees.

Without a retainer, dioceses would probably be required to agree fees for each piece of work at the prevailing hourly rate, and registrars would need to undertake full time recording. Synod needs to be aware that this could lead to an increase in recorded hours and therefore fees. This is a real possibility which the Church may face in 2023 if General Synod does not approve a Fees Order. Of course, the Commission does want to listen and at its recent meeting planned to undertake a process of consultation before it brings an Order before Synod next year.

Members of Synod, the Commission takes its role seriously and recommends this Order unanimously. The Order attempts to balance firstly the needs of diocesan registrars, who deserve fair rewards for their work, with, secondly, those of dioceses, which we realise are facing tighter budgets year on year, and, thirdly, the future and present needs of the Church. We feel that the remuneration rates proposed in the Order are fair and go some way to ensuring that the Church will continue to be able to draw upon that very precious resource of specialist ecclesiastical legal knowledge years into the future.

Members of Synod, I accordingly invite you to approve the Order.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. Should you wish to speak, either stand or, if that is a struggle, raise your hand, and those on Zoom should do it in the usual way. The speech limit from the outset is three minutes, please, because we have two items to fit in before 6 o'clock.

Mr Robert Perry (Truro): I am most grateful to the Archdeacon for his very clear explanation of the background to this proposal. Nothing I am about to say, I hope, will show any lack of respect for the legal profession or for the expertise which we have seen in this Synod over the past couple of days, and no doubt will gain the fruits of when the Canterbury Orders are drafted for consideration on Tuesday. I mean no disrespect there.

I am simply looking at it from the point of view that we are faced with a 14% increase in fees from last year to this and setting that in the context of my diocese, where we are preparing budgets now for 2023 and are anticipating a much lower rate of increase in pay for stipendiary clergy than 14%, it seems to me, putting it bluntly, that if we are offering lawyers a fee increase of 14% and offering clergy a fee increase of much less than that then something has gone badly wrong somewhere. For that reason I am afraid I cannot support this motion.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Chair, I have huge respect for our ecclesiastical lawyers. I also recognise that ecclesiastical law is something of a niche specialism, I am afraid, and we need to attract talented people to it. Paying a reasonable amount for these legal services is part of that. I therefore stand here really quite conflicted. The increase in fees varies by diocese between 13% and 16%. This is a lot, particularly at the current time when dioceses are struggling financially due to the impact of the pandemic. I understand that the fees are a result of a formula agreed by Synod in 2014 and each year since the formula has been applied and the Fees Orders have been approved as deemed business. The formula, I gather, is quite complex and can result in fees going down as well as up.

The issue we face this year is that formula results in a significant increase. There has been some lack of transparency regarding the information feeding the formula. Diocesan budgets are extremely tight indeed in the current financial situation. It would have helped if the information regarding the formula had been distributed to the dioceses. There is significant dissatisfaction regarding this level of fees.

There is also the situation we are not able to amend this Order. It is what it is and Synod can either accept it or reject it. It is not entirely clear what happens if Synod rejects it, but the default position would be that each diocese would need to negotiate fees with their registrars individually. In Oxford we are confident we could do this and the resultant fee would be lower than the fee in the Order. I have to say that I spoke to our diocesan registrar at lunch time and he said he would negotiate a lower fee even if the Fees Order is passed. I cannot speak for other dioceses. Perhaps they could reach a mutually agreeable arrangement. We have a situation where the Church needs ecclesiastical lawyers and ecclesiastical lawyers need the Church.

Synod must decide a way forward from this strange impasse, but I hope in the future there can be more communication and transparency, and I welcome what was said earlier about further consultation.

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (ex officio): Lawyers generally get a bad press, in the Bible, in Shakespeare, in newspapers and just about everywhere, but our Church needs them. It needs specialised lawyers working in this very particular area of law. I call it an area of law. It actually encompasses many, many different kinds of law, with a specific Church take on them. It is a highly particular form of practice.

The uplift here we know is due to two things. One is increased workload and the other is the application of that increased workload to a principle of payment which was agreed by Synod itself. The people doing this work are highly specialised and highly skilled. They are often working long hours, sometimes anti-social hours when emergencies crop up, in stressful situations. The maths has been admirably explained to us in the papers and in the promoting speech, together with, in particular, the approach, as you have said, agreed by Synod just a few years ago. What is proposed is simply the outworking of this.

Registrars will, quite legitimately, have relied on the Synod resolution when in discussion with their fellow partners in their solicitors' firms agreeing to carry on doing work for the Church of England at loss. They will have been able to point to the gradual improvement and the bringing of fees closer (but not fully) up to the commercial level, in getting the agreement of their commercial partners to allow them to continue to carry on with it. Quite simply, members of Synod, I suggest that the Church should stick to its word in accordance with biblical principles. Our yes should be, and remain, our yes.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln): I am also a member of the Fees Commission, which I need to express at the outset of course. I am a member of the Bar, and I wish to emphasise I am not standing here just to come to the aid of brothers and sisters in law who do registrar work, but to speak to the underlying purpose of the fees scheme you have heard and read about, specifically, to speak into the wide-ranging consultation conducted by the Fees Advisory Commission which revealed serious concerns among registrars about the threat of underpayment posed to the ongoing provision of legal support in the Church of England and across dioceses.

Since then you know that the Fees Advisory Commission has introduced reforms, and you have heard about those in the opening address, to correct the damaging record of underpayment and improve the system in other ways. I readily understand there is a conflict between the here and now and what the Fees Commission is trying to achieve in the longer term. The fees increase will hit the diocese I am elected for as well. I believe there is not serious disagreement about what the underlying policy is trying to achieve, and indeed what it set out to achieve back in 2014/15, but the message I want to convey is about what will happen when you allow the price you are prepared to pay for legal services to fall behind rates of remuneration in other areas.

I receive instructions in legal aid cases, cases funded by the State. The fees over a lengthy period have been driven down and now fall far behind the equivalent private rates for the same work. Whenever I make a call to the solicitors who instruct me in those

cases, the person who picks up the phone is not a partner or a senior lawyer, it is a trainee solicitor, or a paralegal, or a legal executive; in other words, the lowest qualified and the least experienced people working in those firms of solicitors in their departments. To make this work financially viable for firms they need to allocate to those legal aid cases the least qualified and the least experienced people. That is assuming they still want to carry on doing that work in the communities that they serve.

Just as a person picking up the phone to me in a legal aid case is low on experience and qualification, so the same will happen in the longer term if you fail to fund properly the registrars who provide the specialist work that we know they all do. Eventually, the marketplace for legal services will work against us and there will be a talent vacuum. If you oppose this Order it will contribute to the drift that the policy of 2014/15 was seeking to arrest.

Synod, with those final comments, I would ask you to approve this Order and not oppose it. We need to reward our registrars and retain the talent that we have now and continue to attract talent in the future.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): I would like to start by fully agreeing that people should be paid the fair rate for the work that they do, but, as expressed by others, my concern is the size of the increase that we are faced with, in a single year, at a time when the Church is under enormous financial stress. As we have heard, the increase that we are faced with is driven by two factors, the first being the continued phased reduction in the charitable discount from 30% to 10%, with a 2% drop being proposed between 2022 and 2023, falling from 16% to 14%. The resulting increase in what each diocese will have to pay from that element is relatively small, but deferring this element by a year would have indicated at least some understanding of the situation faced by dioceses.

A more significant driver in the overall increase that we are seeing is driven by the amount of work undertaken under the retainer. Here I have to say I am confused by two conflicting statements in GS 2278X. Paragraph 10 states that there has been “a 10% increase by value of work done between 2020 and 2021”. However, two paragraphs later in paragraph 12, in seeking to justify the continuing reduction in the charitable discount, the paper states, and again I quote, “There has been a reduction in the national average amount of work which the retainer covers”. Which of those two statements is correct?

I am further intrigued by the way that the fees are apportioned between dioceses. Per GS 1938-9X, approved in 2014, key factors in a diocese are number of open churches and its number of priests of incumbent status or higher. When were those numbers last updated, I wonder, for the purposes of calculating the apportionment? Also, has the method of apportionment been reviewed since 2014, so we can see if it does fairly reflect the degree to which individual dioceses make use of the retainer?

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott (Ely): I am speaking as a member of the Ecclesiastical Law Association and in my role in the diocese, where I work very closely with our legal

team and our registrars, and I echo the comments made about the quality of the work done and how much we depend on them for the smooth running of our operations. However, the proposal before us today of an increase of some 14% or 15% will have a severe effect on many dioceses at a time of financial crisis. We did some work in the finance committee of our own diocese, of which I am privileged to be a member, and the outworking of the increase for Ely will be somewhere in the region the 60K per annum. We need to find that saving in our budget elsewhere and that roughly is equivalent to the cost of an incumbent. Brothers and sisters, how are we going to persuade a parish that they will do without their parish priest so that we can apply these fee increases?

I urge you, Synod, to reject the Order. I think that there may be other ways of advancing this. I do not want to denigrate at all the work of our legal teams, but I do think that we live in testing times and we need to show some respect for the work of our parishes and also to honour the good effects that our lawyers give us.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether this item has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 505 before you.

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

The Chair: I now invite Robert Cooper to come and respond to the debate. You have five minutes.

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham): Thank you for all of those comments. I will try to get through as many as I can in the five minutes. Robert Perry, the increase is not linked to inflation so it is difficult to put those two things together. It is on that five-year average that a number of people spoke about. It is also not take-home pay for those registrars either. They have overheads themselves and they have staff they have to pay, et cetera. It is not going to go directly into the pockets, a 14% pay rise, of registrars.

Julie, I recognise the conflict within you. Looking at that formula, the data that is used, which is one of the questions you asked, comes from the dioceses. It is not the Fees Commission making up the data. It is actually provided by the dioceses and the registrars. On the negotiation with your registrar, you are in a very fortunate position where your registrar might well have done it for less. I suspect other dioceses would not be in that luxurious position, not least because some registrars are single practitioners, and that makes it very much more difficult to do that. I am glad that you welcome the consultation that will happen as well.

Thank you to the Dean of the Arches for her comments and for her support of registrars. Also, I am glad that you do not get a bad press. We are well served by you and we do appreciate that. You reflected on the highly specialised nature of the legal advice that we get in ecclesiastical law. It is not a very narrow area, it is actually a very broad area and we need to reflect that in everything.

Carl, thank you very much for valuing our experienced lawyers and the potential perhaps for getting somebody with fewer skills. My hope is with registrars being remunerated properly that they will develop new staff and actually encourage new people within the legal profession to enter ecclesiastical law. We need those people at the top to bring on new ecclesiastical lawyers as well.

Nigel, thank you for your comments as well. The delay in the 2% of the charitable discount, inevitably what that does is it pushes it down the road. The FAOC had quite a long discussion about whether it was right to carry on what Synod had asked them to do over a period of years. We took that decision to keep the 2% being knocked off this year because otherwise the jump will be a lot bigger in a couple of years' time. You either have to pay now or pay later, one or the other.

Simon, thank you for your comments. Thank you for all you do for clergy advocacy as well. I would say I am afraid your figure was actually wrong and the Ely DBF figure is £55,216 and that would mean an increase of 7K this year. If you could get me a stipendiary priest for the Diocese of Durham, I would be delighted. Thank you very much for the debate. I would ask Synod please to support the Order in front of it.

The Chair. I now put Item 505 to a vote and a simple majority of the whole Synod will suffice.

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

The Chair. The Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2022 will now be laid before Parliament. That concludes this item.

ITEM 506

ECCLESIASTICAL JUDGES, LEGAL OFFICERS AND OTHERS (FEES) ORDER 2022 (GS 2279)

The Chair. We have now come to Item 506, the Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2022. Members will need the Order, GS 2279, and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 2278 and GS 2279X. I invite the Chair of the Advisory Commission, Bob Cooper, to move Item 506. He has up to 10 minutes.

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham): I will not take the whole 10 minutes this time. Members of Synod, it has been requested that the Ecclesiastical Judges Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2022 be debated and, accordingly, I move that motion standing in my name. As with the previous debates, the FAOC welcome this opportunity to have time to explain the background and context to this order. I refer you to my earlier comments on my own short association with the FAOC and value the opportunity to expand on the papers.

The main purpose of Orders of this kind made under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 is to make provision for a variety of fees payable to judges and other legal officers in connection with various legal proceedings. These principally pay fees for faculty and certain other proceedings in ecclesiastical courts as well as the fees of the provincial registrars, the vicars-general and other holders of legal office. In practice, the bulk of the fees paid under the Order relate to faculty proceedings. Many such fees are paid infrequently. For example, hearings in faculty proceedings are rare. Following the well-established approach endorsed by Synod, the Commission has benchmarked the fees wherever possible to the fees payable by the Ministry of Justice to secular judges when exercising similar functions rather than just being increased by inflation.

The Ministry of Justice has proposed that secular judicial pay should increase by 2% in 2022-23. The Commission considers that this is an appropriate benchmark and proposes that the same increase should apply to judicial fees under the Order in 2023. The Commission also recommends two minor amendments to the Order. In 2020, the General Synod approved the introduction of a fee to be payable to the delegates of the presidents of tribunals in connection with certain tasks under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003. In doing so, the General Synod recognised that it is important to ensure that the judicial fees reflect the officeholders' workload. It is vital that the Church can attract candidates of suitable calibre given the complex nature of the work and given the nature of what is at stake for all parties under clergy disciplinary proceedings. Further analysis indicates that there are a limited number of tasks which are more complicated than others and which should, as a result, command an enhanced fee.

We recommend £400 for these more complex cases, the fee being payable for other matters being £208. Synod will be reassured to know that this fee would have only applied to 19 cases in 2021. All fees payable to delegates are paid by the Archbishops' Council rather than dioceses.

Secondly, the most recent General Synod Elections in 2021 highlighted that there is a gap in the provision for a fee to be paid to the judge who determines summary election appeals. The Commission recommends that the fee should be equivalent to that payable per hour for the preparation of a judgment in appeals under the Clergy Discipline Measure.

Members of Synod, you have already heard me say that the Commission strives for fairness and the provision of proper remuneration for specialist services. That principle should apply to those engaged in skilled legal work across the Church whether registrars or judicial officers. Members of Synod, I accordingly invite you to approve the Order.

The Chair: Item 506 is now open for debate with a three minute speech limit from the outset.

The Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Just an extremely brief observation on these troubling costs we incur. We need expert advice and support because our law is dense and complicated and ever-expanding. Who makes it so, Synod?

The Chair: As I see no one indicating that they wish to speak on this item, we do not need a motion for closure and I would invite Bob to respond.

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham): Thank you, Neil. I would like to invite you, if you would like, to come and join the Fees Advisory Commission where you would be most welcome to come as an observer and to give us all the joy that that would bring. Simpler, humbler, bolder, I think that is where we need to be and I think that is in the hands of the Archbishop of York and the vision. Thank you very much that it is going to become much easier, but we do take the point and thank you for that and for making me smile in what was a rather dull speech I had to make.

The Chair: I am sure we did not think it was dull. I now put Item 506 to a vote.

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

The Chair: The Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2022 will now be laid before Parliament. That concludes this item.

THE CHAIR *Canon Izzy McDonald-Booth (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 5.10 pm.

ITEM 14

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND LOWEST INCOME COMMUNITIES FUNDING (GS 2261)

The Chair: Good afternoon, synod. We come to Item 14, a Review of SDF and Lowest Income Communities Funding. For this, again, you will need GS 2261. I should just mention no amendments are in order for this item. I am going to ask John Spence to speak to and move Item 14 and then there will be a debate. You may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Members of Synod, I am asked to propose the motion that Synod do take note of the independent review undertaken and which was the subject of the presentation this morning. When General Synod in 2015 took the very important decision to move away from the Darlow general subsidy scheme in favour of one of intentional investment around low income communities and strategic development projects, it was committed at that time that an independent review would be undertaken at an appropriate time.

That independent review has now taken place and I must add my thanks to those that you have already expressed to Sir Robert, Busola, to Stephen and to Bishop Sarah, who

could not be with us today, for their excellent work. We have gained much from this independent review. There has been much to learn in the ways in which evaluation is undertaken when the project is coming forward and in terms of how it is then monitored. On low income communities, we will continue to work with dioceses to reach the point where we can be clear that all the funds being allocated are, indeed, used in those low income communities for the provision of high quality ministry. I will say that during the next triennium it will be appropriate both for the formula and its appropriateness to be reviewed and the distribution because, sadly, levels of deprivation are bound to have changed in different parts of the country over the intervening period.

On SDF, we have heard very clearly the need to improve the engagement with dioceses and that is underway, to provide a greater level of transparency and in the mode of the three themes of Vision and Strategy: simpler to simplify the whole application process so that it does not become such a burden and such a mountain as to be off-putting and over time consuming. To be humbler, having a humility to learn and ensure that learning takes place across the Church. I may say that we in our own operations within the Investment Board need to forge more time to look at themes and general messages that are coming when so often we can just seem to deal with one application after another. To be bolder. Both the independent review, the debate this morning and in the fringe meeting I was part of at lunchtime, the call for greater innovation, creating devices which will forge and foster higher levels of innovation at parish and community level is well-heard and that will be taken forward.

All that has come out of this independent review has been helpful to us. We have accepted the recommendations in full and the Strategy Investment Board as currently constituted is working through a regular progress check to ensure that all recommendations are duly implemented. But we have also been learning. Throughout the processes we have gone along since the Board was formed in 2017, we have been learning from what has happened as applications have come forward. A key learning has been the lapse of time that typically occurs between an application being agreed and a diocese being ready to implement it. That can occur for several reasons. Sometimes, planning permissions are involved or detailed architect designs are required. Sometimes, it is a question of bringing together the team of people that you are going to need. You just cannot do a plant, can you, like doing a rabbit out of a hat. You have to have the right people and the right structures in place to ensure that they have the best chance of succeeding. The creation of the detailed plan that comes after an application being approved and the scheme getting underway can take quite a time.

As a result, there has been a greater time lag than people would have imagined at the pace of spend. If a project is agreed with funding, let us say over five years, that timing starts not from the moment of approval but from the moment that the plan starts its implementation. While you have heard much about the amounts that have been agreed and allocated, of the £138 million that had been agreed up to the end of 2019, at the end of 2020 only £50 million had actually been spent and, at the end of 2021, £75 million. Of the 69 projects under SDF agreed to date, only six have reached their completion in terms

of the funding provided to them with a further five due for completion by the end of this calendar year. In the light of the pandemic, we have about nine projects which may not be able to proceed and it will be the right thing to do to agree with the dioceses that that be the case. That brings to a total 20 projects, leaving, therefore, a further 49, and there are one or two more still going through the system now, that need to be continually monitored to see that they are outcomed.

But you will appreciate by definition, therefore, that the targets that had been set at the outset for all these projects could never have been achieved by now and the full fruits of the harvest will only be seen to be forthcoming as the years go by. No one could ever have expected that a new church community being planted by another church community would suddenly reach its full potential on day one. Nobody could ever expect that the outcomes of work with youth in Carlisle or young people in Coventry or the Ignite cafes in Canterbury or the student work in Cornwall could ever have reached its full momentum right at the start. It will be entirely appropriate that the new Investment Board continues to keep a close focus on the integrity of those schemes following through, the quality and efficacy of their spend, the learning that comes from them and the assurance that we take forward best practice for the future.

I shall give notice now that, when we come to the following motion, I shall be happy to accept that there should be a further review in two years' time being brought back here in July 2024. The independent review has added richly to our knowledge. We have already indicated that we are embarking on a very different regime going forward in the 2023-25 triennium and in the two triennia thereafter and yet all the learning from that will still apply. This has been a very good use of the time of the Investment Board, those people to whom we are indebted for undertaking the review and to the magnificent officers who have supported it throughout. I commend the independent review to General Synod and I invite you to take note thereof.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I will call people in groups of three for John Spence to respond to in that way.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I declare an interest. I have overseen two SDF programmes around New Worshipping Communities and I lead a Resourcing Church team which is forming six new communities. Two weeks ago, we took away the six Resourcing Churches in Leicester Diocese, their plants and their teams. These are churches that are committed to giving away so as between them to see around 40 new churches form or existing churches that have asked for support to be revitalised. The title "Resourcing Church" puts upon them many projections and expectations and not a few parodies, not all of which are undeserved.

We have had to learn and change and repent as we go, but at its heart is a vision to serve better and connect with all in our parishes, seeing lives transformed as people come to

know the hope of Christ. What was most encouraging though was, despite all these pressures and expectations, not least around significant numerical growth, in our time away none of the priests or their teams focused on numerical growth. They focused on being healthy communities, knowing that numerical growth is God's job not ours. So, as we focused on being healthier, God has grown significantly as people have come to faith and thriving new churches.

Strategic funding is not perfect. I have been involved in all the streams since their inception. I have questions and concerns as much as anyone but, like the famous beer, it is helping us to reach the places we might not otherwise and seeing communities flourish. A part of that flourishing is developing a healthier relationship with death. If there is any organisation on the face of the globe which should have a healthy relationship to new life and death, surely, friends, it is us and yet we keep getting ourselves in all of a muddle.

In the recent decades, very, very few churches have closed in England. Thousands have formed. Where is our attention drawn? That is not to be glib about the deep pain of the changing face of ministry. I am rector half-time of a large team ministry. The week before last I sat with the PCC of one of our beautiful small churches who will have not had a vicar as of this month in the way they have and we have had to work out a way forward. But, out of that, people have taken up new responsibilities and we have seen beautiful green shoots form. God is doing amazing things. If we can reject scarcity and live in abundance, if we can reject defensiveness and find our identity sideways rather than upwards, if we can reject false dichotomies, then I think we have much to learn from what God has done through SDF that will help us into an even better future together.

The Revd Marcus Walker (London): I really do welcome this Report and I am delighted to support the take note motion that will be coming up in a moment. I am also delighted that there will be support for the follow-up motion to bring back to this Synod in two years' time further study. What cannot have failed to strike members of this Synod though is the very concerning figures that are found in this Report. We hear of £176 million being earmarked and we read of the total failure to approach anything close to the 89,000 people predicted to be brought to Christ on the back of this.

We hear of £176 million that the Church has to spend and we also hear of dioceses cutting their stipendiary ministry, sometimes in some dioceses like Leicester by 20%, because of deficits of only £1 million or £1.3 million. Small, little deficits causing huge reductions in stipendiary ministries across the country, whilst at the same time £176 million able to be spent on projects with the spending only lasting for five years. As a Synod, we have to consider whether this is the right balance in the spending of our Church's resources. I am hoping that when this Report comes back in two years' time, it will consider the figures that are missing from this Report: the figures being the number of people who have stopped going to Church as a result of the cutting of the Darlow Formula in the parishes that no longer exist or the parishes that have been merged. We need to have the data about the consequences of the merging and closing of parishes.

The second is, as was raised in the Report itself but without any figures, whereas the Report said some dioceses reported that the financial burden of co-funding large or multiple SDF projects had created or exacerbated financial pressures requiring cuts to other areas of activity, it is essential that these figures are presented to Synod as well so that we can weigh up the balance between the new witness disciples brought by SDF and the Christians who have been lost to our Church and perhaps to their faith on the back of other decisions taken alongside it or because of it.

Miss Abigail Scott (Bristol): This is my maiden speech, so bear with me. I am incredibly grateful for the vision and the strategic way that SDF funding has been used in my diocese. I am a lay member of the team at The Well Church in Swindon, the first plant out of Pattern Church, our Resource Church, for which it has been an absolute joy to be part of seeing what God is doing in our community. We have seen lots of new people, un-Church people, come to faith.

The Well Church, which I am now part of, planted in just September 2021 and we have already seen 20 to 30 adults who are un-Churched or de-Churched now regularly attending and part of the family. Alongside this, we have got 20 kids and a half of our youth group who are either un-Church or no prior Church experience now fully part of Church family celebrating as part of the community and actively going deeper in their faith. Not to mention our very first baptism this last Easter Sunday which was a very special occasion. We regularly work alongside our local parishes in friendship and have seen transformation in our local community because we are stronger together.

SDF funding is absolutely critical to reaching new people currently not in Church in new ways. It is not hard for those who do not yet know God to come to meet him, for those who are lonely and isolated - particularly in North Swindon there is hardly anything for the community but here they find family, they find hope and they find love - to see His Kingdom come. My plea is to keep strategically investing so we can reach new people who may have never even stepped foot in a Church before.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Can I thank you for a wonderful maiden speech and thank you to the speakers from Bristol and from Leicester who highlight just the imaginative ways in which this funding has been used to reach communities from which Christ was almost absent, literally. That is the important piece. In terms of the contributor from London, I understand absolutely the financial situation on dioceses. We talked earlier about what are staying awake moments at night. I will tell you, the Archbishop of York talked about it. When you see priests being laid off, that keeps me awake. I am just a diocesan boy like you and when I see my own diocese going through the strictures it is going through, I am extremely sad.

But, as Sir Robert said this morning, this funding was launched against the backdrop of a Church that had been declining in attendance, as measured in the way that we do, for 50 years. You cannot make SIB, the Strategic Development Fund, take the responsibility

for what was happening before. What it is seeking to do is to reverse it. SDF cannot take responsibility for the impact of a pandemic, which I know from my own congregation has seen members of the Church move away and, sadly, not yet return. Some of them, I am afraid, in our older age bands never will.

You cannot take account of the results so far when I have highlighted that only six out of 69 projects have even completed their funding and that we can only expect the results to grow over time. When SDF was launched in that momentous decision of 2015, the Church Commissioners rightly wanted a very strict understanding of what the payback would be in terms of numbers and financial sustainability. That led to us developing levels of precision which I think we can all say from learning were unrealistic. You cannot predict at the outset that this will produce 480 new pilgrims or 722 of a certain age band. We know that now.

Under the new systems that will be coming forward, that sort of thinking will no longer play a part. It will, indeed, be about simpler, humbler, bolder moving forward and absolutely putting the availability of all forms of ministry, stipendiary, clergy and otherwise, to enable the mission of Christ to go forward. But, just please remember, £176 million may seem very large; the amount of funding made available for SDF is 2% of the annual revenue of the Church of England.

The Revd Timothy Bateman (Birmingham): Like so many in this room, I am passionate about people coming to know Jesus. With regard to SDF, I want to humbly but gladly share that there are huge Gospel benefits and positive Christ-centred impacts that I have observed locally and across the nation. Currently, I serve as one of the clergy at Gas Street Church in Central Birmingham. This was not planted with Strategic Development Funding, although we would have hugely benefited from this. What I wanted to share is that this model of ministry of city centre Resource Churches has been effective in making new disciples and, therefore, I want to encourage the SDU to continue investing in similar models of church planting as we believe it turns around parishes across our cities, towns and nation. I wanted to share not the huge impact it has had at Gas Street itself, but the impact it has had in the churches that have been brought under its care or planted across the city, including areas of social deprivation.

My particular role at Gas Street is an associate vicar overseeing one of the three church sites, St Luke's. St Luke's is situated in a place which has all types of diversity, including social deprivation and it has been integrated into Gas Street Church over the last two years. At St Luke's, God has done some amazing things in our midst. We are starting a new thing there as a result of the Resource Church model from Gas Street. In terms of social transformation, we have seen literally hundreds of people engaging with some of the things that we are doing in the week with our food bank, our community shop, our stay and play, our debt centre, job club, community lunches, et cetera. It is all with people from the local community, non-Christians with no background to Church.

In terms of growing younger, we have also seen engagement in our weekly children's church double in the last six months to around 35 under-11s that now come weekly. I share all of this not to be a self-publicist keen to share accomplishments, et cetera, but, as I mentioned earlier, as a fellow follower of Jesus, passionate about seeing people coming into a relationship with him too and the benefits of investing in Church models like this. I also humbly but gladly share all of this to highlight how the initial injection of money to Resource Churches can be hugely beneficial in multiplying things such as what we have seen in Birmingham.

Gas Street has now planted four churches in the last few years from 2016 and it is about to plant a fifth one, God willing, in the New Year. One of those churches that we planted is St Mark's in Coventry, a Resource Church planted in 2017. It has already planted two churches in areas of social deprivation. In all of these church plants, hundreds of people have come to faith in Jesus and have been baptized. It has revitalised parish ministry, saving many parishes from the death that we have been talking about in many of the speeches and we have seen social transformation. These are all examples of some of the great work that God has done in our midst, of how I believe we have stewarded money well as the Church of England, of turning some of these negative statistics around all for the glory of God. Thus, Synod, friends, brothers and sisters, I would love to offer my support for the SDU and the Report they have produced. Thank you for all the work you have done and are doing. Thank you, everyone, for your time.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): You will have already seen Matt Beer speaking from Telford on the Pioneer project for intergenerational church this morning. We are very pleased to have had some SDF funding for that. I just want to ask one or two questions, really, about how we go forward and whether it is possible, for instance, to use some of the Innovation Fund to actually look at the numbers of people who are now engaging digitally online with the Church. I think this would be something where we would actually find out numbers. We would find out how to engage them in a better way. That is one thing to ask.

From my point of view, I am quite concerned to read about the amount of money that is not being spent and the number of projects really in waiting and the number of projects where we know that, going forwards, the SDF projects will actually not be able to be funded by the dioceses. I wonder if it is possible to extend the SDF funding for some projects because we know that the dioceses will not be able to afford to fund them going forward even when they are successful. My diocese - and I am a member of the Finance Committee - unfortunately is looking at a collection rate of 86% which means that by the end of this year we will probably have a £2 million deficit and we are making some rearrangements ourselves, as many others of you are already doing.

I am really delighted to hear that the paperwork is going to be slimmed because that is one of the major problems. It is energy sapping paperwork and it takes a very long time to sort out the initial start of a project, particularly when, as we found out, it involves new building. I wonder if it is possible to divert some of that money into emergency loans for dioceses? I am saying that hand on heart because I do not know at the moment how we

are going to be situated at the end of this financial year and I know many of you are in the same areas of concern. I am really pleased to hear about the success of some of the projects and I am delighted to hear about that today, but I think this information about the success of projects needs also broadcasting more widely so we can all benefit from them.

The Revd Paul Bradbury (Salisbury): I think this is my maiden speech. Thank you, again, for this comprehensive and insightful Report. I am an ordained Pioneer minister who has benefited over the years from specific funding designed to encourage innovative ministry. In the 14 years that I have been ordained, I have experimented with some things that have developed and established and other things that have thrived for a time and then come to a natural end. I know from, if you like, my long obedience in the same direction, some of the things that the SDF LInC Review also acknowledges. Firstly, that making disciples takes time, particularly in places and amongst people with no prior experience of the Christian faith.

Secondly, that innovation requires patience and space with organisations in order to flourish. We do not have the luxury in the rapidly changing world we live in for constantly demanding more funds to do more of the same. Whether its core functions are working or declining, any organisation will have an eye on its own future by having a clear view of the horizon beyond itself, the kind of world that is coming towards it. Any such organisation will invest in innovation. It will invest in research and development, some of which will fail and some of which will contain within it the lessons and potential models for the future. Furthermore, we have a theology that argues for innovation. John V. Taylor, a former Bishop of Winchester said, "Our theology would improve if we saw the Church being given to the Spirit rather than the Spirit to the Church". The Holy Spirit as the chief agent of mission comes, as it were, from the future, constantly inviting the Church into new things, new places, new expressions of its calling to be communities of Christian hope and healing in the world.

This is the story of acts, the acts of the Holy Spirit constantly surprising the early Church into newness and innovation. The Church is a pilgrim Church, always provisional, continually in humble dialogue with its tradition and its context, in its mission to live out Christ's call upon it. We should not be afraid of innovation because innovation is in the very nature of God and innovation is in the salvation history of God. Therefore, we should feel bold as a Church to invest in innovation and in those who God has called with that particular gift to innovate the traditions of the Church in new contexts and new cultures.

In that spirit, can I ask we pay particular attention to some of the Report's insights. Firstly, the Report states that the SDF programme has become more focused on proven concepts over time, so can we do something to address that by putting more money aside into the Innovation Fund? The Report notes that the time horizons toward sustainability remain too short. Can we review these timeframes, particularly with more emergent work where Pioneers are working to a process and not to a model?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Thank you, and I give very great thanks for the witness from Gas Street, Birmingham, which does give me a chance I have never had before to pay tribute to Bishop David, the Bishop of Birmingham, who was at the forefront of creating a diocesan strategy - a very bold strategy, actually - for an inner city diocese which had huge financial strains, huge ambitions and has boldly undertaken things that would delight the Archbishop of York for being forerunners of the very boldness of the Vision and Strategy. It is terrific what has gone on and is going on in Birmingham.

Penny, I like your point about digital. We should really try to get a handle on that size of the population that is only engaging with us on a digital basis. In terms of the digital work, Priscilla was only saying to me earlier how we now need to work with the digital team that we have - the awarding winning digital team, once again last year sweeping the board in national awards - into how we can still further intensify our engagement with young people so that they really have that ability to be with God through the Bible on a digital basis. Paul, thank you, because you in some ways answered Penny's points. Penny, the money is not not being spent. It is now being spent. We should not underestimate the impact of Covid. It took things away for two years, sometimes taking the people who were going to do the work onto other pastures and so needing to be rebooted. But if you are going to have innovation, you will have some projects that will not work.

As I said, nine out of 69 look as if the right thing to do will be to discuss with the dioceses that it is not right to spend more. But, in terms of your request, Paul, yes and yes, I will say we will need more for innovation in the new regime going forward and, yes, we should be ready to take a much better understanding of how long financial sustainability will be achieved, if it ever will, in some of the projects that we are undertaking and I believe that is the way in which we are heading. Penny, just to answer you on another point, we have already on several projects extended them for up to two years because of the impact of Covid.

The Chair: Archbishop Stephen, did you want to speak?

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to make a very brief point. Obviously, you know from what I said this morning that I really welcome this Report and I think we are already learning a lot from it. But I did want to say to Marcus, if I can, across the floor, I think you put your finger on it, that going forward there is a real question of balance which we need to address and I thank you for raising it so clearly. We do need to innovate and try new things. There is nothing from our recent history to tell us that just carrying on doing the same thing is going to be the answer. Nothing. However, we must honour parish ministry and parish clergy and the Church that we have inherited. We have got to get the balance right and I do not think anyone is pretending we have got it right at the moment, but I really wanted to welcome the emphasis on that word which I think will help all of us enormously as we go forward.

Just one quick story from the York Diocese, where I serve. We are facing huge financial challenges. We are not sure how we are going to be able to keep up our clergy numbers.

Under the old regime, I do not think we would have got the funding that we think we need. Under the new regime, I am very confident that we will because we do need to revitalise parish ministry in some of our poorest parts of the diocese, in Middlesbrough or in Hull, but also in areas of rural poverty and coastal poverty. We are putting together a bid which we think will transform parish ministry in our diocese. We have learnt and we are moving forward, but I wanted to thank Marcus for bringing that word "balance" back in, which is something we will need to attend to.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 14 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 14.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. Canon John, would you like to briefly reply?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Can I thank you, Chair, for enabling me to answer points during the debate. I do not think I need to say anymore other than to thank all members of Synod for your very valuable contributions. Archbishop Stephen, I am still used to you being my bishop, really, but, absolutely, Archbishop, the balance need, the revitalisation of the parishes, that is who we are here to serve, to enable Christ to be at the heart of every community and we will commit to continuing to do so. But thank you so much for all your help, your guidance, your support and your constructive criticism. I beg to move the motion.

The Chair: I now put this item to the vote, that the Synod do take note of this Report.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried, thank you very much. We now move to Mr Clive Bilinness' further motion arising out of this item. I would like to invite Clive to move his motion and speak to it, please. You have up to five minutes.

ITEM 70

Mr Clive Bilinness (Europe): I should explain to my colleagues here that I spent 25 years as an auditor and project manager in the public and private sectors and I am now honoured to represent the General Synod as a member of the Audit Committee of the Archbishops' Council. This morning you heard my admiration of Sir Robert's Report and my admiration for the whole team. It is a classic auditor's report or reviewer's report and it has examined the LInC and SDF schemes thoroughly at different levels from strategic through to individual project controls. It has made a total of 36 individual recommendations. When you perform a review like this, it is normal to review progress against the recommendations after a period. Normally, this would be two to three years. This allows progress to be made and that gives assurance about ongoing progress to all the stakeholders. It also affirms to the project teams that they are going in the right

direction. Frankly, knowing that the reviewers are coming back also tends to rather focus the mind of the project teams.

This morning, I lost count of how many times I heard the words that “we are learning”. This makes me very happy, because this is a commitment to improvement and this afternoon Canon Spence's assurances are also extremely encouraging. But I have also heard criticisms about LInC and SDF and, while I hope we will see early improvements in progress tracking, I think that the Synod would appreciate some further independent assurance in the future. For this reason, I am asking Synod today to pass this motion so we can receive a further independent assurance about these projects in one to two years' time. I should emphasise it may not be Sir Robert who performs the next review, but we will entrust the Strategic Investment Board to appoint the follow-up reviewers. Chair, I beg to move the motion.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of one minute.

Mrs Emma Joy Gregory (Bath & Wells): I am grateful to Clive for presenting this to us and I want to speak in favour of it. I think we have heard from Marcus Walker about some of the areas that need looking at again and ways that we can improve and this is important because we need to get it right for the poorest corners of our country and our Church.

I am a teacher. You have heard me speak about teaching before at the last General Synod in February when I told you that General Synod is just like a big bunch of kids. Well, the teaching analogy I want to use now is that, when you are trying to look at your own work and improve it, you can look at it yourself a few times but, after a while, it needs somebody else from above, or somebody else, another opinion, to have a look at it and improve it.

The Revd Jack Shepherd (Liverpool): Because I am extremely grateful for this Report that we have already considered, I would like to suggest that a further report is carried out in 2024. However, I would ask that it is more theological and rigorously academically theological in its scope. Criticisms of the Renewal and Reform programme were that it lacked a theological point of origin and critics of the same person who said that said that that analyst had been largely ecclesio sociological. I would say we are seeing vast movement in the area of practical theology around this, but I do not see that in the Report we have considered to date. Even though we are seeing centres of theology of church planting developing around the country, including at St Hild's and at Cranmer Hall, I would like to see that reflected in this further report.

The Revd Matthew Beer (Lichfield): I would also very much like to support that we have a further review in two years' time, particularly calling into account the stories from those new Church communities, as well as the inclusion in the Report of how we can see further

churches being planted as well as the self-sufficiency of those churches. I would beg that we accept that.

Professor Roy Faulkner (Leicester): Could I also make the plea regarding a subsequent review which we are talking about, that the definition of a new disciple, as the Chote Report defines it, be explored in a lot more detail. At the moment, the definitions that are used in the Report are very woolly and very subjective based on the view really of the minister involved. I would ask of this approach, let us get a definition of a disciple more clearly defined.

Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester): Point of order. The motion as it stands says "his Synod" rather than "this Synod". I hope it is His Synod, as in the higher power, but it actually says that and so I wonder whether that needs to be changed? It is a minor error, I believe.

The Chair: That is not a point of order, but I will assume it will be changed.

Mrs Julie Dzielgel (Oxford): I would just like to have some form of guidance, please, as to the cost of such a report and whether two years is too short a timeframe for it. I feel a little nervous about having another report quite so quickly and also nervous about the cost.

The Chair: I wish to test the mind of Synod on whether this item has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put a motion for closure for Item 70.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I now put this further motion, Item 70, to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is carried, thank you very much. That ends this item of business and we move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin)* took the Chair at 6.00 pm.

ITEM 19 QUESTIONS

The Chair: We come now to Item 19. We will be continuing in this session the remaining questions, or attempting as many of the remaining questions following on from the last Question session. We are at Question 68 and the Bishop of Chester will be replying as Chair of the Ministry Council.

68. *The Revd Canon Steve Benoy (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: In the light of IICSA and the commitment to embody best practice for victim-survivors, what work has been undertaken to revise the practice guidance for DDOs and their teams when seeking a faculty under Canon C 4, given the requirement to make contact with a former spouse?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Faculties under Canon C 4 are currently in the early stages of review and the extent of the work has yet to be fully scoped. Those responsible for conducting the review will take into consideration the needs of victim-survivors. In the light of this review any necessary fresh guidance for DDOs and Bishops will be prepared and issued.

The Revd Canon Steve Benoy: Bishop Mark, thank you for your reply. I ask my question fully supportive of there being a process to explore the vocation of those who are divorced and remarried. I am also aware that this process can be potentially re-traumatising, both for a candidate and for a former spouse. In what circumstances would it be considered appropriate to not make contact with a former spouse without impairing a candidate's case or being negligent with regard to safeguarding?

The Bishop of Chester: Thanks, Steve. I am really sorry to see your arm in a sling. I think that is a really important supplementary and I will do two things. One is to say I will pass it on with the other things I picked up yesterday about C 4s, but also say, frankly, if it came to me, if it was in the Diocese of Chester, I would take advice both from my registrar and, if necessary from Bishopthorpe here in the Northern Province. What I have experienced thus far is there is common sense and compassion but also a desire to follow the process in a way that ensures that it is fully and properly investigated. I have a high degree of confidence there would be good process. I cannot give you the details but I will pass it on again Bishopthorpe.

69. *The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Disabled potential ordinands (POs), female POs, POs of global majority ethnicity, LGBTQ+ POs and POs from lower income households and/or areas of deprivation, are all statistically more likely to have experienced trauma or abuse.

How will the Ministry Council ensure that problematising experience and direct or indirect discrimination are not the unintended consequences of APWs (Assessments for Psychological Wellbeing), further reducing the breadth of candidates being put forward for ordination and negatively impacting on our work to become a younger and more diverse church?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Issues raised in this question are important and are part of the reason Assessment for Psychological Wellbeing is such a necessary provision. APW offers independent, professional insight to support dioceses in serving the wellbeing of candidates from all

backgrounds and communities within the Church. This matters particularly for candidates with needs or backgrounds which lie outside the current experience of a Diocesan team. APW is part of widening access to (and support within) ordained ministry for those who currently feel excluded.

APWs are offered by professionals skilled in understanding the dynamics of human experience in different contexts. The focus is not on problematising specific experience but on considering, with potential ordinands, how experience such as trauma has been addressed and integrated so that it might become a potential resource for ministry, and how the potential ordinand might thrive in ministry.

Please also note the answer to Question 70.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode: Thank you, Bishop Mark for your answer. Given that the assessments of psychological well-being could potentially uncover or revisit profound trauma and pain, would you share with the Disability Task Group the qualifications that are required of the assessors and the terms of reference that assessors have to follow, to ensure that we do not breach the Equality Act and avoid indirect discrimination?

The Bishop of Chester: Thanks, Tim. Again a really important area. Of course, the fact that discernment can sometimes uncover trauma is precisely why we need this kind of professional support in the process. With the Equality Act, as with safeguarding, I think we aspire as a Church to go above and beyond because this is part of the Gospel, so I warmly receive your question. In terms of detail, I have quite a lot in front of me, which I am very happy to share with you over a pint or what have you later. I would encourage you to carry on, as I think you already are in conversation with the selection oversight group so that details can then be shared with you.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I did not intend to speak but, as an autistic person, I would ask have you spoken to autistic people or autistic organisations to consider whether APW potentially could disadvantage autistic people?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you, Sam. Personally no, because I have not been leading on this. However, I think you mean the project and I believe that the answer is yes. Again, if that is incorrect I shall write to you and tell you. Again, I make the point we need this precisely because bishops are not expert in every situation we come across. This might come as a shock to Synod.

70. *The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Acknowledging the unavoidable power imbalance which exists in the discernment process between potential ordinands (PO) and Dioceses when seeking PO feedback on the experience of being sent for an assessment of psychological wellbeing (APW), has any attempt been made to collect (anonymously or confidentially) and assess the impact of APWs on POs?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: APW is being offered to improve the Church's care for ordinands and potential ordinands (particularly those whose needs might be less common in any particular context) and draws on the professional skills of independent providers to inform and compliment the care already provided by the Bishops and their teams. Monitoring impact is an important part of the process, and the process was developed in the light of experience from Dioceses who have independently implemented their own similar assessments. As we roll out national guidelines, an anonymous questionnaire is being developed to send to candidates who have been sent for an Assessment for Psychological Wellbeing meeting to understand candidates' experiences. The intention is for the information received to inform and contribute to best practice in the dioceses.

The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield): Thank you also for the answer and I am afraid I am going to ask you something about detail so you may just be inviting me to join you and Tim for a pint on that. Regarding the anonymity and confidentiality of any feedback, given the relatively small number of potential ordinands and the timing of the assessments, will the questionnaires collating their feedback go to a national discernment team and then be fed back to dioceses in order to protect that confidentiality and anonymity?

The Bishop of Chester: I have a lot of information in front of me but not knowing exactly, "The information will not be shared beyond the questionnaire and the information analysed will remain confidential. Raw data analysed by the project officer ...", I do not know if this helps but I am very happy to have a pint with you later.

The Revd Zoe Heming: You heard it here, folks.

71. *The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* Given the duty of care that dioceses should rightly exercise, when a potential ordinand is deemed (by the one off APW) to require a therapeutic intervention prior to proceeding in the selection process, have those dioceses who are early adopters of the scheme consistently funded that intervention, and what happens if they (and the candidate) have no funds for that?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Guidelines are provided for Directors of Ordinands on working with candidates following the receipt of an Assessment for Psychological Wellbeing Report. Where matters are raised for further exploration, they advise that a range of options are discussed with the candidate to help in exploring these further. These may include one-to-one counselling or therapeutic work. The guidelines include a recommendation that Directors of Ordinands are clear about the availability of diocesan resources or other independent resources available to support any of the options offered to a candidate, where this is needed. Since Assessment for Psychological Wellbeing is intended to resource diocesan discernment processes, we do not have information on the precise arrangements for individual dioceses, and neither is historic data for "early adopters" readily available within the timeframe for responding to questions.

The Revd Zoe Heming: I am sorry, I feel I need to apologise before I start. If I understand your response correctly, and I may not, and that dioceses are only advised to inform candidates whether they do or do not have the resources to pay for any therapeutic interventions, how will the national discernment framework mitigate against the postcode lottery for accessing support that may be insisted upon in order to continue in the discernment process.

The Bishop of Chester. Thank you and please do not apologise, we are here to answer questions. While I would not say we love answering questions, that is what we are here for. Honestly, we will try to monitor it and if it becomes a problem, which at the moment it really is not in terms of the feedback that is coming to us, we would seek to make some kind of intervention. At the moment and again I will say very publicly, if this becomes problem please let us know because we would want to do something about it. The anecdotal evidence is that we are getting feedback from dioceses that it costs more not to address this than it does to address it, if you see what I mean, because it just stores up the problem.

72. *Ms Fiona MacMillan (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given that Assessments for Psychological Wellbeing (APW) are to be “consistent and normative” but not “mandatory”, how can the national Church ensure that all potential ordinands are treated equally and fairly in the discernment process?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: In the Shared Discernment Process, dioceses are encouraged to develop best practice in their processes of discernment. This includes introducing Assessment for Psychological Wellbeing in the way and at the time that works best within their own context. Detailed guidelines and training opportunities are offered to DDOs in all dioceses in developing and implementing these assessments, with ongoing advisory consultation readily available. Both the discernment of vocation and the care of ordinands (and potential ordinands) rightly remains the responsibility of the Diocesan Bishop and her/his team.

Ms Fiona MacMillan: Thank you for the fulsome answer to the question. Given the variety of outworking and incorporating the guidelines between dioceses, will national oversight be held by the national discernment team, to lessen the risk of discrimination, as well as to learn and incorporate learning from feedback from both potential ordinands and dioceses to check it is having the well-meaning desired effect?

The Bishop of Chester. I think so, yes, although it will also be held by the community of DDOs- and I always think it should be DDsO rather than DDOs - because this is a shared project that we are developing together. The feedback is there not only to care for the individuals but also to help us improve. We are however continually walking this line in the National Ministry Team of being a national Church which is made up dioceses that are independent. That is a constant tension that we face. We cannot tell a diocese to do

something but we can seek to maintain national good practice, and that is what we try to do. I would argue, on behalf of the team I am very proud of, they do quite a good job of that.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I notice that the questions have all been asked by people from a seated position, which might indicate a level of concern about people with disabilities around this whole issue. Whilst offers of pints are really welcome, would the Ministry Council undertake to consult properly and fully with disabled groups in the Church of England to ensure that this matter is considered fully in consultation with them?

The Bishop of Chester: I do disagree with the premise of the question because the question implies that we have not consulted with disability groups and I would argue against that. If my offer of pints comes across flippantly, then please forgive me, I do not mean it to. So many of these things are best continued in conversation. APW is not primarily about disability. It is primarily about well-being, about safeguarding and about collecting information that we need to be able to care for people well through this process.

REMUNERATION & CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE

73. *Professor Lynn Nichol (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: In the written response to Q150 at February Sessions about the link between working hours and clergy well-being the Bishop of Hereford stated that “many dioceses now recommend that, once a month, clergy should take two consecutive rest days”. Has the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee considered issuing national guidance recommending that all Clergy should be given this opportunity and all Diocese should recommend that clergy should take two consecutive rest days once a month?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Committee reflected further on the question at the February sessions at its February meeting, including the possibility of recommending a five-day working week for clergy. However, it noted that the legal right of clergy to have an uninterrupted 24-hour rest period each week mirrors the regulations for employees. It commended the practice in many dioceses of clergy taking a 48-hour rest period once a month. But it took the view that, rather than RACSC issuing further guidance. It would be more effective for senior staff in each diocese to encourage clergy to use the existing flexibility and discretion they already had in order to take care of themselves and maintain their well-being.

Professor Lynn Nichol: Thank you for your answer and for your commitment to clergy well-being. Given the known impact of overworking on individual clergy well-being and therefore on the mission of the Church, on what basis did the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee decide that it would be more effective for senior staff to encourage clergy to maintain their own well-being rather than issuing national guidance

on clergy taking 48 hours' rest once a month? Rather than choosing one approach or another could these two things be seen as complementary?

The Bishop of Hereford: We did consult on this matter quite extensively. The feeling that we came to after consultation and talking as a committee was that this still remained a decision best made by both dioceses and local clergy who, of course, are officeholders rather than employees, and therefore many find it advantageous to make decisions about their own hours of work. Your point there is a good one about overwork. We all know that much of that overwork is sometimes driven internally rather than by external expectation. Given that the nature of the pastoral relationship between archdeacon and bishop is intrinsic to that care package, in order to encourage clergy not to overwork we came to the conclusion it was best left to that dynamic and that relationship.

74. *The Revd Jeremy Moodey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Dioceses have different policies on the payment of parochial fees (e.g., for occasional offices) to self-supporting and licensed lay ministers, and retired SSMs with permission to officiate, with some dioceses currently prohibiting any such payments, and other dioceses allowing different proportions of the fees to be paid. Given the rising cost of living, the cuts in stipendiary ministry leading to the increased use of SSMs and LLMs, the notion of a shared national ministry and the biblical principle that “the labourer deserves to be paid”, and recognising that not all SSMs/LLMs will want payment, what plans does Ministry Division have to establish national guidelines under which all dioceses would be required to permit such payments if requested or needed?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Ministry Development Team has no plans establish further national guidance. The existing guidance makes it clear that these fees legally belong to the DBF and that a proportion of the fee may be offered to self-supporting ministers and retired clergy. There is a wide degree of interpretation about what is meant by “the labourer deserves to be paid “ in this context, although it is not generally understood to imply that all ministers are entitled to fees or stipend if they request it. Some dioceses offer a proportion of the fee to self-supporting ministers, while others only do so when ministers have retired, whether from secular employment or parochial office. Any attempt to impose consistency would be likely to meet with resistance from clergy and dioceses whose practice was different. In any case, guidance would not be binding on dioceses without legislation being passed.

The Revd Jeremy Moodey: Thank you, Bishop, for your reply. I am in the fortunate position of being a self-supporting minister who would not need nor want to claim a share of a parochial fee. I am also someone who has fully retired from secular employment. If I had previously been a stipendiary minister and was now retired with permission to officiate, I would be able to claim an occasional office fee, but because I am licensed to a parish in my particular diocese I cannot do so. Can you explain what logic there is for maintaining this arbitrary distinction between PTO and SSM and, indeed, LLM when

surely we are called to a common and shared ministry - lay and ordained, stipendiary and self-supporting in our communities.

The Bishop of Hereford: In short, I cannot explain the logic of it because there is no logic because it is down to diocesan decision-making, and different dioceses have different views. All of the fee for occasional offices is down to the diocesan board of finance which then make decisions about where it should be disbursed. I think we felt in conversations about this that one of the problems is that dioceses tend to want to retain that level of independence. I know that in some dioceses where there has been a move to change the disbursement of fees in that way it has been quite a difficult conversation. The short answer to it is there is no logic to it because it is a diocesan decision

75. *The Revd Canon James Blandford-Baker (Ely)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: How has the clergy stipend compared with the percentiles of average earnings in England over the last 20 years?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: In terms of percentiles of average earnings, those at the 100th percentile point are at the highest end of the average income distribution and those at the 1st percentile point are at the lowest end. Clergy receiving the NSB figure of £16,480 in 2000 were at the 56th percentile point for total income before tax in relation to average earnings. However, clergy receiving the NSB figure of £27,420 in 2020 were at the 54th percentile point. This shows that clergy stipends have decreased in relation to other earnings, but only slightly. This only refers to stipend and not other benefits such as payment of Council Tax and provided housing.

76. *The Revd Canon Julian Hollywell (Derby)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Whilst the proposed 4% rise in stipend for 2023 is commendable, what work is being done following the Remuneration Review to reverse the relative downgrading in the clergy stipend that has occurred over the last ten years given the financial crisis? Is linking the stipend to RPI or an equivalent professional wage under consideration?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Archbishops' Council have deferred stipend setting for 2023 given the current high rate of inflation, and future uncertainty. However, it was agreed to set a potential direction of travel for 2023 of 4%. This figure is subject to review in the light of increasing inflation, the cost of pension contributions and diocesan finances and a decision will be made later in the year.

The Council agreed last December that NMS will, in future, *on average*, increase in line with inflation (as measured by CPIH) subject to three yearly reviews. This policy is subject to review if high levels of inflation establish themselves. It is unlikely that an increase at the current level of inflation will be given, although it is hoped that it will be possible to catch up in future.

The remuneration review concluded that there was not an appropriate equivalent professional wage to compare clergy stipends against.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southall & Nottingham): Bishop, thank you very much for your answer. I was really intrigued to notice at the bottom the comment, "The Remuneration Review concluded that there was not an appropriate equivalent professional wage to compare clergy stipends against". If I remember correctly I think *Generosity and Sacrifice* identified a comparable wage. Is there a reason why the review now believes that comparison does not work?

The Bishop of Hereford: I am trying to wrack my brains why that was the case. We did again discuss it quite extensively. The RACSC committee is a different committee from the one that was around at the time of *Generosity and Sacrifice*. I cannot exactly remember precisely why we came to that conclusion but that was the conclusion that we came to. I am very happy to look into the minutes of the meeting and let you know the rationale behind that, if that would be helpful.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul: That would be very helpful.

77. *The Revd Sam Maginnis (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Report of the Clergy Remuneration Review GS 2247 confirmed that the Archbishops' Council, in its role as Central Stipends Authority, has agreed a policy to ensure the National Minimum Stipend (NMS) increases in line with CPIH inflation subject to review every three years "and the need to review this position if high levels of inflation establish themselves".

At the most recent review in May 2021 the Council set an increase to the NMS of 1%, against a CPIH rate in April 2021 of 1.6%. Given CPIH has since rocketed to 7.9% and is set to rise further, will the Council now follow its own policy and undertake an urgent review of the NMS to ensure clergy are adequately protected from the growing cost-of-living crisis, and are consequently able to continue ministering effectively to others impacted by it?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Archbishops' Council have yet to agree the NMS for 2023, and will do so later this year taking account of the latest inflation figures. The Factors that will be taken account of when setting the NMS are set out in the answer to the previous question. Initial consultation earlier in the year suggested a figure of 4%, however the Council concluded that it was too soon to set such a figure given uncertainty around inflation. £3m of additional funding has been provided in 2022 to help clergy facing hardship due to the cost-of-living crisis. We are aware that increases in stipend will require increases in parish share which is also under severe pressure as a result of inflation and the pandemic.

78. *The Revd Christopher Blunt (Chester)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Following the Church Commissioners' disbursement announced in May what changes are proposed to National Minimum Stipend (NMS) or to restoring post-2011 pensions (1/2 NMS) to pre-2011 levels (2/3 NMS) to alleviate retired-clergy poverty and meet our duty of care?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: A decision on NMS for 2023 will be taken later this year. We are aware of the need to balance concerns about the cost of living with ensuring that stipends remain affordable when they are largely funded by current giving.

No change is currently proposed to future pension levels, as this would reduce the ability to maintain stipend levels.

The Revd Christopher Blunt: My supplementary question is really a question for clarity because I need to report back to a retired Clergy Association member. In your reply you say, "No change is currently proposed to future pension levels, as this would reduce the ability to maintain stipend levels". Surely after the spending plans debate you cannot possibly mean that the Church of England does not have the money, so do you mean simply that pensions have been deprioritised compared to everything else or do you mean something else?

The Bishop of Hereford: What I mean is that currently current pensions are financed by diocesan budgets rather than the Church Commissioners. The Church Commissioners are responsible for historic pensions but not current ones, so any change in the level of pension would require both a debate at this Synod and of course diocesan boards of finance to agree to a substantive change in the level of pension remuneration. In our research that we did as part of the RACSC Review, the relative struggles financially comparing stipendiary clergy to those in retirement concluded that we would be better focusing resources where they are scarce on increasing stipend levels than a large increase in the current provision for pension levels.

79. *The Revd Leslie Siu (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: What is the theological rationale for stipend differentials (i.e., between Episcopal, Archdeacon, and Parish Ministry role) in the C of E, where is it articulated, and how does that differ from the theological rationale adopted by the Roman Catholic Church where bishops have the same level of stipend as priests?

The Bishop of Hereford (the Rt Revd Richard Jackson) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Remuneration Review did not discuss the question of differentials, which it considered outside the scope and a distraction from more pressing issues about clergy remuneration. However, it took the theological thinking in *Generosity and Sacrifice* as its starting point and did not dissent

from its view that “differentials where paid should be modest”. The review examined remuneration in other Churches and noted that the model for clergy remuneration in the Roman Catholic Church was entirely different. Their stipends were determined at a diocesan level and on the assumption that almost all priests would not have a family. Stipends were considerably lower (£3,000 pa in some cases) and clergy were offered additional payments from Church funds for each Mass said and were able to keep Christmas and Easter offerings.

The Revd Leslie Siu: Bishop, thank you again for this helpful information. The current differential, if I have done my sums correctly, between the average parish clergy and diocesan bishops is £20,000 a year in terms of stipend. Does the Committee feel this falls within the parameters of *Generosity and Sacrifice* of being classified as modest? If not, what would the Committee believe was a modest differential?

The Chair: I am afraid you are asking for an expression of opinion.

The Revd Leslie Siu: I was just asking for a fact about what the Committee’s view is.

The Chair: I am sorry, I am ruling that out.

The Revd Leslie Siu: Perhaps you will buy me a drink afterwards.

The Revd Dr Tom Woolford (Blackburn): What process is open to Synod by which moving forward we might request the theological rationale for pay differentials to be thought through and then articulated?

The Bishop of Hereford: That is a very good question. I am not sure I know the answer to that question, not being sufficiently au fait with synodical process. I do not know. I would have to get back to you on that in order to tell you how that would be done and I am sure I will be advised appropriately.

The Revd Dr Tom Woolford: There are a bunch of us meeting for a pint later, so.

MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

80. *The Revd Ruth Newton (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In the light of the Net Zero Carbon ambition and the impact of rising fuel costs what advice can be given to dioceses and parish clergy to reduce car dependency and encourage cycling where appropriate in rural multi-parish benefices with minimal public transport, both in existing benefices and as a factor in any future plans.

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The following are offered as suggestions:

- Consider whether a meeting can take place online. Dioceses and parishes can support clergy in this by valuing and modelling online meetings. Encourage lift-sharing, which can be facilitated by apps.
- Financial support for the purchase of a bike or e-bike. For example, a church in Portsmouth Diocese bought an e-cargo bike using a Workplace Sustainable Travel Grant from the local council. Investigate other local schemes.
- Support cycling in practical ways: Install bike racks at the diocesan office and at churches so bikes can be safely locked, provide somewhere for a cyclist to change, leave a helmet and at least wash hands where the installation of a shower isn't appropriate.
- Distance between churches and existing public transport links between communities could be considered in decisions about configuring multi-parish benefices.

Installation of EV charging points in all parsonages. EVs cut fuel costs, though not car dependency.

The Revd Ruth Newton: Given that HMRC travel rates of 45 pence per mile have not risen in line with fuel rates, what is the Church doing both in itself and in its engagement with Government to ensure that clergy, who due to lack of public transport must travel by car to their ministry are not left out of pocket.

Mr Mark Sheard: That is a really good question, Ruth, and thank you very much for it. I have been giving some thought to this and there are some considerable challenges for clergy. For example I came across the fact that clergy are not eligible to purchase a bike under the Government's Cycle to Work scheme because they for work and not to work. There are a number of issues here. I cannot answer your specific point, but I share your concern and I could either say you can buy me a pint later, that seems to be the mood of Synod, as that seems to be the mood of Synod, or better still, I will get back to you with a note on that.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark): I just want to draw attention to that point because just coming up to Synod, being disabled, I cannot use public transport. I did my sums and it is going cost me an extra £50 compared to how it was before.

The Chair: I am sorry, can we not have a speech and have a question. Thank you.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode: Again, it is just drawing attention to that point. Would you please seek a change to that level as much as possible?

Mr Mark Sheard: Most certainly, Tim. I am sure you are not alone in this Synod in noting

the increased costs of travel and not least the appalling travelling conditions on the M1 yesterday. Yes, I will certainly follow that through.

81. *The Revd Anne Brown (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: How many churches and dioceses have gained Eco status and at what award level?

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

Churches:

3,565 Church of England churches and 61 LEPs are registered on the Eco Church scheme.

Altogether, 1,253 churches have achieved an award: 1,084 bronze, 316 silver and 19 gold (some churches have more than one award).

Dioceses:

All 42 Church of England Dioceses are register on the Eco Diocese scheme. Thirteen have achieved the bronze award. There are several applications for the silver award in progress, but none finalised yet.

The number of registrations and awards continues to rise rapidly, and so has the rate of increase.

All churches and cathedrals that haven't already are encouraged to register with Eco Church.

Diocesan offices can register, and just complete the relevant sections. TEIs can also register, although we are in early discussions with A Rocha UK about a custom version.

There is a similar scheme for schools, Eco Schools, and schools are also encouraged to register for Let's Go Zero.

82. *The Revd Dr Michael Brydon (Sodor & Man)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Does the Church of England play any part in the induction of new members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, so they understand the relationship between the Church and State and their Parliamentary role regarding it?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Church of England is not involved in the formal induction of new members, which is a matter for the parliamentary authorities. The Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons meets new members as she has responsibility for pastoral support on the parliamentary estate.

83. *The Revd Dr Michael Brydon (Sodor & Man)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Church of England is governed by the law of the land in ways that impact upon the local community such as burial rights, the election of churchwardens and faculty jurisdiction. What efforts are made by the national Church to educate those holding local political office about these requirements?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Church of England is essentially a locally-based organisation and engagement with local government which includes unitary authorities, district councils, county councils, metropolitan authorities, London boroughs and, indeed, parish councils happens best at diocesan and parish level rather than nationally. Dioceses, parishes and cathedrals are well placed to relate to elected members and officers of local government and to understand the issues with which they deal. It is through good personal and local relationships that we can encourage better understanding of the kind of issues raised in the question.

In local matters where national legislation plays an important role, the NCIs seek to build effective relationships and share a clear understanding of how the Church works and what is needed from legislation. An example is the close relationship forged with the General Register Office over marriage registration law, giving us a route for raising other matters within the GRO's remit.

84. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: At the February 2022 meeting of General Synod I called for an agenda item or a special online Synod to discuss the cost of living crisis and its impact on clergy, churches, and the communities they serve, as well as to hear a plan from the national Church Institutions and Archbishops on how they will help clergy and churches as they see giving fall, but the cost of everything rise due to high inflation. Parishes need help to be in a position to help their communities, especially as gas bills are set to rise again in October as the cap is increased and pressures continue on food and energy.

I explained this topic was unsuitable for a PMM as it would simply take too long to get it to the floor of Synod, and what we needed was an intervention from the Presidents, our Archbishops. I called for an extraordinary one day or half day synod to hear views and receive a presentation on a package that the NCIs will put in place to support parishes and clergy in every community in the land. The Archbishops responded by email, saying they "shared my concern" suggesting I table a PMM, or that "Should MPA wish to propose a debate in July, then the Business Committee will of course consider that".

Can Faith in Public Life (previously MPA) tell us if they considered proposing to the Business Committee that the Church Commissioners be invited to give a presentation to the July Synod, or a special online session, on what they intend to do to channel money to parishes and clergy to help them, while they help their communities?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The MPA Council (which still exists although the staff team is now F&PL) has not been able to consider this, as only one of its elected members was re-elected to Synod and, following the election of new members, the Council has not yet met.

The MPA Council has no monies to disburse and no authority over the decisions of the wider NCIs. Questions about the kind of package proposed here should be directed to the Church Commissioners or the Archbishops' Council.

The cost of living crisis arises across our current engagements with government and other bodies, and the Bishop of Durham has been active in raising it in Parliament and elsewhere. MPA is a member of a coalition of charities concerned with combatting poverty among children which is addressing the moral, political and economic complexities and combining its members' voices for maximum impact.

Mr Sam Margrave: We need to support clergy and help churches as inflation hits hard. Will the MPA look at bringing forward a webinar and bringing together people from across NCIs or the Church to explore how we can help churches and clergy with the cost of living crisis so they can focus on being there for their communities and not worrying about the next bill through the post?

Mr Mark Sheard: Thank you, Sam. That is a very helpful supplementary and it was good to have a conversation with you earlier to understand precisely what it is that you wanted us to do. Obviously, as I answered the question, the MPA has no funds to disburse per se but we can convene. I think we have seen some great success with webinars what the Evangelism and Discipleship Team have done with their webinars, and I can certainly look into what we can do to address the specific point that you raise.

COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CHURCH HOUSE

85. *Mrs Rebecca Hunt (Portsmouth)* asked the Chair of the Council of the Corporation of the Church House: I note that Church House will be used in October for a Pink News Awards Ceremony. To what extent is the Church of England's doctrine on marriage and sexual practice taken into account in policy on the use of Church House by outside organisations?

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Council of the Corporation of the Church House: The Corporation lets its premises within the framework of the law to earn income to maintain Church House and to make grants to the work of the Church of England. The Corporation follows an ethical letting policy for all uses of the building and reserves the right to refuse any bookings which would be contrary to this policy. The areas for refusing bookings that are covered by the policy include armaments manufacturers, tobacco manufacturers, gambling organisations, pornography organisations, alcohol industry or any other booking which would be contrary to the vision and mission of the Church of England.

Mr Benjamin John (St Albans): What discussions happened in the decision to allow Church House to host the Pink News Awards? If none, will the Corporation please reconsider whether such an event is contrary to the mission and vision of the Church of England?

Mr David Kemp: With your permission, Madam Chair, I answer on behalf of Dr Baxter who is not able to be here. The Conference Centre of Church House operates according to an ethical policy determined by the trustees of the Corporation. It is available on the Notice Board and previously circulated to Synod members. This was recently updated with advice from the Revd Professor Oliver O'Donovan, whose paper is also on the Notice Board which has also previously been circulated to Synod.

The trustees are well aware of the Christian theology of marriage and the teaching of the Church of England. It notes that the work of "Pink News" is, in their own words, "to inform, to inspire change and empower people to be themselves". The event which is booked celebrates those who campaign for equality and, as such, does not contravene our ethical policy.

However, as with other issues raised over the years, the Corporation is always willing to look again at its ethical lettings policy to see if it needs to be refined in order to ensure it can meet the complexities of contemporary life.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Supplementary.

The Chair: Do you really need one, Sam? Go ahead.

Mr Sam Margrave: "Pink News" on 21 June 2022 published a campaign ---

The Chair: Sorry, can I just have a question, please.

Mr Sam Margrave: This is a fact, Chair, that I am putting forward.

The Chair: I am sorry, I still need a question.

Mr Sam Margrave: "Pink News" put forward a campaign to support kinky gay sex as part of their organisation and to promote that. Have you considered whether that is extremely controversial and in line with the ethical guidelines?

Mr David Kemp: We have considered that it does not contravene our ethical policy. Whether it is controversial or not is not the question.

BUSINESS COMMITTEE

86. *Mrs Debra Mclsaac (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: There

is an increasing use of “fringe” events hosted by a Working Group, Reference Group or Review Group which have the purpose of informing Synod of developments or taking soundings of members such as the Cathedrals Measure in the last quinquennium and the Governance Review Group, or the Business Committee session on Monday lunchtime. What steps could be taken such as recording these sessions, and what permissions would be needed so that all members of Synod have access to the information provided, questions and answers during the session and the issues on which Synod members’ input is sought?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee last issued a Policy on Fringe Meetings and displays in May 2017 which covers who can hold a fringe meeting, booking arrangements and compliance with other policies and guidelines. It does not cover how fringe meetings should be held or whether they should be recorded, both of which are entirely the decision of the organiser.

As well as providing information, Working, Reference and Review Group fringe events allow for members to comment informally and “off the record”. Recording the event would mean this was no longer the case.

Recording such events, even at a low-tech level but suitable for future use by Synod members would attract additional costs and resources.

It would be good practice that fringe events run by such groups make any presentations available to all members after the group of sessions.

The Business Committee will discuss this at our September meeting.

Mrs Debra McIsaac: Will the Business Committee please reconsider or review its policy on fringe meetings and displays, including giving advice to fringe group meeting organisers as to questions of recording and make available the facilities to do so, at the cost of the fringe group organisers?

Canon Robert Hammond: As I said in the response, the content of a fringe meeting is down to the provider of the fringe meeting. At the moment, there are no suggestions by the Business Committee about that. I did say we will consider that in the round in our discussions in September.

87. *Mr Andrew Orange (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Why was it decided that voting for the CNC should take place live during Synod worship rather than remotely over a longer period of time, and what arrangements have been made to enable those who are unable to be present (either in person or online) to vote?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Report of the Crown Nominations Commission Election Process Review Group (GS2202) made a number of proposals about how future voting for CNC members should take

place. GS 2209, debated at the July 2021 group of sessions sets out those which were approved including “that the election takes place in the context of prayer and worship”. The Standing Orders were amended in July 2021, and SO 137B(3) set out that the voting must take place at a group of sessions with the result being declared at the same group of sessions SO 137B(7). There is provision for those who are unable to be present in person due to illness or disability to vote using the online portal (SO 137B(4)).

The Business Committee has sought to arrange the voting in according with these new Standing Orders.

Details regarding the handling of the election process will be circulated as a Notice Paper.

88. *The Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Would the Business Committee commit to review the need for a code of conduct for Synod members, encompassing not only the need for prayerful and respectful behaviour within timetabled Synod sessions but also both in person, online and print media between sessions?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The existing voluntary code of conduct, GS Misc 1175, was last revised in 2017. The Business Committee considered the Code of Conduct at its meeting in May 2022 and agreed that further work is needed both on its enforceability and application to Synod members outside of formal groups of sessions. The Business Committee will review the code of conduct and are holding a fringe meeting on Monday evening and members are encouraged to give the committee their views there, or at any other time.

89. *The Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Would the Business Committee commit to review the need for a code of conduct for Synod members, encompassing not only actions within timetabled Synod sessions but also the use of social media, one-to-one communication and traditional media between sessions which could be deemed illegal, offensive, or bringing the work of Synod and the institutions of the Church of England into disrepute?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: Yes. As part of its regular review of policies, the Business Committee discussed the current voluntary code of conduct at its meeting in May 2022. It was agreed that there should be further work on the current voluntary code of conduct to ensure that it is fit for purpose and to review the extent it could cover the areas mentioned.

The Business Committee will be holding a fringe meeting on Monday evening, and this will be one of the items that it would welcome members feedback on.

90. *Miss Emily Hill (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: The General Synod Code of Conduct is currently a voluntary code that members are asked to abide by. The Business Committee recognises in this document that we are a high-profile

organisation that hopes to maintain the trust of the public. Would the business committee consider amending the code of conduct to make it enforceable, ultimately ensuring members can be held accountable if they participate in malicious speech or actions either in person or online.

Has the Business Committee considered amending the Code of Conduct to make it enforceable, ultimately ensuring members can be held accountable if they participate in malicious speech or actions either in person or online?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: Yes. As part of its regular review of policies, the Business Committee discussed the current voluntary code of conduct at its meeting in May 2022. It was agreed that there should be further work on the current voluntary code of conduct to ensure that it is fit for purpose. This will include whether there should be an enforceable code of conduct for members and the implications of that.

The Business Committee will be holding a fringe meeting on Monday evening, and it would welcome members engagement with this.

91. *Professor Roy Faulkner (Leicester)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: During the period from 1959-2022, the number of stipendiary clergy has dropped from 13,075 to 7,210. In the same period, the number of Diocesan support staff has risen from 250 to 6,500, while the number of people in congregations has dropped from 2 million to 700,000.

Will the Business Committee allow an opportunity to debate Diocesan stipendiary clergy/support staff ratios, as a matter of urgency?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee can only consider requests for business that are put forward by Boards, Councils or Diocesan and Private Members Motions to be included on the agenda.

If there is a request to debate Diocesan stipendiary clergy/support staff ratios, the Business Committee will consider it in the usual manner.

Professor Roy Faulkner: Thank you very much for your kind and helpful answer, but I did say at the end of it did you think that it was important to debate this stipendiary/clergy support staff ratio as a matter of urgency. Do I take it from your answer that you do not regard this as a matter of urgency?

Canon Robert Hammond: You may be asking me for an opinion if it is a thought.

The Chair: I think you are correct. I am sorry.

Canon Robert Hammond: It is going to do the bar very well tonight, this Question Time.

92. *Mrs Emma Joy Gregory (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: The General Synod has had presentations and take note debates from some of the Archbishops' Commissions, however, with the Housing Commission as an example, their recommendations are being implemented without the agreement of the General Synod. Will the reports of other Commissions be debated and voted on by General Synod, to ensure its full backing before changes are made to financial or staffing commitments which could impact other policy priorities already agreed by the Synod?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee can only consider requests for business that are put forward for inclusion on the agenda for a group of sessions.

If the Archbishops, or the Archbishops' Council, request that the reports of Archbishops' Commissions should be debated, the Business Committee will consider this in the usual manner.

93. *The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: The Disability Motion at this group of sessions is the first motion focused on disability for 15 years. There has been minimal progress in enabling and celebrating the mission and ministry of disabled people in the intervening time. Given that one of the aims of this disability motion is "to start a ball rolling" so that additional targeted proposals may be brought, with the aim of changing the culture around disability within the Church, would the Business Committee agree to consider timetabling further motions on disability from the Committee for the Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) within this quinquennium?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: Yes, the Business Committee would welcome a future request from the Committee for the Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) for another debate and, although no commitment can be made before the committee settles any Synod agenda, would consider it in the usual manner.

94. *Mrs Sue Cavill (Derby)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Why is the Business Committee of the General Synod not timetabling a detailed debate and vote on the Governance, Vision and Strategy, Transforming Effectiveness and Simpler NCIs plans? "Take note" debates are just that, opportunities for taking note, they do not indicate approval, yet these workstreams having made presentations and take note debates are making financial commitments for the next three years and indicative burdens/ commitments for the next decade.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee can only consider requests for business that are put forward for inclusion on the agenda for a group of sessions.

If there is a request from the Archbishops' Council or from another official body to debate the Governance Review, the Vision and Strategy, the Transforming Effectiveness programme, or the Simpler NCIs plans, the Business Committee will consider this in the usual manner. Take note debates provide an opportunity for Synod members to comment on and feed thoughts into developing work, and to take note of papers produced by other Church bodies without giving formal approval.

Mrs Sue Cavill: Thank you for your answer to this question which explains that the Business Committee can only consider requests on the matters such as I cited in response to a question from official bodies. When debates are timetabled, how is it decided whether they are take note debates or debates where the proposals are voted on?

Canon Robert Hammond: When the Business Committee considers the type of business, we are given an indication of the elements that will be used within that timescale by whoever is proposing it, be it a presentation or a take note debate. It is not our decision on what it actually is. We schedule an amount of time based on the indication of the business that will be presented.

95. *The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: With one of the three Vision and Strategy stated priorities being “to be a Church that is younger and more diverse”, what plans are there to ensure that General Synod hears the views of young people?

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: In November 2021 around 200 General Synod members engaged in workshops with 30 young leaders aged between 12 and 17, generating input into each of the priorities around the Vision and Strategy. The Business Committee would like to have a similar level of input at future sessions and will work with the Bishop of Durham, the Education and Growing Faith and Vision and Strategy teams as to how best to do this. We need to be realistic about the complexity of trying to bolt this on to our existing synodical processes and the extent to which the voice of any group of young people could be considered representative. The Business Committee would also like to encourage members to deliberately seek the views of young people in their parish, diocese and deanery before and after each session of General Synod.

The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond: Thank you for your answer and your enthusiasm for getting Synod to hear the views of young people. Given the fact that in some dioceses like my own the number of young people in parishes is less than 25%, or around that now, are you committed to getting the views of young people in other ways?

Canon Robert Hammond: I think it is really important that Synod hears the views of young people. The Business Committee cannot dictate who is elected to the Business Committee, as I said in the response, but we will certainly work with others to find ways of getting more views from young people into our work.

Mr Samuel Wilson (Chester): In further ensuring that the views of young people are heard here on Synod would the Business Committee look into how it can fill the gap that has been left by the Church of England Youth Council representatives, recognising that simply hearing their views is different from giving them an equal voice and, crucially, a vote?

Canon Robert Hammond: That is a complex question because we cannot do anything about the Church of England Youth Council. As I said in the response, we look at a number of ways in which we can hear the voices. It may not necessarily be on the floor of Synod. It may be encouraging those who write our reports to engage with young people as those reports are being written.

CLERGY DISCIPLINE COMMISSION

96. *The Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: Given that almost all are agreed that the Clergy Discipline Measure has had some very unhappy results and that it will take some time for a new Measure to be approved, are there facts on the ground to show that complaints brought under the Measure are being dealt with more speedily, and that fewer complaints, except in fairly or very clear cases, are being brought by Dioceses against their own clergy?

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: Allegations of misconduct under the CDM 2003 are not brought by dioceses against their own clergy. Under section 10 of the Measure a PCC, churchwarden or any other person with a “proper interest” may institute proceedings.

The number of allegations brought against clergy is set out each year in the Commission’s annual report to Synod (GS Misc 1318). In 2021 there were 94 allegations against priests or deacons and 22 against bishops or archbishops.

The Commission does not collect data which monitors the speed at which individual allegations are dealt with during the diocesan stage of proceedings. For cases that have been referred to a tribunal there has been a significant reduction in the amount of time it takes for trials to be heard. This is principally due to the amendments passed in 2021 to the Clergy Discipline Rules and further efficiency procedures implemented by staff.

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham): The question refers to the unhappiness with the Clergy Discipline Measure. What work is the Commission doing to evaluate whether dioceses and bishops are properly following the Measure, the Rules and the Code of Conduct?

the Ven. Mark Ireland: Thank you for the question. As a new member of the Clergy Discipline Commission, I do not think I can give you a full answer but I will undertake to go back and find out and raise that question. Any questions which are raised here, we are very happy to discuss. There is, of course, an opportunity in the debate on Tuesday morning to look at this, the whole future of the CDM process, in more detail.

CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION

97. *Mrs Sandra Turner (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: The Five Guiding Principles state that the Church of England remains committed to: “enabling those who, on theological grounds cannot receive the ministry of women priests and bishops, to flourish within its life and structures “.

Since the Five Guiding Principles were established, how many appointments of Diocesan Bishops have been made of those who hold to a traditional complementarian theology?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: Since 2014, the Crown Nominations Commission has nominated two people to Diocesan Sees who described their theological position as Traditionalist Catholic or Complementarian Evangelical. One of these candidates subsequently withdrew acceptance of the nomination.

98. *Mr Gabriel Chiu (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: How many members of the “Ready Now Diocesan Bishops” (RNDB) list prepared for the CNC are complementarian evangelicals and how many are traditional (non-ordaining) Catholics?

Insert text of Q99 here:

Mrs Sarah Finch (London) to ask the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Q99 How many traditional Catholics and Conservative Evangelicals are listed in the ‘Ready Now Diocesan Bishop’ list provided to the CNC when considering diocesan appointments?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: With permission, I will answer questions 98 and 99 together.

No-one from these Church traditions is currently nominated to test a call to episcopal ministry as a diocesan bishop.

There are currently six people who describe their theological position as Traditionalist Catholic or Complementarian Evangelical nominated to test a possible call to episcopal ministry as a suffragan bishop.

Mr Gabriel Chiu: Thank you for the full response. Please, may I ask for the number of Traditionalist Catholic and Complementarians nominated to the suffragan sort of core

discretely, so sort of how many are Traditional Catholics and how many are Complementarian Evangelicals?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I have no idea at all, I am afraid. I will have to ask. I will ask and write back to you, thank you very much indeed.

Dr Rosalind Clarke (Lichfield): I would like to ask how many in total are included on those lists so we can get a sense of the proportion that are represented in these theological positions and what is being done to ensure that more from those traditions are included on such lists?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: The same answer to how many in total. I am very happy to answer these questions. I think for a lot of us up here thinking back over the answers, if you are going to ask numerical questions or questions of fact, if you could just contact us a bit in advance I am thinking it will save a lot of beer and the Bishop of, I do not know, Chester I mean, will - sorry, we have drunk a lot of wine together and beer over the years.

The second thing is the appointment secretaries currently have been writing out to bishops asking them to review those that they nominate because the nominations come from the dioceses and then it goes through a process. There are lots of areas where the lists need refreshing and so we are going through that exercise at the moment. I will undertake to re-emphasise to them the importance of the diversity of theological as well as other forms of diversity, the rest.

Mrs Sarah Finch: Thank you, Archbishop, for your response. What is the plan to remedy the fact that no Traditional Catholic or Conservative Evangelical is currently being considered for ministry as a diocesan bishop?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: It is exactly as I just said on the previous question, Mrs Finch. We are seeking to refresh the list and we will certainly take note of that. In the end, whether people are nominated is, of course, a question for the CNC and not within the gift of the Archbishops or any individual and the voting on that is, by decision of the Synod, entirely secret. Our ability to affect this is somewhat limited.

DIOCESES COMMISSION

100. *Mrs Emma Joy Gregory (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Dioceses Commission: Is the Dioceses Commission satisfied that the proposals that have been put to it for the reappointment of the Sees of Ebbsfleet and Maidstone make adequate provision for the continuance of existing roles?

Dame Caroline Spelman (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Dioceses Commission: At its June meeting the Dioceses Commission gave its agreement to the proposals put to it for provision of bishops who offer extended episcopal care to parishes that cannot accept

the priestly or episcopal ministry of women. The Commission was convinced these proposals represented adequate provision for these ministries.

A press release outlining what was agreed was released on 30 June 2022 and is available here: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-and-news/press-releases/bishops-maidstone-ebbsfleet-and-oswestry>.

Mrs Emma Joy Gregory: Has the Dioceses Commission discussed options whereby Traditional Catholic or Conservative Evangelical bishops should be appointed as suffragan bishops to ease the considerable load of the vast geographical areas such as Ebbsfleet?

Dame Caroline Spelman: Thank you, Emma. The supplementary you have put to me enabled me to help the Archbishop because the Dioceses Commission has very recently given consideration to this. It may be helpful to Synod members to know that there are, in fact, three provincial episcopal visitors ministering for Traditional Catholic parishes in Beverley and in Richborough and in Fulham and that the new appointment to the Bishop of Oswestry will be an appointment to the Traditional Catholic tradition and the Ebbsfleet See will be a See for the Complementarian tradition. The Dioceses Commission considers every suffragan see on a case by case basis and we are committed to supporting these constituencies.

101. *Dr Richard Mantle (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Dioceses Commission: Following the June meeting of the Dioceses Commission, did the Dioceses Commission agree with the proposals to fill the Sees of Ebbsfleet and Maidstone?

Dame Caroline Spelman (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Dioceses Commission: At its June meeting the Dioceses Commission gave its agreement to the proposals put to it for provision of bishops who offer extended episcopal care to parishes that cannot accept the priestly or episcopal ministry of women. A press release outlining what was agreed was released on 30 June 2022 and is available here: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-and-news/press-releases/bishops-maidstone-ebbsfleet-and-oswestry>

102. *The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Dioceses Commission: Following the leaked publication of the “Ely, Sheard, Swinson “ paper in February by the *Church Times* and the *Times* newspapers, what requests or conversations have the Dioceses Commission had, regarding the reduction of number of dioceses or bishops, merger of diocesan offices or review of boundaries?

Dame Caroline Spelman (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Dioceses Commission: Following my appointment as Chair of the Dioceses Commission by this Synod, I have been happy to accept invitations from regional groupings of bishops to discuss the work of the Commission with them. This has included reflection on the options discussed in

the *Bishops and their Ministry* paper. There have been no requests for consideration of reduction of the number of dioceses or bishops as yet.

The Revd Patrick Richmond: Thank you so much for your answer. I am not sure I saw a comment about requests about mergers of diocesan officers or reviews of boundaries and I wonder in the conversations has there been a discussion of what motive there would be to undergo these sorts of changes and were turkeys and Christmas mentioned?

Dame Caroline Spelman: Thank you very much, Patrick. This allows me to share with Synod members the fact that I wrote to all the regional convener bishops offering to meet with their bishops in their region to discuss the content of what we know in shorthand as the "Ely Paper" in as far as it relates to structures, because that is the work that is Dioceses Commission oversees. I am in the process of touring the country having one to one conversations as well with bishops. I have visited the South-West, the North-West, the North-East, the York Diocese, East Midlands in my diary for this month, and in due course the South-East. But I remain open as the Chair of the Dioceses Commission for these conversations to take place and we have the opportunity to discuss with the key stakeholders these early proposals within the Bishop of Ely's paper.

FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION

103. *Mr Adam Kendry (Armed Forces)* asked the Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: What is the Church of England's definition of a woman?

The Bishop in Europe (the Rt Revd Dr Robert Innes) replied as Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: There is no official definition, which reflects the fact that until fairly recently definitions of this kind were thought to be self-evident, as reflected in the marriage liturgy. The LLF project however has begun to explore the complexities associated with gender identity and points to the need for additional care and thought to be given in understanding our commonalities and differences as people made in the image of God.

LEGAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

104. Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford) asked the Chair of the Legal Advisory Commission: As regards the process for the appointment of members to the LAC, have all the places now been filled by the Appointments Committee and have steps been taken to ensure that, in the future, members of General Synod will be invited to nominate individuals for appointment to the LAC by the Appointments Committee before appointments are made?

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis (Dean of the Arches & Auditor) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Legal Advisory Commission: The Appointments Committee may appoint up to 17 persons to the LAC, of whom at least one shall be a member of the House of Bishops, and not fewer than three shall be members of any of the three Houses of the General Synod (in addition to the *ex officio* members). Six of those 17 places have been filled,

and a further three persons have not yet confirmed whether they will accept an offer of appointment.

GS Misc Paper 1324 Reflecting the Body of Christ: A Simple Guide to Appointments 2022-2026 explains the appointments process. The Secretary to the Appointments Committee will email all Synod members before each meeting alerting them to the appointments that will be made and asking all members to consider whether they would like to apply, so when the remaining LAC appointments are to be considered that will be included in the email.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr: Can I thank the Legal Office with whom I was in discussion about this question for the very positive way in which they helped in answering questions, so thank you. But my question is this. Many thanks for the precise and informative answer, could you please let the Synod have the names of the six people who have already been appointed?

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis: Yes, certainly, and thank you very much, Stephen, for emailing me this in advance and anticipating the good practice recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury a moment ago. It is very helpful. There are actually I think a few more than six but I will read out the names of the appointees: The Worshipful David Pittaway QC, Chancellor of the Diocese of Peterborough; Ms Araba Taylor, Deputy Chancellor of the Dioceses of Southwark and of Canterbury; the Worshipful Ruth Arlow, Chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury and Deputy Chancellor of the Diocese of London; his Honour Judge David Hodge QC, Chancellor of the Dioceses of Blackburn and Oxford; Mr Stuart Jones, Registrar of the Dioceses of London and Norwich; Ms Cordelia Hall, Deputy Registrar of the Diocese of Oxford; the Right Revd Andrew Watson, Bishop of Guildford; the Ven. Douglas Dettmer, Archdeacon of Totnes; the Revd Paul Benfield; Mr Robert Pearce QC, and Mr Andrew Roberts who is the Diocesan Secretary in Peterborough.

I can give you the *ex officio* members as well very quickly. They are the two Vicars-General, Timothy Briden and Peter Collier; the three Provincial Registrars, Darren Oliver, Louise Connacher; and the Revd Alexander McGregor, who is also Official Solicitor to the Church Commissioners and Chief Legal Adviser to Archbishops' Council, and Mr Christopher Packer who is Legislative Counsel to the General Synod and myself.

LITURGICAL COMMISSION

105. *Mr Bradley Smith (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: The Church of England's liturgical resources for the Platinum Jubilee included just three prayers in traditional language, only one of which was taken from the Book of Common Prayer (1662). Was consideration given to including any of the other royal prayers from the BCP?

The Bishop of Exeter (the Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: The Liturgical Resources for the Platinum Jubilee were conceived of as

additional to the valuable prayers contained in the Book of Common Prayer, which will be well known by those who lead worship in traditional language, given that several of them are in the orders for Morning and Evening Prayer and for Holy Communion. The Commission also promoted the use of the Accession Service annexed to the Book of Common Prayer for use on the anniversary of the Accession.

106. *Mr Bradley Smith (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: Every morning, a Common Worship collect is published on the Church of England's social media channels. Why are the traditional collects from the Book of Common Prayer never used as the "prayer for the day"?

The Bishop of Lichfield (the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: The Collect used each day is taken from Church House Publishing's Reflections for Daily Prayer (book and app), meaning followers on social media are praying along with thousands of Anglicans worldwide. These Prayers for The Day, shared on the Church of England's Facebook, Twitter and Instagram channels, are the posts that see the highest number of likes, comments and shares, showing how valued this moment of prayer is for those on social media. The choice to use consistent language in *Reflections* allows for liturgical and linguistic consistency across a range of formats including audio versions of Morning and Evening Prayer which have reached more than 750,000 listeners since March last year.

Mr Bradley Smith: I thank the Bishop very much indeed for his reply and I am really encouraged to see that the Collects are doing so well, being so well-received online. Could the Bishop tell me what plans there are to create audio versions of prayer book offices of morning and evening prayer?

The Bishop of Exeter: Thank you, Bradley, for your supplementary. As far as I know, there are no such plans at the moment. Those decisions are actually made not by the Liturgical Commission but actually by the Communications Department. I am really happy to take your question and to pass it on, but I do not know the answer to that question because it is not my decision and it is their decision.

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

107. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What plans does the Council have to provide ministry in newly built estates, and how do they intend that such ministry will be funded?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The deployment of ministry to different areas depends on the decisions of individual dioceses. The new Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment seeks to provide extra capacity for dioceses in developing their ministry, and this is likely to include newly built estates.

Existing ways that the national Church have funded ministry in such estates include Strategic Development Funding for pioneer ministry or new churches in eight dioceses including Chelmsford, Portsmouth, and Southwark, as well as Lowest Income Communities funding supporting parish ministry as a whole.

Regarding ministry on estates in general, the Estates Evangelism Task Group is doing great work in encouraging local congregations and dioceses to think of estates as places of missional potential and to highlight inspirational models of church life on estates.

Mr Robin Lunn: Thank you for your response, John. A quick question. Does the Estates Evangelism Task Group believe in being involved in the creation of the estate just after it has finished being built, in effect, and ---

The Chair: This is sounding like you are asking for an opinion, sir.

Mr Robin Lunn: Sorry, no, I am asking would they be involved at that point and also would they assist a deanery if it has support from the diocese to so do to ask their help.

Canon Dr John Spence: I would always go for collaboration between all the different people who have an interest in the topic. It is very interesting for me to encourage everything that can as you have major new housing estates being built, that the Church has a presence in the shape it would wish there.

108. *The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: GS 2262 states that in 2023-25 the Church Commissioners intend to distribute 30% more than in the current triennium. What percentage increase will there be to Lowest Income Communities Funding?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Lowest Income Communities Funding is part of the core funding of the Archbishops' Council, intended to provide ongoing support for parish ministry in the poorest areas in perpetuity, sustainably, and without uncertainty in future funding levels leading to cuts at times of market uncertainty.

The actuarial calculation results in a figure of 3.45% p.a., or 12% over the triennium as the inter-generational distribution level, and this has been applied to the Lowest Income Communities Funding.

On top of this, there will be significant additional investment in the most deprived areas through the new Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment, which will be prioritised to the most deprived areas. Analysis has shown that 40% of all Strategic Development Funding, and 60% of that awarded in 2021, was directed at mission in the most deprived areas, such as parishes on estates and inner cities.

109. *The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: GS 2261 states "Most dioceses in receipt of Lowest Income Community Funding (LInC) distribute the funding to their poorest parishes by formula through the parish share system, sometimes with a top-slice to fund relevant diocese-wide spending. But some dioceses treat LInC income more as part of general resources". What steps are being taken to ensure that this funding reaches the poorest parishes for which it is intended?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The intention of the funding is to support mission and ministry in areas with the lowest incomes, where there is not the capacity for mutual support from elsewhere in the diocese.

Every diocese is asked to provide information on which parishes are supported by the funding. This additional level of focus on poorest communities is a significant change to how national funding is administered. Therefore, there is a ten-year transition period, ending in 2026, allowing for dioceses to move resources without causing high levels of disruption.

Each year, the level of accountability increases, and each year, dioceses are increasing the focus on deprived communities, as agreed for this ten-year transition. In 2021 60% of funding went to the most deprived parishes. In the new funding programme, LInC will be included in strategic conversations with dioceses to ensure that the percentage reaching the most deprived communities continues to increase.

110. *Professor Roy Faulkner (Leicester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Church Commissioners and Archbishops Council issued a press release on 12 May 2022, announcing a 33% increase in grant from 930 million in 2010-22 to £1.2 billion in 2022-2025. The Archbishop of York is quoted as saying "funding in the past, if we are being honest, was a bit too driven from the centre". He then went on to say, "We've learnt, we've listened. 'We have changed our mind". The Archbishop of Canterbury went further, "Over the last few years, the priority has been very much for heavily populated areas. However, having listened carefully to what people were saying, this extra money is for everyone, including rural areas especially".

Given the Archbishop's emphasis on rural parishes, what mechanisms exist to establish how much of this extra money is in fact going to fund the day-to-day ministry of stipendiary clergy in traditional, rural Parishes?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Allocations to support rural ministry will not be pre-determined: the funding will be distributed in response to diocesan plans in line with the Vision and Strategy bold outcomes which include a parish system revitalised for mission so churches can reach and serve everyone in their communities.

The Archbishops' Council currently tracks the amount and proportion of national Church funding directed to particular areas and demographics and will continue to do so under the new investment programme.

Funding in this triennium was specifically allocated to urban contexts because there were limited resources, and so allocations were focused on areas with less ministry resource and attendance. This restriction will not apply in the new funding programme.

Professor Roy Faulkner: Thank you, John, for your very helpful reply, but in the discussion about it you essentially say that the Archbishops' Council will track Church funding and bearing in mind what you have said earlier on today about the fact that there are changes in priorities about how this Church funding might go ---

The Chair: Can we have your question.

Professor Roy Faulkner: I am saying, can you tell me will the Archbishops' Council have a possibility to direct funding rather than just tracking it?

Canon Dr John Spence: That would not be for me to determine. If there was a case for the Archbishops' Council to seek to direct funds in a particular place, that would be something we would consider. I am always mindful that the Archbishops' Council should not overstep its role.

111. *Mr Robert Zampetti (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What steps have the Church Commissioners taken following the publication of the Chote report to ensure that future SDF grants and Lowest Income Fund projects deliver their stated aims and objectives effectively (for instance, making sure that dioceses do not treat LInC income as part of general resources)?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Independent Review recommended that effective deployment and accountability of LInC is enhanced when dioceses explain not just to the Church Commissioners, but also their own synods and stakeholders how resources are allocated. We are encouraging dioceses to share more widely their use of LInC funding, and organising a seminar for dioceses in receipt of LInC to share their allocation methods in order to encourage mutual accountability and learning.

Every SDF project currently goes through a rigorous two- stage application process which specify the hoped-for outcomes. These are monitored through the lifetime of the project through annual reviews and an end of project evaluation.

Further monitoring of the overall funding schemes is being developed, guided by the six bold outcomes of the Vision and Strategy, to support the effective measurement of funded work.

112. *Mr Robert Zampetti (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Since the recent independent review of Low Income Communities and Strategic Development funding by Robert Chote recommends as a priority that "Dioceses and the national Church should foster applications from different traditions..." and "that SIB monitor and report on the diversity of projects by tradition", is there any further data on how many parishes received SDF funding by tradition (beyond the 43% of CRT-related projects which the report estimates)?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: No further data is available on SDF funding by tradition. As the question notes, this is an area that the independent review has requested further work.

Defining church tradition is complex: many have overlapping identities, offer a range of services or are difficult to put into boxes. The Strategic Investment Board is looking at how the full range of traditions in the Church can be supported without over-simplification or quotas, including offering greater support to parts of the Church with less experience in applying for funding. We would encourage those from every tradition with ideas for mission aligned to the Vision and Strategy to speak to their diocese.

The 43% includes a large number of projects where a CRT-linked church is funded alongside churches from other traditions (e.g. catholic, broad, and other evangelical churches). Therefore, a smaller fraction has gone to CRT-linked churches themselves.

113. *Mr Clive Billenness (Europe)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Chote Report (GS 2261) states that resource churches, supported by the Strategic Investment Board (SIB) through the Strategic Development Funding (SDF) in the period 2014-2021 received £74.5 million of the £176.7 million that they are expected to receive before this income stream terminates. During this time 89,375 disciples were expected to be created. In fact, only 12,075 have been created. This equates to a per capita spend of approximately £6,000 per disciple created.

What analysis has been carried out and what projections made to determine the relative future outcomes, in terms of recruiting disciples, of the Resource Church model described in the Chote Report, vis-à-vis using the same amount of money to support the day-to-day front-line ministry of traditional Parishes?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The question refers to figures for all of Strategic Development Funding, not just Resource Churches. As the independent review shows in figure 12, over half of funding has gone to supporting existing churches in mission.

A further note is that the 89,375 figure is what projects hope for by their completion date. Most SDF projects are part-way through their delivery; it would be unrealistic to expect their full outcomes until they are completed.

Every SDF project goes through a robust two-stage application process where it must set out its outcomes, which are tested against strategic impact (i.e. additionality to ongoing ministry). SDF outcomes are monitored annually, and are broadly in line with what would be expected at this point, taking account of Covid-19.

Resource Churches form part of the mixed ecology. The independent review notes the impact on growth, giving, and new vocations in paragraph 3.39 and figure 11.

114. *the Ven. Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given the commitment made by Synod in February 2015 in "Released for Mission" (GS Misc 1092) to recognise that the provision of administration in rural multi-parish benefices should be "a legitimate call on mission funding", what priorities and guidance will be incorporated into the new triennium funding arrangements to ensure that this is included and provided for in Diocesan spending plans?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Consultations with dioceses and others on the new strategic mission and ministry investment programme are underway but we are not yet at the stage of drawing up detailed guidance for the programme. However, I can confirm that funding for administration support, as part of a wider programme of work in line with the Vision and Strategy, will be within the scope of the new funding.

The national Church is also working on ways to relieve the administrative burden of parishes, including around HR, finance, payroll, administrative software and improving advice provided.

the Ven. Stewart Fyfe: Thank you for your very encouraging answer. Given the number of times the issue of administration has arisen in debate as a limiting factor for mission, will we ensure that a rural practitioner is involved in drawing up the detailed guidance for the new Strategic Investment Programme and perhaps also, with sympathy for my friend, the Bishop of Burnley, a practitioner from an urban deprivation ministry, so that we can ensure that this is embedded from the start and that we are not just critiquing it afterwards?

Canon Dr John Spence: The determination of the membership of the Board will be for the Archbishops' Council. Clearly we will be very keen to have all the different disciplines and backgrounds we can. But we should not just limit this to the Investment Board. We need to be engaging as we understand more fully how we can magnify and optimise learning and innovation across all areas, estates and rural particularly.

115. *Mr Peter Barrett (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given the significant funding through SDF, what action will be taken to ensure better statistics around return on investment, especially given the gaps between plans and actual achievements, the number of "new" disciples being one example (Figure 10, GS 2261 LInC SDF document)?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Every SDF project goes through a robust two-stage application process where dioceses set out the planned outcomes for the investment. The Strategic Investment board looks at both the potential impact and delivery confidence. Each year, projects and their outcomes are reviewed – this looks at gaps between plans and actual achievements which builds learning within each project and across the Church. There is also an independent evaluation at project closure.

To date, recorded outcomes are broadly in line with expected progress, taking on board delays created by Covid. Over time, as an increasing number of projects complete, the robustness of the information and learning around return on investment will grow.

The Vision and Strategy team is seeking improvements to outcome measurement practice in the next triennium to enable wider sharing of learning on what has worked and what hasn't and to better inform future investments

Mr Peter Barrett: Thank you for your response, Canon Spence. I wonder if you can help me. I am struggling with a phrase from the SDF Report. Let me just quote and then ask you a very short question at the end. It says, "More specifically, 14% of funding has gone to projects exclusively made up of plants from the Church Revitalisation Trust network and into Holy Trinity Brompton (and a further 29% has gone to projects where CRT churches are present among those of other networks and traditions). This is not itself proof of bias". I just wondered if one tradition has access to 43% of funding why that is not evidence of bias?

Canon Dr John Spence: Because we are responding to where the requests come from. I am sorry, this is not opinion. Bias would exist if it was proven we were favouring one tradition against another in applications which we have approved. There is no such evidence whatsoever and we continue to encourage all traditions to bring forward their projects.

116. *Canon Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the disbanding of the Rural Affairs Group and the loss of a dedicated National Rural Officer, which body or officer is responsible for the implementation of the nine recommendations made in the report Released for Mission: Growing the Rural Church, as accepted by General Synod in February 2015?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Dioceses have the primary responsibility for effective strategies for the support of their rural parishes, and some of the specific recommendations relate to diocesan work.

The Vision and Strategy team in new simpler NCIs structure will provide missional support for the Church as a whole. The structure is designed to be flexible in meeting the needs of the Church with resources allocated accordingly. This will help break down boundaries

between what were dedicated roles and bring a range of experiences to bear in addressing recommendations for the future of the Church.

Specific recommendations in the report relate to buildings, ministry, or parish governance, and so will be taken on board by the relevant national teams in their work to support the Church across all contexts.

117. *Mr Benjamin John (St Albans)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: To what extent have national and diocesan approaches to evangelism and mission been shaped, or will be shaped, by John Hayward's important analysis at churchmodel.org.uk?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The national Church and dioceses seek out and learn from different research and analysis in developing their mission. A range of sociological and theological research around changing patterns in belief and attitudes to the Church of England are drawn on in developing key approaches in the Vision for the 2020s.

Our emphasis on missionary disciples shows how seriously we take our call as a Church and individuals to be effective witnesses to Jesus Christ. The new national resources called Everyday Faith and Everyday Witness are examples which seek to equip us all for our mission and witness.

118. *the Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the parochial fees table for 2022, there is a fee of £74 (£58 payable to DBF and £16 to PCC) for the burial of body or of ashes in a cemetery following a service in church. However, there is a fee of £30 (payable to DBF) for the burial of a body or of ashes in a cemetery where there has been no service in church. What is the rationale for this discrepancy?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The fee is £30 where the burial or interment of ashes immediately precedes or follows on from a service in church; this applies when the burial takes place on the same day as, or on the day before or the day after, a service in church.

The fee of £74 is for the burial of a body or of ashes in a cemetery following a service in church on a separate occasion. The equal funerals policy, which seeks to ensure that the cost of a funeral where there is a service in church is not greater than the costs where there is not a service in church, would suggest that these fees should be set at the same level. This will be considered when the next Parochial Fees Order is prepared in 2024.

119. *The Revd James Pitkin (Winchester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Church of England Employee and Clergy Advocates (CEECA) is the C of E grouping within the Faith Workers' Branch of Unite the Union, and currently represents over 1,600 clergy across the dioceses and at all levels of ministry, as well as over 200 lay employees within diocesan and national Church structures.

The process detailed in the most recent report of the Central Stipends Authority GS Misc 1311 for setting the National Minimum Stipend (NMS) and National Stipend Benchmark (NSB) includes engagement with “key stakeholders” about appropriate increases in the NMS and NSB. Given CEECA’s growing membership and its goal of securing better conditions to enable the ministry of all within the Church of England, will the Archbishops’ Council as Central Stipends Authority now recognise CEECA as one of those key stakeholders and commit to engaging with it in the stipend setting process?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: The NMS and NSB are set by the Archbishops’ Council on the recommendation of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee (RACSC). There is already a high level of engagement with CEECA. RACSC has met the CEECA Committee annually for many years now . The CEECA Committee also meets the NCIs’ People Director, the Director of the National Ministry Development Team, and the RACSC Secretary three times a year. At present, however, only around 20% of stipendiary clergy are members of CEECA. We also need to have regard to the views of clergy elected to this Synod.

The NCIs have a formal agreement for collective bargaining, including remuneration, which covers only staff employed under the joint employment arrangements. This formal recognition includes Unite, the union which includes CEECA members. Dioceses are separately responsible for setting and agreeing the remuneration for clergy and their lay staff.

The Revd Sam Maginnis (Chelmsford): I should probably declare an interest. I am asking this question as the Chair of the CEECA Executive. Dr Spence, thank you for your answer. Given, as you say, that CEECA now represents 20% of stipendiary clergy - and growing - and also lay Church of England employees, would the Archbishops’ Council encourage diocesan boards of finance to engage with CEECA in making decisions about remuneration and terms of service locally?

Canon Dr John Spence: I will have to take advice from Archbishops’ Council on that.

The Revd James Pitkin (Winchester): I also declare an interest. I work with Sam Maginnis in CEECA. Recognising that the RACSC has, indeed, since 2016 invited CEECA to be present for a small part of their meeting once a year, can Canon Spence indicate how much consultation on the proposals relating to the setting of stipend levels at a national level can be held?

Canon Dr John Spence: I shall respond in writing on that. I am sorry, I cannot help on that, I do not know. And you are not here to offer me to buy you a beer. As there is no room at the bar left after Mark, we are stuck anyway.

120. *The Revd Canon James Blandford-Baker (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How many posts in the NCIs have attached to them Occupational Requirements, and how has that number changed over the last five years?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Only certain posts, typically senior roles, within the NCIs require an Occupational Requirement (OR). Posts are assessed at the recruitment stage, each time a role is advertised, to determine whether an OR applies. Based on recruitment over the past five years, the number of senior posts (considered to be Bands 0-2) recruited with an OR are:

2017 – 25 posts filled, 12 with an OR
2018 – 17 posts filled, 5 with an OR
2019 – 31 posts filled, 6 with an OR
2020 – 25 posts filled, 1 with an OR
2021 – 24 posts filled, 5 with an OR
2022 – 11 posts filled, 3 with an OR

Analysis of our senior recruitment prior to 2017 identified a further 10 posts with a OR, equating to a total of 42 staff.

The Revd Canon James Blandford-Baker: Hoping to extract a free pint. Given the very large reduction in occupational requirements in the National Church Institutions, can you tell me what the explanation or rationale for that has been?

Canon Dr John Spence: My understanding from the HR function at Church House is that we are adhering to the occupational requirements piece and it may be that over time the law itself has required a very greater devotion to where occupational requirements are absolutely appropriate. I am satisfied from all that I have been told that, wherever it is appropriate, we are including that in the job description.

121. *The Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How many FTE staff in total deal with communications in Church House?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Current FTE headcount for the Communications department is 10.

There are a further 10 FTE headcount in Digital with 3 current open vacancies.

Communications is funded by a variety of departments and budgets within the wider Church, which is reflected in the department's structure.

The Comms team manages media outreach, internal and stakeholder communications, safeguarding communications, financial communications for the Pensions Board and the

Church Commissioners, support for the Lords Spiritual, updates to diocesan comms teams and 5 annual reports. Church House Publishing also publishes a full range of resources and materials for clergy and the wider public.

The Digital team is responsible for the full range of social media, web communications and content including AChurchNearYou and the creation of the weekly online service as well as digital coordination between Lambeth and Bishopthorpe.

The aim of the Comms and Digital departments is to leverage the profile of the Church and support the Church in sharing and bearing witness to the Good News of Jesus Christ.

122. *the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: I understand that the Archbishops' Council has entered into a legal agreement with Atlantic Geomatics, regarding the digitising of all baptism, marriage and funeral records, and every tombstone and memorial, to be carried out by FamilySearch, a company owned by the 'Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints' (known as the Mormons), giving them preferential access to 250 million records and the right to sell their digital copies to others.

What scrutiny was given to this agreement by the members of Archbishops' Council, and what consultation took place with other possible partners such as the Chief Archivists in Local Government, before the agreement was signed?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the of the Archbishops Council: The contract was subject to a full year of scrutiny and revision by the NCIs Legal Department and the final version was signed by the relevant Director. This is standard practice with all major legal contracts. The contract is between Atlantic Geomatics and the Archbishops' Council only and does not have any legal impact on any other part of the Church.

Staff working on the project are aware of the important part local record offices play in curating parish records. Local record offices have been involved throughout this project and will continue to be. This includes regular meetings with Chief Archivists in Local Government.

To correct an error in the question, Family Search is not party to the contract, will not own the rights and cannot sell the digital copies of the records they make.

the Ven. Mark Ireland: Thank you, Mark, for your reply, which I read as confirming that there was no sign-off at Council level and no consultation with the Chief Archivists in local government before the agreement was entered into with Atlantic Geomatics, which seems remarkable. My question relates to the last part of your answer which suggests that there was an error in my question and that Family Search - an organisation which is owned by the Mormon Church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints - is not party to the contract and will not be able to sell copies of the digital copies they make. However, your

answer contradicts a document issued by the Church of England on 17 November 2021, which I have here, which clearly states that ---

The Chair: Can we have your question, sir.

the Ven. Mark Ireland: It clearly states that My Heritage and Family Search are partners with Atlantic Geomatics and that they have the right to sell copies of the records they make to the general public to recover their investment.

The Chair: I am sorry, I need to have your question.

the Ven. Mark Ireland: So which is correct, your answer or this document, I am confused?

Mr Mark Sheard: I rather anticipated there might be a supplementary from you on this, Mark. Although, as you rightly observe, I was not across the detail of this, I have made some investigations. I understand you have already had extensive contact with Becky Clarke particularly on this. These are quite detailed matters and probably this is not the right forum for it. I would suggest nor is the bar the right forum for it either in this particular case and so I am very happy to meet with you and I will arrange for Becky also to be party to that conversation to clarify any confusion that there has been. Thank you for your question.

Mr Nic Tall (Bath & Wells): Given that the County Archivists Local Government Group whose professional expertise we rely on for the care of many of our historic records were not consulted in the drawing up of the contract with Atlantic Geomatics and that their opinion of the arrangement is that it does not serve the Church of England well ---

The Chair: What is your question?

Mr Nic Tall: --- will the Archbishops' Council undertake to meet with CALG to revisit the arrangement and work with them in drawing up a new one which serves the Church's and our partners' interests better?

Mr Mark Sheard: I think I can probably give a commitment that we are very happy to meet. The outcome of that meeting I think should be left until that meeting takes place.

123. *The Revd Canon Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given the material that members of the Archbishops' Council have been copied into relevant to the case of Dr Percy, have any of them submitted a Serious Incident Report to the Charity Commission and if not, why not?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: There have been long-running and some public exchanges with the Archbishops' Council and members of General Synod and others relating to the process followed by the National Safeguarding Team and Dr Percy. This includes some

correspondence directly with the Charity Commission, following which discussions took place between the Council and Charity Commission senior officers. Recent correspondence from Dr Percy and some Synod members sets out a difference of views as to how best to introduce independent oversight into Church of England safeguarding. The Archbishops' Council does not assess that such correspondence meets the threshold for a serious incident report.

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: Dr Harrison, thank you very much for your reply. Can I further ask, we asked for an independent inquiry into incompetent processes and suppression of evidence in the Church of England safeguarding and the setting up of bias reviews purporting to be independent. We especially request that senior Church officers, senior clergy, lawyers and PR agents are subject to such an inquiry. This includes NST, diocese ---

The Chair: I am sorry, I am not sure you are on line with the question.

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: This is 123.

The Chair: What is your question?

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: It is a supplementary to 123.

The Chair: But what is your question?

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: I am coming to that, Chair.

The Chair: No, no, I need you to get to it now.

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: Okay.

The Chair: Because time is on us, please.

The Revd Canon Simon Talbott: Dr Harrison, could you comment on what I have just said in that case, and I will leave it at that stage.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: Thank you, Simon. I did not quite get all of it. It was rather apace. We have already had some issues around the Independent Safeguarding Board in Questions 4 and 5 and we have had a fairly full conversation discussion with it. As you know, the answer to my question related to your points about the correspondence which was between certain parties in the Council. This is an ongoing process, as you know, and the whole role of the Independent Board is very much in our mind and we are keen to pursue it. I think we need perhaps to have a conversation to clarify that. I did not really get, I am afraid, all you were saying, sorry.

124. *Professor Helen King (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What were the results of the consultation process on the changes to the Canterbury CNC which closed on 31 March 2022?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: An analysis of the consultation responses can be found in GS2260.

The individual results of the consultation will not be published as explained in the privacy notice which respondents to the consultation were given, as follows:

“Your data will only be seen and analysed by the staff supporting the consultation and the Archbishops' Council. It will form the basis of a report to the Archbishops' Council.

The final proposal taken to the General Synod in July 2022 will not contain any personal data. Where it mentions responses to the consultation, data will be anonymised. It will be shared with the Anglican Communion, as well as published as part of the General Synod papers”.

This can be found in annex B of the consultation document (GS2253)

125. *Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What steps has the Archbishops' Council taken to ensure that the CNC consultation for the See of Canterbury learns from the past reviews, by Cameron, Hurd and Luce which carefully considered the balance in the national, provincial, and international roles of the Archbishop of Canterbury and how the role interacts with the roles envisaged for the See of York and the role of the Bishop of Dover?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The aim of the consultation was to gauge opinion from a wide variety of key partners on this subject, but we have taken note of these helpful reports, specifically Hurd which noted the centrality of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Communion and suggested a CNC-type process for the See of Dover had its merits.

126. *The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given that the Archbishop of Canterbury sits and votes on legislation in the Upper House of the Westminster Parliament, what expert legal and constitutional advice was taken in that regard to the proposed changes to the Canterbury CNC outlined in GS 2260 in relation to the Lords Spiritual and Church establishment more widely, as raised in paragraph 39 of GS 2260?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The matter of Lords Spiritual and Church establishment more widely is not the subject of the proposed changes to the See of Canterbury CNC, which

focus on the membership of the CNC. Advice that was needed for the review was obtained from colleagues in the Legal Office on these questions.

127. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In order to make an informed decision, may General Synod know what the process will be for the election or appointment of Communion representatives for the Canterbury CNC, and how will the diversity of Primate, priest/deacon and communicant lay representation outlined in GS 2260 para 47 be ensured?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As outlined in Notice Paper 2, the 60th Report of the Standing Orders Committee, if the Synod votes in favour of the changes outlined in GS 2260, the Standing Orders will specify that the selection of the Communion representatives will be made by the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates' Meeting of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council. The selection process will be decided by this Joint Committee, as it is now for the selection of the singular Communion representative for the See of Canterbury CNC.

The diversity of Primate, priest/deacon and communicant lay representative is covered by the drafting changes to the Standing Orders also outlined in Notice Paper 2 which says that the Communion representatives chosen must include "at least one Primate, at least one priest or deacon and at least one actual communicant lay person".

128. *Mr Jonathan Baird (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: There is a wealth of evidence (including From Anecdote to Evidence, Going Deeper & the experience of the Dioceses of London and St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) that the best way to arrest and reverse the decline in congregational numbers is to deploy stipendiary boots on the ground (and more lay people) and, in so doing, to increase revenues. In the medium term, stipendiary clergy more or less pay for themselves.

Spending plans of £447 million were announced flamboyantly in the triennial budget. Only an unspecified portion of less than the eleven percent of this spend, which has been allocated to People & Partnerships Funding, is being spent on additional ordinands. Why so small a sum?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Ordination training (IME1) is mainly funded by Vote 1 diocesan apportionment and Diocesan Maintenance grants. The Additional Ordinands Funding (AOF) provides additional funding for this training from the Church Commissioners. This enables the Council to balance the training of sufficient clergy to meet Diocesan predictions of the number of clergy posts required, the number of vocations being discerned, and the implications of the Vision and Strategy priorities. In particular, the proposed level of AOF enables the anticipated increase in the number of ministers in training to be resourced without causing a significant increase in diocesan apportionment.

If vocations to ordained ministry increase further, then the spending on Additional Ordinands Funding within the People and Partnerships funding will also increase.

129. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Does the Archbishops' Council have any policy on the optimum number of churches and parishes that one vicar should be responsible for?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: No. Patterns of ministry deployment are generally a matter for dioceses to decide, in light of local needs.

130. *Mr Christopher Townsend (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What action has been taken, or is being taken, to build recruitment processes which ensure that appointable UKME/GMH candidates for senior posts within dioceses, NCIs and Strategic Programmes will include a representative number of candidates drawn from evangelical and traditional catholic traditions?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: We have taken and are planning further action to improve the representation of people from UKME/GMH backgrounds across the NCIs more broadly including a specific focus on senior roles. This includes a cross-departmental working group and the ongoing employment of a diversity specialist to shape policy and practice. However most senior roles within the NCIs do not have an

Occupational Requirement under the Equality Act 2010 so it is not appropriate to gather information on church tradition in these cases. Individual dioceses will take their own approach to this work with reference to Church tradition.

131. *Mr Christopher Townsend (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What processes will be implemented to ensure that the target minimum of 30% UKME/GMH participants in future cohorts of the Strategic Leadership Development Programme will include a representative number of candidates drawn from evangelical and traditional catholic traditions?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops Council: While the processes for identifying participants on the next SLDP programme have not yet been designed, the Development and Appointments Group and the Ministry Development Team are mindful of the recommendations within the *From Lament to Action* Report and are currently considering how these can best be implemented. This includes a desire to ensure that there is a diverse pool of candidates including representation across church traditions. As in previous years we will work with bishops (including those providing extended episcopal care) to help them identify and consider potential new participants.

132. *The Revd Canon Paul Bradbury (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It is 3 years since General Synod carried a motion which "encouraged every parish and Diocese to be part of [a] movement forming new disciples and new congregations through a contextual approach to mission with the unreached in their communities" (GS 2142). GS 2142 also stated a Ministry Division target of doubling and doubling again the number of pioneers (lay and ordained) by 2027. Since then, the post of National Pioneer Development Adviser has been lost and the oversight of the Greenhouse project, encouraging and enabling fresh expressions in 10 Dioceses, reduced to merely 1-day a week oversight.

What is being done to invest in pioneering and fresh expressions at a national level to ensure that the aims of GS 2142 continue to be held?

133. *The Revd Canon Paul Bradbury (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It is 3 years since General Synod carried a motion which "encouraged every parish and Diocese to be part of [a] movement forming new disciples and new congregations through a contextual approach to mission with the unreached in their communities" (GS 2142). GS 2142 also stated a Ministry Division target of doubling and doubling again the number of pioneers (lay and ordained) by 2027. Since then, the post of National Pioneer Development Adviser has been lost and the oversight of the Greenhouse project, encouraging and enabling fresh expressions in 10 Dioceses, reduced to merely 1-day a week oversight.

What progress is being made toward the targets aimed at increasing the number of pioneers across the Church of England?

The Bishop of Chester (the Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops Council: With permission I will answer questions 132 and 133 together

As part of being a mixed ecology Church we have set ourselves the ambitious target of 10,000 new worshipping communities across the four areas of home, work/education, social and digital. This emerged as a direct result of GS2142. Therefore at the local, diocesan and national level we are working to fulfil this. The Greenhouse Project is key to this and has more staff time dedicated to it with a full team of consultants rolling it out. We have a mixed ecology working group led by Dave Male & Bishop Mike Harrison to work on next steps and a new team of six Bishops to champion this work across the Church. The newly announced Triennium Funding will give capacity for more new communities and more pioneers, both lay and ordained.

The Revd Canon Paul Bradbury: Bishop, thank you for your reply. Does the aim of doubling and then doubling again by 2026 the number of Pioneers in the C of E still stand? And will the post of National Pioneer Development Adviser be replaced full-time to enable this aim to be met?

The Bishop of Chester: Thank you for your supplementary, not least because you rescue me from not having a third or fourth bite at the cherry of answering these questions. I think the aim does still stand. In terms of the replacement of staff, we are working on that right at the moment. The thing I would like to say to you and to Synod is, when I spoke to Bishop Mike about this to say, "Are you happy with this answer?", his response, characteristically, was: "I'm not happy but I am content". And I think the reality is we are working on this and we are trying to do our best.

134. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Despite the national Church's parliament not having had the chance to vote for or against the draft Vision and Strategy, national Church Institutions are being tasked by the Secretary General to implement the Vision and Strategy as if it has been passed. This has so far resulted in wide-scale reorganisation of NCIs, closure of the Life Events team, a freeze on recruitment to new posts, redundancies, and a significant reduction in Synodical staffing. Again, at this session, the Vision and Strategy document isn't coming to General Synod for a for or against vote. There are many cases cited in my letter to the *Church Times* (20 May) outlining where the General Synod has not been – or is no longer – discussing, discerning and deciding the direction of the Church of England.

Can the Presidents explain why these changes have been made without any endorsement or engagement from the whole body of General Synod?

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied as *Joint President of the Archbishops' Council:* The Vision and Strategy deliberately did not proceed from a small caucus but was prayerfully discerned with hundreds of people, lay and ordained. We have continually sought to engage Synod in this ongoing process along with Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the College of Bishops. Although I must admit Covid and Zoom has meant we have had less group work at Synod than I hoped. I pray the workshops on Younger and More Diverse on Sunday will enable Synod to discuss and discern further. Our prayer to be a Jesus Christ shaped church is very simple, built around three key priorities and a church which is simpler, humbler and bolder. Our energy needs now to be focussed on discussing, discerning and deciding how we turn this into actions which enable us to become a people shaped by Jesus, activated for his mission and sent out to be his witnesses.

135. *Mrs Debra Mclsaac (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How are the recommendations made in the *Released for Mission: Growing the Rural Church* Report GS Misc 1127 relating to the c11,500 rural churches which comprise approximately 66% of all parishes in the country being integrated into the Vision and Strategy including what the Report refers to as "an incarnational approach to the relationship between church and the community at large"?

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied as *Joint President of the Archbishops' Council:* The Vision and Strategy work is looking forward to the future for all the church including the rural church and involved in the consultation

were many from rural benefices. The key aspects of the Vision and Strategy include its aspiration that we fully represent the communities we serve, with a parish system revitalised for mission so there is a pathway for every person into an accessible and contextual expression of Church. This reflects the experience captured in GS Misc 1127 particularly the incarnational approach to the relationship between Church and the community at large.

136. *The Revd Marcus Walker (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Would the Presidents detail the process by which "A Vision and Strategy for the Church of England in the 2020s" has received approval or assent by the General Synod of the Church of England?

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell) replied as *Joint President of the Archbishops' Council*: Simply this is a vision that has emerged from the Church at every level to enable the Church to witness to Jesus and see the transformation of our nation. I don't think it belongs to any one group or body, but many Synod members have been involved in this prayerful and prophetic exercise. Who here today doesn't want to be part of a church which sends people out to live for Christ, a church which connects with every part of our population, a church where children and young people experience the welcome embrace of our Saviour and where locally, we look like the communities we serve. What has emerged is the essence of who we are and seek to be - a church that is Jesus Christ shaped - if we could become more Jesus Christ shaped, we become signs of the Kingdom to our nation and world.

The Revd Marcus Walker: Archbishop, given how much of the funding of the Church is being governed by the Vision and Strategy document and given that so far this General Synod has not approved it in its entirety, could you tell us when we could have a debate with an amendable motion so that this can be fully discussed and approved and, I am sure, passed?

The Archbishop of York: Marcus, thank you. Obviously, I cannot tell you that because that would be a decision for the Business Committee and I would like to give a longer answer but it is 2 minutes to 7. But it is my hope and intention that the General Synod is fully involved in the development of these ideas. As I think I made as clear as I could do in the time available in the speech this morning, this has been led by the bishops and the diocesan secretaries. It has involved huge consultation. There have been numerous Synod debates. Much of the actual bold outcomes and substance of this draws absolutely specifically on existing Synod motions that actually we never saw through on. But, of course, we must continue to let this evolve. The vision, nobody is debating that. The priorities that flow from it need constant debate, constant evolution. I cannot talk any longer. I will take away what you have said.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Supplementary.

The Chair: We really need to close this item, Sam, I am sorry. Thank you, Archbishop.

Questions not reached during Synod.

137. *The Revd Joshua Askwith (Chester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How does Growing Faith fit in with the national vision and strategy and how do you ensure it is simpler, bolder, humbler and Jesus-shaped and Jesus-centred?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Growing Faith is at the heart of the national vision to be a church which is younger and more diverse and provides the connection point for this vision and strategy and our wider work in education. Growing Faith promotes culture change which brings church, school, and household into partnership for mission to support the discipleship of children and young people and aims to create a culture of instinctive engagement with children, young people and families. It seeks to:

- catalyse deep and lasting culture change which prioritises the needs, voice, development and impact of children, young people, and families. (Imaginative Practices).
- deliver programmes, networks, research, and resources focused on the faith development of children, young people, and families (Encounters with Jesus).
- embed long-term strategic relationships between schools / colleges, churches, and households at local, regional, and national levels (Connected Communities).

138. *The Revd Joshua Askwith (Chester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How can the Church of England ensure that any money available for work with children and youth be made accessible to the parishes where it is most needed?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It is always our desire that money for work with children and young people finds its way to the local church to ensure young lives are transformed by their encounter with Jesus Christ. This happens though through a variety of ways involving different parts of the Church to ensure we have the right people in the right places to fulfil our ambition of doubling the numbers of children and young people over the next ten years. At national level, investment over the next ten years will prioritise this work. It is all our responsibilities as the Church to ensure that money for work with children and youth is prioritised and made accessible at a local, diocesan and national level.

139. *Mr Matt Orr (Bath & Wells)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Following on from GS 2161, where the final part of the motion agreed we'd receive an update in two years regarding the progress of evangelism and discipleship with under 16s, when will the analysis of progress, statistics and findings be made publicly available in order for us to learn and assess how best to grow our churches younger?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As General Synod requested, further work has been done and

qualitative and quantitative research conducted by Savanta ComRes in 2021 and 2022. This research, shaped with the input of Synod members, was with churches of a variety of sizes, geographies and traditions who had grown their engagement with young people between 2014 and 2019. Findings will be presented at one of the Younger and More Diverse workshops on Sunday afternoon and made publicly available afterwards.

140. *Mrs Clare Williams (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What, if any, provision is being made in the new NCI structures for specific support for children and youth ministry at a National level?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Children and Young People are at the very forefront of our work at every level. In the Education Team there are four new posts in the new Growing Faith Foundation led by Lucy Moore. In the Vision and Strategy team every job description has Children and Young People as part of their role. One team member will have specific responsibility for ensuring the team does all it can to enable the doubling of numbers of children and young people locally over the next 10 years. The Ministry Development team intends to increase support for this vital area of ministry. Seven bishops will champion the priority of Younger and More diverse nationally. We are also working closely with various organisations and networks with expertise in this area including Youthscape and the Missional Youth Church Network to examine how we can support and resource them in supporting children and youth ministry locally.

141. *Mrs Amanda Robbie (Lichfield)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How does the Church House communications team decide what to post on social media, and is there is a strategy paper that outlines how those decisions are made, especially those around what secular festivals and events they choose to mark?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Church of England uses its digital platforms to encourage and inform clergy, lay leaders and regular churchgoers in their faith and the life of the Church of England, but also as an evangelism opportunity for members of the public, encouraging them to explore the Christian faith and find a local church via AChurchNearYou.com. A team of lay and ordained colleagues from Church House work on resources and content that's shared on the Church's social channels, such as the weekly online services, the reflections during campaigns and invitations to church. In regard to secular festivals and events the Comms team relies on a combination of factors including: new opportunities, precedents set by previous postings, ongoing and specific relevance to the news cycle and uptake in previous years.

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

142. *Mrs Gill Verschoyle (Salisbury)* asked the Church Commissioners: Why are the Church Commissioners funding Vision and Strategy programmes as part of the Triennium

Spending and Indicative 10-year plan before the General Synod has agreed any of the proposals relating to Vision and Strategy?

The Bishop of Manchester (the Rt Revd David Walker) replied as Deputy Chair of the Church Commissioners: The Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council are the trustee bodies with statutory responsibility for making decisions on the distribution of national funding.

Their decisions follow a thorough process. For the two most recent triennia the Commissioners and the Council have established a time-limited Triennium Funding Working Group (TFWG) to prepare recommendations for the spending plans. The TFWG brought together members of these two trustee bodies and members of the House of Bishops, reflecting the particular role of bishops in leading dioceses in an episcopal church. The TFWG consisted of eleven members, most of whom are General Synod members, and included laity, clergy and bishops.

The Church Commissioners and Archbishops' Council have supported the strategic priorities and bold outcomes of the Vision and Strategy, which emerged from wide discussions across the Church and which were discussed and shaped by Synod members. They agreed with and adopted the recommendations of the TFWG, which included funding support for this Vision & Strategy.

143. *Dr Cathy Rhodes (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners: What new resources will the Church Commissioners make available to help parishes and dioceses engage with the Routemap to Net Zero Carbon, with particular reference to poorer dioceses?

The Bishop of Manchester (the Rt Revd David Walker) replied as Deputy Chair of the Church Commissioners: A range of new video case studies published on the Church of England website show what is possible and provide inspiration.

A Net Zero Carbon Resource Hub has been made available for dioceses to share plans, documents, and information, so they do not need to 'reinvent the wheel'. Packs explaining what the Routemap means for clergy, schools, et cetera, will be launched later this year. Webinars will run in August and September to share key points.

The Routemap milestones include wider actions for the NCIs on engagement and capacity-building, which include creating further communications materials; training, including expanding and promoting the successful webinar series; and producing templates.

In terms of financial resources, significant additional funding has recently been made available for net zero work. Decisions will be taken later in the year and into 2023 about how it will be allocated, but capacity-building for dioceses as appropriate to their resources is anticipated to be a key part of this.

144. *Mr Paul Ronson (Blackburn)* asked the Church Commissioners: How much money has been spent by the respective NCIs on the Vision and Strategy, Transforming Effectiveness, Emerging Church, Simpler NCIs and Governance programmes? In particular, how many staff are employed by each of these work programmes, and at what pay grade?

The Bishop of Manchester (the Rt Revd David Walker) replied as Deputy Chair of the Church Commissioners: The total cost to May 2022 is £1.5m of a total budget of £2.7m for 2021 and 2022 with expenditure reflected in the Archbishops' Council but funded almost entirely through the virement of Church Commissioners' funding from areas of underspend within the 2020-22 triennium spending plans. This includes staff costs, research and scoping work and the costs of implementing changes.

The majority of this cost to date relates to projects within Transforming Effectiveness (Simpler NCIs and Simpler Support for Dioceses and Worshipping Communities and Location/Accommodation) which are on track to deliver annual savings of over £3m.

In June 2022 the programmes employed 5 people, all on a time-limited basis:

- 1 Project director (Governance): Band 0
- 2 Senior project managers (Location/Accommodation and Simpler NCIs/Simpler Support): Band 3
- 1 Technology lead (Simpler Support for Dioceses) to have resilient, fit-for-purpose technology solutions and reduce costs: Band 3
- 1 HR business partner supporting the Simpler NCIs project: Band 3

Two further roles supporting Governance, at Band 3 and Band 5, will be advertised shortly.

145. *Mr Andrew Orange (Winchester)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given the requirement, under Total Return Accounting, that the permanent endowment should grow in line with inflation over the long term to protect the needs of future beneficiaries, and given also the current expectation of double-digit inflation coupled with lacklustre stock market performance, would the Commissioners agree that the money available for distribution and spending will have to be constrained in the coming years and that – to the extent funded by the Church Commissioners – announcements of next triennium funding are contingent on this point and therefore not certain to be delivered?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The base level of the Church Commissioners' endowment at the end of 2021 was £2.5bn. This is adjusted each year by inflation and reduced to the extent of pensions paid from capital. The base level being significantly less than the total fund provides some mitigation against the impact of inflation as far as Total Return Accounting is concerned.

The Commissioners' distribution policy has smooth and stable distributions as a priority. As part of this we aim to give a full triennium's notice of any reduction in distributions that might prove necessary following an adverse actuarial review which could occur following

sustained investment market weakness or a significant deterioration in assumptions such as higher long-term inflation.

However, a relatively short term burst of high inflation, say a year or two, is much more likely to impact the purchasing power of the Commissioners' distributions than the absolute level of those distributions.

146. *The Revd Dr Tom Woolford (Blackburn)* asked the Church Commissioners: In the February 2022 Sessions, I asked the Church Commissioners (Q109) "What circumstances in the situation of the ministry needs of the national Church would trigger a suspension in the normal parameters of fund distribution by the Church Commissioners in order to make exceptional levels of contributions?" The First Estates Commissioner answered that the Assets Committee in making a recommendation "aim for distributions at the maximum sustainable level" and explained the process and some of the rationale.

I humbly seek to resubmit my question, since I mean to ask about circumstances in which the normal parameters for disbursement would be suspended and funds distributed beyond what would prove to be a sustainable level in the (very) long term.

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: In determining the level of distributions from the Church's endowment managed by the Church Commissioners, the Commissioners' Assets Committee has a statutory obligation to have regard to independent actuarial advice. The need for actuarial advice cannot be suspended without a change in the law which we consider would be unwise.

The trustees have a fiduciary duty to act in the interests of beneficiaries, including balancing the needs of current and future beneficiaries.

The principle of intergenerational equity is fundamental in determining the level of distributions. In determining distributions for the next triennium, this principle has been reviewed and interpreted more broadly by including qualitative as well as quantitative measures. This, together with the above-target investment returns that have been achieved, has enabled the Commissioners to plan to distribute sums 30% higher in 2023-25 than in the current triennium, including distributing some funding on a strictly time limited basis over and above the level which could be afforded on an ongoing basis, whilst fulfilling their fiduciary duties. For example, supporting net Zero work will cost money in the present but we trust it will provide benefits to future (as well as current) generations.

147. *The Revd Canon Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities & TElS)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given the recent apology from the Archbishop of Canterbury regarding Queen Anne's bounty's links to slavery, would the Church Commissioners take steps to do a thorough investigation of all its current investment portfolio, to ensure that they do not have any links to 'modern day slavery practices' and commit to an ethically responsible investment practice?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Slavery was and continues to be a shameful and horrific sin. As a responsible investor, we have been addressing the risks of modern slavery for several years across our investments. Listed equities are screened for human rights risks, including modern slavery, prompting engagement with companies if incidents are identified.

With the “Votes Against Slavery Project” we engage FTSE350 companies that fail to comply with the UK Modern Slavery Act.

Participating in the “Find It, Fix It, Prevent It” project, we engage directly with companies to help them develop better processes for finding, fixing and preventing slavery. We also work with stakeholders to develop data sources and tools to help investors understand the issue, and we engage policy makers to promote appropriate regulatory frameworks to deal with the issue.

Our teams review how labour is utilised across our real assets like farms and supported The Clewer Initiative and the development of the “Farm Work Welfare App”.

148. *The Revd Ruth Newton (Leeds)* asked the Church Commissioners/Chair of the Pensions Board: A motion passed at General Synod in July 2018 called on the NIBs to divest by 2023 from those fossil fuel companies that are not aligned with the Paris Agreement. Do the NIBs intend to do this and, if so, by what date in 2023, and what detailed criteria will they use for determining whether a company is aligned with the Paris agreement?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The National Investing Bodies (NIBs) will divest from oil and gas companies which are not aligned with the Paris Agreement by July 2023 (the fifth anniversary of the Synod Motion).

We continue to use the Transition Pathway Initiative analysis to assess whether companies are Paris aligned.

149. *The Revd Sue Lucas (Chelmsford)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given the commitment of this Synod for the C of E to be Carbon Neutral by 2030, and that, despite many years of engagement by the Church of England with fossil fuel companies as a shareholder, there is clear evidence that such companies are not taking sufficient action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions quickly enough, and the recent decision by the Church of Ireland Synod to divest from fossil fuel companies, what is the justification for the Church Commissioners’ strategy of continuing to invest in fossil fuel companies on behalf of the Church of England?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: As per July 2018 Synod Motion, the National Investing Bodies (NIBs) will divest from fossil fuel companies not aligned with Paris by 2023.

As noted when the NIBs updated Synod in July 2021, we set a series of progressively higher interim hurdles which has led to some companies improving, and divestment from others.

In January 2022 the NIBs divested from 28 high emitting companies which did not meet the most recent hurdles, while 9 companies improved to meet the 2021 hurdles. Following this round of divestment, we remain invested in a small number of fossil fuel companies and continue to engage with them.

150. *The Revd Mark Bennet (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: A year ago, the Church Commissioners were among the shareholders that voted three new Directors onto the Board of ExxonMobil, and yet recent research from Global Witness and Oil Change International has revealed that Exxon plans to spend \$83 billion on new oil and gas projects between now and 2030. In the light of the decision of the Pensions Board to disinvest from ExxonMobil, what progress have the Church Commissioners been able to make to ensure alignment with the Paris Agreement? “

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: We continue to engage with Exxon, and to monitor and review progress made by the company in aligning with the Paris Agreement.

In January 2022 Exxon released its Advancing Climate Solutions - 2022 Progress Report. While this report indicated some progress, it does not go far enough. We will continue to press the company to commit to taking responsibility for, and to reducing, scope 3 emissions and to show a genuine strategic shift to align capital expenditure to investment in climate solutions, other than those that mitigate business-as-usual emissions.

If we do not see more progress by the end of 2022, we will divest.

151. *The Revd Canon Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities & TElS)* asked the Church Commissioners: What steps the Church Commissioners have taken to challenge ExxonMobil’s lobbying activities to curb the activities of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The Church Commissioners are members of Climate Action100+ (CA100+), the collaborative climate engagement initiative. We have either been Exxon engagement lead or supported the Exxon engagement lead for several years.

In 2021 CA100+ expanded its engagement to address climate lobbying activities. This includes engaging with companies on the following questions:

- whether they have a Paris-Agreement-aligned climate lobbying position for all of their direct lobbying activities;
- whether they have Paris-Agreement-aligned lobbying expectations for their trade associations and disclose their trade association memberships;

· whether they have processes to ensure their trade associations lobby in accordance with the Paris Agreement.

We continue to engage with Exxon, and to monitor and review progress made by the company in aligning with the Paris Agreement. If we do not see more progress by the end of 2022, we will divest.

152. *Dr Cathy Rhodes (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given the National Investing Bodies' pledge to reconsider their shareholding in TotalEnergies if it did not exit Russia, in the letter sent to Total's Chair and CEO, and the CEO's subsequent statement that it will continue to buy Russian gas, how long will the NIBs continue to invest in TotalEnergies?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The Church Commissioners and the Pensions Board continue to engage with TotalEnergies related to its approach to Russia, in line with our Human Rights Policy. Following the letter we sent to the CEO, we note the company issued a statement that provided further clarity as to the approach it was taking relating to its existing assets in Russia, committing to gradually suspend its activities in Russia.

We have not concluded our engagement with the company and both the Commissioners and Pensions Board currently remain invested in TotalEnergies.

153. *The Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester)* asked the Church Commissioners: What steps are being taken by our Church Commissioners to increase tree growing on Church-owned land, in line with comparable landowners and their commitments to address the Climate Change crisis?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: 114,000 acres of the Commissioners' global land holdings were forest as of December 2021. In the UK our woodland coverage was 24.9%, over 25,000 acres. We are committed to increasing tree cover and have planted 819 acres of new woodland in the UK since 2014. Late last year we purchased a parcel of land in southern Wales with the intention of establishing a new woodland with 85,000 trees (subject to planting permissions).

Additionally, there are reviews ongoing across the rural portfolio to assess opportunities for riparian tree planting; increasing woodland cover - especially where wildlife corridors can be improved and created; as well as improved management for biodiversity and timber. We encourage our farming tenants to consider tree planting opportunities where they sit alongside a wider sustainable farming business.

We have forged close working relationships with both the Forestry Commission and Forestry England, and regularly meet with Institutional Peers including the Duchy and Crown Estates to share best practice.

154. *The Revd Robert Lawrance (Newcastle)* asked the Church Commissioners: Are the Church Commissioners willing and able to implement a mechanism to fast-track amendments to current Farm Business Tenancy Agreements to allow farmers to opt to increase tree-planting within specified hedges, margins and agroforestry schemes?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner. New farm business tenancies have been updated to include a special condition section, which can allow and encourage farmers to improve their hedgerows, incorporate tree-planting within specified hedges and margins.

We encourage existing tenants to improve their hedges where possible including tree-planting. Tenants are encouraged to approach us and our agents regarding any potential agroforestry schemes, and these will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

We will continue to review our farm business tenancies and as demonstrated are willing to update these when appropriate.

155. *The Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: In light of the policy recommended by the UK's Climate Change Committee and supported by CPRE to increase hedgerow cover by 40% by 2050, what steps have the Church Commissioners taken to increase the planting and restoration of hedgerows on their land?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner. We encourage our tenants to restore, create and gap their hedgerows when appropriate, with our agents assisting and providing consent when it is required.

We are developing a sustainability strategy for the rural portfolio within which we hope to develop a hedgerow strategy. A key aim of this strategy will be to encourage hedgerow improvements to be achieved in collaboration with our tenants.

We encourage our tenants to engage with the evolving Environmental Land Management scheme and existing Countryside Stewardship schemes where hedgerow management is an important element.

Finally, we have agreed a joint project with an interfaith group whose volunteers will carry out a hedgerow planting scheme alongside our tenants at various farms in the Autumn 2022.

156. *the Ven. Elizabeth Snowden (Chelmsford)* asked the Church Commissioners: How many hectares of the Church Commissioners' rural land is peatland, and please could you outline the strategy and timeline in place for its restoration and protection?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner. The Commissioners own landholdings which cover areas of peat-based soils across the

Cambridgeshire Fens including farms at Ely and Peterborough, all of which are let to tenants who have direct control of the management of the land.

Our rural asset managers have been working with our farm tenants directly, and visiting these farms, to seek to understand how the Commissioners can support tenants in improving the peaty soils they are responsible for, with a visit to Ely as recently as June. Importantly, we are engaged with the newly established “Fenland SOIL” group which is in turn seeking to engage with policy makers and seek to improve data around peatland, as well as update existing peatland maps.

More specifically, the Commissioners are supporting the “Fenland Farmer’s Dialogue” workstream which is a forum for learning and collaboration between Fenland Farmers and subsequent learning will be fed into the Lowland Agricultural Peat Task Force (LAPTF).

157. *the Ven. Elizabeth Snowden (Chelmsford)* asked the Church Commissioners: What is the current level of Church Commissioner engagement with the tenant farmers on its rural land to encourage, enable and support them to adopt regenerative farming strategies?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: We encourage our tenants to adopt regenerative farming practices through both amendments to tenancy agreements and engagement.

Our long-term farm business tenancies (FBT) have been updated to include specific soil clauses which oblige tenants to carry out soil surveys at the beginning, midway and the end of the tenancy agreements to ensure the soil does not degrade.

We encourage regenerative farming practices through clauses within the special conditions section of our FBT, these are farm holding specific and include hedgerow management, field margin management and data sharing.

When publicly marketing farms for let, our farm particulars clearly set out our desire for a sustainable farmer. A full referencing and tender process is conducted to ensure new tenants share our carbon and biodiversity goals.

We have started engaging with existing tenants and understanding their sustainability credentials. Our emerging sustainability strategy will set out how through further collaboration with new and existing tenants we will encourage regenerative farming.

158. *The Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester)* asked the Church Commissioners: Following their response to a question at the November 2021 General Synod, have the Church Commissioners now decided whether to sign the 30x30 commitment to protect at least 30% of nature by 2030, as the UK Government and many others have already committed to do?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: We are ensuring that we take a full and considered approach to all formal commitments that are made, but the Commissioners' ambitions remain aligned with supporting nature recovery and biodiversity enhancement across our real estate assets. We have not signed up to 30x30 yet as we have a let portfolio and we are assessing the timeframe for change alongside our tenants.

We are seeking to take a rounded view of biodiversity improvements alongside greenhouse gas reduction, and must do so within the context of UK food security and a productive farmland environment.

Since the previous Synod, the Commissioners are very pleased to have joined the Wildfowl and Wetland Trusts' "Blue Recovery Leaders Group". This select group is seeking to create over 100,000 hectares of networks of healthy wetlands across the UK. Our rural asset managers have already seen projects being delivered including the creation of "field scrapes" within a farmland environment and working with organisations including the Wildlife Trust and Natural England to create new nature friendly habitats, many of which are within protected landscapes.

159. *The Revd Anne Brown (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: What are the main findings of the Church Commissioners' Natural Capital Assessment and when will it be published?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: This comprehensive assessment looked at a range of areas including biodiversity, agricultural productivity, SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest) and greenhouse gas emissions. The findings and recommendations are being reviewed in detail and will form a key basis of our approach to sustainability and net zero commitments and we aim to begin reporting in 2023.

160. *Mrs Gill Frigiero (Coventry)* asked the Church Commissioners: What steps are the NIBs taking to increase investment in renewable energy and energy efficiency, especially in light of the climate and cost-of-living crises that many of our congregations and global neighbours are facing?

Mr Alan Smith (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The team has been investing in renewable energy and energy efficiency investments since the establishment of the infrastructure portfolio in 2013.

The infrastructure portfolio totalled £130m in value at the end of 2021, and includes wind, solar, recycling and EV charging investments predominantly in the US, UK and Europe.

The team continues to focus on new opportunities to deliver "win-win" opportunities in the climate-related infrastructure space.

Within the UK land holdings, we have actively pursued both wind and solar opportunities. A 168MW wind scheme is currently nearing completion on our forest land in Scotland which has created local employment and will deliver sustainable renewable power to 108,000 homes. We additionally own 9MW of renewable generation in England & Wales and 31MW of operational wind power in Scotland. In the US we are working with developers to agree options for potential solar development on our timberland investments - in particular in Virginia.

PENSIONS BOARD

161. *Mrs Abigail Ogier (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Given the International Energy Agency (IEA) and UN warnings that there can be no new fossil fuel developments if we are to limit global heating to 1.5 degrees Celsius, what are the NIBs doing to raise concerns about Shell's plans to develop the new Jackdaw gas field in the UK North Sea?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: Whether particular gas fields are developed and in line with UK Government net zero commitments is the responsibility of government regulators. Due to the work of the Pensions Board in developing a net zero standard for the oil and gas sector the Board have been invited to present to the North Sea Transition Authority. We will be raising the need for demonstrable alignment of licensing with the delivery of government net zero commitments.

162. *The Revd Robert Lawrance (Newcastle)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Following the recent encouraging announcement that the Pensions Board is working with twelve leading UK pension funds to support the climate transition in emerging markets, what specific projects and regions are the Pensions Board looking to invest in as a result of this initiative?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: Considerable work is underway amongst the group of 12 UK pension funds that have been convened by the Pensions Board to understand the nature of transition underway in key emerging economies. We have been supported in this work by the UK Government Department for Work and Pensions and are in discussion with the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office. It is too soon to be more specific on projects and regions although it is the intention of the Group to detail our approach ahead of COP27 in Egypt later this year.

163. *Mr Nigel Lea-Wilson (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: What is the level of episcopal pension and what are the criteria for qualification in terms of years of service in office, and how do these both compare with other clergy?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: Under the Rules of the Church of England Funded Pension Scheme, the benefits payable at retirement are determined by the pensionable service of the member, when that service was completed, and the National Minimum Stipend in the preceding year to retirement.

Currently the pension payable to a stipendiary member of the scheme is £12,632pa from age 68, assuming the maximum pensionable full-time service of 41.5 years. The scheme also provides a lump sum of £37,896.

The holders of certain offices receive a pension based on the multiple of the pension above, but not a multiple of the lump sum. The multiples are set out below:

Archbishops of Canterbury and York	2
Bishop of London	1.8
Other diocesan bishops	1.5
Suffragan bishops, deans, provosts and archdeacons	1.25

The Rules of the Scheme, which include the benefits payable, are made by the General Synod, not by the Pensions Board.

164. *the Ven. Dr Adrian Youings (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: How long, on average, is it taking to assess an application for clergy retirement on the grounds of ill health?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: The time depends on the nature of the member's condition and the Board's ability to obtain the medical evidence required to determine whether the individual qualifies for an ill-health pension under the Scheme Rules.

Whilst we prefer to obtain advice from the member's GP or consultant in assessing the application, there is often a problem with the speed of the advice being received, and sometimes by the quality of it. Where necessary, we may need to clarify the advice received or seek the opinion of our own specialist advisers. Once clear advice is to hand, we assess and notify the member of the decision within five working days.

It is not uncommon for cases to take between three and six months to be completed.

165. *the Ven. Dr Adrian Youings (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: In the last three years, how many retiring clergy have not been able to move into their CHARM house at the point of retirement, and what is the average, and range, of delay?

Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: National and regional restrictions significantly affected conveyancing, property works, and moves for much of 2020 and early 2021. Our answer therefore focuses on moves into CHARM in the year to 1 July 2022.

We encourage clergy who might need housing to apply early, up to 5 years before retirement.

In the last year, 35 households moved into CHARM. 24 had applied 12 months+ before retirement, of which 15 moves occurred as planned. The other moves were delayed on average by 4 months (some by 1 month; others for c.8 months). Delays were due to difficulties in purchasing properties in an over-heated market; challenges with completing refurbishment and ill-health adaptation works caused by labour and supplies shortages following the pandemic and Brexit; and accelerated retirement dates.

A further 8 moves took place where applications occurred post-retirement. 3 moves completed where applications were <12 months. Increased demand is forecast for 2022-24.

SECRETARY GENERAL

166. *Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford)* asked the Secretary General: Given the rising costs of venue hire and food in London, most fringe meetings organisers now have to charge more for a catered meeting than can be claimed under expenses. Can the expense limit be re-considered and increased so no-one is excluded from playing a full part in General Synod because of their income?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: We do not want any member to feel excluded from playing a full part in General Synod because of their income. Any member who cannot attend Synod due to financial issues should speak to their diocese in the first instance.

The limit that can be claimed for expenses are reviewed regularly and we aim to ensure that they reflect costs as much as possible, whilst operating within the guidance set out by the HMRC.

If financial issues are constraining members from holding a fringe meeting, other options such as uncatered meetings or online meetings can be considered.

167. *The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Secretary General: In the light of the announcement of recent redundancies at senior level in the national Church Institutions (NCIs), could Synod be informed of the current ratio of men to women in senior roles and how the current ratio compares with figures for the past decade?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The NCIs consider senior staff to be those employed in Bands 0-2. Currently, as at 30 June 2022, the ratio of women to men at senior level is 42:58. We only have data available to cover the past five years. The ratio of women to men during the period was:
2017 - 39:61

2018 - 37:63
 2019 - 38:62
 2020 - 41:59
 2021 - 42:58

168. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Secretary General: For each of the national Church Institutions individually, what has been (a) the number of full-time equivalent staff (both permanent and agency), and (b) the operational cost? Please present the annual actual figures in tabular form for each of the years 2017-21, as well as the 2022 and draft 2023 budget figures.

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: I have arranged for data on the staff headcount and total operational cost for the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners, Church of England Central Services Limited and Pensions Board to be placed on the noticeboard. In the time available we have been unable to source comprehensive information on a like for like basis for the other NCIs. Most NCIs have yet to start work on their 2023 budgets: information on the Archbishops' Council's 2023 budget can be found in GS 2268.

Staff numbers	2017 Actual Headcount	2018 Actual Headcount	2019 Actual Headcount	2020 Actual Headcount	2021 Actual Headcount	2022 Budget FTE posts
Archbishops' Council	109	117	124	141	162	161
Church of England Pensions Board	66	73	81	86	81	79
Church Commissioners (investments)	34	38	41	49	56	79
Church Commissioners (excl. investments)	32	32	32	33	32	51
Church of England Central Services Ltd	153	161	165	178	177	168
Operating Expenditure	2017 Actual £'million	2018 Actual £'million	2019 Actual £'million	2020 Actual £'million	2021 Actual £'million	2022 Budget £'million
Archbishops' Council (Vote 2)	16.5	17.6	19.3	19.3	22.2	28.2
Church of England Pensions Board	7.2	7.8	8.7	9.3	11.1	10.9
Church Commissioners (investments)	9.0	10.2	12.1	16.8	16.5	20.6
Church Commissioners (excl. investments)	7.4	7.8	7.6	7.5	8.3	9.9
<i>Church of England Central Services Ltd (allocated to other NCIs and included within the above budgets)</i>	14.2	14.9	15.7	17.0	16.9	15.8

Notes:

In comparing figures from year to year, it is worth noting that actual figures reflect the impact of vacancies. Headcount budgets assume a full staff complement, with a £ provision included in budgets for likely vacancies. most cases. Excludes temps.

Structural changes across the NCIs across this period have resulted in staff moving between NCIs most notably as a result of Transforming Effectiveness. This includes movement between in/out of Lambeth Palace (not shown above).

These figures include both permanent and fixed-term contracts. There has been an increase in the use of fixed term contracts in some areas recently e.g. for projects in the National Safeguarding Team and the Emerging Church of England programme.

Church Commissioners investments team are reported as expenditure on raising funds.

Church of England Central Services Ltd (ChECS) and accommodation costs are allocated to other NCIs and included within the respective funding NCI budget. (the full ChECS costs are shown in the ChECS line and the full accommodation costs are shown within the Archbishops' Council line).

169. *Mr John Brydon (Norwich)* asked the Secretary General: In a recent letter to the *Church Times* the Secretary General of the Archbishops' Council explained that the Triennium Funding Group membership is drawn from the Church Commissioners, the Archbishops' Council and members of the House of Bishops. In arriving at its recommendations, the Group consulted with Diocesan Secretaries and the House of Bishops yet the Church Commissioners are, according to the Church of England website, accountable amongst others to General Synod and not just a part of it. So why was there no direct input from the Houses of Clergy or Laity and will this situation be rectified in future?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: This approach to constituting the Triennium Funding Working Group (TFWG) was devised in 2018, and repeated in 2021-22. The TFWG brought together members of the two key trustee bodies concerned, the Board of the Church Commissioners, and the Archbishops' Council (laity, clergy and bishops), together with other members of the House of Bishops, reflecting the particular role of bishops in leading dioceses in an episcopal church.

170. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Secretary General: What steps have the NCI's taken to assess staff morale and well-being over the last five years?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The following staff surveys have been held since 2017: three extensive satisfaction and employee engagement surveys (2017, 2019, 2021); two surveys dedicated to staff wellbeing (2020); one pulse survey (2021), and a survey of homeworking set-up. Both the extensive surveys and the pulse survey included a range of questions designed to measure the wellbeing and morale of staff.

Regular drop-in sessions hosted by our trained Mental Health First Aider network (formed in 2018) have also helped to gauge staff wellbeing, whilst HR Business partners work with NCI leaders. Staff sickness absence is regularly monitored.

All our assessment data and insight on well-being and morale is reported to Chief Officers, Trustees and our Joint Staff Council including our trades unions, and responses are discussed. This is in line with our legal health and safety obligations and our NCI values.

171. *Mr John Brydon (Norwich)* asked the Secretary General: What assessment has been made by the Secretary General of the risks facing the Church of England in the next decade including those arising from suggestions that it be disestablished?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The national Church Institutions have a clearly defined risk management policy. The Archbishops' Council Audit Committee regularly reviews the strategic risks facing the Council and the wider Church. The Audit Committee considers emerging risks as part of their review. The Archbishops' Council conducts a detailed review of its strategic risks and those facing the wider Church at least annually. Disestablishment is not specifically referenced in the Archbishop's Council risk register.

172. *Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Secretary General: How many judges, barristers, solicitors, legal executives, and other lawyers are either directly employed or were, for each of the past five years, instructed for one or more pieces of work by the Archbishops' Council or other national Church Institutions; and what was the cost of such employment or instruction in each of those years.

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The number of legally qualified people and their immediate support staff employed by the NCIs during the years requested were:

2017 - 10

2018 - 13

2019 - 12

2020 - 14

2021 - 13

The global salary costs for those years were:

2017	935,078
2018	1,014,276
2019	1,000,863
2020	1,316,156
2021	1,483,801

With respect to lawyers instructed by the NCIs but not employed by them, the information requested is not readily available and could not be obtained without disproportionate cost.

173. *The Bishop in Europe (the Rt Revd Robert Innes)* asked the Secretary General: The Archbishops' Council recently agreed that all member-level meetings in the NCIs should take place on zoom in order to minimise costs. Can the Secretary General explain how this decision was arrived at and how much consideration was given to the overwhelming superiority of in-person meetings for working groups such as FAOC that bring together disparate individuals to address complex and sensitive subject matter?

174. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Secretary General: Is it the case that Synod committees, boards, councils and commissions are being instructed to meet remotely wherever possible, and if so which member-level body took that decision?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: With permission, Chair, I will answer questions 173 and 174 together.

The Joint Employment and Common Services Board (JEC SB) approved at its January 2022 meeting a cross-NCI meeting policy which was then noted by the NCIs' principal trustee bodies and disseminated to their sub-committees and to associated groups supported by NCI staff.

To generate savings on travel costs and to enable more diverse participation, the policy asks that most member-level meetings across the NCIs generally take place online, with face-to-face meetings of each body only taking place once or twice a year.

The policy recognises that some groups will wish to meet in person for members to get to know one another and for fellowship. There may also be a specific business need for meeting in person. The policy therefore includes the opportunity to register an exemption and meet more frequently in person, ensuring that hybrid options are available and that proper scrutiny has been given by the committee as to whether meeting in person is necessary.

NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL

175. *Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Much attention rightly has been given to the Church's role that will follow the Schools Bill 2022. As a significant number of home schoolers across England are Christian can you please explain what engagement the Church has had in defending the rights of Christian home schoolers?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The Lords Spiritual listened carefully to the concerns of Christians who home school their children and through our engagement with the Schools Bill, both formal and informal, have sought to ensure that whilst it is appropriate for there to be a register of children receiving home education to avoid a situation where vulnerable children are missed by the system and find themselves at risk of harm, it is not necessary for the government to collect wide ranging data without good reason. Government or Local

Authorities should not inspect or control the content of that education, but simply ensure that all children are properly accounted for and known to be receiving suitable education.

176. *The Revd Jo Winn-Smith (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Following the horrific revelations regarding Child Q and statistics regarding the stripping and searching of children by the Metropolitan Police, including its disproportionate impact on those of black and minority ethnic backgrounds, have any and, if so, how many, Church of England school children been impacted by such events?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: We are deeply shocked by the horrific case regarding Child Q and the trauma she suffered. All schools, as well as other agencies, will have been shocked to see these revelations and will want to ensure they learn from the mistakes that were made in this case. Whilst we are not party to any confidential data held by schools in such cases, the Church of England nevertheless strives to provide education in accordance with our vision. This includes educating for dignity and respect, recognising that each child is unique and made in the image of God. The work the Education Office is promoting on racial justice, equity, diversity and inclusion seeks to provide a positive approach to addressing issues that disproportionately impact on UKME/GM children and staff and is also proactively seeking the growth in the number of school leaders from those backgrounds.

177. *Dr Julie Maxwell (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that much has changed since the introduction of the current Valuing All God's Children policy in 2019 – including: i) clarification of UK law by EHRC; ii) the findings of the Cass review on the multifactorial causes and different outcomes for childhood gender dysphoria; and iii) Hilary Cass stating that the social transitioning of children by schools is not a neutral act, when will the 2019 policy be reviewed and updated?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Valuing All God's Children is intended and used as a resource to help schools tackle homophobic and transphobic bullying so that, even in the midst of wider and often heated public debate, they can ensure that children are treated with dignity and respect (especially in relation to protected characteristics under equalities legislation) and also learn to respect the views of others. We are keeping the document under review and in the event that the DfE or Government produce any further guidance on how protected characteristics are treated within a school context, we will update our document accordingly.

178. *Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: One of the measures in the Government White Paper on education "Opportunity for All", that was published in March, stipulates that by 2030 every school in England will be academized. And in May, the Government published a new Bill "to pave the way" for all schools to join a Multi-Academy Trust (MAT).

What impact will the Bill have on the governance of various Diocesan Boards of Education, the Church of England schools and the maintenance of their Christian distinctiveness?

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The Schools Bill has finished committee stage in the House of Lords and as a result the government has announced that large parts of it will be removed, with revised proposals being brought forward when the Bill reaches the House of Commons. In the context of church schools, the Bill is important as the clauses concerned with schools with a religious character make provision relating to matters affecting church academies, including in relation to governance arrangements and the teaching and inspection of religious education and collective worship. These mirror key aspects of the maintained school framework for the academy framework and transfer existing academy trust obligations from a contractual onto a statutory footing, to better safeguard provision and ensure that the Christian character of Church schools is secured for the future.

CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL

179. *The Revd Canon John Dunnett (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Are central records kept of the provision of security alarms for diocesan-owned clergy houses?

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: This matter is not within the purview of the Church Buildings Council. We have made enquiries and do not believe any central records are kept on this matter.

180. *Mrs Katia D'Arcy-Cumber (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Council: How many cathedral and church buildings in the Church of England have a toilet facility with Changing Places high dependency facilities, kitted out with hoist, adult-sized changing bench and space for carers, to enable those with complex disability to access both church and community?

the Ven. Robert Cooper (Durham) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: There is currently one Church of England church registered with Changing Places UK as providing these facilities (St John the Evangelist, Farsley, in the Diocese of Leeds). Government funding of £23.5 million, announced in March and awarded to 191 local authorities, will raise the total number of Changing Places lavatories in England from around 1,300 to around 1,800, with cathedrals among the venues in which new facilities are due to be built.

The Church Buildings Council published new guidance on providing equal access to church buildings last year: this encourages churches to give careful consideration to installing Changing Places facilities, advising that compelling reasons should be given for not doing so, and that in cases where such reasons prevail, an accessible lavatory should be provided as a minimum acceptable level of provision.

COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

181. *The Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: The Anglican Mission in England (AMiE) plans to consecrate two additional church-planting bishops in Autumn 2022. What active steps is the Church of England taking to build good ecumenical relationships between our Churches?

The Bishop of Fulham (the Rt Revd Jonathan Baker) replied as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: The Church of England seeks to maintain good relations with all its ecumenical partners. There are various contacts at a personal level, both locally and at church leadership level, between clergy as well as laity of the Church of England and AMiE, and as far as it is possible to work constructively alongside AMiE, the Church of England seeks to do so. AMiE is not a Church covered nationally by the Ecumenical Relations Measure, nor is it gazetted under the Sharing of Church Buildings Act. For information, AMiE is not a member of the Anglican Communion, nor is it in communion with the Church of England.

The Chair. We need to close this item and can I remind Synod that tomorrow morning we are invited to join Holy Communion in the Minster. The coaches will be leaving at 10.00 am, 10.05 am and 10.15 am for the service which starts at 11.00 am. After the service, you are invited to engage with the Living in Love and Faith art installation in the Minster. The coaches will be returning to the University departing the Minster at 12.45 pm, 12.55 pm and 1.05 pm. Please bring your Synod passes with you for access into the Minster. Closing worship now will be led by Fr Andrew Moughtin-Mumby and the Chaplain and, following the closing worship, the Archbishop of York will dismiss the Synod with a blessing. Thank you, everyone.

The Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark) and *the Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the General Synod)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

Full Synod: Third Day Sunday 10 July 2022

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. This afternoon session will consist mainly of group work. In the first half of the afternoon you will be able to attend two out of nine short workshops looking at aspects of the Vision and Strategy which relate to becoming younger and more diverse. Stephen Hance will run through these workshops in a few minutes' time. They are listed in GS Misc 1316. They will run from 3.10 pm to 3.40 pm and 3.50 pm to 4.20 pm. In the second half of the afternoon you will attend one workshop on *Living in Love and Faith*, for which information is included in GS Misc 1315 and the Twelfth Notice Paper.

I am about to ask the Bishop of London and Bishop of Portsmouth to explain the process, but I should like to remind members that business will resume at 5.45 pm in here for Item 20. Bishop Sarah.

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE): I would like to start by saying thank you; thank you for engaging with *Living in Love and Faith* here at Synod; thank you to those of you who have travelled with us with *Living in Love and Faith* and Synod since the beginning of 2017; thank you also for engaging with LLF in your local communities, or within your deaneries, or within some other group. I dare to hope that that is all of us. But if it is not, it certainly is not too late.

Last weekend, like many dioceses, we had the privilege of ordaining deacons and priests within the Diocese of London. With 50 women and men to be ordained deacon, I spoke about how, when my children were small, we owned a small day boat. It was nothing special. It just about had sails, an outboard motor and a sound hull. We set off sailing off the north Norfolk coast in Blakeney. Those of you who know Blakeney will know that the tide is quick to turn. Locals amuse themselves watching drivers who have parked their cars far too close to the water's edge and return to discover their car afloat. They also watch sailors who have misjudged the tide and are left stranded on the flats. Well, I have to admit that we were in the latter group.

Taking the boat out one day, we just pushed our luck and the boat too far. We found on our return that the tide had outrun us and, despite being sent into the water to try to push the boat afloat, we were well and truly grounded. So, having put the anchor in, we began to wade, our children began to swim. Walking back rather wet and disheartened, I reminded my husband that I had told him he was going too far; and of course he did not. Then one of my children sat down, tired and hungry, and it was only that that made me stop. And as I turned around I realised what I was missing in my preoccupation with my destination and with my downheartedness. There was an incredible sunset. It was stunning. It was uplifting. It was refreshing. In fact, as a family we stopped and soaked it in for some time.

As I have said before, the gift to the church of LLF is as much the journey as it is the destination. In fact, if anybody was hoping for a certain destination in February 2023, I have to say you may be disappointed. We will put into port, but it is probably true that our journey around this area will continue for some years as people of The Way.

As far as LLF is concerned, you may feel that we have hit a sandbank or we have lost our way. Well, let us pray that we may navigate by the sun. Or you may be wondering whether we will ever finally see land. I think that we can begin to see something on the horizon. By the time we next gather, in February 2023, the boat will be manoeuvring itself into port as the Bishops bring the fruit of their discernment to Synod, with a clear sense of direction about questions of identity, sexuality, relationships and marriage.

I would like to recap the journey so far. Back in 2020, the LLF resources were published. In your capacity as members of Synod do make sure that you have explored these resources fully. Consider dipping into some of the podcasts, or have a look at some of the video stories that were part of the course. I particularly commend to you some of the material on the Bible. There are two podcasts and a remarkable written dialogue between two biblical scholars who disagree with one another; knowledgeable and graceful.

The publication of the LLF resources heralded the beginning of the engagement part of our journey. It has been an ambitious undertaking. Thanks to the commitment and the hard work of the LLF advocates and their teams in every diocese, thousands of church communities have taken part. The Church has never done anything quite on this scale before. The process will not have been perfect. No doubt there are still people, perhaps even clergy, who have not even heard of *Living in Love and Faith* – and by that I mean the project, not the virtues. But we do know that thousands have heard and have taken part. Many did not wait for Covid restrictions to be lifted; they met on Zoom. Others waited until they could meet in person. Many groups are still planning to engage this summer and autumn.

Encouraging people to take part was itself a significant challenge, but the Bishops also promised that the learning and reflections of everyone who took part would be listened to and reflected upon.

Therefore, the second challenge has been to encourage people to send their feedback by 30 April. When the window for responding closed, over 6,400 people had responded use the questionnaire. We had over 50 creative responses and 250 independently sent responses had been received. These are now being gathered into a report. Its purpose is to reflect back what people have said, what they have learned, what they have experienced and what they hope for in the life of the Church.

The creative responses that have been sent have already been gathered and you will be the first to see them in the multimedia installation in the Spring Lane building this Synod. The installation is called "From the Heart". That is because responding to questions of identity and sexuality involves our hearts as well as our minds, our spirits as well as our bodies. Our partial understanding of the truth about who we are, in the light of who God is, may not always be found in the expression of words or prose, but rather in poetry, art and song. Please do consider honouring these contributions from the heart by giving them your full attention and your full self.

In September the Bishops will begin a process of discernment about the way forward, exercising their teaching ministries as guardians of the faith. They will bring Scripture and the tradition of the Church to this process. They will bring the LLF book, the Church-wide responses and their own life experiences and engagement with LLF. They will be prompted by the resources Friendship and Being Church, to think theologically and biblically about what it means to be church in light of the LLF process and questions

raised.

The Bishops will be accompanied by diverse members of the Reference Group for a part of each of their meetings so that their deliberations are grounded in the reality of the diversity that exists within the Church of England today. The work we have been doing together we do in public gaze. Faith and Fracture, the sculpture that you hopefully interacted with at York Minster this morning, reminds us that this process of engaging with one another, of finding ways to navigate disagreement as God's children, is an act of public witness. How will we be living testimonies to the reconciling love of God as we discern a way forward for the Church? Maybe it is here that we have work to do. How do we witness, in our conversations, in our work together, in our disagreements and our differences, to the reconciling love of God?

As this final phase of this part of the journey begins in September, please pray for your Bishops. Pray that they may carry the weight of your hopes and fears and their accountability to God as leaders of the Church, and that they will be abounding in hope, filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, in whose presence we do this work. Pray for yourselves as you receive the fruit of this prayerful work when you next meet in February 2023, and as you work out its implications in the life of the Church in the years to come.

You may be asking what happened to the boat on the mudflats? Some 10 hours later, in a gale force wind, before sunrise, we sailed her back, and we learnt about what it is to have your anchor hold in the storms of life. But that is a story for another day. It was the memory of the sunset, the gift that we nearly missed, and which I still remember. It was the journey and not the destination that was transformative.

As I reminded the ordinands last weekend, remember that we cannot bear the weight of this calling in our own strength, but only by the grace and power of God. Pray therefore that your hearts may be daily enlarged and your understanding of Scriptures enlightened.

Before Eeva comes to speak about the process we are going to hold a time of silent prayer, and pray earnestly for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Dr Eeva John (ex officio): So, during this Synod it is a bit of a liminal time because you are awaiting the report of the responses to Church-wide engagement. It is therefore an opportunity, I think, to get to know each other better and to listen both with our heads and to see with our heart as we individually and together ponder what is the Spirit saying to the Church today and how is the Church being shaped by God today.

Today also is an opportunity to put into practice something of the culture change that Bishop Emma spoke about in February. You will remember that you engaged with the Difference course and the Pastoral Principles. This is what she said in February: "This is an opportunity to be the change that this world, and our Church, so desperately need; a community that enables diversity, difference and even conflict to draw us closer together into the love of Christ and into new possibilities that we may not yet have imagined".

We will be inviting you at 4.30 to do some group work. The group work will be focused around the Bible and in a sense our own relationship with the Bible as individuals and as a Church. All the details of where you need to go are in this leaflet, the Notice Paper that you have had.

Just one really important announcement, group 11 is no longer in D/L/103, it is in D/L/037. We hope to provide people to help you find whichever room it is that you need to go to.

May I remind you that this is a time to get to know each other. When you gather, have a look around at each other, love one another, be quick to listen, and slow to speak. Be sensitive to the different places that we all come from on these deeply personal subjects. Your focus will not be so much on the topic itself as about the Bible, so do not worry, this is not going to be a session that is likely to take us to deeply uncomfortable places, but we do need to be careful with one another, really express and be conscious of the love of Christ which joins us together. I do hope you really enjoy the group work and we will be gathering some of your reflections as part of that discernment process that the Bishops will then be taking forward in the autumn. Thank you so much.

The Chair. I now call on the Bishop of Portsmouth, please.

The Bishop of Portsmouth (the Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Frost): Good afternoon, Synod. Before we go to our LLF groups later on in the afternoon we have the opportunity to do some Vision and Strategy group work about growing younger, and more diverse. Just a few thoughts about that before we hear voices of young people, which I am sure will delight you.

It is a beautiful and difficult thing to really hear and receive from others, in all their difference, and this process and this afternoon's time together has made me ask again, "What are you doing, Jonathan? What are we doing when we talk about growing younger and more diverse?"

Some of you may know the thought of Jürgen Moltmann very well. I have followed the development of his thought for years now, and in many ways he has shown us how to keep our identity in Christ open to the voices of others. One of the groups that has been a consistent dialogue partner for Moltmann is mystical Judaism, the Kabbalistic tradition. From there, there is a concept literally meaning contraction, called *tzimtzum*. Some of you will have made the same journey as I have. It speaks of the contraction of God that gives space for creation, the dying of God that brings life to others, the standing back to allow voices to be heard.

I think there is something in that for us, that we this afternoon in two different modes, one in thinking about the younger and diverse ambition that we have, and the other in learning to listen well and walk together, we are creating space for each other as God has created space to share God's life with us.

The disciples were arguing and worried about their status and position in life. Jesus took a child and set him in the midst of them creating a new space and new conversations. The disciples, then and now, were concerned with resourcing: where will we get the money to feed this crowd? But it is a child in their midst who becomes the point of transformation as an offering is made and adults have to learn to receive. My brothers and sisters, this child looked to Jesus. He was confident that his gift, the packed lunch, would not be despised and it was enough.

Let us as we walk with one another, keep our eyes fixed upon the same risen Lord in our midst and make space, learn as grown-ups have to learn, to give way, to stand back, to let others speak their truth and articulate with their voices. This afternoon is nothing other than an invitation to participate in the gracious humility of the Triune God's mission of love to the world, for us to say ah yes, and to create space for others, often very different, from very different perspectives and backgrounds, to offer their yes too. Let us listen to some voices.

(Video shown)

Mr Stephen Hance (ex officio): Good afternoon, Synod. We are going to move into a time of workshops now for the next hour and a bit, looking at different aspects of our Vision and Strategy as it relates to this vitally important objective that we should become younger and more diverse. Each of the nine workshops will run twice, from 3.10 to 3.40 and then from 3.50 to 4.20. You can choose and get to two out of the nine. You will spot that the workshops are just 30 minutes' long, so please try to arrive on time and move quickly between them so we can make the most of that time.

The details are set out on the Twelfth Notice Paper, but just quickly to give you an overview. There is a workshop on sharing some new research, which Synod requested in fact, into churches with growing work among children and young people. Debbie Clinton will be hosting that. There is a workshop looking at ways of church and school and home working together. Lucy Moore will be hosting that. There is one correction to the Notice Paper. That is going to be in room D/L/0036, not as it says on the Notice Paper.

There is a workshop looking at creative and practical ways to reach underrepresented groups, which Andy Milne and Dave Male are going to be hosting, and another on starting youth work in parishes where there is nothing happening at the moment with Chris Curtis of Youthscape. Then there will another one on joining with God's mission in the margins, marginal places, marginal groups, with Dave Champness. Bob Jackson will be leading a workshop on the future of online church and sharing some research that he has done around that. There will be a workshop on disabled people in the Church with Zoe Heming and Fiona MacMillan, and Sanjee Perera will be leading one on how to make the Church more ethnically diverse. Finally, if all the others are full, you can come to one on how to motivate the million to reach our communities, which is with me.

Rooms are, as I said, all spelt out for you on the Notice Paper and as you leave here there will be colleagues to point you in the right direction if you are not sure where the room is for your chosen workshop. That, I think, is it.

The Chair. Thank you. So you know what is happening for the next two slots. Thank you, Stephen. And then after that, as you can see on the Twelfth Notice Paper, we go into the *Living in Love and Faith* groups from 4.30 to 5.30. You can see which group you are in from the lists there. Then at 5.45 we are back in here for a main debate. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR *Canon Izzy McDonald-Booth (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 5.47 pm.

SPECIAL AGENDA III: PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

ITEM 20

ASSISTED DYING (GS 2266A & 2266B)

The Chair. Welcome Synod members. Before we begin, I would just like to ask the Chair of the Business Committee, Robert Hammond, to come and speak. You have two minutes.

VARIATION

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Synod, as you will remember, the debate on the War in Ukraine was adjourned on Friday, and so the Business Committee would like to bring this back tomorrow morning. We also have had notification of a request to debate the deemed business Code of Practice under the Clergy Discipline Measure, GS 2281, so we need to find time for that as well.

So, Chair, I would like to propose a change in the order of business so that the adjourned debate on Item 6, the War in Ukraine be taken on Monday morning after opening worship, but before Item 21, the Archbishops' Council Annual Report, GS 2267, and that the Code of Practice under the Clergy Discipline Measure, GS 2281, be debated after Item 501, the Amending Canon No. 42. That, unfortunately, will mean that the Lincoln Diocesan Synod motion will in absolute all probability not be taken at this group of sessions I am afraid. I propose that.

The Chair: Under Standing Order 9 does Synod give its consent to me to vary the order of business as proposed.

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

The Chair: I would just like to let Synod members know that there will be chaplaincy support both in the foyer downstairs during the debate and afterwards in the Berrick Saul Building in the chapel. The chapel is also open at the moment if anybody needs quiet space. For this item, members will need GS 2266A and GS 2266B. Can I invite Simon Eyre to come and speak to Item 20? You have 10 minutes, Simon.

Dr Simon Eyre (Chichester): Can I first of all thank all of those of you who signed this Private Member's Motion to make this debate a possibility, I am very, very grateful for that, and to the Business Committee for scheduling time. There are three strands to the motion, but they are inextricably linked, and I hope I will make that absolutely clear to you.

We owe a huge debt of gratitude to those who have pioneered and developed the practice of palliative care in this country over the last 70 years. Dame Cicely Saunders stands out as one with a lasting legacy. Now, perhaps her greatest achievement was the development and recognition of the concept of total pain. She came to understand that if people were struggling with uncontrolled physical pain, there were often psychological, spiritual, social, emotional elements to that, and it has become a principle upon which our palliative care system has rested for the last 70 years.

It is why specialists from a wide range of disciplines, not least hospital chaplains, have so much to offer in end-of-life management. Now, over those past 70 years, we have seen the growth and development of the hospice movement and there are over 200 independent charitably funded hospices now. Together, with the palliative care services in our hospitals and in community settings, we have so much to be grateful for. But there is a problem.

In March 2021, the Sue Ryder Foundation published a review of the levels of funding that hospices were currently receiving from their local healthcare commissioners and attempted to project the costs involved in the next ten years. They thought £947 million would be required for this. The current level of government funding for palliative care stands at only 37% of that figure. The authors concluded that probably a 70% amount was required, allowing for charitable funding as well, in order to sustain the hospice infrastructure.

Earlier this year, legislation was introduced for the very first time making it mandatory for all integrated healthcare boards in England to provide and commission palliative care services. While this is very welcome, unless the funding follows that, there is the very real risk of further hospice closures. Now, one of the consequences of an inadequately funded palliative care system is that it can be perceived as failing to deliver when it is most critically needed. For those of us who have had the privilege of working in general practice, the scenario of trying to manage a terminally ill patient at home when their condition is steadily deteriorating, late on a Friday evening with no hospice bed and very overstretched community palliative care provision, will not be unfamiliar.

It is out of such scenarios that the problems arise, contributing to the increasing and growing call to legalise assisted suicide in the ten years since this was last debated at General Synod. Since 2013, there have been four unsuccessful attempts made in Parliament to change section 2 of the 1961 Suicide Act. Notably, on 22 October last year, Baroness Meacher's Assisted Dying Bill was debated in the House of Lords with many contributions from our own Bishops. And on 16 March this year, Lord Forsyth attempted to introduce an amendment to the Health and Care Act 2022, but that was defeated by a majority in the Lords. Even this last week, on Monday, the Petitions Committee of the House of Commons debated a government E-petition on this very subject.

So, why do we need to take our stand in this debate? First and foremost, I believe it is because the sanctity of life is central to our understanding as Christians. Genesis 2 reminds us that it is God who breathes life into all of us. Psalm 139 tells us that all our days are known to God before they come into being. And Psalm 31 states that our times are in his hands. We need to hold firm to these truths, but beyond this, there are several cogent arguments for upholding the current legislation.

There are several vulnerable groups for whom any change in the law would constitute a particular threat. We have an increasing number of people who have lost mental capacity in this country. There are currently over a million active Lasting Powers of Attorney covering health and welfare. There is a very real risk if we change legislation that these LPAs could be used to prematurely end people's lives. Terminally ill patients often experience understandable depression and anxiety, but with support and medication often a person's feelings of hopelessness can be transformed. With a change in the law, a number might choose assisted suicide before receiving that help. Those with learning difficulties might be unable to comprehend what is being suggested to them, while those with disabilities have been drawn into legislation for assisted suicide, where that has been legalised in a number of countries. The risk is that they could feel, potentially, pressurised into accepting assisted suicide to unburden those caring for them.

And then finally, there is the situation where terminally ill people might themselves feel motivated to seek assisted suicide in the belief that they would be easing their relatives' distress, and to reduce the economic impacts of their illness on the family. Also, there is a risk that unscrupulous relatives might take advantage of that, i.e. increasing care costs eroding their inheritance.

Then there are the effects on medical practice to think of. Those working in palliative care may well feel their role is compromised. There has always been the recognition that increasing doses of medication for the palliation of symptoms can possibly lead to altered consciousness and respiratory depression, hastening death. But the intention has always been to alleviate symptoms, not deliberately and prematurely end life. A change in the law could dramatically alter that approach.

There may be the risk of complaint or even legal action where the views of relatives clash with those looking after a patient if assisted suicide were to be refused. Certainly, there

is precedent for that in countries which have legalised assisted suicide. Conscientious objection might prove very difficult to negotiate with an unsympathetic employer, and there is the very real risk of doctors colluding. The requirement for two signatories, cited as a key safeguard by protagonists of assisted suicide, is no guarantee of a safety net.

Finally, there may be genuine difficulty in the healthcare system meeting the changed demands that changed legislation would bring. In 2011, Canada, who are a country very similar to ourselves, were in a very similar situation. But following legal challenge, the Medical Assistance in Dying bill became effective in 2016, allowing both for assisted suicide and euthanasia. Initially, the legislation was restricted to those over 18 suffering from a serious physical health condition, whose natural death was reasonably foreseeable. But following further legal challenges, there is no longer the requirement for somebody to be terminally ill, and a natural life of even up to ten years has been accepted. From 2023, people with mental illness as their sole underlying medical condition will have access to MAID. There would be every prospect that any change in the Suicide Act in this country could eventually lead to similar consequences.

It would be naïve not to recognise that there are difficult scenarios to manage, particularly motor neurone disease and other neuro-degenerative diseases, where full capacity and consciousness remain intact, pose some of the sternest challenges. Also, for many in this day, their first direct experience of dying will be the death of a close family member. Now, if that is a difficult experience, clearly that is going to have a lasting impact. Perhaps the fact that the word “agony” was used fifteen times in the Baroness Meacher debate in part reflects that.

Our response needs to be an honest one, an honest admission that palliative care can fail to deliver its best at times. But it should also be our logical conclusion that we need to seek ever-improving excellence in palliative care services through training, research and investment, rather than enacting new legislation to allow assisted suicide as a route out of the problem. Now, some prominent voices would have us believe that the majority of Christians are in favour of assisted dying and that somehow the leadership of the Anglican Church is out of step with its membership.

Today, we have the opportunity to set the record straight by giving this motion our united and wholehearted support. We need to send the strongest possible message to our Government about the need for the necessary investment in palliative care, to the people of this country that we care passionately about the needs of those reaching the end of their lives, and to provide reassurance to vulnerable groups that we will do our utmost to protect their welfare.

Jesus said “I have come that you may have life and life in all its fullness”, surely that is not only when everything is going well in our lives, but also in the difficult days that can come as life draws to a close. I beg to move this motion that stands in my name. Thank you for listening.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I should let Synod know that we have had a lot of requests to speak, so I am starting us with a three-minute limit on speeches

Ms Fiona MacMillan (London): Today's motion helpfully draws on the experience of Canada, where, as said, despite the initial safeguards, after less than five years, assisted dying legislation was extended to include disabled people. It framed assisted suicide as an equality right. Inclusion Canada, a community of disabled people and their families who campaigned against it, had long feared that having a disability would become an acceptable reason for what they called "state provoked suicide". Since the decision, disabled Canadians regularly report that it is easier to get funding for supported dying than for supported living.

The UK has become an increasingly unsafe place to be a disabled person, with statutory discrimination now hidden in plain sight. Our Government, particularly in its current form, would be no safeguard on this same slippery slope. The UN Convention on Disabled People's Rights was ratified here in 2009, but over the last 12 years the Government has consistently undermined disabled people's rights and autonomy. This was so marked that in 2016 the UN began an investigation into the treatment of disabled people in the UK, the first ever such investigation into a member state.

Since the Welfare Reform Bill of 2012, support for disabled people to participate in family and community life has been repeatedly undermined, while media rhetoric such as "benefits are a lifestyle choice" or "work is always good for your health" has contributed to a rise in disability hate crime. Despite the familiarity around disability generated by the 2012 Paralympics, 2018 research by the charity Scope showed that 67% of the UK population hesitate even to speak to a disabled person.

During the pandemic, sweeping do not resuscitate orders were issued to people with learning disabilities, dementia and autistic people without their knowledge or consent or those of their families. A disproportionate number of those who died from Covid were disabled people. Recent research indicates this was more likely to be caused by discrimination than by underlying conditions.

These all demonstrate a failure to value disabled people's lives. Past performance and current attitudes sadly signpost to future likely action. The slippery slope in Canada sets out a potentially terrifying future for disabled people in the UK should assisted suicide legislation be adopted here. I urge Synod in the strongest possible terms to support this motion.

Ms Emily Hill (Hereford): Thank you, Chair, for calling me to make this, my maiden speech. I am speaking to you today, not only as a member of this church and Synod, but as a healthcare professional who has worked on a Covid respiratory ward since the beginning of the pandemic and witnessed or been involved in a countless number of deaths. The papers we have been provided as reading material before this debate are heavily biased towards this motion, with no alternative view being offered. I do not contest

us showing appreciation for healthcare professionals and chaplains or calling on Her Majesty's Government to provide adequate funding for palliative or end-of-life services.

The statement used by the end-of-life team at my hospital is that we only have one chance to get this right. Currently, there are hundreds if not thousands of people who are dying uncomfortable and painful deaths when they do not need to. I can attest that while we try to make the end-of-life process as pain free and kind as possible, the standard treatment does not work for everyone and sometimes people suffer.

As Simon said earlier, Psalm 31:15 says "my times are in your hands". This, among other pieces of Scripture is often interpreted to mean that we should not end our life too soon. But then surely the opposite is true, that we should not prolong it. And yet most, if not all of us, have taken antibiotics to treat an infection that could have otherwise been fatal. Most of us would appreciate someone performing life-saving treatment if you were to suffer from a cardiac arrest or choked on your afternoon tea. So, why can we prolong life, but not appropriately assist people to end it ever so slightly earlier to ensure peace.

In GS 2266A we are given three definitions of different types of assisted suicide, including assisted dying, where a patient is prescribed life-ending drugs to self-administer if they have less than six months to live, thus giving the patient control over how they die, giving them a chance to die how they see fit, giving them the right to choose their care.

Yes, there are issues around safeguarding those who are vulnerable, but we are not called in this debate to work out the logistics of an assisted dying scheme, nor are we called in this chamber to actually change the legislation. We are called to ask the Government whether or not we agree that certain patients should be offered the guarantee to die a good death. This motion forces us to view three separate issues as one. Can I recommend that Synod do more work on this area, when we are allowed to debate the three definitions of assisted suicide separately, and therefore can I ask you not to pass the motion as it currently stands.

The Bishop of Carlisle (the Rt Revd James Newcome): Synod, this is, I believe, an excellent and timely motion, which I hope all of us can support wholeheartedly. As Lead Bishop for health and social care I am especially grateful for the positive reference to healthcare chaplains, the emphasis on good palliative care and the clear call, in paragraph (c) to keep the current law on assisted suicide, and I take the points about the different definitions that have been made. We are talking, I think, particularly here about the giving of poison by people who are suitably qualified to those who are nearing the end of their life.

And that, of course, is the contentious part of the motion, as we have just heard. Understandably, it arouses strong emotions on both sides of the debate. Emotions matter very much, but they are not the best foundation for making difficult, ethical decisions. And the reasons why the Church of England has consistently and strongly opposed the legalisation of assisted suicide are very helpfully summarised, I believe, in the paper we

received from the Secretary General. I would love to expound on them all, but there is not, unfortunately, time, although you may be happy to hear that.

But let me highlight three words, all conveniently beginning with the letter c - an expository preacher's dream - which recur most frequently in conversations about assisted suicide. The first, of course, is compassion, a profoundly Christian virtue which is often claimed as the sole prerogative of those who would like to see the law on assisted suicide changed. Many of the tragic stories we hear make that a hard argument to resist and are deeply moving and disturbing, but the exercise of compassion applies not only to those nearing the end of their life, but also to the thousands of vulnerable, elderly and disabled people whose intrinsic worth and very existence could be threatened by the legalisation of assisted suicide. Compassion goes both ways.

The second word is choice. I can see I am beginning to run out of time, so I will probably end on this. Choice has been described as one of the idols of our day. Surely, the argument goes, I have the right to choose the manner and time of my death, just as I have the right to choose where I live or what work I do, but of course the choices I make do not only affect me, they also affect those around me, including, in this case, my family, my friends and neighbours, my doctor and the norms and values of the society in which I live and die. Choice is by no means as simple as it seems, and it is different from our God-given free will, which entails the freedom to become the people God has made and called us to be.

The third word is control. I will not go into it now, though I could, but I would say that allowing people to die is different from assisted suicide and when people get a grip on what assisted suicide means in this context, they can usually see very clearly why the Church of England has consistently resisted it, and I hope will continue to do so.

The Chair: I am now going to take a couple of speakers from Zoom. I would like to call Canon Val Plumb and then Priscilla White.

The Revd Canon Valerie Plumb (Oxford): I have always found this matter of assisted dying incredibly uncomfortable until life revealed to me that I equally find deep and painful suffering just as uncomfortable. The last words my mum ever said to me were "I love you, and promise that you won't let me suffer". I loved her so much, but I could not keep that promise. My mother died of pancreatic cancer. I nursed her with my sister until she went into a hospice. I will not share with you the tragic details but let me say this right now, that no amount of superb hospice care could ever take away the indescribable look of terror and despair in my mother's eyes as she struggled to sit up just to vomit black sludge.

That was the moment that I got down on my knees and I prayed so hard that God would take her because I realised there and then that this was not a life being taken, instead it was a terrifying existence full of devastating pain, inexplicable suffering and deep despair, and she deserved better. She was a deeply religious woman, who throughout that time

repeatedly asked if things could be speeded up, because heaven was her only relief. From that experience, I and a lot of others have come to see assisted dying not necessarily as a shortening of life but more about shortening death and thus reducing unnecessary suffering.

Synod, I find it surprising that this motion has come forward, given that the Church's current policy is to have this issue examined by a Royal Commission, a policy adopted, I think, in 2014, the same year my mother died. I understand that at the time this was backed by senior clergy, including the Archbishop of York, John Sentamu, about eight years ago. So, where is it?

I also want to say that over 200 million people, worldwide, have the option of assisted death if they become terminally ill, including 11 jurisdictions in the US, all states in Australia and neighbouring New Zealand. Closer to home, Scotland, Jersey and the Isle of Man, all bringing forward assisted dying bills. So, it is concerning me deeply that the rest of the UK is being left behind with unsafe, broken law. There is no law to stop people taking their own life, but there is a law to prevent them doing so under medical supervision, in a more dignified way, instead of leaving themselves to be found by deeply distraught loved ones.

On Monday this week the MPs debated, amongst other things, assisted dying for the first time in over two years, with twice as many MPs in favour of the reform. Whatever your views on assisted dying are, I think we can all agree that we must protect the vulnerable, therefore I would seek some understanding as to why the Church believes this issue is ripe for a Royal Commission and yet is happy to predetermine all those efforts by stating its opposition via this motion today. If it is no longer policy to have a Royal Commission, could we be informed as to when that decision was taken, and why.

Finally, just to be clear, this is not a debate about investment in palliative care, which we all support, it is a debate about humanity and choice. Compassion is at the heart of Christianity, so Synod I urge you to oppose this motion so we can at least have the courage to explore it further, not just for us but for those who really need our care.

The Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): My voice is a little ropery but I hope loud. I am speaking today in favour of the motion and wishing to share something of our experience as a family with the excellence of palliative care that the NHS provides. Hopefully, it will not be too self-indulgently emotional. Five years ago while on holiday in Italy, our daughter was diagnosed with a brain tumour and a huge shout-out to that health service which managed to diagnose her quickly. We came home and she had a biopsy and it turned out to be one of the nastier ones. She was treated and she spent some time in and out of hospital. With the last bits over the last summer, she found herself in and out of hospital again and again.

Then, we had those words, "There is no more that we can do". Her firm wish was to die at home and they did everything to get her home as soon as possible. Although she died

after only about ten days, it was as peaceful and as good as it possibly could have been. As a family we were there. She was safe. We were able to love her across the line.

Now I come to my own experience. I have had cancer over the last seven years and I hope that, when it comes for me to finish that journey, I can have as peaceful a time as her. I realise, especially having just heard Val, that not everyone's experience is the same and I know of others who have taken their own lives. But we can promote the fantastic work that the NHS does. Just to finish with a quote from Julian of Norwich, which sustains us through all of this, "God said not 'Thou shall not be tempested. Thou shall not be travailed. Thou shall not be diseased'; but he said, 'Thou shall not be overcome'".

The Bishop of Norwich (the Rt Revd Graham Usher): Friends, like many folk here, I speak having sat many times with parishioners who have died and I count those times as amongst the greatest privileges of ministry. Only a few weeks ago, I sat for a number of evenings with an archdeacon colleague as he gathered the frailty of his ill body and prepared to die amidst the outstanding care of the Priscilla Bacon Hospice. Archdeacon Ian Bentley, witnessed to many in those closing weeks, weeks that he saw not as closing but opening ones into the mystery of God's eternal life and love.

As I sat there with him, I rightly pondered, probably like many of you who have ministered in such situations, on the nature of suffering, its deep complexities which mean that there are no glib or easy answers. I pondered personal autonomy and freedom, which Bishop James has already mentioned, and I pondered about personhood. A former Archbishop of York, John Habgood, wrote this, "The continuity of personhood is located not simply in a physical organism but in a relationship with God, which is not destroyed when mind and body fail. Something important remains," he wrote, "even in the most dysfunctional body".

Life is God's precious gift and every life carries intrinsic sanctity, significance and worth. I would suggest that dying well can only be understood in the broader context of living well. To live well is to prepare oneself to die well. It is often said that the Victorians were obsessed with death and avoided all talk of sex. Our culture seems to be obsessed with talking about sex and shies away from all talk of death. But part of the life of our Church is to enable good talk about death, to help people to begin to trace answers to questions and to support people with the spiritual resources for a good death.

Jeremy Taylor, writing in the 17th century in his work *Holy Dying* summarised this entire matter. "It remains", he wrote, "that we who are live should so live and by the actions of religion attend the coming of the day of the Lord that we neither be surprised nor leave our duties imperfect nor our sins uncanceled nor our persons unreconciled nor God unappeased". In supporting this motion, please also support those who minister and those who encourage conversations to help us live well and to die well.

Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield): Thank you, Simon, for tabling this important PMM which I wholeheartedly support. I will focus on one aspect of the issue, that of prognosis, which is applicable here. I declare an interest. Professionally, I am a consultant surgeon with

a special interest in upper gastrointestinal disease. What I will say is an example from my practice but is more generally applicable. Many, many times I have had the responsibility of breaking the bad news to a person that they have cancer, sometimes advanced cancer which is beyond reasonable prospect of cure, and that the aim of care will be palliative treatment of their symptoms.

After I have explained this as compassionately and clearly as I am able, what happens next? Most commonly, after saying thank you for my honesty, the person or someone with them asks, "How long, doctor?" In other words, what is the prognosis? I have then had the challenge of explaining the extraordinarily difficult, or actually impossible, how impossible it is even for somebody who is very experienced to predict how long one individual will survive. We do not know where the person in front of us is in that spectrum, will they survive for an average length of time, beyond or less than that. Sometimes, even this information is not available. Sometimes, we get it wrong. Concern about length of life as well as quality of life are chief among patient and carer concerns, as we have heard today.

I urge us to regard the premise of a defined prognosis in terms of survival time, on which any proposed legislation on assisted dying or suicide is based, to be fundamentally flawed and, therefore, to be opposed. Let us work to help people understand this concept and, yes, let us call on the Government to fully resource the palliative care services that they have committed that the NHS will provide, to close the funding gap and to resist any change in the current legislation. Both patients and carers who find themselves distressed and vulnerable in these highly stressful situations need us to do this. As believers in the Creator, eternal God, the giver and sustainer of life, let us support this motion.

Dr Nick Land (York): I am a psychiatrist and, as such, I have also had a medicolegal practice in the Court of Protection doing capacity assessments on vulnerable people wishing to make life-threatening decisions.

No one could not have been moved by what Val Plumb has just told us, but the issue and the problem we have is that no legislation and no jurisdiction has been able to devise a way of having assisted suicide in a way that it does not rapidly expand to a whole range of other vulnerable people. It starts with people with terminal illness in great pain, then it is the non-terminally ill in pain that then are chronically ill, then chronically ill children and then the mentally ill. On top of this, when you have assisted suicide it begins to put intolerable pressure on vulnerable people, vulnerable people who already feel that society does not value them, and if suicide was available to them their guilt in not opting for it to free their families from their perceived burden of care begins to overwhelm them.

Let me tell you a story about my mother, which I tell with her permission. She has got Lewy body dementia. She has had that for several years. She is in chronic pain. She has got very poor mobility. I went to see her six weeks ago. She was lying in bed and she was weeping. She said, "Nick, please help me die. You've got to help me die. I can't

cope anymore". She is a Christian. She said to me, "I just want to go home". I talked to her. I prayed with her. I do think perhaps as well she has depression. Interestingly, she said, "And what can I pray for you?" Despite her level of distress, and my wife, who is a wiser woman than I am, reflected back to her how even in her pain and her disability she was still a prayer warrior who could pray as she had done for decades for us as a family. Six weeks later I went to see her earlier this week. She was up. She was cheerful. She had just come back from a service in her residential home where she was really excited that she had taken two other residents who had never been to church to the service.

The thing is depression is very common in chronic illness. It is very common in pain. If we do not have good palliative care and liaison psychiatry services, people will opt for assisted suicide rather than get the treatment that would prolong their lives and their happiness. But, perhaps even more clearly, no human community has been able to find a way to create legal structures which allow those with capacity to offer suicide without simultaneously putting vulnerable people in large numbers at risk. Whilst I have every compassion for the story that Val Plumb tells, the reality is if we have assisted suicide thousands and then millions across the world will be put to death without their permission because we cannot find ways of protecting them. Every human being is created in God's image. Our value is in His sight not by what we can do.

The Chair. I have just been asked to say for the people joining us on Zoom that if they need to use chaplaincy services they can email Synod Support.

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE): Thank you for all those who in this debate are sharing their personal experiences. I know that must be coming at a cost. I have over the years had the privilege of seeing some of the best palliative services in the world here in this country and I know that these services make a difference not just to the individual who is dying but also to family, friends and also staff. It has always been my view, even when I was in government, that the UK Government does not properly fund palliative care services. The Government depends upon charitable giving and, whilst that is great, it is not adequate or appropriate. Not funding properly palliative care services leads to not just unequal access but it also leads to difficult deaths. Therefore, if this Government takes seriously the idea of enabling people to die well, the funding needs to be put not just into palliative care services but also into palliative care research. As Nick just suggested, that is where the link is with assisted dying.

Also, part of good palliative care is also good bereavement care. I have recently over the last year chaired the UK Commission on Bereavement and, as a result of that, I have heard of all the hurdles that so many people have had to good access to bereavement support. Of course, that not only affects the death that they are facing, it affects their death and their dying when it comes. Every person who faces the death of someone who is significant in their lives should not do this alone but have access to good bereavement care. Of course, clergy and the Church are significant and they play a significant part in

providing bereavement care and that, in turn, is significant to palliative care. We play our part.

The UK Commission on Bereavement is a partnership of charities and researchers. It will produce its recommendations in September, part of which is encouraging recommendations on the Government but also on us as providers of bereavement care and palliative care. I would encourage us as a Church and us as clergy to look out for those recommendations so we can play our part in improving bereavement services and palliative care in this country.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr Paul Matthams (Channel Islands): I speak in relation to the last part of the proposed resolution, that concerning assisted suicide. I speak in favour of it, but I do consider it essential that we develop further our understanding of the difficult issues raised and I do so in the context of recent events in my own home island of Jersey. As many will know, in Jersey we are not part of the UK. We have our own Parliament. We make our own laws.

Last November, our Parliament voted in favour of the principle of assisted dying. Legislation is presently being prepared. It will come before the States, the Parliament, in November and by this Synod next year we may well have on the statute book within one of the Parliaments in the British islands a law on assisted dying. There are safeguards in the in principle approval but, of course, they are not set in stone. We do not know what will be in the legislation. Also, of course, as has already been raised, there is the issue of so-called mission creep.

We have heard many personal experiences. I will not go into detail of my own, but when my mother died last year I prayed so hard that she would be taken and that she would be taken home quickly when it came to the end of her life. Whilst I fully support the motion, I do urge that it be discussed further in our dioceses and in our deaneries and that we develop our understanding of the difficult issues raised in order that we may constructively participate in the debate. It is an issue, Synod, that will not go away.

Mr Benjamin John (St Albans): The Oregon 2021 statistics paint a picture of the concerns of those choosing this pathway: % fear of losing autonomy; 92% less able to engage in activities making life enjoyable; 68% loss of dignity; 54% feeling like a burden on family, friends and care givers. What does it mean to have dignity? What does it mean to have autonomy? We hear that often value of life is tied to quality of life. When those abilities are taken away, we are worth less. Life is not worth living. But the reality is that we are not autonomous - God is. And, in some sense, our bodies are not ours. Do you not know that your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have received from God. You are not your own. You were bought at a price. What we do with our bodies matters.

These awful, horrible stories of pain and suffering, but whatever euphemism we use suicide is still suicide and murder is still murder. But how can we offer hope in the face of death? The Bible is realistic, but it is an opportunity to show Christ's love to others by serving those who are most vulnerable. Dignity means showing people who are dying that they are still valued, not like dogs to be put down, stepping into those messy, hard situations and showing compassion and suffering with. Whoever you are, whatever you are going through, whatever your bodily functions, you are not a burden and Jesus invites you weary and heavy laden to himself to give you rest. We call them to Christ to the hope that we have of the eternal Kingdom when we will receive new bodies, where there will be no more death and pain and suffering and where we will rejoice in the presence of our saviour. Let us join with Job in crying out that the Lord gives and the Lord takes away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

The Bishop of Worcester (the Rt Revd Dr John Inge): I am grateful for this motion and I want to follow on from what Jane Patterson said about prognosis. My wife, Denise, died on Easter Day in 2014 after a year's battle with cancer, leaving two daughters aged 15 and ten. She was 51. How easy it would have been when she was given that terrible prognosis that she had terminal cancer to give in and to succumb to despair. If assisted dying had been legal, I am sure that she would have been very, very tempted to opt for it. As it was, the quality of her life at the time of her diagnosis and following it was pretty poor by any standards. We were all depressed. However, against the odds, the chemo that she was given did have an effect and the tumours shrank for a while.

Had assisted dying been legal, we might never have had the opportunity to enjoy the precious months together that we were given following that terrible diagnosis and the despair of the moment could so well have become determinative. What a tragedy that would have been. As it was, Denise was able to emerge from the darkness of the initial diagnosis and the trauma of the treatment which followed to enjoy some precious time. As she wrote shortly before she died, "Contemplating mortality is not about being prepared to die. It is about being prepared to live - and that is what I am doing now, more freely and more fully than I have since childhood. The cancer has not made life more precious. That would make it seem like something fragile to lock away in the cupboard. No, it has made it more delicious". As this motion suggests, our energies should be directed towards assisting people to live with dignity, not assisting them to die.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 20 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 20.

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

The Chair: I now invite Simon to respond to the debate. You have four minutes.

Dr Simon Eyre (Chichester): I think if nothing else comes out of this debate, then I think you will have begun to understand the complexities of what is involved. I want to say a heartfelt thank you - and I mean this - to Valerie particularly for sharing her experience. I

am sure there are many other untold stories perhaps in this chamber which might mirror that and it is very painful to have to hear those stories where palliative care has failed and it has not been able to deliver what it might. She mentioned the Royal Commission. That is a decision for Parliament. That is not within our remit. I am very grateful to Emily for her experience from Covid. The NHS was in a terrible state during Covid trying to perform under the most strained of conditions. I worked for NHS 111 for a year and through April and May 2020 they were some of the most difficult months that I had experienced as a practitioner.

I am grateful to Fiona for highlighting the particular aspect of disabled people and I think they would be very, very much at risk from any legislative change. I am grateful to Bishop James for clarifying, with his three Cs, the importance of palliative care and end of life care. Priscilla White gave us, if you like, that balancing thing where palliative care really has performed well. When you are considering how to vote, it is a tension. It is a tension between what palliative care can offer and those difficulties. But what I have tried to put before you is that the root of the problem is actually that we have palliative care that is not sufficiently comprehensive at the moment and it is not providing the care that is needed. We only have one palliative care consultant per hundred thousand population at the moment. We only have one palliative care consultant for every thousand deaths in this country. That is not enough and that is what we would be appealing to the Government to rectify.

I am thankful for the Bishops' interventions, Bishop Graham and also Sarah for your insights from your time in Government and also to Bishop John and his story of his wife's death but, in a sense, the hope that there was in that period and the joy that they had.

Prognosis was mentioned. Thank you, Jane, for highlighting that. It is a very difficult area. I always hesitated to try and give a prognostic time when I was working. It is impossible. I have many experiences. To give you one example, a young woman who had a chondrosarcoma of the skull - which is a malignant tumour in the skull - was given three months to live. She registered with me after she had been alive for about six months. She was still registered with me when I retired. She must have survived 15 years. Those things happen. They do happen. Prognosis has also been further complicated by new and innovative treatments where with conditions that were previously thought to be hopeless we now have people who respond and people who do not respond and deciding who is going to be helped is difficult.

I am going to finish, and please I do apologise if I have missed anybody but I want to just reflect on the sermon this morning. It was the Good Samaritan. What the Good Samaritan did was he came alongside that man and he journeyed with him. That is what we are called to do. We are called to journey with people through their terminal illness. We are not called to cut it off early. It may be difficult, but we are still called to journey, to give love, care and make people still feel valued even in their final days. I thank you for all your support and I thank you for all your contributions.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order. Given the importance of this item and the fact that we are asking for action by Her Majesty's Government, it is important that we have an accurate record of the vote and so I wonder if you would order a count of the Synod.

The Chair: Yes, I will do that. Thank you very much. Do I see 25 people standing? Yes, I do, thank you very much.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Point of order. Madam Chair, this has been a very moving and thoughtful debate and I think it would be good if we could pray before we voted, simply because of the way in which people have spoken and I wonder if you or someone might be called to lead us in prayer.

The Chair: Thank you. Let us have a moment of quiet, please. Thank you, Synod. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 20.

The motion was put and carried, 289 voting in favour, 25 against, with 33 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: Therefore, this item is carried. Thank you very much, Synod. This now concludes this item of business and Synod will be adjourned until 8.30 when members will be invited to return to the Central Hall to undertake the voting process for the CNC. Members are reminded that they will need to bring a device, phone, laptop or a tablet, for the voting.

Full Synod: Fourth Day Monday 11 July 2022

OPENING WORSHIP

Ms Fiona MacMillan (London) led the Synod in an act of worship.

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

The Chair: As we start, William Nye is going to say a few words.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Good morning, Synod. I thought you might appreciate an update on the process for elections by the House of Laity and House of Clergy for the Crown Nominations Commission. Once again I want to apologise for the confusion and complexity of last night. I hope you all slept well. As of this morning, we are still assessing the position. As I speak, the Clerk to the Synod is probably at this very moment on the phone to Civica Election Services with the Registrar. When she has completed talking to them, we will be able to assess the best way forward, in light of all your work to submit ballots yesterday, and I will update you further on this later this morning as soon as I can, once we have assessed the best approach. Thank you very

much.

ITEM 6 WAR IN UKRAINE (GS 2259) (RESUMED DEBATE)

The Chair. Thank you, William. We now turn to the resumed debate on the war in Ukraine. For this members will need the Order Paper for today, Order Paper V, and GS 2256. You will recall that we had reached Item 60. The Revd Jack Shepherd had spoken to and moved the motion and that was open to debate, so we will pick up from there. Then we will come to Item 61. Once that has been debated, we will return to the debate on the main motion, Item 6, as amended, if indeed it is.

ITEM 60 (RESUMED)

The Chair. Item 60 is that in paragraph (c) after “each diocese” insert “and each parish”; after “long-term refuge” insert “and hospitality”; and after “other conflicts” insert “and forms of danger”. The speech limit will be two minutes from the outset. Item 60 is open for debate.

Mrs Nadine Daniel (Liverpool): I wish to commend both the motion and the amendment. Let me explain why. Disclosure, I am the former national refugee welcome co-ordinator for the Archbishops’ Council. Since June of last year, no Afghan who has entered this country under the safe and legal pathway is a refugee. They do not have the protection of refugee status. Since February of last year, the 115,000 Hong Kongers who have sought refuge on our shores do not have refugee status. Since 23 February, no Ukrainian who has entered our country has refugee protection. They have three-year visas. Eight years on from the start of the war in Aleppo, the rebuilding of Aleppo has not started. I just offer that up.

The reason I wish to commend the amendments is this. Having worked with practically every diocese in the Church of England, I have to tell you that they are very good at strategy, most of them, and most of time, but it takes a village to raise a child. It takes a community, a parish, to resettle a refugee family. We are called and impelled by Christ to offer hospitality. It is not just war that causes people to flee to our shores. I would urge you to support both the motion and the amendment.

The Chair. I can see no one else standing so we now come to a vote on Item 60.

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

ITEM 61

The Chair: We now move to Item 61 and I call on Patrick Richmond to speak to this motion. He has two minutes.

The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich): On Friday, Clive Scowen spoke to his two amendments to the effect that the peace between Ukraine and Russia that we hope for and pray and call for should be a just peace. The first amendment was, I believe, accepted and carried. You can see it in Item 6(b) “urging all Christians and people of faith to pray that the war in Ukraine be ended justly”.

This second amendment, which I am moving on Clive’s behalf, is concerning section (d) in the main motion “calling on Her Majesty’s Government to work to secure a just peace”. So, instead of a negotiated peace we are calling for a just peace. Why are we doing that? Well, of course because the Bible links inextricably peace and justice. They are two sides of the same coin. St Paul calls for the Kingdom of God which is justice and peace. Justice, righteousness, these are linked with the peace of the Kingdom of God that we are praying for and that we are calling for.

In the motion as it stands it talks about negotiation which is the means, but we are calling, Clive and I, for you to amend that to talk about justice because this is the substance, this is the end; this is what we want to achieve by the means of negotiation and other means as necessary. I therefore move the amendment standing in Clive Scowen’s name calling on the Government to work to secure a just peace.

The Chair: Bishop of Leeds, do you support this amendment please?

The Bishop of Leeds (the Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): I am not going to resist it. I think the point of the wording is that a lot people resist the idea of negotiation, but however this conflict ends, there has to be negotiation of what happens thereafter. I would prefer it if we kept the word “negotiation” and stick “just” in, but that is not what is proposed. I am not going to resist it, but I have made my point.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 61 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr Daniel Matovu (Oxford): I thank you, Chair, for calling me to address this august body for the very first time. The amendment proposes to insert the word “just” into the main motion. As I recall, the Bishop of Leeds said he would not oppose this on Monday because, as he put it, “Who can speak against justice?” Who indeed can speak against justice? But justice for whom? Just for the white Ukrainians?

One thing that is missing from an otherwise excellent report supporting the main motion is there is no mention of the treatment of black and brown refugees from Ukraine. Many of you will no doubt have heard disturbing accounts of how black and brown refugees,

such as African students or professionals, have been prevented from boarding buses or trains, even when there were seats available, or, when they did manage to get on a bus or a train, being forcibly removed and told to walk - to walk - as if they were less human.

I understand that the majority of you will be jealous of my all-year-round tan. It was not from a bottle or under a lamp, but I am fearfully and wonderfully made, as are all my black brothers and sisters and, by the way, as are all of you.

It does not just stop at the border. The EU countries have been ready to fling their borders open to receive refugees from the Ukraine, but white refugees from Ukraine. The fact is that black and brown refugees have found it much harder to get visas and permanent residency in another country. So my brothers and sisters, whilst I support the amendment, and I wholeheartedly support the main motion, it does not go far enough, in my view. This Synod should denounce the differential treatment of black and brown refugees from the Ukraine.

Canon Mrs Jane Evans (Leeds): I spoke on Friday in favour of the main motion. The point I was hoping to make in my remarks then was that the situation is complex, complicated, nuanced and not as black and white as we often think, and whereas I obviously agree with my Bishop that one cannot argue against justice, I do think the word “negotiated” is really important in this resolution because of the complexity of the situation. I therefore oppose the amendment.

The Chair: I am now minded to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure, so we are voting to close Item 61.

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

The Chair: We now come to a vote on Item 61.

The motion was put on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very close so I am going to order a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The motion was put and lost, 137 voting in favour, 147 against, with 29 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: We now return to debate the main motion as amended. You can see the amendment we did before in bold on Item 6 and then Jack Shepherd’s amendment has also been voted for. Those who wish to speak, please stand.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (the Rt Revd Robert Innes): I want to begin by thanking most sincerely all those who have supported the appeal for Ukraine launched by the Diocese in Europe USPG. We have raised over £300,000, which is being used for humanitarian work in Ukraine and amongst Ukrainian refugees.

My diocese includes the chaplaincy in Kyiv. It also includes chaplaincies in Riga, Tannin and Helsinki, frontline states, some of whose members are really frightened at what might lie ahead for them.

The first thing I want to say is we need to watch our language really carefully because those who live very close to the border with Russia hear what we say and rely on us to speak words of peace.

I want to talk mainly about Russia. At the beginning of last week I made a pastoral visit to our chaplaincy in Moscow and its chaplain Malcolm Rogers. I visited the Tretyakov Museum of Russian Art, and for the first time in my life I stood before Andrei Rublev's icon of the Trinity, an icon which has been deeply influential in my own spirituality, and is arguably the icon that has had the most influence on post-war Western trinitarian theology. But the point is the Tretyakov Museum has no less than 55 galleries full of Russian art, most of it religious and an extraordinary contribution to European culture.

I spoke with an older American lady on our church council. She told me about her husband aged 85. I asked her what he thinks about the situation in Ukraine. She said, "He believes it is a clash of civilisations; a clash between the secular West and Russian Orthodoxy. Amongst Russians of his age", she said, "that is the commonly held view".

We surely all want to condemn the illegal and unjustifiable actions of the Russian regime in Ukraine, but that cannot and must not mean the demonization of Russian people, Russian culture or of our brothers and sisters in the Russian Orthodox Church. We are in an extremely delicate and dangerous point in European history. It is imperative that we find ways of keeping dialogue with the Russian people and the Russian Orthodox Church open. As a Church we must hold the leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church to account, unhesitatingly condemn Russian leadership/aggression, and at the same time be very careful in our actions and words of feeding into a narrative that the Russian regime itself propagates, and which can only undermine the cause of peace and reconciliation.

The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin): I just to want to very briefly say that I hope that we will have some joined-up thinking. It is not just praying for justice, justice is already included in the motion. It is important that we hold that negotiation quite clearly but, in doing so, we must in joining up our thinking be praying for our international world leaders, praying for a calibre of leadership that is not simply going to be looking at its own self-interest, "We must not make this decision because it might upset our voters". We want greater leaders than that internationally, who are going to look in the round and care about humanity, and be able to sit around the table long before wars start and negotiate for the kind of world that is necessary for us to celebrate that we are all fearfully and wonderfully made in the image of God.

The Revd Professor Morwenna Ludlow (Exeter): This is my maiden speech. Everything

I say will be in support of the motion and echoing the words of Bishop Robert, who we have just heard.

I would also like to draw the attention of Synod to a declaration of Orthodox theologians on Russian world theology, published in March 2022. You can find it on the publicorthodoxy.org website. In this statement, Orthodox theologians from various traditions and locations condemn Putin's invasion of Ukraine, and Russian claims of political and religious control over Ukraine. However, they also do something else. They note the polarising rhetoric emerging from Putin, supported by some - some - members of the Moscow Patriarchate in Russia. This is Putin's rhetoric. We do not have to accept it. It would be a tragedy if we allowed it to cause a break between western and eastern Christians.

In their statement these Orthodox theologians also critique the underlying theology of Putin's Russian world ideology, which denies the equality of all humans made in the image of God, and which associates a human kingdom with an earthly kingdom. These Orthodox theologians have spoken boldly, biblically and incisively. There are Orthodox Christians, especially in Russia, who are showing considerable bravery in speaking out. These, too, are our neighbours.

So I would support, and urge your support of this motion, because it is not just a political and humanitarian motion, but it is a theological issue causing us to express what our true Christian values are. Therefore, I ask you to support it.

The Chair: I now move to close Item 6.

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

The Chair: Bishop of Leeds, I call on you to respond to the debate. Thank you.

The Bishop of Leeds (the Rt Revd Nicolas Baines): Thank you to all those who have contributed. I feared we might have lost the momentum with the hiatus between Friday and today, but these things are deeply felt. Thank you to Jane Evans for making the point on Friday that neither side can win and in one sense neither side dares lose, and that negotiation is inevitable. In fact, Jane, you talked about the ease with which we use words and that has been reflected in other contributions. We have to be very careful about the language we use.

Stephen Maxfield on language pointed out that both Russia and Ukraine are signatories to the UN Charter and the questions this conflict raises about rules-based international order. Again he emphasised, and many have repeated, nothing - nothing - justifies what Putin has done. There is no argument for that.

The Archbishop mentioned meeting with the Patriarch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. It is well worth reading the report on that on the Archbishop's website.

Stephen Platt, again thank you for pointing out that the Russian Orthodox view and response to this conflict is not uniform. We must not categorise people simply because they belong to a particular group or Church, therefore, they believe or they approve of whatever. It is not that simple. We have to keep the channels open.

Moving on from some of those amendments, the Bishop of Coventry spoke about nuclear non-proliferation and that needs to be taken seriously. Thank you, Jack Shepherd, for saying that in one sense the motion needs to go further.

Martin Gainsborough made a very strong point about language about when we use language such as “rules-based order”, when we speak in binary terms, that you are either this or you that, and yet we have not understood the Russian mindset. Russian history, culture, theology is not Western, and you cannot understand this conflict, or Russia, without looking through the lens of Russians, and through Putin in particular. That takes really hard work. It is not obvious. The language of authoritarianism, executive sovereignty. It was a very important speech.

Nadine Daniel, thank you. Yes, they have not even started rebuilding Aleppo. You made the point that it is not just individuals hosting Ukraine refugees that matter, it is the community in which they are set, and we all have a responsibility in that.

Patrick Richmond, peace and justice yes, but, as I indicated earlier, we cannot shy away from the need for negotiation even if one side beats the other into submission. You have to create a future that is based on relationship and agreement and some sort of negotiation. It cannot be avoided.

Daniel, I am so pleased that you raised the question of the differential treatment of refugees in Ukraine. Those of colour not being allowed on to buses, and being treated differently from those who are white. We do not have time to go into it but it raises a serious question about - and I am going to categorise here which I said we should not do - Ukrainian and east European, in some cases, attitudes to race. That is for another occasion.

Jane Evans, thank you again. The Bishop in Europe, it is very important that we listen to you and that we pray for your people. You remind us that there are neighbours to Russia who will listen through very different ears from those of us who are fairly remote.

Rose, thank you, perspicacious leadership we all need. Morwenna, thank you again.

I think in conclusion all I would want to do is say that in all the complexity of this stuff that we simply need to pray very simply with very few words: Lord have mercy, Christ have mercy, Lord have mercy. I beg to move.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. Item 6 as amended is now being put to the vote.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order. This is an important item. It is asking the Government to take action, so it would be useful and important to have an accurate count of the vote. Would you order a count of the Synod?

The Chair: Yes. This is the counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 6 as amended.

The motion was put and carried, 323 voting in favour, 2 against, with 2 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: Thank you, Synod. This closes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 9.58 am.

ITEM 21

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT (GS 2267)

The Chair: We come now to the Archbishops' Council Annual Report. This is a presentation under Standing Order 107. There will be a short presentation and then there will be an opportunity to ask questions on the work of the Council in 2021. They will be questions only, not speeches, and the questions will be taken in batches of three. So, I will be calling three people at a time. We start with a presentation, then, from Charlotte Cook and Luke Miller. I call upon them to make their presentation, please.

The Revd Charlotte Cook (ex officio): Chair, members of Synod, it is our pleasure to present the Council's Annual Report for 2021. This will be the last annual report under the nine objectives from the extended quinquennium: evangelism, discipleship, ministry, common good, education, resources for the church, safeguarding, governance and a church for all people.

In 2022 the Council will report under its new objectives on page 35 of GS 2067. We will highlight the achievements and activities within some of the objectives, not all nine as some have already been discussed in other debates. Although this is the Council's report as a trustee body, it reflects on the mission and ministry of the wider Church of England in our communities in a year that was, again, impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic.

So, for discipleship and ministry, the Archbishops' Council has continued its focus on prayer and worship, both at its own meetings and presiding resources for the Church. The digital discipleship portal for *Everyday Faith* was developed and launched last year, adding to other online resources, such as the *Daily Prayer* podcast, launched in March 2021. This registered more than one million downloads, with around 8,000 people listening each day. *Daily Prayer* is the latest in a series of Church of England prayer and discipleship apps and podcasts available, which have now been accessed eight million times. This is up 50% on the previous year.

We have also continued with the provision of the weekly online service and are grateful to all those who have made wide-ranging contributions to this aspect of our work. Due to further pandemic restrictions in 2021, churches continued to deliver online and hybrid worship, and the *Daily Hope 24* worship phonenumber has received more than 550,000 calls so far, 20,000 every month, with more than seven million minutes spent on the service, launched as a way of bringing worship and prayer into people's homes.

The role of clergy has been instrumental in supporting worship during this challenging time, both online and in person. In 2021, 501 people were recommended for training for ordained ministry. A quarter were under 32, 11% were of UKME/GMH heritage, and 55% were women. We expect nearly 400 ordinands to complete their theological training this year, and to take up stipendiary curacy posts in 2022. Of these, around three-quarters of the posts are likely to be funded by the dioceses, while the Strategic Ministry Fund grants administered by the Council's Strategic Ministry Board will help to support around a quarter of new curacy posts.

The Strategic Ministry Fund was set up in 2019 to help ensure that diocese are able to fund additional curate numbers, to increase the number of candidates for ordained ministry, and funds were allocated towards the cost of additional curacies with the Council approving a Strategic Ministry Board to administer the grant process.

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): Under the heading of Social Action and a Church for All, work has continued on advocating that the Government should lift the two-child limit in the wake of the sharp rise in new claims for Universal Credit caused by the Coronavirus pandemic. The Council's Mission and Public Affairs Division, together with the Child Poverty Action Group, had previously conducted and published research on the impact of the two-child limit in tax credits and Universal Credit, in the document All Kids Count on the impact of the two-child limit after two years.

The Social Impact Investment Programme was established in 2021 to deploy social investment capital to advance the church's missional objectives. Last year, the Council made its first commitment in this space, £1.6 million to the Women in Safe Homes Fund, which works in partnership with organisations to provide homes for vulnerable women and their children, who are homeless or at the risk of homelessness.

The Council studied the report of the Archbishops' Anti-Racism Taskforce, and agreed immediately to begin to take forward 34 of the 39 recommendations, which were directed to the national Church. The Racial Justice Commission was established and will work on enabling the flourishing of all people who engage with the Church.

A fifth of the Church of England's 12,500 parishes are estates parishes, and focus work has taken place to support engagement in these deprived areas. Looking forward, much of our future grant awards will prioritise the most deprived and resource-poor contexts, will fuel a pipeline of leaders in frontline ministry, both ordained and lay, and will address

key gaps, such as volunteer and paid leaders for ministry with children and young people, and becoming a Church which better represents the communities we serve.

A new vision for further education launched in 2021, with the report *Vocation, Transformation and Hope* highlighting how FE makes a significant difference to the three themes in people's lives – a sense of vocation, their personal transformation and their hope for society.

In terms of governance and resources, the end of the previous extended quinquennium - sexennium, was it? - and the start of this new quinquennium, has led to new members making up 60% of the General Synod's total membership, and we are, of course, grateful for all your dedication, engagement and service and that of our predecessors. We have focused on the development of the Vision and Strategy to be a Church that is younger and more diverse, to be a Church where mixed ecology is the norm, and to become a church of missionary disciples. The Growing Faith work, promoting a partnership between the three communities of church, school and household continued to develop and expand in 2021, with the establishment of a new Growing Faith Foundation to serve as a strategic lead across the Church to grow a younger Church and increase engagement with children and families in different settings. This work is carried out by the Church of England National Education Office, overseen by the Council and the National Society. The Governance Review Group reported and work is being taken forward by the Governance Project Board, which will report to Synod in 2023.

In a subject dear to the heart of an archdeacon, work continues to encourage an ever more generous culture in churches to grow their ministry for the future. This includes expanding advice and guidance for parishes, encouraging digital giving and providing training for clergy and laity.

Funding of £6 million was secured from a further tranche of the Government's Culture Recovery Fund grants. Members will find details of the full support for churches and cathedrals from pandemic-related grants in GS Misc 1326. The Council was pleased at the extension of the government's Listed Places of Worship grant scheme, which pays grants equal to the VAT incurred on repairs, such as urgent structural work, reducing the fundraising burden on churches and congregations.

The Revd Charlotte Cook (ex officio): So, I hope that gives you a flavour of some of the Council's work on behalf of the Church this year. And I do want to emphasise that, on behalf of the Church, this year. As I conclude on behalf of this Council, I would like to thank William and the staff team for their support, advice and unstinting work in support of the Council members and of the whole Church during this year. The panel of Council members look forward to hearing and responding to your questions now.

The Chair: There is now an opportunity for members to ask questions. I will take them in blocks of three, if indeed we have that many questions to start with.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (the Rt Revd Robert Innes): Thank you for the report from the Archbishops' Council. The Report deals very extensively with the Church of England's work in England. I was looking for references to work beyond England, in the Channel Islands, the Isle of Man, and indeed in Europe. I could not find any, but perhaps I am just missing them, and if I am, could you tell me where they are? More broadly, and referencing the previous debate on Ukraine, work with other churches is extremely important in a fragmented and divided world where misunderstandings arise very easily.

The Chair: And your question on that aspect is?

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (the Rt Revd Robert Innes): What is the Archbishops' Council's strategy for ecumenical work and what resources are being allocated to it?

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): Firstly, I would really like to see a full report, and is it possible that we could have it at the next session on the SDF funding and how it is being allocated and which projects have been supported in which diocese. I am asking this question because when finances were being discussed before, we had some information that I did not know, and I do not think most members of Synod were aware of.

Secondly, is it possible, please, for us to consider our digital disciples online more fully and have more money devoted to this? I have already asked for more discussion and more of a survey.

The Chair: Thank you. You have already asked two questions, that is slightly stretching the boundaries a bit.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I declare an interest, as Chair of Trustees of the Salmon Youth Centre in Bermondsey, formerly the Cambridge University Mission. Given the first of the six bold outcomes to double the number of children and young active disciples in the Church of England by 2030, and given the loss of staff referred to in questions 31 and 32, what plans does the Archbishops' Council have to ensure that the outcome is sufficiently prioritised and resourced. Will it, for example, encourage the greater use of organisations like Missional Youth Church Network and Youthscape, which led such excellent workshops yesterday?

The Chair: I call upon either Luke or Charlotte to answer, or indeed John. So, we welcome him as a way of answering questions if that is the appropriate way to do it. So, we have answers to those three questions.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): It is going to very quickly become obvious the way this works – I do the easy ones, so I will do the first two, and I will leave the hard ones to Charlotte and Luke.

Robert, we do not do a cook's tour of every part of the geography. I know that we have had extensive conversations with Europe about potential funding. We have a scheme in

Sodor and Man going on, so we just do not list every geography, but I take your point about inclusion. On ecumenical pieces, that is covered in Vote 3, which I will be picking up on the budget. We do have a budget for grants to ecumenical bodies and I know that the Archbishops themselves, well beyond the Archbishops' Council do much to foster ecumenical relations.

Penny, I think your answer on the first one about getting the full details of SDF funding, I would direct you particularly to the Strategic Investment Board Report, which gets published annually, and I believe is available to all General Synod members, if not, it certainly should be, which gives you the level of details I think you are seeking for. And if there is more detail you want, we can include it in a future year's report. You already picked up, maybe, the question of digital disciples, absolutely right, it is an excellent point, and when we come to consider the three-year programme for the digital spend, I shall be keen to see it included there. Can one of you help on the children?

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): Just to say to Penny that the staff help us with the Strategic Investment Report. It is GS Misc 1327 if you want to look that up. In terms of Adrian Greenwood's point about children and young people, we certainly wish to work with all possible partners. Good work with children and young people is something which needs to be supported from the centre and bubble up, as far as possible, from the bottom.

Many members of Synod are actually engaged in young people's work, I am wearing my Sea Cadet Chaplain's badge, you will have seen the display for chaplaincies to all kinds of different organisations, many of which are youth organisations in the exhibition centre, and there are many other organisations like Youthscape and those others mentioned by Adrian, and I am sure members will have many others that they know. We need to be supporting all of those in all of our work and ensuring that the Archbishops' Council puts in appropriate structures which ensure that youth work is supported both from the top but also embrace it from the local level where our young people are.

The Chair: Opportunity for further questions.

The Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter): Thank you for a really helpful report outlining the comprehensive work of the Archbishops' Council and for the wider Church. I began, as I read through, to feel that in its eagerness to be upbeat, and perhaps not wanting to scare the horses, the reality of decline was not being faced. I quote from page 4 of the foreword, "aimed at ensuring that the Church continues to be a growing Church for all people in all places", but despite the best efforts, and the fact that there are wonderful pockets of growth, is that true? My question is could Synod be given clear, regular statistical updates on the state of the Church of England? Numerically, using the statistics submission which parishes labour to produce each year, and financially, with a picture of dioceses across the nation. Good diagnosis and research such as we were given yesterday on churches with children ---

The Chair: I think I have heard you put the question, could we have good statistical information – that is the question.

The Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter): That is the question.

The Chair: So, if you would kindly stop, that would be good.

Dr Ros Clarke (Lichfield): On page 30 of the report, we are reminded that 2021 saw the development of the Vision and Strategy for the next 10 years for the whole of the church and the identification of the three strategic priorities. My question is at what point during that process was the synodical structure of the Church involved in the development of the vision and strategy and at what point did it give approval for the vision and strategy?

the Ven. Dr Adrian Youings (Bath & Wells): As an archdeacon I am being increasingly approached by churches to talk about closure. When John Spence came to our diocesan synod not many years ago, he said that the issue of closing of churches had been put in the “too difficult to deal with” pile. I just want to ask whether the Council is removing it from the “too difficult to deal with” pile and is actively considering the issues around that issue?

The Revd Charlotte Cook (ex officio): So, Graham and Ros, I will seek to answer your questions, thank you so much for them. Graham, in terms of a regular report, there is the statistics for mission and the parish finances, which are given annually and published on the website. There is no move to look at anything more regularly than that. However, I would want to say that if that is something that you continue to want then feel free to mention it again. As we all know, growth is not just numbers, even though they are indicative of something and we know that God continues to grow His Church, and we are expectant as the Archbishops’ Council that God will do amazing things through the work of the Church of England, so thank you for your question.

Ros, thank you for your point, that has been raised a couple of times already in Synod, and Archbishop Stephen spoke about it at question time. So, thank you.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Thank you, and Graham, actually your points on reporting, we did do a lot of reporting previously on numbers attending. It is a flawed number in many ways, but it has been knocked sideways by Covid, so I think we can look again about how we enhance the visibility of the scale both of those attending and worshipping communities, but I think we should take that one away.

Adrian, on your point, which you have quoted me from Bath & Wells, the question of closures I think I referred to was in the context of church building closures. Churches are, of course, the people in them or the people in the worshipping community, and the question of what happens about that can only ever be determined at the most local level. The bigger issue of church buildings, and the legacy we have of an amazing number, the country’s majority number of listed buildings, is, I think, something which I do not like

saying is on the “too difficult” pile, but in many ways it still has to be addressed at strategic level, and I understand that, and I think sometimes one operates in an Archbishops’ Council aware of these things but not always able to find the solutions to them when there are other priorities to address.

The Chair: In view of the pressure on the agenda, I think we could allow ourselves one further round of questions, but no more than that, if anyone has any further questions. Two people up there, and then we will have to wrap up this item on the agenda, in order to move on and get through all the other things that we have to deal with.

Mr Matt Orr (Bath & Wells): As seen in the Talking Jesus Report launched earlier this year, the highest percentage of people who have come to faith did so “from birth”, with the second highest being from the 15 to 18 range, followed equally by the 11 to 14s and the five to 10s. Does the Council believe that there could be more to be done to the budget to reflect this information in regards to funding evangelism?

The Revd Timothy Bateman (Birmingham): This is regarding the education section. Given that we want to reach more children and young people from non-church backgrounds, and given children and young people from non-church backgrounds are found in many of our Church of England schools, this obviously links to our Vision for Evangelism Strategy, what would you love to see happen to achieve reaching children and young people of non-church backgrounds in our Church of England schools? Could you flesh this out a bit more?

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): I will have a go at both of those. Matt, yes, I think that, personally speaking, anything that we can do to support the growth of young people’s faith and particularly within families, and that tripodal piece of work, that it is families at home, it is school and it is Church, and the three things need to work together, in order effectively to nurture particularly those of us, like myself, who grew up in the faith. It is a clear point and there is clear work going on in that that we need to continue to support.

Tim, yes, I think that we have got an amazing thing, and what would I like to see? I would like to see lots of other schools using the SIAMS that we have, the inspection regime for schools. I would like to see churches looking at how they might look at their own practice against what schools are asked to do, because in a Church of England school the inspector can wander up to any child in any year group and say, “What does your prayer life mean? How do you talk about your faith?” And – I speak as a parish priest still – I wonder how much, if I were to do that in my congregation with both adults and young people, that would get the kind of effective response that we expect at schools, which are open to all of all faiths and none, to deliver for all of our children of all faiths and none, even in the church setting.

So, I hope that we can use some of those tools that we have already got even more effectively in order to help our young people, and indeed our grown-ups, and those of us who are very ancient but young at heart, to thrive in the faith.

The Chair: As I have indicated, in view of the pressure on the agenda, I think we have to terminate this item of the agenda now and so I invite you to remain in your seats for the next item on the agenda which is the Archbishops' Council budget for 2023. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *the Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 10.24 am.

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL BUDGET 2023 AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT (GS 2268) ITEM 22

The Chair: Good morning, Synod. We now move to Item 22, well in fact Items 22 to 28, and you will need GS 2268 for this series of debates. In a moment, I am going to call John Spence to speak to all these items, from 22 to 28, and therefore John will be having 15 minutes in order to do that, because he would rather do it that way than address each of the separate motions, but then we will have to work our way through the motions on the Order Paper. So, John, I invite you speak to Items 22 to 28 and you have 15 minutes to do so.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Good morning again ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for coming to this conversation where you will seek to approve the Archbishops' Council Budget for 2023. We have two tasks before us this morning. Firstly, to agree that expenditure as it relates to the items covered, largely by apportionment, and, secondly, to agree the apportionment and pooling adjustment.

So, we start by looking at the overall budget. Item Votes 1 to 5 total £57 million, and that is the item I will be talking to today. But the other elements of the budget, the £110 million laid aside under the new spending plans for the new Diocesan Investment Fund, a further £10 million for People and Partnerships, which is basically about capacity, and £19 million reserved for plans to be developed for racial justice and net zero. That brings the total budget to £196 million, and that compares with £148 million in 2020, so you can see here the scale of additional investment that is being made available, indeed, to address and reverse the trends that we have been seeing in the Church overall.

If I then turn to Votes 1 to 5, Vote 1 is for Training for Ministry, and that is £15.7 million, National Church Responsibilities £33.1 million. On to Vote 3, which says here Grants, it is grants to ecumenical bodies, Robert Innes, and provisions for other purposes, £1.5 million. We have £0.6 million under Vote 4, that is our responsibility for pensions to mission agencies where we have been providing the personnel. And then finally, Vote 5, retired clergy housing under the long-term agreement to continue and grow the funding of this item, £5.8 million. But I guess what you can see there is how that is funded, that £56.8 million in total, funded £31.3 from the apportionment, and I thank all the dioceses for continuing to support us with this funding: £19.9 million from the Church

Commissioners and the rest of the funding coming in from other outside providers, through grants, or from the income we earned through sub-lettings and the use of our reserves. So, that is how the funding is in place.

But what may be of greatest interest is to understand where the key changes in spend are coming. So, under Vote 1, ordinands and curates, ministry training, I regret to say that we will see a decline in spend in 2023 of £15.7 million, down from a budget of £16.8 million last year. In 2015 in response to what dioceses told us, we set to have a target of growing the number of ordinands by 50% in 2020, and that goal was largely achieved. We now see that large number coming out of training not being balanced by the number going in, and surely this is the expenditure line we would want to see increase in future years, and I am encouraged by the news that there is an expectation of an 11% increase next against this year's number.

Within the National Church Responsibilities, well, safeguarding has been an ever-greater sum, and when we budgeted for 2022, we budgeted on the sum of £4.8 million. It was subsequently determined that we should roll out the regional model more quickly and we had to find extra funding for the Safe Spaces project, which is so important to the survivors, and so that is why that budget was exceeded and is largely replicated in 2023.

We continue to increase the investment in digital work, Penny, and it is exactly that extra resource that we can use for the areas that you were talking about earlier. But the big change in the National Church Responsibilities vote, Vote 2, is down the bottom there under Emerging Church. Now, this is a strange label for it, but it is because it is two elements under the Transforming Effectiveness Programme, initiated in 2021 and led by Bishop Martin of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich. There are two elements that are causing this increase, one is simpler support for dioceses and parishes where there are projects to centralise and automate some of the processes previously done on a manual level, at parish level particularly but also dioceses, and people are employed in making that happen.

Secondly, a £4 million project, which is looking at reconfiguring our accommodation within Church House to reduce significantly our footprint. That £4 million spend, which will seem a huge amount, but it is a very complex building, is actually going to produce annual savings of £1 million per annum across the NCIs, so you can see that this was a very strong business case.

Under Vote 3, we do need to increase the figure make a £250,000 provision for additional legal costs. Under Vote 5, as I have said, we commit and have committed since 2010 to increase annually the amount we put into the fund for retired clergy housing because we have not yet reached the peak of demand in that space.

I think it would be very interesting for us to observe how that apportionment and the degrees to which Votes 1 to 5 are funded by apportionment has changed over the last decade. In 2014 apportionment accounted for 89% of the spend under Votes 1 to 5, and

that has now come down to 55% in 2023. That has produced a saving of £71 million over the decade. But if I only take 2020-23 alone, the savings to dioceses is £57 million. That is 57 million that would otherwise have been asked of dioceses to pay an apportionment. I hope you understand that the Archbishops' Council here are all too aware of the enormous financial constraints dioceses face, which is why we are freezing apportionment once again. Apportionment now has been kept flat or below inflation consistently across recent years.

If we look at that decade over where that big increase in spend has come from, I just give you here some of the key items. I go back to ministry training. Back in 2014 £13.1 million, reaching a peak last year of £16.8 million, and that is where we aspire to see it grow again. Safeguarding, which we were not spending anything meaningful on, £6.4 million. I did mention in the previous slide the £5.6 million being replicated. At the same time, the Past Case Review Programme is coming to an end and so grants come down from £1.5 million to £0.8 million and that is what makes up the £6.4 million total there.

Who could argue anything other than we have had brilliant dividends from the Digital Team, who have now trained thousands of parishes and individuals on how to use digital work, who have created the central devices of which we have heard earlier, who continue to sweep the board in winning awards across the whole of the industry.

These are all elements of investment that is either essential, as in the case of safeguarding, or highly desirable in terms of other elements. I have mentioned retired clergy housing already. At the bottom there, Shared Services, going up by nearly £2 million over the decade.

Two big items there, firstly the creation of a proper data services function to improve the quality and consistency of management information across the Church. Secondly, the central funding of the programme to give diocesan giving advisers the Giving and Generosity Programme from which so many dioceses are already benefitting, and to which I will return in a moment. I would want to, at this point, just give thanks to all those who have stepped in to provide that funding over the last decade. Of course, the Church Commissioners, the Corporation of Church House, benefactors and some other providers as well.

But if I turn now to look at the wider picture, ladies and gentlemen, you see where the real financial challenge facing the Church is. Since I became your Finance Chairman in 2014, I have been reporting that the pool of regular givers is growing in age and declining in number and that giving was only increasing every year because of their increasing personal generosity. By 2019, I was reporting that that had ceased to be the case, that the decline in the numbers was now so strong as to offset the increase in personal generosity. Of course, Covid has hit us very hard - indeed, particularly among that very pool. In 2020, we saw a 7% decline in parish share against 2019 and that was compounded by a further 3% decline in 2021.

I am pleased to say that, so far this year, we are seeing a 3% increase, but the fact is we are still 7% below 2019 levels. Moreover, since 2019, we have seen compound inflation totalling 12% and so the reduction in the spending power of that parish share is approximately 20%. I have asked that we undertake an urgent re-forecasting of diocesan expected surpluses and deficits for 2022 and looking ahead to 2023 so that we can fully understand the scale of the issue. But can I just say to you that, beneath that 7% aggregate number, there is the most extraordinary range. We have dioceses who have been giving close to 2019 levels and others that are 20% down. I make no judgment. There are different circumstances in different places. But I say to you, please, where you can see that your diocese is well below 2019 levels, in the range 10% to 20% which puts it in that lower level, please consider what might be done by your diocese to reach out to those who are having more success.

There is a very clear correlation between the levels of generosity and the individual leadership given by the diocesan leadership team and by the way in which they use their Giving and Generosity adviser - and, if your diocese has not yet accessed the scheme, I encourage you to do so. Generosity is both the enabler and the outcome of the revitalisation of parishes. We cannot survive ever by merely subsidising the past. We must encourage the new growth and sometimes that means stripping out bits of old wood to let new shoots grow as every gardener would tell you. We also need to allow the seed to fall on fertile land as evidenced by new church plants. That is the way to our future. Because, of course, the financial challenges persist. Rather like a jet engine pushing out against us, we fully understand that safeguarding has not just meant more cost at the centre, it has meant more cost at every level.

Inflation is said to be with us at high levels for the next 12, 24 months. Inflation is the enemy of ambition and we really need to understand how much of what we want to do may be sucked into dealing with what we have to cope with. You are all facing increased taxation at parish and diocesan level with things like National Insurance and regulation grows and divides as ever. But, ladies and gentlemen, let me give you three positives. The Clergy Pension Fund, which was heavily in deficit through brilliant work by the Pensions Board under John Ball, have now returned to surplus and earlier this year were able to announce an interim 3% reduction in the contribution rate from 39.9% to 36% - so, actually, nearer 4%.

Consultation is now underway to understand what can be done more and, subject to ongoing strong performance, the approval of the Pensions Board, the outcome of that consultation and the approval of the regulator, they are hoping to cut the rate of contribution down with no deficit funding required and with all member benefits retained intact from 39.9% to 28% and that produces a saving of over £20 million across the Church. While we have our cash challenges now, we have the benefit of the wonderful investment performances that have taken place across the years: at national level with the Pensions Board to whom I have just alluded, the sustainability of the Church Commissioners' funds and the fact that at parish level we still see reserves of around £1 billion in aggregate. These are funds which will need to be drawn on as we revitalise the

Church, as we take forward the Vision and Strategy - or, rather, you do because it can only ever happen from the local level up.

The final great thing we have going for us is that we are united. As we talked about on Saturday in worship, we are a unity and we are one body in Christ. My dear friends, as I have always said to you, the money is not the end game. The money is merely an enabler to release the Holy Spirit to do its work in every community, in every village, in every town, in every county and across the country. Let us release the Holy Spirit.

if you just think about the word "Spirit" for a moment, let us S, strip out every artificial boundary, so that we may P pursue and relentlessly adopt the best proven practice wherever it exists across the Church. Let us I, inform and inspire each other to create a can-do positive culture, built on our known successes which surround us more than we realise. And, yes, R, let us revitalise parishes or help parishes and communities revitalise themselves, recognising again that nurture and recovery may involve surgery on occasions. Let us, I, innovate and take risks as Christ himself did and we walk in the footsteps of Christ. T, let us transform the trust that exists between us, because we are one body and we ask God to send us out in the power of His spirit and in that spirit to live and work to His praise and glory. That is the only reason I do this role.

Ladies and gentlemen, I lay before you the apportionment, as we ask you to agree today, with all the increase in spending which totals 8%, for the reasons I have stated, being funded by the Church Commissioners. I lay before you motions 22 to 28 standing in my name.

The Chair. Thank you, John, for that masterful presentation. I am taking that that you have moved Item 22, which means that Item 22, which is the Report on the Budget, GS 2268, is now open for debate. I am going to take contributions in batches of three so that John can respond in that way. If you are wanting to stand, please do so and the initial speech limit is five minutes.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): Thank you very much, John, for your inspiring presentation and for the exciting vision which the Archbishops' Council has for taking forward the spiritual and numerical growth of the Church. If a budget is a vision in numbers, then I am excited about the budget that you are presenting. But there is an area that I am concerned about with the Archbishops' Council's work this year. It is one where I think, actually, we may have both a lack of financial ambition and be imposing a cost on the parishes.

That is to do with the National Burial Grounds Survey, which has the laudable aim of creating what would be a database of potentially 250 million records which would be searchable, which would be very helpful for families and which, because we have all of this information held within the Church of England, we would be in a good position to establish and use this data in some way that would provide an income stream for the Church. But, instead, we have outsourced the collection to Family Search which, as many

people know but not everybody, is an agency of the Mormon Church, an organisation with very different religious beliefs. They, obviously, see the financial benefit and have been keen to undertake this work but they will do so in a way which will not benefit the parishes.

It will actually cause a cost at a number of levels. One, directly to parishes because every parish that wants to maintain its digital record will then have to pay a subscription of £96 a year, increasing no doubt with inflation, but also because there will be a cost because at the moment most of our records are held by the county record officers who do a sterling job as diocesan archivists and they are able to monetise searches on those records for themselves which subsidise the fact that they maintain huge numbers of Church of England records at their own public expense. Without that income stream, they will probably want to review arrangements which will either come as a cost to the Archbishops' Council or to the dioceses or to the parishes.

I am also concerned that by lacking ambition in trying to do this ourselves, or perhaps working in partnership with the chief archivists and local Government, we are actually losing income for the Church but we are also causing confusion in the minds of people who are very often vulnerable adults who are looking for information about deceased relatives who will be directed to the Family Search website where this information will be available after three years. That website is closely linked to the Mormon Church website. In fact, within four clicks of the Family Search website you are on a page which says, "Do you want to receive prayer and comfort from the Scriptures? If so, fill in this box and two of our missionaries will visit you".

I put it to you, members of Synod and I put it to you, John, we should not be outsourcing the pastoral care of vulnerable people in a time of loss to an outside agency which, although it calls itself the Church of Jesus Christ is, in fact, not recognised as such by any ecumenical body. I ask the Archbishops' Council to review this agreement it has entered into both for its financial cost and also for its impact on the spiritual mission of the Church.

Mr Andrew Orange (Winchester): I only want to make one substantial point. It is often said that there is too much cost at the centre of the Church of England. Just to remind you, in these presentations, which are given in rounded millions, let us just keep in our minds that £1 million is roughly the cost of employing 20 vicars. I note in the paper that the operating budget for the national Church, which is Vote 24, for 2023 is 17% higher than it was in 2022. I am afraid that seems a big increase even in these inflationary times that we have. It is also amounting to £5 million. On the rough maths I gave you, £5 million is a hundred vicars employed for a year and so it is not insignificant.

Canon Spence, you kindly did explain to us that a large part of this was the Emerging Church cost, the centralising and automating of process, the refurbishing of Church House, but I just want to put the point that this, nevertheless, seems to be a very big sum of money and I will myself not feel able to vote for Vote 24 because of the size of it.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I want to express a concern, John, about the size of the Training for Ministry budget. My sole reason for doing this is my concern about loss of posts within dioceses and the future way in which we are regarding the number of ordinands coming forward, the decrease and closure of churches and the decrease of posts in dioceses.

I am seriously concerned that if we raise people's expectation of Training for Ministry and at the end of that we are not able to provide them with work, that we are asking people to make a commitment which we cannot finance or sustain. I think that will be deeply unkind actually in the future of the Church and, while I deeply hope for the increase in the number of people who come to Church as disciples and those who engage with us and become Christians, I am a pragmatist and I do think we need to be very careful that we do not advance people's expectations of a future in the Church in work terms without being able to finance that in the future.

The Chair: Thank you, John.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Well, thank you, and, firstly, Mark, thank you for that. I was leaning over to David, my ever-present support here, because I was slightly puzzled. This is an issue that has been started out of the Church Buildings' team, really, under Becky Clark and I would encourage you to have a conversation with her about the detail because I am being told in my ear this is not something that has physically been discussed at Archbishops' Council. I am told that the costs are not necessarily live. We clearly do not want to do a piece of work if it does not add value but adds a lot of cost and time. If we can take it offline and I will ask that a note be provided to Synod in due course.

Andrew, I assure you that, and my colleagues know, I get very concerned about every extra hundred thousand let alone every million that we spend, but I do think if you have a business case put before you to spend £4 million and to achieve savings of £1 million, that feels to me like a good deal and I think I would encourage you to be tracking us to show that that £1 million saving is, indeed, achieved and delivered and monitored. That is the responsibility that your Finance Chairs should have to this Synod that we will keep the project to budget, we will deliver it and we will track that the saving is delivered so that those funds are, indeed, released. I think that is what drives them, otherwise I could not have supported that budget either to be honest.

Penny, the whole issue about ordinands, this is surely the whole point of the new Vision and Strategy work and the new funding mechanisms. Because we were concerned this year that the financial challenge facing dioceses was such that they may be struggling to have the confidence to appoint emerging curates to posts, the Ministry Council brought in the post of First Responsibility Scheme and that is now being deployed and has some spare capacity in it to have some more. But, surely, it is when you can move to mission plans lasting over nine years that that can give the confidence to enable people to see ahead that the number of ordinands will be needed.

I am aware that large numbers of priests have reported that they will see the Church through the emergence from the pandemic and, thereafter, retire and, where people want to retire after 30, 40 years of brilliant work, surely we must help them to do so. We continue to be advised by dioceses, despite the financial challenges, that these are the sorts of numbers of ordinands that will be required and we, the Ministry Council and the Church at the centre, are responding to that which is asked of us. I really would hope, Penny, that your fears, which I fully understand and empathise with, can be allayed as we bring that nine year funding model into play as quickly as possible.

The Chair. We continue to debate Item 22.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): Vote 1 continues to be called Training for Ministry when, as John has clarified, it is about training for ordination. I wish that we could either change the title to include all ministry, lay ministry, or we could have a specific item somewhere which says where the money comes from for the training of lay people, which in many of our other debates is assumed to be something which is going to be the way our Vision and Strategy are implemented. Every diocese is working on schemes which assume that they will have fewer and fewer stipendiary clergy and that more and more of the work of ministry and mission and evangelism will be carried out by lay people, particularly licensed lay people, but where is the money for training those people? Is it to be assumed that the dioceses have to find all the money for training lay people?

The Revd Dr Sean Doherty (Universities & TElS): In response partly to the previous speaker, that is one of the things that will be discussed this afternoon in relation to RMF - Resourcing Ministerial Formation. We are very grateful in the TElS for, as John Spence alluded to, the reduction in the numbers coming into training and, therefore, the support that the Archbishops' Council has made available to us to mitigate the kind of impact of the fluctuating numbers. But those fluctuating numbers do create significant challenges for us, which is why changes are needed to how ordained - like with the previous speaker - ministry training is funded, which again we will be looking at this afternoon in RMF. If members would like to know, they can come to the fringe meeting this lunchtime in Vanbrugh Room 44 at 1.15.

The Chair. Thanks for the advert.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I repeat the declaration of interest that I made earlier in my question. I am following up on my question with the concerns around the laudable, bold outcome number 1, doubling the number of children and young active disciples in the Church of England by 2030. I have been involved in non-based church youth work, open youth work, for 50 years and I have obviously been involved in church based youth work as well and ran a Sunday school class for 20 years.

There have been some notable exceptions, but my impression across the country through the Diocesan Lay Chairs Forum is that work with children and young people has been severely impacted by the pandemic. I do not think we can underestimate the place that we are in. Therefore, whilst I absolutely support this bold outcome, I think we need to be realistic about facing up to where we are starting from. It is a standing start, I fear.

So how are we going to move forward? What practical things are we going to do? We need to recognise, it has been in previous Synod reports, that a high percentage of our Church congregations have no children at all and a very small percentage have only a significant number. There has been a hiatus with the number of suitably trained and licensed children, young people and family workers. A lot of them have been attracted over into the increased number of ordinands that John was telling us about earlier, which is great that we have ordinands and ordained people who come from a youth work background but it means that we have lost those people on the ground. So we need some more.

I am pleading here for a joining-up of Education, who are in charge of *Growing Faith*, of Ministry Development Team - I am a member of the Ministry Council - in the training of youth workers, and, Debbie Clinton and Dave Male in Vision and Strategy who have got the priority for this, it is essential that they are talking to each other all the time to make sure that this number one bold outcome is given the absolute attention that it needs. To take the example from Youthscape yesterday, he said to us, "Put children and young people on your PCC agenda, diocesan synod agenda and Archbishops' Council agenda every meeting".

The Chair: I am going to ask John to respond to those three and then we will come back.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Can I start by thanking Sue for the excellent points. Training for Ministry should mean that and it is ministry in all its forms. I will ask that we consider in future including training of lay ministry in all its forms within Vote 1 or else that we make clear what that title covers, so thank you Sue for that.

Sean, well done on your advert for your fringe meeting. I do feel obliged to respond by saying there is a digital fringe meeting on at lunchtime as well and I am chairing that one so it is bound to be good. But, anyway, Sean, you know that we have given some support to the TEIs. I do have to say publicly, as I have said privately, one of the great ways for the TEIs to respond would be yourselves to become a bit more entrepreneurial and to reach out to offer training into some areas that you do not offer at the moment. That lay ministry debate we have just had, I just think there are great opportunities for the TEIs to find new pathways to make available for all the things we yearn to do.

It brings me back to Adrian and the youth worker side of it. Adrian, your points were not really for this debate, they were much more for Vision and Strategy, but if I wear the hat as Chair of the Strategy investment Board for the time being I would be looking to see that every mission statement that comes forward now is quite explicit in where the

elements of investment requested will go into the youth work and children's side as well as into the work around the LInC communities and ethnic groups. We need to see that visible. We need to develop career plans .. I was talking to Dave Male about it over the weekend. We need to develop much more of a career structure for youth workers so that people do not just come in for a couple of years and then move on. If you want people to come, stay and grow, you need to develop.

I will say to you that it is not for this debate whether it is right to have bold outcomes over 10 years. It is right to have bold outcomes. Why would I ever settle for 20% growth or 40% growth? It has been very clearly demonstrated to us by one of our senior officers that we have 1,000 churches roughly in this country with over 25 young people. If you could triple that, you would have 3,000 churches. That says you focus on getting from 1,000 to 3,000. That is 2,000 churches across 40 dioceses, so 50 churches a diocese. It can happen.

The Church nearest to me ,where I do not happen to go but the one along the road from us, had an excellent vicar who retired, there was an interregnum, and a new young priest has come. They have gone from no children to 40 children in nine months. Where there is focus, where we dedicate the right resource, where we get the right people there and give them the right backing, anything can be done by a church that devotes itself, body and spirit, to doing so.

The Chair. I am going to take a couple more contributions.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Two declarations of interest. I am on the Archbishops' Council, just in case you forgot, and both the Archbishop of York and I have children or children-in-law who have just got ordained or are just getting ordained.

I want to bring out three things and ask this Synod to vote very strongly for these allocations, particularly for the ones that affect training in all its aspects. We are the General Synod of the Church of England. Church is an important word because it brings into mind that we have to remember that God is involved. This is the God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead. If we are not investing in training and development and ordination at an ever-greater pace then we may as well just say that our strategic vision is the elegant management of decline. If we are not investing in this way, we will not save the parish; we cannot. If we are not investing in this way, we cannot reach the estates; it will be impossible. If we are not investing in this way, we will not see growth, because there will be no one who steps forward and says, "Here am I; send me". That is what we are called to do, lay and ordained, across the country.

I back what John has said and the extraordinary work that has been done by so many to develop the greater number of ordinands and to bring forward the importance of lay training and lay ministry and of work with youth and children.

The alternative to that is that we end up - as someone once commented about British Airways, saying it was a very large pension fund with a moderately sized airline attached - as a very large investment fund with a very small church attached. Please support these allocations overwhelmingly.

the Ven. Dr Adrian Youings (Bath & Wells): Can I just address two points from the budget? One is the less sexy bit at the end about the clergy retirement housing grants. I submitted a question we did not get to in Question Time, but the answer said that in the last year 37% of retiring clergy were not able to move into their CHARM housing by the date of retirement. I have one clergy person in my archdeaconry who will not be able to move into his CHARM property until 10 months after he is retired. He is still living in the vicarage in the parish, his successor has been appointed and moved in and has had to go into another house in another part of the benefice.

Can I therefore please ask that if we are going to put money into something that we review the effectiveness of the area into which we put money? Please can dioceses be compensated for having to supplement the rent having to be paid in order for those clergy to remain in the parsonages before they can move into their retirement properties.

Secondly, can I address the issue of first appointment grants? As dioceses we were given notice of our ability to apply for those grants on 6 May and the last date for submission was 31 May, which was not time to put together proper grant applications for positions of first responsibility for this year. Having said that, is there any funding likely to be allocated for positions of first responsibility for 2023 and beyond?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): If I can deal with you, Adrian, first, that is a new issue on me in terms of delay in getting into CHARM housing. I will ask somebody from the Pensions Board to let you know the particular case there. What I will be asking the Pensions Board to provide is the scale of the issue and what other situations are there like this. What the Pensions Board did do, of course, was seek to consolidate the provision of that housing in order to optimise the effectiveness and efficiency of the scheme. That may be an unfortunate trade-off. I will need to check that one.

On your other piece about positions of first responsibility, it was a scheme done at very short notice. It is very unusual for something to be done like that. It was because of a real attempt to help with the problem that was emerging. I believe that there is going to be a second round, Adrian, where you can apply if you missed that deadline, and I am sure somebody from Ministry Council will clarify that. Please, it is not the norm. We would always aim to give plenty of time to dioceses to complete those pieces.

Can I thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for his intervention? As you know, ladies and gentlemen, I complete my 10 years in post after the Synod next year and maybe, Justin, you would like to put your hat in the ring to be the next Finance Chairman. I think you would be very good at it.

The Chair: Synod, I am going to test your mind as to whether we have debated sufficiently. What we are debating at the moment is the Report and we will then be voting on the Report. Then we have to get through all the apportionments. I am not just being mean about the amount of time to debate this. Can I put to you that we close this debate?

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

The Chair: John has responded to the debate. Therefore, I put Item 22, which is the Report on the budget, to the vote.

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

ITEM 23

The Chair: We now move to Item 23. John, would you please move Item 23?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I formally move Item 23.

The Chair: Item 23 is now open for debate. All those wishing to speak, please stand or indicate. I see someone standing. The speech limit is three minutes.

The Revd Jo Winn-Smith (Guildford): I was not expecting to make my maiden speech at this point. I am very appreciative that in the Report we see that money has been put forward for some lay ministry training in the Archbishops' Council's budget. However, although John is often very inspirational in his words, I have to take exception when he asks for TEIs to be entrepreneurial. I have recently stopped teaching at a TEI where I was on a 0.4 FTE role. That is two days a week. I often worked many, many hours more than that. When you are teaching one or two days a week and have to take several weekends a year to teach, and we are desperately trying to get other people to come in to receive that training, being encouraged to do more when we are already doing our very best is quite painful. I am sorry to have to say that.

The Chair: Thanks, Jo. I see no one else standing so I ask John to respond to the debate.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Jo, I am very sorry, I did not mean to upset anybody in any way or to impugn the suggestion that people themselves should do more. I was talking more about the sector and the ambition that we work together to create a thriving sector. That should never have been meant to mean that I was implying the individuals therein were not doing their best. I know you do and thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, John. I therefore put Item 23 to the vote.

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

ITEM 24

The Chair: John, would you move Item 24, please?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I formally so move.

The Chair: Item 24 on National Church Responsibilities is now open for debate. You have three minutes.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): I am speaking in my capacity as John's deputy on the Finance Committee, so I have already been told that I will be speaking in support of the motion.

What I would really like to do is just to spend a few moments acknowledging the fantastic finance team that we have at Church House. Often enough in this Synod we can be quite critical of various things that happen in Church House and of the staff there, but in the finance function we really do have an outstandingly strong team. Managing the overall Church economy is really tricky. It is a highly complex system and balancing the finance flows across that system is really challenging. Even preparing the budget papers that we are looking at requires considerable insight and a willingness to rework the budget numerous times through multiple iterations.

The Church also, as John has outlined, has multiple financial layers. We have the Commissioners, world-class investment managers who have been producing world-class returns, which through the triennial funding have increased their distribution significantly. The Pensions Board, as John outlined, has reversed its deficit position so that pension contributions will reduce significantly for the benefit of dioceses.

However, post Covid and in a time of high inflation, we know that many of our parishes, and consequently our dioceses and also cathedrals, are facing significant financial challenges and constraints. It is the finance team within the Council which is charged with providing support to dioceses and cathedrals that are facing these financial challenges, as well as managing the day-to-day distributions and keeping sound accounting records. Also, the Finance Committee obviously supports the work that they are doing. I would also like to assure Andrew Orange that the Finance Committee rigorously challenges all increases in the budgetary items. I would like to ask Synod to acknowledge the work of the finance team, led by David White, who is sitting to John's left. Thank you very much.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Revd Martin Poole (Chichester): For a number of us involved in Fresh Expressions or Pioneering, or Alternative Church/Creative Worship, the term Emerging Church is about something completely different. It is about new forms of church which are

innovative and hoping to help grow the Church. May I ask, please, that that budget line be renamed. What you talked about was a rebuilding programme, I think, but just so we have some clarity. I thought there was a nice big chunk of money coming to help people do some Fresh Expressions work, and it turns out to be about refurbishing Church House. If it is possible to rename that budget line, that would be helpful.

The Chair. I see no one standing, therefore, I invite John to respond to those contributions.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I did not catch the last speaker's name, but absolutely, sorry for you. Emerging Church is a title that has emerged within a wider group of work going on all about the work that has led to the Triennium Funding Working Group plans, the Vision strategy. Point taken. I love Fresh Expressions and I hope that you will be able to work with your dioceses in those mission statements so we can find all ways of letting the lungs of the Holy message get out.

As for Carl, ladies and gentlemen, the notion I could ever tell any member of my Finance Committee to do anything is utterly deluded. They are the most rebellious crowd. You are quite right to pay tribute to the finance team, alongside David, who you have seen more visibly this time than ever how much help he gives me, and Jo, of course, who leads the team and all members.

I would say to you, ladies and gentlemen, you may not appreciate it, but under the transforming effects of this programme over the last year, nearly all the staff in Church House have been going through a restructuring programme which has seen a large number of people leave, a large number of jobs go and people having to move into other roles for which they had to apply. With the emotional strain that places on you, alongside Covid, alongside all the other demands the Church is making, alongside the multiple governance organs we require them to attend, which is why the governance review is so important, that team has been flawless to me in the delivery of all the things that have been asked. To all the Church House team - to you, William, and Gareth and the Church Commissioners and all of you - your leadership has been essential, and please, ladies and gentlemen, understand that the pain that has been going on at diocesan level has been matched at least a bit by the staff in Church House.

The Chair. Thank you, John. I therefore put Item 24 to the vote.

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

The Chair. That is clearly carried.

ITEM 25

The Chair. John, would you move Item 25, please?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move.

The Chair: Item 25, which is Grants, is now open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore, I put Item 25 to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a show of hands

ITEM 26

The Chair: John would you move Item 26 which is mission agency pension contributions?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move.

The Chair: Item 26 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore, I put Item 26 to the vote.

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

ITEM 27

The Chair: John, would you move Item 27, which is clergy retirement housing grant?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move.

The Chair: Item 27 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore, I put Item 27 to the vote.

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

ITEM 28

The Chair: We move to Item 28. Would you move that item please, John?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): I so move.

The Chair: Item 28 is now open for debate for those who wish to speak. I see no one standing, therefore, I put Item 28 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That closes these items of business and thank you for all your contributions. We remain in the chamber for the next item.

THE CHAIR *Canon Izzy MacDonald-Booth (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 11.22 am.

The Chair: Good morning, Synod. I would just like to invite the Secretary General William Nye to say a few words to us

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Synod, I can give you a further update on the business of the elections. Sadly, most people seem to have left at the prospect of legislative business, but we have some provisional good news. We have been in robust contact with Civica Election Services. The provisional view of the Clerk at this point (advised by the Registrar) is that last night's vote, despite its difficulties, can proceed. I will explain why it is a provisional view, though, very briefly. It is provisional because we still need to do a little bit of checking, as I will explain.

To be completely transparent the position is this. Civica has received 296 online votes from people from York and voting from home. We have 84 paper ballots. The 84 paper ballots are all signed. Thank you very much. They all appear to be valid and do not appear to be spoiled, so we have so far registered 380 votes in total. That is about 90% of the possible electorate, and if you are wondering why it is not 100% in the appropriate North Korean manner, it is because there are some vacancies and I know that a number of *ex officio* members of the House of Clergy and Laity tend not to vote in this particular election. Also the Clerk has not yet heard from anyone seeking to vote online from home saying they were unable to do so. Civica will be checking whether there are any duplicates in that 380. That is why I say at this point this news is provisional. We have sent the 84 paper ballots (scanned obviously) to Civica and two of the candidates were able to be present observing us doing that, seeing how we did it.

There is one small point that would just be helpful. Of the 84 paper ballots, 81 are identifiable in terms of signature, name and number. Three ballots have signatures, for which thank you very much, but we have been unable to read them. If you think that you might possibly have a signature that is hard to read, and you know that you put in a paper ballot early on at about 9 o'clock or five past 9 and you did not put your number or name on it, if you think this might be you, or somebody you know, could you ask that friend of yours who you know to go to the information desk and very kindly sign an Order Paper or another piece of paper with your normal signature but this time with your name and number, and then we will compare those with the three ballots. If you are leaving now we will assume, of course, you are going to get coffee, not to do signatures. That will be a kindness and then we will be able to identify all the ballots and that will help with ensuring there are no duplicates or very few duplicates indeed. If you could do that by early lunchtime that would be very helpful and then I will report further on progress with the elections. Thank you very much.

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 501

AMENDING CANON NO. 42 (GS 2269)

The Chair. We come to Item 501 draft Amending Canon 42, which is before the Synod for First Consideration. For this members will need the draft Amending Canon GS 2269 and the Explanatory Notes 2269X. You will also need access to the Fourth Notice Paper, paragraph 16, for the financial implications of this item.

I would like to call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, Stephen Hofmeyr, to move Item 501 "That the Canon entitled 'Amending Canon No. 42' be considered for revision in committee". You have 10 minutes.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): Good morning, Synod. Please forgive me if you are familiar with some or all of what I am going to say. However, the efficiency of this session is likely to depend, at least in part, on the clarity of my introduction.

In this session we are concerned with an Amending Canon. What is a Canon? There are two types of legislation in the Church of England: Canons and Measures. While a Measure can do anything that an Act of Parliament can do, and Measures have the same force and effect as Acts of Parliament, the effect of a Canon is more limited. It is the Church governing itself, not the Church making law for the land.

What do Canons deal with? Canons tend to focus on matters of ministry and doctrine. Measures, on the other hand, frequently focus on what you might call temporal aspects of the Church. They relate to the administration and organisation of the Church.

What is the legislative process that we are embarking upon. Standing Order 48(1) provides for Measures and Canons to be considered by the General Synod on five successive stages: First Consideration by General Synod, and that is what we are doing today. It is the first stage. Second Consideration by the Revision Committee of this Synod. Third, the Revision Stage when the draft comes back before us to be considered clause by clause or paragraph by paragraph. Fourth, the Final Drafting and, fifth, the Final Approval.

Once approved by General Synod, Canons go directly to the Queen for Royal Assent. Measures follow a different path. Measures must be approved by both Houses of Parliament and, once approved, Measures receive Royal Assent alongside Acts of Parliament.

This morning, as I said, we are concerned with the very first stage of the legislative process for an Amending Canon, First Consideration. What we will be doing in the next few minutes is no more than beginning the process of implementing a decision which

General Synod has already made. I stress we are not revisiting the decision which General Synod has already made. If you do not like the decision which General Synod has already made, I am afraid it is tough. The decision which General Synod has already made is the foundation upon which we are building today.

What is the purpose of this particular Amending Canon? It is being introduced by the Business Committee pursuant to our resolution in November 2020 to implement recommendation 1 of the Independent Investigation into Child Sex Abuse in the Church of England. The terms of recommendation 1 and the General Synod Resolution are set out in the papers, and I will not repeat them.

What, in summary, are the proposed changes? You may want to have the draft in front of you, GS 2269. Draft Amending Canon 42 amends the canonical requirements relating to safeguarding which are found in Canon C 30. Four changes. First, paragraphs 2(1) and 2(2) require diocesan bishops to appoint diocesan safeguarding officers instead of diocesan safeguarding advisers. The change is very significant. Whereas the DSA's role was to advise on safeguarding matters, the DSO's role will be to be responsible in the diocese, independent of the diocesan, for professional leadership on and management of safeguarding matters.

Second, paragraph 2(3) to make provision for the professional supervision of DSOs and for quality assurance of their work, a key aspect of the proposal. Third, paragraph, 3, to amend Canon C 30 so that the list of those who may carry our risk assessments may contain names of bodies as well as names of individuals, this is a purely practical amendment. Fourth, paragraph 4 answers the question when will this come into effect, and the reason it is being done in this particular way is to enable the National Safeguarding Team to roll out the new supervision process in stages rather than having to do it in all dioceses at the same time.

If the motion is carried, what happens next? The next stage will be the Revision Committee stage, and members who wish to send proposals for amendment for consideration by the Revision Committee must do so, please, in writing by Friday 9 September 2022. So, there will be ample opportunity for you to make recommendations after today for consideration by the Committee. It is my pleasure to move the motion before you at Item 501, that Amending Canon No. 42, safeguarding, be considered for revision in committee.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester): I am a survivor of abuse, CDM abuse, and I am in favour of passing this to revision and wanting this to happen because I hope it will strengthen the hand of a new role for the safeguarding officer in our dioceses, to work with the new revised role for bishops in our dioceses in the Clergy Conduct Measure that

is being proposed to apply safeguarding principles to the needs of respondents as well as complainants in the CDM process.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (the Rt Revd Robert Innes): Thank you Stephen, for you very clear explanation of the Amending Canon. I have had, I think, four DSAs over my time as Bishop, and some have been exceptionally good. I cannot say that all of them have been exceptionally good. As I understand the effect of this legislation, the DSO will be appointed by the bishop, paid by the diocesan Board of Finance and supervised by the National Safeguarding Team or by a central body. What I am wondering is if the safeguarding officer's performance is such that there are capability issues, who manages those, and ultimately, if things really do not work out, who is responsible for the termination of the contract of a DSO?

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham): Synod, I support in principle the change in designation from diocesan safeguarding advisers to diocesan safeguarding officers, the key principle is that the change gives DSAs more power, makes them less subservient to their bishops and frees them to challenge decisions being made by bishops. But this Amending Canon does not actually do that. It does give them a change of title but it does not give them more power. The Canon also makes DSOs, as they will now be called, subject to professional oversight of the NST, or at least that is what it says in 2269X. But the wording of the Canon is that it is "the body responsible for overseeing the implementation and operation of the code and Section 5(a) of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016".

The problem is there is no such body designated in legislation as the body overseeing that code, the legislation says it is the duty of the House of Bishops, so they are taking responsibility from the diocesan bishop and actually, in law, the letter of law, putting it to the House of Bishops.

There are various things about the code that I was going to say, but I just want to cut it short. Synod members, I spoke about giving the DSOs the powers to act with more independence from their diocesan bishops. I wonder whether this is the best way to do it, I really do think we need a Measure, because we need to give the DSOs power to have access to documents, to share information and so on, and the Canon does not do that, we need to get through issues with GDPR and other things which a Measure can do.

So, on that basis can I encourage you to sign my Private Member's Motion on Scrutiny of Diocesan Safeguarding. This, if passed, would lead to the creation of a national body, which could be the one to provide oversight to DSOs, and would have additional powers to intervene in cases where dioceses and bishops are not following the guidance, and potentially preventing complaints under the CDM, which at present is the only way poor practice by bishops can be challenged. I welcome this, but I think we need, alongside it, a Measure to actually give proper power to DSOs to act.

Mrs Nicola Denyer (Newcastle): I am speaking as a Lay Ministry Development Officer for the Diocese of Newcastle and work very closely with our diocesan safeguarding adviser at the moment. I also have been a nurse and midwife and a safeguarding training officer for Northumbria Healthcare NHS Trust. I welcome this. Anything that creates some independence for safeguarding professionals to do their work is necessary. In the NHS I worked with multi-agency professionals from police, social care, housing, and independence is absolutely crucial in all of our roles when we are dealing with cases that are complex, difficult and harmful to many of those involved.

I think that this will help with the survivors of abuse, as the first person mentioned. In Newcastle Diocese there has been a lot of work around survivors recently, working with the National Safeguarding Team. Anything that we can do to encourage survivors to speak out, as a couple of really brave people have in Newcastle Diocese, would be welcomed. For those people who have been harmed by abuse, being able to know that there is some independence is absolutely crucial in feeling brave enough and able to speak about what has happened to them.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): I, like others, welcome, of course, this enhancement to the role and to have a diocesan safeguarding officer instead of an adviser. But noting its importance and its independence, I just wonder about the situation that will inevitably arise at some stage when you have a vacancy, the person in post will leave, or whatever. There is no mention in this of the timescale associated with the appointment, and, as I say, given its importance and significance, and given its independence from the bishop, I think it would be helpful to have some indication of the urgency that would be necessary to have this post filled.

You really would not want it to be vacant for any longer than the shortest amount of time, given the workload and its significance. I just wonder if something could be brought in to ensure that the appointment would be made as soon as practicable, and, indeed, whether or not there should be provision for cover from some other diocese in the absence of somebody in that role.

The Chair: Do I see anyone else standing? In which case could I ask Mr Hofmeyr to come and speak. You have up to five minutes.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): Thank you Lisa, speaking from personal experience. The answer to your question is yes, it is likely to assist both complainants and respondents in the CDM process, but we need to be aware that process is itself being looked at, at the moment, and as Synod together we will need to consider both these matters together in tandem, but thank you for raising that.

Bishop Robert, thank you very much indeed for the questions that you have raised in relation to capability issues. The position will be that the person responsible for it will be the DBF line manager, in those circumstances, however if there are other proposals which

are considered better, please do send them in writing to the Revision Committee for them to consider.

Gavin Drake, your concern is that insufficient power is given to the new DSO, well again, may I encourage you to write in with suggestions to the Revision Committee to ensure that that power can be extended in a way which is appropriate in the circumstances. Also do we need a Measure, well, I would suggest that the framework is already in place but of course we would welcome your proposals to the Revision Committee.

Nicola Denyer, thank you very much for your comments and welcoming independence, those are very helpful to us as we take this forward to the Revision Stage. And then finally, John Mason, concern about vacancies. We need to remember that it is a statutory responsibility to have in place a DSO, and in circumstances where there is a vacancy an interim replacement will be required to fill that. But again, if you would like to make alternative proposals, do please write in by 9 September in order for those to be considered by the Revision Committee.

The Chair: I now put Item 501 to the vote.

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

The Chair: The draft Canon is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee, as stated in the agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk of the Synod, to reach them no later than 5.30 pm on Friday 9 September. That completes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 10.45 am.

SPECIAL AGENDA I LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 507

CLERGY DISCIPLINE MEASURE 2003 - AMENDING CODE OF PRACTICE (GS 2281)

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 507, the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 - Amending Church of England of Practice for approval. For this, members will need GS 2281 and the Explanatory Note, GS 2281X. I call the Ven. Mark Ireland to move 507.

The Revd Canon Mark Bennet (Oxford): Point of order.

The Chair: Point of order.

The Revd Canon Mark Bennet (Oxford): I cannot find those documents on my app. Can someone tell us where they are?

The Chair: That isn't a point of order, but we will see if we can find out.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): Members of Synod, as a new member of the Clergy Discipline Commission, it is my privilege to bring to you three small but important amendments to the Code of Practice under the Clergy Discipline Measure. These are aimed to improve both speed and transparency in the application of the current Measure. Now, members of Synod will know that there is an opportunity to debate the wider issues around the reform of clergy conduct and clergy discipline in a debate tomorrow, so I would respectfully ask that if members could focus on the specific amendments today and save any speeches about the wider reform until tomorrow, I would be very grateful, especially as somebody else will be presenting tomorrow.

The Clergy Discipline Commission is responsible for formulating guidance on the operation of the Clergy Discipline Measure, and it is found in the Code of Practice, which is kind of a users' guide. For those of you used to self-assembly objects for furniture, you need the manual in order to be able to operate it effectively.

There are three main changes proposed to the code, which aim to speed up the process. The first is about criminal cases and this relates to what happens when there is a police or criminal trial at the same time as CDM proceedings. At present, the code provides that the CDM case should be paused pending the outcome of the secular processes. We are conscious that this can be the cause of considerable delay in the progression of an allegation of misconduct under the measure. This often takes place while the respondent is suspended from office, which is really bad for the respondent, and it is really bad for everybody concerned. And it is not in the interests of justice.

The proposed amendments to paragraphs 87 and 92 reverse the presumption that it will always be necessary to pause the CDM proceedings pending the final outcome of the police investigation or a criminal trial. The changes provide that allegations of misconduct should now proceed unless the police or other relevant statutory agency have expressly stated that the Church's processes would prejudice their investigation or a criminal trial. In those cases, the CDM proceedings may be paused pending the outcome. It is the view of the Commission that, aside from the most serious cases, many more matters will proceed alongside the criminal processes, avoiding lengthy and costly delays.

The second amendment is about employment cases. There is a similar argument to paragraph 89, so the same approach applies to secular employment disciplinary investigations. The proposed guidance requires that a view be formed as to whether it is appropriate to wait for the outcome of the secular disciplinary action before proceedings with allegations under the Measure, rather than assuming that you must have to.

The third amendment is about publishing penalties, and all penalties imposed under the Clergy Discipline Measure should be made public. This is fundamental to the principles of open and transparent justice. It is important in accountability and it is important for

safeguarding. Penalties imposed by a tribunal are published on the Church of England tribunal web page. The current guidance provides that where the respondent admits misconduct, and the bishop imposes a penalty by consent, which is of course the vast majority of cases, brief details of the case should be placed on the diocesan website. Further, it states that penalties imposed other than by a tribunal, that is after a criminal conviction or divorce, should be made public. The Commission is aware that there are differing approaches to the publication of these types of penalties, which is a way of saying that some dioceses do, and some dioceses do not publish this information, and some hide it on a page on the website where it is very hard to find that information.

There is also a hesitation on the part of registrars in publishing this information as to what information should be given, that it should not be too much, or that it should not, on the other hand, be too little, and people read into something that this is allegations about something when it was not about that at all. This inconsistency of approach causes prejudice both to the issue of transparency but also to respondents, who find themselves not knowing what details will be made public after they have admitted misconduct.

To ensure a consistent approach that is fair to everyone, the proposed amendments to paragraph 312 provide that publishing penalties by consent and penalties imposed under sections 30 and 31 will no longer be the responsibility of the diocese or the province. Instead, the responsibility will rest with the office of the President of the Tribunals, who will cause them to be published on the Church of England website. The name of the respondent, the date the penalty was agreed or imposed and the statutory ground of misconduct, but not any details of the particular misconduct, will be published. This should provide transparency, but also an assurance that the level of disclosure is the same in every case, and there is not the diocesan equivalent of a postcode lottery.

Synod, these minor amendments are part of the ongoing work of the Clergy Discipline Commission, which we undertake to ensure that the Clergy Discipline Measure works fairly, efficiently and provides justice for all. They will have an important impact on improving both speed and transparency and I commend them to you for your approval. I beg to move the motion in my name.

The Chair: Thank you. I think it was Mr Bennet who was looking for papers, and they are to be found under deemed business, because this item was and now is no longer deemed. I call the Archbishop of Canterbury followed by Gavin Oldham. The speech limit is five minutes at this stage.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I think we need to remember that this interlinks very closely with the work being done by a group led by the Bishop of Worcester, John Inge, on how CDM works and the intense concern that there is both from complainants and respondents about the whole operation of CDM in many different ways.

One of the most concerning things for me, as someone who has to handle this a great deal, is around this question of publication. Around misconduct it seems fairly obvious, but until we have a new way of dealing with CDM that distinguishes between misconduct and accidental error, we can find that CDMs abort and technically fall within the class of misconduct, and yet when you look at the background and when you go into the case, you realise that there are strong justifications for what was done by a particular person and it is more miscalculation than misconduct.

You then get into the difficult situation of are you going to find something as misconduct where we now know it will be published, and where it looks equally serious with other forms of misconduct, or are you going to say, no, this is not misconduct although technically it falls within it. It is a bit like the old question in the 19th century when there were too many capital crimes and juries would refuse to convict because the penalty was out of sync with the nature of the crime.

And therefore I would like to ask Archdeacon Mark if he can reflect on this and give some kind of response as to how we avoid a whole range of areas of misconduct all being treated equally when it may just be a moment of absent mindedness, of negligence, of fault by someone else and they get caught up in the system. I think we need to do justice as our primary concern.

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham): I have been wondering how best to challenge concerns I have under the Code of Conduct and I am reluctantly going to ask Synod to reject these amendments, and I will tell you why.

We are being asked to confirm three amendments to the Code of Practice. But actually Synod, you are not. What you are being asked to do, in law, is to approve the whole Code of Practice, as revised by these three amendments, because the legal basis for the code is section 39 of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003. Measures are primary legislation, they are the law of the land. Section 39(2) says that the Commission may at any time amend or replace the Code of Practice by a further Code of Practice and there are various provisions as to how that is done.

In cases such as this, where there are no amendments proposed to what is being suggested and brought to us, Synod can approve the revised code and then it comes into effect. We are not being asked in law to approve just these amendments, but the whole code, and so you need to be clear about that.

Why is this a problem? The last time this code was brought before Synod was in April 2021 and it contained a number of new clauses or new rules on confidentiality. I say rules, but they are not rules, the code is not enforceable, but dioceses and bishops treat it as if it is. The new clauses, paragraphs 306 to 309, which were not debated when it came to Synod in April 2021, say that all allegations of misconduct are private and confidential. You might say that is fair enough that this would ensure that matters are dealt with fairly and the process is not prejudiced, but that level of confidentiality that the

Church applies to proceedings under the Clergy Discipline Measure does not apply to any other aspect of our legal system, and tribunals are a legal, judicial body. And if you do not believe me, try asking for a Data Protection Act access request to get data from the CDM and you will be told that it is a judicial body.

The House of Lords Judicial Committee and after it the Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled and stressed the need for open justice. Justice needs to be seen to be done. There are various clauses in 306 to 309 about confidentiality which have the effect of silencing victims, complainants, and also respondents. It says that the parties cannot show papers to anybody except for legal representatives. Clergy facing allegations are often provided with Legal Aid. No such support is provided to complainants or victims.

It gets worse because clause 308 says that, "In particular, individuals (regardless of whether or not they are a party) should refrain from making statements, posts, comments or similar on social media, websites, print media or other public forum which in any way reference the detail of the allegation, the individuals involved, or give an opinion as to the merits or otherwise of the alleged misconduct". This clause has the effect of telling journalists and newspapers they cannot report on CDM cases, which is outrageous. It is not a power that the Commission has.

I encourage you to read 306 to 309, but in particular 309. This is the really offensive one because it warns people that they could be referred to the High Court for contempt. Synod members, they cannot. The wording in 309 relates to somebody breaching an order made by a tribunal. It does not relate to somebody breaching the Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct is not enforceable. The Commission has no power to refer anybody to the High Court for contempt, but tagging that onto the bottom of a new section on confidentiality has the effect of bullying victims and survivors into silence. After I discovered these new clauses in 2021, I spoke to a number of members of Synod who said that they had dropped the ball on this case. There was a determination to do something about it, but you cannot do something about it until the Code is brought back, as it is now.

Synod members, the nuclear option is to reject these codes and I encourage you to do that, so that it goes back to the Commission and they can come back with a revised code without these offensive paragraphs in. An alternative would be if somebody moved a motion under Standing Order 30(1)(d) that the debate be adjourned and resumed in February. That would be less nuclear, but it would send a message to the Commission that we want this to come back without these offensive clauses in. So, as it stands, Synod, I ask you to reject the amendments.

The Bishop of Durham (the Rt Revd Paul Butler): I thought it was important that Synod heard from a diocesan Bishop having to work these things and I speak in favour of these amendments. The issue around police and criminal, frankly, has caused me to be bound in an awful situation more than once where everybody knew that we could move forward but we could not because of this rule. This is a very sensible, helpful change for us and

I know our local police have always thought it odd that we could not move forward previously. That one is extremely helpful.

Likewise, the one on employer. Whilst this is to do with the CDM, I would note that, actually, it ought to also apply in lay situations as well. The publication of penalties has been utterly fraught with what an earth do I put on the website: why, when, am I even consistent within my own diocese about how I do it because I have relatives complaining about them being exposed by the publication on the website? This is a very helpful way of making sure we are nationally consistent. It is right that it is published but to do so in a completely consistent way across the nation and, being blunt, it does relieve me and my colleagues of the pressure of deciding what we do in terms of publication. I am grateful for this proposal and I hope that Synod will agree to all these amendments.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (ex officio): I say, with respect, that I have considerable sympathy with the point made by the Archbishop of Canterbury and, as well as being transparent, we need to be proportionate. Those are both well-established principles of justice. In other areas of professional discipline, the question of whether or not to publish any penalty essentially forms part of the penalty framing and deciding process. I offer the following suggestion, if there was a desire to move in a direction towards giving greater scope for proportionality, the possibility that a bishop or Archbishop could indicate what they were minded to do about publication and that then be referred to some other person to make the final decision so that there is public accountability. That other person could be the already overburdened President of the Clergy Discipline Commission or her deputies or, dare I say, the Dean of Arches and Auditor potentially. I just offer those as a possible way of tweaking this to meet the Archbishop's point, which as I say I do have considerable sympathy with.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am a member of the Clergy Discipline Commission. It might help new members who were not here in April 2021 - I think we were on Zoom - when Simon Talbott very helpfully raised the issue of looking at the code in its entirety, which is just over a year ago. We had a full-ish debate. Obviously, time was short, but we had a good debate and the code was received and approved by 285 of us in favour, none against and with six abstentions. As I say, we have looked at it in some detail, but I think Gavin's points need to be heard and I think we should have a transcript of that and it will come to the Commission, I am sure, in due course to review it. My understanding of today is this is really about the amendments, not about the whole code and when we are voting we will be voting for or against amendments - but I am sure we will be advised in the summary later.

I think in terms of justice, what I find unjust, and I have been on the Commission for some time, is the variability across the diocesan system in how these things are either published or not published or what is actually said. I think the point that Mark made about sometimes too little publishing in terms of the words means that people read more into it

than they should, which is difficult for clergy. Equally, if too much is said it could be very difficult for clergy and their families and their parishes. So I think this is trying to tidy up what is actually a helpful move and it does make the system more just, taking into account Morag and the Archbishop's comments about how to actually work out how to do it well.

Mr Clive Billenness (Europe): I am merely going to ask the Commission and Archdeacon Mark to take away a point, which is that the standards of proof in a criminal case and in employment proceedings and CDM are different because a criminal case is beyond reasonable doubt whereas these disciplinary proceedings operate on balance of probabilities. I have raised this issue because in the current Measure there is no means by which if a respondent's representatives do wish to ask for an adjournment on the grounds they expect exonerating evidence to be provided under the compulsion of court evidence, they cannot apply for the case to be adjourned.

While I do not want this to become what you could describe as a chancer's charter for people to delay the inevitable justice, I would ask them to consider a means by which the representatives of a respondent can request an appropriate adjournment if they can provide to the authority a good and cogent reason why an adjournment should take place and I do not see that at the moment in the Measure as proposed.

the Ven. Paul Ayers (Leeds): I have a question about each of these proposals. On the first two, the idea that CDM investigations - I think Mark used the word "investigation" which is what I would query - processes should continue in parallel with police or employers' processes. I am worried about this. I would like to ask what he thinks. The Church does not have powers to investigate. It cannot compel evidence. It cannot make witnesses under caution. It does not have the force of a contract of employment. Generally, we do not know whether an offence has taken place until another investigation has taken place. I cannot imagine a situation in which a CDM process would continue until statutory or contractual investigations have concluded.

On the third proposal, I agree very much with Archbishop Justin and with Morag Ellis that publication could be brutal when CDM is the only way we have got to address misconduct or even a lapse of judgment which may be less than gross misconduct. I can think of cases where I have brought a CDM where the fact of publication on a national website would have given me pause as to whether I really wanted to use CDM but I did not have anything else to do. I think that those who have dealt with a case need discretion as to how much and whether and when to publish this. I can understand why Bishop Paul would like to be relieved of the responsibility but I cannot really agree with him.

The Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): Point of order. I want to ask the Synod to adjourn this debate to February under Standing Order 30(1)(d).

The Chair: I will just take advice. Thomas Seville has moved the motion that the debate now be adjourned and resumed at the next group of sessions. If the motion for adjournment of debate is carried, the debate will be adjourned and resumed in

accordance with the motion. If the motion is lost, the motion for the adjournment of the debate may not be moved again except with my consent. I call on Thomas Seville as the mover of this motion for the adjournment of the debate to speak on it, followed by the mover of the main motion to reply. I will then consider whether to allow any further debate. Your speech limit is two minutes.

ADJOURNMENT OF DEBATE

The Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I have a great deal of sympathy and support for the proposed amendments and I have listened with great attention and welcome to contributions made by Paul Ayers and the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, I am alarmed that we might be endorsing things which I would have to vote against, and they are deficiencies in the code itself. I do think those are seriously problematic. I was one of those who abstained in the debate two years ago and I would not wish to have to vote against something where the aim of the debate was to improve. I suspect I am not alone in this. I do think it is very important to allow access and freedom in our relationships with those who make complaints. I am not quite sure that the Church has really got to the right place and I do think this needs to be looked at again and I ask Synod to support my motion for adjournment.

The Chair: Mark Ireland to reply.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): I resist Thomas' motion. I do so because I think this has turned out to be a bit of a proxy for the wider debate about CDM which I warned about in my opening speech. These proposals are simply about three amendments to the current Measure. You are not being asked to debate the current Code of Practice because you did that in April last year and you approved the current Code of Practice by 280 votes to nil. So, Gavin Drake, with the greatest respect, your speech was wrong in law; we are only being asked to propose these three amendments which are designed to achieve transparency and speed, which are two things which have been consistently things that Synod has been requesting us to address. These are technical amendments which will enable us to do that and, if we simply defer this, these same amendments will have to come back on a future occasion and so we will have to have the debate again. Please resist this motion.

The Chair: Given that we have heard an argument for and against the adjournment motion, I do not consider that the motion for the adjournment of the debate needs to be debated further. I, therefore, put to the Synod the motion that the debate now be adjourned.

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

The Chair: We do now have a couple of minutes in hand and, given the level of interest, I am inclined to take two really brief speeches before we move to vote on this item.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Rt Worshipful Peter Collier QC (ex officio): When I became the Resident Judge at Leeds in 2007, if a case of serious sexual assault came into court I could list it for trial within four to five months. When I retired four years ago, that had dropped back to almost 12 months. The speed with which the police and the CPS in my time dealt with cases meant that they were often in court very quickly after the complaint was made. The woeful reduction in funding of the police, the CPS and the Courts Service means that right now it is often four to five years from complaint to trial taking place. You may have seen the proposals we are discussing tomorrow contain a similar proposal to the one here to reverse the presumption of staying cases until secular proceedings are complete. Sir Steven House, the Acting Metropolitan Police Commissioner, on 20 April proposed that the police themselves in cases of misconduct, which were possibly also crimes, should also stop pausing their processes saying that they needed to get on both in terms of efficiency and also the public sense of good. If the police can propose reversing their proposals, surely we should do so and should do so now.

The Bishop of Worcester (the Rt Revd Dr John Inge): In supporting this motion, I simply want to point out, I am sure all of you have read your papers for the debate tomorrow morning on the proposed reform of the CDM, the proposal to produce a CCM, and in that we suggest that the presumption that disciplinary proceedings should be halted during a police investigation should be reversed. What is being proposed now on that is to bring into effect what we shall be proposing tomorrow morning and I support the motion on that ground and I am very much with the Bishop of Durham as far as what he said.

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

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

The Chair: The motion for closure is carried. You need to respond to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): There are a lot of important speeches to respond to. First of all, the Archbishop of Canterbury, thank you, Archbishop, for expressing your intense concern that I think we are all aware about concerning the operation of the current CDM Measure and as an Archdeacon I fully understand that. But I think the important point here is that the publication of penalties is not about accidental error because a penalty is imposed where there has been culpable misconduct. We all make mistakes, but that is not going to end up with a penalty for culpable misconduct. You may well get a severe telling off or be required to do some further training or other things.

But open justice is a fundamental principle of English law. There is no other profession where the outcome of a disciplinary process is kept secret. At the moment, because of the inconsistency, there have been cases where people have been prohibited from

ministry and yet it has not been published anywhere that that has happened and that is clearly not good and not safe practice from a safeguarding point of view.

Regarding Gavin's concerns, I do know that you have been in correspondence, Gavin, with the Commission and the Commission is satisfied that the current guidance around publicity is both lawful and appropriate. The clauses that you refer to, which we are not debating today, which are 306 to 309, are actually simply stating the legal position. It is not a threat to invoke proceedings. The whole challenge with the use of social media is we do not want to muzzle people from telling their story, but we must try to avoid trial by social media in a way that could prejudice the outcome of a disciplinary process.

I am very grateful to Bishop Paul for his support for the amendments. With respect to the Dean of the Arches, her suggestion about the bishop making a suggestion to the President of the Tribunals I think still lacks consistency because it would still end up with 41 different people looking for a form of words. Actually, I think the point that Bishop Paul was making is that diocesan bishops are very close to the situation and know all the people involved and it is better to have a measure of objectivity by this being publicised centrally on a central basis. I am grateful to Jamie Harrison for his support. In response to Clive's comments, there is actually provision to adjourn but that is in the Measure not in the Code of Practice.

In response to Paul Ayers' point, in fact, a tribunal can compel witnesses and can require disclosure of evidence. In response to Peter Collier, thank you for your expertise and for your cogent argument for speed, which is one of the things which we are trying to address because we have been listening to the concerns of Synod. Thank you very much to the Bishop of Worcester who will I am sure be looking forward to the wider debate tomorrow. Thank you for your support for these, again, very narrow and specific amendments which are designed to improve both speed and transparency in the administration of the current process. For that reason, I commend them to you.

The Chair: I now put Item 507 to the vote.

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

The Chair: The motion is carried. The Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 - Amending Code of Practice has been approved. That completes this item of business. We now break for lunch and return at 2.00 pm.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin)* took the Chair at 2.00 pm.

ITEM 29

AFFIRMING AND INCLUDING DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE WHOLE LIFE OF THE CHURCH (GS 2270)

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. We come now to Item 29 on our agenda. Members will need GS 2270. Before I call on Timothy Goode to move the motion, may I just say we have a number of people indicating that they would like to speak, so after the first three people speaking in the debate, I will be minded to move down to three minutes. Let me now call on Timothy Goode to move the motion. You have up to 10 minutes.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark): Good afternoon, Synod. May I take this opportunity to welcome those from the disabled community, who have joined us here in the chamber for this debate, and also for the many who are joining us online. I know so many have invested in this debate. Thank you so much for joining us.

“In God we have a new dignity and God calls us to fullness of life.” Synod, this quote does not come from Scripture, but from the introductory statement at the beginning of the Common Worship baptism service. It seeks to lay out before all those coming forward for baptism that each one of us, who have been made in God’s image and likeness, is unique and precious in God’s sight and deserving of dignity. But not only that, it is a statement of intent, that together we are called to fullness of life. It affirms the Church’s call to invest in the fullness of life of each one of us, speaking with a prophetic voice for justice and equity of all God’s people, including disabled people.

The motion before you this afternoon seeks to hold us, the Church, to our baptismal promise by focusing our attention on the Cinderella of marginalised groups. Over recent decades, diversity, equity and inclusion have become amongst the most pressing conversations taking place across our culture, let alone the Church. While much of the diversity discussion has rightly centred on issues of race, gender and human sexuality, a very important community has largely been missing from that conversation, yet at about 20% of the population, the disabled community is the largest minority group in this country.

At some point in our lives we will all experience our interdependence more acutely than others, for we are all utterly dependent in the womb. We were all utterly dependent when we were born. We may have experienced periods of dependence during our life, for example in our mental health or mobility, and we are likely to become increasingly dependent in our later years. Therefore, to include the disability community within the wider discussion about diversity, equity and inclusion is both a justice issue and a Gospel imperative. For this motion affects each and every one of you. Not one of us is exempt. “In God we have a new dignity and God calls us to fullness of life.”

For many disabled people, being able to fully participate in the life and worship of our local church community has been a constant and often insurmountable challenge. The Church has a history of failing to notice or acknowledge disabled people and, at worst,

has discriminated against them. Synod, we must face up to our failure. The Church is not a safe place for disabled people to flourish. It is not a safe place because many believe that disclosing disability or neurodiversity will lead to discrimination, for disabled people are all-too-often misrepresented as passive and devoid of personal agency. Disabled people continue to face considerable barriers to full participation; barriers of physical, spiritual and educational access, alongside attitudinal barriers, which are in turn reinforced by often poor, unnuanced or outdated theologies of anthropology, hermeneutics, ecclesiology and eschatology.

During the first lockdown, the Church at large was exposed to some of the very restrictions of access that disabled people continue to face, experiencing at first-hand the terrible loss of not being able to gather together in the church building and worship. Now with that lived experience, the Church can no longer ignore the cry of disabled people that is coming from the margins. The time is long overdue for the Church to utterly re-evaluate the mission and prophetic ministry of disabled people and tear down the cultural, societal and theological barriers that deny the full participation of disabled people within the mission and ministry of Christ's Church.

The motion set before us this afternoon is a first cry to that call from the wilderness, and each clause is a springboard to achieving cultural change. If passed by Synod, and as each clause then embeds itself within the mission and ministry of the Church, we intend to return to Synod with fresh proposals that we pray will further transform the culture of the Church towards disabled people.

Synod, we should not fear dependency. As Christians we are dependent on God as revealed to us in Christ Jesus, and our dependency is founded on the very constancy of God's immeasurable love for each one of us in all our wonderful diversity.

As a disabled person, I am often dependent on the constancy of others. Being healthily dependent is founded in a loving relationship, built on mutuality, gift, hospitality, generosity and profound grace. The Church as the body of Christ on earth, the wounded hands and feet of Christ, has not mirrored the constancy of God for disabled people. For to fully belong is to be missed when you are not there, and the Church has not missed disabled people, and, as a result, the relationship the Church has with disabled people lacks trust and lacks dignity. "In God we have a new dignity and God calls us to fullness of life."

In this morning's Gospel at Morning Prayer we were wonderfully presented with the story of the paralytic man being let down through the roof by his friends so he could get to Jesus. This extraordinary passage is overflowing with compassion, empathy, justice, forgiveness, intentionality, imagination - tearing down all physical and societal barriers in its wake. The friends did not follow the crowd. The friends intentionally bypassed the crowd and through hard graft and working with the paralysed man together they overcame each and every barrier and managed to bring their friend to Jesus' attention. It was the fierce faith of the friends that made Jesus say, "Friend, your sins are forgiven you". It was

because they valued and loved their friend that they set in motion a profound process of healing.

Dear Synod, I, too, am calling on the fierce faith of friends. Like the friends of the paralytic man, we have a precious opportunity this afternoon to set in motion a process of profound healing. Healing of all of us. Healing of the Church. For the focus of this motion is not to help some marginalised other. The focus of this motion is about all of us becoming more fully the body of Christ. For we are the body of Christ. In the one spirit we were all - all - baptized into one body. Let us then pursue all that makes for peace and builds up our common life. For in God we all - all - have a new dignity, and God calls us all to fullness of life. I move this motion standing in my name.

The Chair. I am aware that some in this debate will not be able to go to the microphone and there is a roving mic available for usage. For those who are able to get to the microphone, once I have indicated that you will be speaking, if you could make your way down closer to the podiums, that will be very helpful with regards to keeping to time. I call first Fiona MacMillan and, secondly, Rachel Mann. You have up to five minutes.

Ms Fiona MacMillan (London): I welcome this motion as a first step towards a Church of England with a more accessible culture. It is an important signal about our collective commitment to disabled people, to becoming a more diverse Church.

Let me first declare an interest. I am newly elected as one of your representatives to the CMDDP under whose banner Tim has brought this motion, and I am honoured to be part of the St Martin-in-the-Fields project mentioned in the motion. I hope that describing these projects and some of the people who are part of them may enable Synod members to understand something of the context, the need and the way ahead.

St Martin-in-the-Fields is known for doing good things in the area of disability, but this has not always been the case. It has previously been a hard place to get in and join in, but change has come from truly listening to disabled people, making space for us to lead, and being prepared to change. St Martin's disability advisory group now holds termly open meetings for people with insight into or interest in physical, sensory, cognitive and mental health or neurodiversity, whether from our own experience, from living alongside loved ones, or from our working lives.

We identify barriers to belonging and suggest solutions because those who are affected by an issue often know what would work better. They just need to be asked. We share ideas with the wider community recognising that we are all a combination of needs and gifts, and when our needs are met our gifts can flourish. Looking outwards St Martins works in partnership with Inclusive Church in a national conference on disability and theology, now in its 11th year. It is not about disability but for disabled people. A majority of the conference planning team, speakers and delegates are disabled or neurodivergent. Yet each year new delegates come and tell us, "I didn't know there were any disabled

leaders”, or, “I tried to join in my local church but because I can’t do it the same way as everyone else they won’t let me do it at all”, or, “I always thought I was the only one”.

Disabled people are often marginalised by experience or geography. The conference has become a space for us to gather to resource each other and the Church. One told us, “I came last year to learn tips to take to my church back home and instead found I had been given back to myself. I went home with more confidence to say, ‘This is who I am and this is what we can do’. I have come back to be restored again and resourced for another year.” Some are in ministry. Others are on the edge of church or faith. Two weeks ago I had a card from someone who wrote, “I had felt alienated and had no idea how to hold my faith and chronic health conditions coherently but you and the conference team and the contributors have shown me how I can inhabit the label ‘disabled Christian’ well.” Last weekend they were ordained deacon.

Churches can be good at lots of things, but if they present barriers not obvious to any except those affected, they are still exclusive. By and large, churches are built and run by and for the well and the neurotypical. Unless we listen, how will we know what the barriers are?

Part of the problem has been that disabled people’s voices are not heard. The work often happens by the centre looking outward. Disabled people who cannot access a building will not just wait patiently outside for the promise of future access. Those met with a constant drip of what is not possible and why, will stop asking for change, and will simply stop coming. Disabled people inside the Church often experience discrimination or judgment in the very place that promises to accept them just as they are.

Last week’s Methodist Conference said, “Inclusivity is not about issues but about ensuring that justice, dignity and solidarity are a core part of the Church’s work”.

Synod, accessibility is not an act of charity but a matter of justice. I urge you to support this motion as it is presented, as one step on a much longer journey. I hope this will be the start of not just greater inclusion, but of transformation, because as long as we are excluded in practical and thoughtless ways, disabled people will continue to ask: what does the Church stand for?

The Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): Synod, I want to talk about a precarious and sacred thing. I want to talk about the body, and the scarred and wounded body in particular. I want to talk about one such example, my own. Given we live in a society which over-prioritises sight, very often I am not seen as disabled at all. But my body is something of a beautiful wreck. Due to complex Crohn’s disease, I have had over a dozen ops. Not only can you play chess on my tummy but all the board games. My colon is long gone. I have had a permanent ileostomy for 14 years. This weather is near disastrous for me. I wildly dehydrate and the wafer which sticks my bag to my body melts. As I speak to you, the waste stuff of my insides pumps out into a bag, and I guess you might imagine that I should be embarrassed to tell you that. But I found God in the midst

of this reality. God is in the facts and in the promise. And no more or less in this often shattered and ever-more vulnerable body, *vulnus* meaning “wound”, wound as in opening, and in that opening I think there is a way to the God who one day shall take the glorious facts of this disabled body into the resurrection body. If Christ’s glorious risen body bore the wounds of his vulnerability into heaven, why should not mine?

I speak in resounding support of this motion as it stands, and with thanksgiving for the costly commitment made by those who have worked, often with less support and resources than they deserve, to call the Church back to a proper delight in and cherishing of us all, no matter how temporarily abled or long-term disabled, or for ever disabled we are. For we are God’s image bearers, called into the likeness of Christ.

As a member of the Faith and Order Commission, I would welcome and delight in the opportunity to work on new resources. If I have a request it is to ask us not to lose sight of the cost of living with invisible disability, in a world and Church that has reductive definitions of what counts as disability. I ask then for the Church’s theological imagination to be set alight by the Holy Spirit. The body of Christ, Synod, friends, is a wondrous and beautiful thing into which we are called. The riches of God are found as we celebrate the diversity of these fragile ever-changing bodies we actually are and, as we give thanks, as they take their place in God’s glorious body.

The Bishop of Warrington (the Rt Revd Beverley Mason): Recently in the Lectionary we recalled the resurrection appearance in John 20 where Jesus appeared to his disciples. Thomas was missing. We have no reason to believe that anybody in the room noticed that Thomas was not among them. What we hear is that when Thomas hears whom and what he has missed, he reacts not with joy upon hearing the good news of Jesus Christ but with the heart of somebody who was outside the room.

Many of us in this room know the hurt of being excluded. We know the psychological torment of this. We doubt our own self-worth. Rightly or wrongly, we will fill in the gaps. What most of us do not know is what it is like to live with this as a constant, to live with the hostile stares and the unspoken question of whether people should even be inside the room.

As we have heard, people with disability are a discriminated minority. A charity that is close to my heart is Changing Faces, which campaigns for individuals with facial difference. People may get past the written application for jobs, but when interviewers are confronted by their visible difference, the interview is, typically, awkward or cut short.

In a world that is so undermining of image, with such enormous consequences upon the mental wellbeing of individuals, especially of our young, it is good for us to remember that people with physical and mental difference and disability, for whatsoever reason, are and remain in the image of God.

I am very grateful to my friend Tim Goode, the CMDDP, the Disability Task Group and DDA network for bringing this important motion to Synod, which I fully support.

I would also like to thank Tim and others in this room for your faith and faithfulness against what must at times feel like an insuperable challenge.

I would also ask that ongoing consideration is given to the breadth of disability, including and particularly the neurodivergent. As a bishop involved in the discernment of vocations, it is evident that the Lord desires a neurodiverse leadership, ordained and lay. But there is a clear need for (a) greater awareness of this, (b) a deeper understanding, and (c) financial provision to enable effective vocational discernment and support at every level. Friends, everyone should be able to find their place in the room and at the table.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester): I am a member of the Liturgical Commission. It was good to see in the paper how it reflected on the cost of the various changes. The example they give of changing the rubric such as “All stand” may seem inconsequential, and therefore have an inconsequential cost, but if this involves Article 8 work when changing parts of the baptism service, Holy Communion or the Ordinal, the cost is no longer inconsequential because of the time it takes up, not just within the Commission but actually coming here to Synod. There is a time as well as a financial cost to it, and the time is probably longer than you might imagine, or begin to hope for.

There are other areas of the rubric that really need updating as well, which have not yet been able to start. Currently it only refers to bishops in masculine pronouns. It would definitely be good to ensure that future liturgy reflects what the Group is calling for and would fully agree with that to enable greater inclusion. If they can give us any advice for any future work that we do, that would be really good to hear.

As an aside, personally, I would like other changes to happen. One of the things which Archbishop Justin does often when he introduces the Lord’s Prayer, is say, “Let us now say the Lord’s Prayer in whatever language comes most naturally to you”. There are lots of ways that we exclude people without even thinking about it. We regularly introduce the Lord’s Prayer like this in the church that I am part of because we are in a multilingual parish. There are languages that people speak in our church that I had never even heard of before and, sadly, I am not multilingual.

Inclusion is a very important area and we definitely need to address it going forwards, but we have to explore the financial and time cost of changing what we already have. How we train clergy and Readers and others leading worship using existing liturgy is a very good place to start, even before any changes can happen, and there are many people within the Liturgical Commission who would be dancing with delight to know that there was to be more training spent on how to use liturgy and lead worship well.

The Revd Jackie Doyle-Brett (York): Darius was ordained deacon at York Minster this Petertide. He is serving his placement at York St John University and at Christ Church, Bridlington. Darius has a great sense of humour, flashes of profound theological insight and significant pastoral and evangelistic skills. He is described by many who have met him as a blessing. His placement supervisor particularly valued Darius' technical expertise during lockdown. He has been instrumental in encouraging several people to come to faith. Darius has cerebral palsy and communication difficulties, and is usually accompanied by a PA, who helps others to understand him. Darius and his PA Mark are in the public gallery this afternoon.

I would like to make a contribution to the debate based on Darius' lived experience. His words: "I have been humbled by the last nine years that I have taken part in the discernment and training process and have felt so welcome by the Diocese of York and St Hild, my TEI. In this time people have recognised that I have something to give, have worked alongside me and consider me a colleague, and valued my contribution. People have mentioned that in selecting and ordaining me, doors have opened for everyone by showing how God is able to use people just as they are. However, I have also encountered challenges in the Church, in particular people who see my disability before they see me as a person. Some churches I have attended think that it is appropriate to pray for my healing without my permission. However, I recognise myself to be a child of God, who is loved by Him and who is called by Him to ministry without the need for healing, just as I am."

Darius supports the proposals, but feels they do not necessarily go far enough, and that if the Church is serious about including disabled people, then this can only be a start. There is a need for a culture change and the cost of this change cannot be underestimated. It about far more than wheelchair access to church. In light of my journey alongside Darius in the discernment process, when I was the young vocations adviser for York, and the impact he is already having on those he ministers to, and on the basis of my own personal conviction, I enthusiastically urge you to support this motion.

The Chair: I call on the Revd Val Plumb to speak to and move her amendment. You have three minutes.

ITEM 71

The Revd Canon Valerie Plumb (Oxford): Synod, you know I get passionate about things. Born and still ministering with a disability, I am so delighted that this is on the Agenda. I give a liturgical woohoo. I naturally support this motion that Tim has brought, but I would like there to be an amendment to part (d), notwithstanding the General Synod motion passed in July 2007, that every diocese should appoint a lead person on disability issues. In July 2007, the General Synod passed a motion that every diocese should have a lead person on disability issues and ensure that these issues are an integral part of the functioning of the diocesan advisory committees and parsonage boards.

Introducing the debate, the then Bishop of Sheffield, the Rt Revd Jack Nicholls, moved a motion that called on Synod to affirm and value the contribution of disabled clergy and to ask dioceses to appoint a lead person, make appropriate training available and ensure that disability issues were made an integral part of the functioning of all diocesan structures. We are now in 2022, 15 years later, I am going to ask the question: how are we doing? My colleague, the Revd Katie Tupling, now chairs the Disability Advisers Network, who meet on a monthly basis on Zoom and she tells me that around 32 of our 42 dioceses have a named person on disability. However, most of those have disability, say, within a broader brief such as equality and diversity or within an HR role.

Some of them are volunteers alongside full-time parish commitments. Most have no budgets set aside. Some come with no expenses. There are only two dioceses that have advisers with a salary and a focus on disability as a specialist role, London and my own home Diocese of Oxford. This amendment is intended to remind Synod of the promises made in 2007, that each diocese still needs a local grassroots voice envisaged by the 2007 motion as well as this motion which encourages a pooling of resources to pay for vision and oversight. I want this amendment to be noted as a connection to the past and a recognition of the situation so far but, most importantly, so that the intention of the 2007 motion is not lost to history.

The Chair: I call on Canon Timothy Goode to respond. You have up to three minutes.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark): Synod, I want to welcome this amendment and thank Val very much for putting it forward. I want to accept it exactly as is written on the Order Paper. It reminds us that we have, Synod, been here before and we really do not want to be in this situation again. But not only that, it also reminds us that when Synod passes motions that are not first strategically thought through and costed, offering no idea where the funding is coming from, it often leads to frustration and deep disappointment and that has certainly been the case for disabled people in the Church. We are really seeking to change the way we work so that we are building the change on success, on real tangible cultural change. I am really grateful that this amendment draws attention to the failings of the past but also draws attention to the rationale behind this motion's approach and, as such, I urge you to please welcome it.

The Chair: Item 71, the amendment, is now open for debate. If you would like to address Item 71, then please do so.

the Ven. Alastair Cutting (Southwark): Back in 2007 when this was debated, I think I remember talking about Alan Haskey. Alyn Haskey was a poster boy back in the day. His poster that he was on for was for the Spastic Society, as it was then known. He was sitting robed in his graduation robes from this University where he had just got his degree. He ended up getting at least two more, if I remember, down the line. He also wanted to be one of those who could minister within the Church of England and he was told, "Well, that is not really going to be possible really, is it, because you're a wheelchair user and

you shake too much". That was the reason that was given to him, "How would you ever preside at the eucharist if you were going to be shaking too much?"

Alyn actually made it through as a Reader, first of all, and then indeed to be ordained and it is so good to see that others are also following in his footsteps. He would have been proud. I am really pleased that we are going back to this previous motion and underlining it again and to strengthen, to say where we have been before, to underline it and to bring it into this one. I hope strongly that you will support not only this amendment but the motion as a whole.

Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark): I welcome this amendment and, indeed, this motion and want to commend them both to Synod. The disability brief is truly huge and we need to be strategic here. When we think of disability, we must think not just of physical conditions but also those with no visible clues. My mother has bipolar disorder which has impacted hugely on both her church life and on mine. I also speak as the mum of a gorgeous nine year old boy who is autistic. As a family, we have experienced difficult discrimination from other church members, comments, criticisms as well as clergy who just did not want to discuss our son's diagnosis or condition with us, even when we had previously been part of that church congregation for a decade.

But this is not just about clergy and church leadership and, indeed, diocesan support. It is about all of us. It is truly heart-breaking to desperately want to be fully part of a church family and yet often find yourself and your whole family on the outside looking in because of the barriers that have been mentioned. In our case, our son experienced sensory overload within seconds of entering a church building and so we spent a lot of time running round the churchyard outside - literally outside. There is so much hope and support churches can offer to people with all kinds of bodies and minds, those that are easier to spot and those that are hard to understand. But, to do so, we must take time to listen with open minds and support with hearts that are wide open. My family have also been part of churches where our son has been deeply loved. His needs have been met, he has thrived and clergy have thanked us for bringing him to church saying it would not have been the same experience without him.

Professor John Swinton, who I think Tom quoted earlier, points out that while inclusion is a great starting point, as a Church we need to go much further. Inclusion is good but belonging is so much better. I urge Synod to support this amendment to ensure there is support at diocesan level and within those diocesan structures to ensure that people with all types of bodies and minds know that they are fearfully and wonderfully made and feel that, among the people of God, they truly belong.

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE): I would like to support this amendment. In London, as you have heard, we have been fortunate enough to appoint a disability adviser. It gives us both capacity but also skill and gifts to take seriously the culture change that is required in this motion. As Tim suggested, each one of us is made in the image of God, all people, regardless of the nature of our embodied

or cognitive sense or sensory shape. The London Diocese has been able to create a disability statement, informed by our disability adviser. It highlights that, if we are going to live this theological foundation out, fundamental is reimagining our current models of ministry and our expectations of ministers.

We need to be asking not how can disabled people fit into the Church as it is, but how will the presence and perspectives of disabled people change the Church as it is? If we do not ask this question and are not prepared to answer it creatively, we will end up being tokenistic and we will risk seeing that disabled people need to overcome their disability and do everything that we expect of a fully abled minister. That is not right. It is only when disabled people can fully belong and participate in the life and the ministry of the Church and through their presence be agents of change for the whole Church that we will begin to be the body of Christ for the world today. This requires a fundamental mindset. For most people, disability is viewed through a medical model in which it is viewed as a problem or a lack of ability or a negative trait, yet the disabled yet risen through Jesus Christ calls us and demands us to think differently.

The appointment of the disability adviser in London has enabled us to begin this cultural change and thinking and, as a result, we have gathered data about clergy and disability through past and current disability surveys. Both surveys reveal a higher than expected number of clergy identifying as disabled and also stories of people feeling misunderstood, unsupported and reluctant to share their issues within the Church or with the senior staff. Whilst there is a lot of work to do, the appointment of the disability adviser has enabled us to begin to rethink our cultural framework, to challenge us and to be there in our vision for every Londoner, to encounter the love of God. I support this amendment and this motion.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 71 has been sufficiently debated. That is the amendment. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 71.

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

The Chair: Can I have a show of hands on Item 71, thank you.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. Can I just say that Mr Sam Margrave has kindly withdrawn his amendments. I am very grateful to him and, unless anyone else chooses to amend them, it lapses.

The Chair: We now go back to the main motion, Item 29, as amended by Item 71. We are still on a three minute speech limit.

Mr Temitope Taiwo (London): Synod, I have been a follower of Jesus for seven years, an Anglican for a shorter amount of time and a member of Synod for even shorter than

that - although the notion of time at Synod takes from a different feel, if you agree with that. But, in this short time at Synod, I have had the most profound conversations both here in the chamber and over dinner tables and I have experienced beautiful moments, one of which was the time of worship yesterday evening and hearing the sound of the human voice as we sung in unison together. If you were to press me as to why I deem those moments beautiful, a sizable part of that would be attributed to the fact that, as I turned around and look to my left and to my right, I noticed my brothers and sisters, many of whom are disabled persons from my knowledge, and I cannot help but be stirred by a gratitude and joy for their lives.

Like Tim shared in his opening speech, disabled people are the Cinderella of minorities and I say that because, as a minority, I completely agree. Yet this only dawned on me a few years ago. You see, whilst I am a relatively young disciple, I have had many experiences across Church traditions and theological views. One view I had been taught in particular was that disability in any of its forms was a problem to be solved, like Jackie shared moments ago. You can imagine the conflict I felt a number of years ago when, as a new budding youth worker, I momentarily lived with a family that differed from me in many ways, in colour, in class, in experience of life, but a family that also had a young teenage boy with a severe disability.

Synod, I was taught both directly and indirectly to view someone like this as other but, as the days and the weeks and the months rolled on, what I saw and experienced and felt from this young man was not problematic but powerful. It was not an issue to be solved but an individual to be celebrated, and was not someone who was other but a young man who was and is my brother in Christ. I was taught disability was something to be changed, but the beautiful irony is that a young teenage boy with a disability changed me. So I end with these words. If Christ is not ashamed to dwell in them, I will not be slow to embrace them. So, Synod, I strongly support this motion as amended and ask that you will do the same.

The Bishop of Exeter (the Rt Revd Robert Atwell): Let me begin by thanking Tim Goode for this motion and, speaking as Chair of the Liturgical Commission, assure him that the Commission stands ready to support this enthusiastically. It is really important to make our worship more inclusive of disabled people. Two years ago, the Commission published guidance about worshipping alongside people living with dementia. It is really important that we get our worship right because, as we all know, worship can generate, unwittingly, feelings of both inclusion and sometimes exclusion.

But, in relation to this particular motion, there is just one cautionary word I would like to offer and that is clause (a) in the motion includes an example seeking to remove rubrics. As I understand it, the motion refers to liturgical directions either spoken by the person presiding at a service or which appear printed in service booklets. I think it would be really good to offer guidance for best practice in this regard, but it would be a different matter if this motion were interpreted as requiring the Church of England to remove or modify every rubric in our current authorized liturgies that suggests posture.

To be frank, it will be a nightmare to enact. As my colleague, Shayne Ardron said earlier, to make such changes in forms of services which are alternative to the prayer book would legally be Article 7 business, if not Article 8, and it would require a full synodical process. This would be a significant task requiring time and effort and, in the end, distract us from the main task of affirming and including disabled people. I also think it is unnecessary because there is already flexibility in the interpretation of rubrics dictating posture such as the requirement in the prayer book for a person to kneel when receiving Holy Communion.

I want to support this motion enthusiastically, but with strong encouragement to avoid the prospect of hours and hours going through thousands of rubrics in Synod. Instead, let us foster a wide-ranging discussion working on a guide of good practice which has at its heart the experience and the advice of disabled people. In short, I advocate a holy pragmatism. Our liturgies need to be framed in ways that are pastorally sensitive and where posture, for the most part, is seen as a matter locally determined.

Mrs Jeanette Appleton (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I declare an interest here. I am also joining Fiona on the committee for the ministry of and among deaf and disabled people. I say that for all the people who are new to Synod who may not understand all the acronyms, and also to let you know that I am an occupational therapist and also someone with a hidden disability.

Can I tell you that the Holy Spirit is hovering in this room. Much of what I was given to write for my speech has actually been said word for word in other speeches which means I only need to give you the last paragraph. That is: what next? Because I gather from the mood in the hall that we are going to vote for this motion. But we voted for this motion 15 years ago, as Val reminded us.

As an occupational therapist, one of the things I am expected to do is to provide a practical pathway for people to put into place recommendations, and so I have one for you. Please take your Order Papers home. Do not throw them away, do not put them back in the boxes that are provided because what I would like you to do is make this a priority for your prayer.

I want you to make it a priority for your prayer every day until we reach our destination. I would also like you to make this a priority for your reports back to your diocesan synods and to your deanery synods so that the message reaches as quickly as possible to the coalface of PCCs - that is parish council committees, I think - and also the DACs - the diocesan advisory committees. I want you to really hold this and keep holding it because that is how things progress. As an OT, if the programmes were not carried out every day, if people forgot them, you did not make progress. Without prayer, nothing happens and so that is the priority. Please, mention this when you get back to your homes.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): I am Sarah Tupling and this is my name in sign language. I am one of the three reps on Synod who represent Deaf Anglicans Together. Unfortunately, the other two are not with me at this moment. One is seriously unwell, unfortunately. So many of the things that I want to say have been said before and I think they are important words to hear. I think a lot of the things we need to think about are around hidden disability. If I was not signing here in front of you or signing in the dining hall or I was just sat alone eating my diner, people would walk past, maybe speak to me and not know that I was unable to hear what was going on because deafness is very much a hidden disability.

I have noticed there are many other people here that wear hearing aids and that is a very visible manifestation of people's disability and I think it is fantastic that we have that representation here within Synod. That makes me very happy. I am one of the very, very few deaf lay Readers in the UK. My big concern is around training opportunities. I was delighted to see this morning in John Spence's speech that £15 million will be allocated to training. That is wonderful. It really is truly, truly marvellous. But where is the specialist training for deaf lay Readers? For deaf clergy? For deaf priests? And for all of the other important roles that we need to allow our mission to be successful? What we are seeing is, when deaf clergy leave, they are not being replaced. If we lose a deaf chaplain, a deaf chaplain moves, there is nobody to take that role on and that is a huge travesty.

I really like the motion as presented by Tim today. I think it is very important and he talked a lot about inclusivity. In some churches, there seems to be the notion that bringing in a sign language interpreter is the answer to all of the problems and that achieves inclusion. I am very sad to say that is not, in fact, the case. This motion is fantastic. If we want deaf people to be fully involved in the mission and ministry of the Church in every level, we cannot rely on interpreters to make that happen. That is not the answer.

I am sure it is not only deaf people who experience these barriers. I am sure there is lot of, as just said in the previous group we went to, "Oh, we will just put a ramp in and that will solve the problem for everybody". It is much, much more complicated and nuanced than that. It is not just ramps and loos.

Again, I very much want to support this motion. We need to be supporting deaf and disabled people to access training and to be able to take up these roles. If we want to be simpler, humbler, bolder, we need to start by being bolder rather than being simpler, I would say, and really move things forward in a much more progressive fashion. Sorry to the Archbishop of York for trying to restructure his catchwords there.

The Revd David Tolhurst (Durham): Many years ago, when I still lived back down south, I worked for what became the Department for Work and Pensions. I worked for some time in the Kent Placing Assessment and Counselling Team and, in fact, Chair, was the Disability Employment Adviser for Dover. I worked as an Access to Work Consultant and it was my job to assess and arrange for adjustments in the workplace, to ensure disabled people could stay in work or could engage in new employment. My work was framed by

the Disability Discrimination Act and I was responsible for negotiating what a reasonable adjustment was and was not with employees.

Yesterday, it was my joy to attend the workshop *Getting In and Joining In* led by Fiona and Zoe, retitled, quite helpfully, *More than Lifts, Loops and Loos*. Well, in a previous life I was the person who did the lifts of the loops and the loos and, then, when I worked for that very team, everything changed because across a government office, mine and Natalie's eyes met and the rest is history. Natalie, my wife, was born with cerebral palsy, having many operations, walked with the aid of a stick and, as life has changed, is more and more dependent upon wheelchair use. I can echo, it is far more than lifts, loops and loos that are needed. How many times, my wife will tell you, she has been looked down upon and swept aside and, even some years ago at an ordination in our own cathedral, told that people like her needed to sit over there and then was stuck behind a pillar unable to see the bishop ordaining. It was not me, by the way. She had a special seat at my ordination. But, as a normal person, she was simply swept aside.

How many times has she been asked if she wanted prayers to cure her? She loses count. Her answer, inspiringly, is always the same: "No, thank you. I am God's child. I am created in the image of God. But can I pray for you?" This motion is not about access. It is about inclusion and belonging. It is not about reasonable adjustments. It is about the transformation of a culture, one that will take time, that will begin with the steps outlined in this motion.

Synod, can I please urge you to fully support the motion, but not just by raising your hand or pressing the number 1 button on your electronic handset or even using the buttons on the online voting platform. Do it also by praying, by transforming your place of work, worship and ministry so that we can join in the beautiful hymn words of Marty Horgan, "Let us build a house where all are named, their songs and visions heard and loved and treasures taught and claimed as words within the words, built of tears and cries and laughter, prayers of faith and songs of Grace. Let this house proclaim from floor to rafter that all are welcome in this place".

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Revd Canon Dr Tim Bull (St Albans): I was not going to speak in the end because there have been so many profound and moving speeches, but just to tell you briefly about one practical thing that a small group of us is doing. We want to remove all the barriers in the Church, including barriers to disabled clergy taking on senior roles of bishop, dean and archdeacon. Much like the leading women course, we are putting together a programme or something - we are in the early stages yet - to equip disabled clergy to take on these senior roles.

We are working with disabled clergy, with a Team GB Paralympian and we are drawing on the best experience we can get from teachers, trainers and facilitators. We have got fantastic and brilliant ideas and they are going to be great. But, of course, these ideas

will be absolutely no good at all if the Church is still biased and prejudiced against seeing people who maybe have a visual impairment, from the deaf community, are neurodiverse or use a wheelchair in the senior roles of bishop, dean, archdeacon and the like. I just want to bring this to your attention and encourage you to vote in favour of this motion, not just things we have been talking about but to open up the entire ministry in the Church to people with disabilities.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (the Rt Revd Ruth Worsley): You have already heard from Alastair Cutting of the pioneering Alyn Haskey. His life and testimony had a profound effect upon many and his ability to laugh and see the best in all made him a great colleague. He was in his final year of curacy when I arrived in the parish as priest-in-charge. He was feeling somewhat downbeat. There were many things that remained uncompleted within his training schedule. He had never taken a wedding or funeral and his input in services appeared to be limited to his undoubted skills as a speaker.

Like Darius, Alan found that well-meaning people had sometimes limited his opportunity to participate fully in the life of the Church. Ramps had been provided. A dining table had replaced the nave altar to accommodate his wheelchair. But much was needed for us to realise the gift that Alyn was to us. A cultural shift was required so that we could not miss the unique gift of becoming the whole body of Christ, the broken body of Christ.

I remember one very special Sunday where I stood alongside Alyn at the table of welcome and, as he spoke the words of consecration, so I became his hands and feet. Together, we illustrated the vulnerable body of Christ in the breaking of bread and sharing of wine. Sisters and brothers, Alyn may have needed me to support him in fully participating within the life of the Church, but I needed him too to understand the full nature of the Christ we both followed. I urge you to support this motion.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 29, as amended by Item 71, has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on this item.

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

The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham): Point of order.

The Chair: Can you tell me what Standing Order has been breached?

The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham): No, I remember, I have got it. I have to wait until he has answered.

The Chair: Can I invite Tim to respond to the debate, please. You have up to five minutes.

The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark): Thank you, Chair, and a huge thank you to all who have contributed to what I think we would all agree has been a really, really special and moving debate. Thank you for understanding and endorsing the approach

that the Disability Task Group is really setting forward and I look forward to being back with new motions furthering the full participation of disabled people. There are so many people to mention. Forgive me, therefore, if I do not do a running tally of all who have spoken, but I do actually want to just thank very much Sam for his passion for the disability cause.

We have spoken a lot in the last 24 hours and he recognised that we wanted as many voices as possible to speak, but his passion for justice and for disabled people is absolutely palpable and I wanted to honour that. Thank you so much, Sam. I also want to thank Darius for joining us today in the gallery. He is sporting his wonderful new dog collar and I have to say, Darius, you make my heart sing, you really do. It is wonderful to see you here and to support us in this work, thank you so much. I also though want to note the real challenge that Fiona has given us: what does the Church stand for? And reinforce our baptismal promise that in God we have a new dignity and God calls us to fullness of life. Please, let us go from here and live out our baptismal promise.

Can I just also touch on and thank the Bishop of Exeter for his speech and to reassure the Liturgical Commission that we are absolutely up for a conversation. This is not about a retrograde just carrying on with everything before. We really are looking forward to that conversation and I welcome the conversations we have already had which have been very encouraging. The way we physically engage with our worship is vital, but can I stress it is vital for disabled people too and that has never ever been acknowledged. What this motion is calling for is for us to acknowledge to listen so that we can all be the body of Christ together in worship.

Thank you very much for all that we have said in our own conversations as well. I am going to stop there for all your sakes because I would like to actually hold the end of this debate in prayer and we have, I hope, a slide which will be shown. Is that possible? If it is not there, that does not matter. Here we go, lovely. If you would join in all that is bold. Shall we take a moment of quiet just to give thanks for that debate for all that we have shared and for all that we are going to take away and act upon.

(Prayer)

The Chair: We come now to vote on Item 29.

The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham): Point of order. Aren't you proud of me, Durham! I would like to request that we do this as a counted vote, not just of the whole Synod but by Houses and so I hope that three voices will resoundingly support this motion. I know I am not supposed to put opinion as to why, am I.

The Chair: Thank you. Do I have 25 people standing in agreement? Yes, I believe we do, thank you very much.

The vote on Item 29, as amended by Item 71: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 32, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 153 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, 162 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The Chair. The motion as amended was carried. This item is now closed and we move to next business.

THE CHAIR *the Very Revd Andrew Nunn* (Dean of Southwark) took the Chair at 3.23 pm.

The Chair. Synod, before the next item of business, the Secretary General would like to address us.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Members of Synod, I am sorry about such a change of tone, but I need to give you an update on the latest position on the elections from the House of Laity and the House of Clergy to the Crown Nominations Commission. This will, I am afraid, take a minute or two. I have some good news, some not quite so good news and something of a dilemma which I will put before you.

First, the good news. The counting of the votes from last night is underway. We have not so far identified any duplicate votes. At the time of writing this, we had not so far been formally notified of anyone eligible to vote who was unable to vote, though I have since had a note from some individual who may be in that position. We are looking into it.

There may be people who were unable to vote while being eligible from whom we have not yet heard. One detail on that. Please note that, under the Standing Orders, to be eligible to vote you must have been present last night and that means either in this chamber or on Zoom between 8.30 and 9.30 yesterday evening. So, Synod, I want to explain that we now face, as I have said, something of a dilemma. We have two principal options and I am going to explain them to you.

Option 1: we can proceed with counting the votes from last night and announce the results as planned before prorogation tomorrow. Note again that the new Standing Orders recently introduced require us both to conduct the election and to announce the results during one group of sessions. So there is a deadline tomorrow. But there is, of course, a risk of an appeal against those results. If an elector believes that he or she was unable to vote while being eligible to vote, they may very reasonably appeal the result. Now, Synod, if an appeal is about that - the exclusion of one or two electors, which would, of course, be quite serious enough - then the appeal process could be run within about ten days. If the appeal were upheld - though, of course, I cannot say what the judge of the appeal might do - it is possible that the judge might simply direct a recount to incorporate ballots from those one or two electors excluded. That though might change the result we had announced or it might not, which would not be very satisfactory.

Option 2: why not then simply rerun the election? Well, to rerun the election, given the time in the group of sessions we are at, we would need to ask Synod to suspend the Standing Order requiring the result to be announced at this group of sessions because there is not time to process it. That would require a 75% vote of the Synod that might well be forthcoming. We would then need to run the election again over this evening and tomorrow morning using paper ballots and electronic versions of paper ballots for those at home on Zoom and we could do that. But what about the people who were here to vote yesterday but are not present today? There is a risk that some members of Synod might not receive the notification of a rerun election and might not have a chance to join Zoom before lunch tomorrow in order to vote. Such people might, again very reasonably, also want to appeal against the result of a rerun election. There is a risk of an appeal against the conduct of a rerun election. An appeal against one or two people would, as I say, take about ten days. An appeal against the conduct of the election overall could take a few months to resolve, I am afraid, under the Standing Orders given the need to establish an appeal panel and to hold a hearing.

So, Synod, neither option is entirely without risk. I imagine few people would favour the third option of calling a special extra group of sessions purely in order to hold the CNC elections. The Clerk and I have discussed this dilemma with the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity. It is our decision, but I believe the Synod officers support it. It is our view that option 1 is the preferable option. We do not propose to run the election again. We will count the votes from last night's election. If there are one or more electors who were individually unable to vote while being eligible, we will invite them to appeal the result and we will then seek to expedite the appeal as quickly as possible and to establish whether the results are changed or not.

If there is a wider appeal - which, of course, Synod members are entitled to do - that too will be dealt with according to the Standing Orders but may take considerably longer. We do though expect to announce a result tomorrow morning and those pairs elected then will be members of the new CNC unless and until that result is changed following any appeal. We have, I am afraid, been unable to come up with a better option given the circumstances we find ourselves in. Once again, I am very sorry that we are all left in this unsatisfactory position and I am very grateful to many members of Synod for expressing your understanding and forbearance. Thank you.

SPECIAL AGENDA I

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 502

DIOCESAN STIPENDS FUNDS (AMENDMENT) MEASURE 2022 (GS 2255)

The Chair. Synod, we now come to Item 502, the draft Diocesan Stipends Fund (Amendment) Measure, which is before the Synod for First Consideration. For this, members will need the draft Measure which is GS 2255, the Explanatory Notes, GS

2255XX, and the Policy Note, GS 2255PP, and they include the financial information that we need. I am, therefore, going to call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, the Bishop of Sheffield, to move Item 502, "That the Measure entitled 'Diocesan Stipends Funds (Amendment) Measure' be considered for revision in committee'. Bishop, you may speak for not more than 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Sheffield (the Rt Revd Dr Pete Wilcox): Synod, I want to begin by telling you about Lucy. Lucy is a young priest in the Diocese of Sheffield, ordained deacon in 2019 and priest in 2020. During her curacy, she has pioneered a new worshipping and missionary community on one of our most deprived neighbourhoods in the deanery of Attercliffe, bringing back into use a former church building and reviving a stipendiary ordained ministry in its former parish. But, this summer, her curacy will end and she has to move to an incumbency. This is her account of the outreach she has so ably led in the past two years.

“Our priority has been to collaborate with local people and organisations to make the lives of local people better. We seek to introduce people to Jesus' love through building relationships and by serving our neighbours. We have a weekly cafe, which is our key point of contact in the week, with a relational fringe, and a very natural place for faith conversations. We are growing a variety of support services offered there.

“Before the cafe we have Morning Prayer and we have been surprised by how many people consistently arrive early for the cafe to join us. Since we began a regular pattern of worship in January, we have now established three congregations, all fairly humble in size, a weekly Sunday evening service, a monthly outdoor wild church service in the church's community garden and a monthly mid-week Communion, which we have only just begun. Between these services we have an overall regular worshipping community of 30 people, and are growing each month. We have had multiple enquiries about baptism and are planning a new baptism prep programme in response. It is early days but all in all we have regular meaningful contact with at least 55 people in the community and are hopeful that these numbers will continue to grow, and that many will grow in their relationship with God”.

Why have I told you about Lucy and this beautiful ministry in one of our most deprived localities of the diocese? Well, because the truth is that the diocesan board of finance in Sheffield has no budget to sustain this work. Left to ourselves we could not afford to place a stipendiary incumbent in Arbourthorne. Very soon I hope to license Lucy to an incumbent status role there so that she can indeed continue this good work. How? Through the generosity of another diocese. Some of you may remember from our debate in November that last year the Diocese of Oxford took a decision to give away £1 million of its wealth over four years to allow five of the least wealthy dioceses in the country to invest in additional missionary capacity. That generosity has benefited not only Sheffield but Newcastle, Liverpool, Birmingham and Canterbury. In Sheffield we have allocated the funds we have received to sustain Lucy's ministry. That is the difference that inter-diocesan generosity can make and in Sheffield we thank God for it.

Even Oxford was not able to give out of its diocesan stipends fund which is currently restricted. Friends, I confess that this debate is a little unexpected. Following the overwhelming endorsement of a motion in November 2021, the Business Committee determined on 23 March this year, under Standing Order 51A, that the First Consideration of this Measure could be deemed, or taken as read. That would have been the first use of a new power that is intended to make the legislative process quicker in certain favourable circumstances, and it would have enabled us now to be debating the Revision Stage of this draft Measure.

However, as they are perfectly entitled to do, 29 members of the Synod have requested a preliminary debate, so here we are. But if I am a bit surprised that we are debating First Consideration this afternoon, I am really not disappointed. I am convinced that one of the most important challenges facing this Synod in this quinquennium is to achieve greater mutuality and greater transparency in regard to the financial resourcing of the mission and ministry of the Church of England nationwide. We are going to need in the coming years greater generosity, greater liberality, greater open-handedness but also, equally, greater transparency, greater clarity, greater open mindedness. To that end, frankly, the more Synod airtime we devote to this Measure and its associated tasks, the better.

As I indicated in November, if we are to find a settlement which truly will enable us to resource the cure of souls fairly throughout the country to maintain a vigorous stipendiary ordained ministry in the most deprived communities of the land so that in every place we can bring the grace and truth of Christ to this generation and make Him known to those in our care, it will require transparency, mutuality and generosity. Greater generosity will be required on at least four levels. The underwriting of the stipendiary ordained ministry of the Church of England will continue to require, first of all, the generosity of individual worshippers. Up and down the country there is still work to be done to excite that generosity with more consistency. The working group I chair is liaising closely with the National Giving Team on this.

Then, secondly, there is a need for intra-diocesan generosity within dioceses. At present there are too many anomalies, inequalities and inconsistencies in the extent to which parishes contribute to their diocesan parish share or common fund. Up and down the country there is a need not only for greater generosity but for greater fairness within dioceses. More transparency in relation to the inequalities in relation to parish wealth must be a good thing.

But then, thirdly, there is a need, as Lucy's situation demonstrates, for greater inter-diocesan generosity, for generosity between dioceses. It is well known that not all dioceses are equally richly endowed, and it was striking to me to hear that point referenced even in the safeguarding presentation on Saturday. The Gospel places on the more wealthy dioceses an obligation to have regard to those dioceses which are less wealthy. St Paul's appeals for contributions from Macedonia to his for collection for the saints in need in Jerusalem surely applies to us at an inter-diocesan level.

Then finally there is a need at the national level for greater generosity. Since we debated in November the need to draft the legislation before us today, we have heard the good news that the Church Commissioners within the next triennium increased by 30% the sums available to dioceses to sustain the mission and ministry of God in local communities. For this I say hallelujah.

But generous as it is, the sums announced for 2023-25, and even the commitments made for 2026-31, are not a complete solution. Generosity is still required from the other partners I have mentioned and indeed from all who make up the economy of the Church of England.

To repeat what I said in November, this Measure is only permissive. It does not require any diocese to give to others. It does not mandate anything. It merely removes a restriction so that dioceses which have the means and the will to be generous to others are less constrained in future than they are at present. My mother-in-law Mary brought up four daughters on a stipend due to a Baptist minister, but she engrained in her children, and through them in me, this saying: "You will always have enough to be generous". Yes, times are hard for every diocesan board of finance. Yes, inflation is high, the cost of living is increasing daily and the economic future is uncertain, but Christians are called everywhere and always to be generous. How can we not progress this afternoon a Measure which merely permits, does not require generosity and how will we challenge the wretched inequalities of wealth across our nation as a whole, and the present dire needs of the poorest among us in the name of Jesus Christ, if we are not tackling at every opportunity the inequalities within our own institution?

Friends, this Measure is surely part of the way forward. It is not a solution to the challenges we face but it can make a contribution. This Measure will not confiscate money. It will simply loosen some purse strings to enable some wealthier dioceses to partner more generously in the Gospel with some dioceses which are less wealthy.

And so I move, "That the Measure entitled 'Diocesan Stipends Funds (Amendment) Measure' be considered for revision in committee".

The Chair. The motion is now open for debate.

The Revd Kate Warton (Liverpool): I am delighted that we have the opportunity today to discuss this Measure, which I think is extremely important and long overdue. I have spent all 17 years of my ordained ministry in deprived urban parishes in Liverpool Diocese and we often talk there about our hope that parishes with greater resources will support those with lesser resources, whether that is because they pay more parish share so that others can pay less or because those with more ministers offer them for cover elsewhere.

Of course then we would hope that similar resource sharing and support would happen between dioceses. There is an extraordinary disparity between richer and poorer

dioceses. Compare the £171 million of Oxford with the £1.5 million of Liverpool. This is not due to good versus poor financial management. It is due to all sorts of complex factors: historic assets, variations in land values, et cetera.

As a side note, I like to play a fun game where I invite my southern friends to guess how much I paid for the three-bedroomed two reception room terraced house with front and back gardens and off-street parking which I own and rent out in Huyton. They try hard but they can never guess low enough. Ask me later but it is a five-figure sum, not six. Of the 10 dioceses with the lowest historic wealth per capita, seven are in the north and one is somewhere in the middle that many of you southerners probably think is north.

As the accompanying papers remind us, dioceses with smaller DFS balances are more vulnerable. This is obviously a live issue currently due to the pandemic and the cost of live crisis. The principle of Acts 4 is important here I think. It would be very easy to dismiss this as a lovely idea from the early Church but totally impractical today. What if it was in fact a beautiful blueprint for the use of our DSFs? What might it actually look like for no one to claim that any of their possessions was their own but rather to share everything that they have?

It is great to hear of Oxford Diocese leading the way with their grant of £1 million over four years, and it is very timely, given the conversations we have already had during this Synod session on Link funding grants. It was wonderful to hear from Bishop Pete the story of Lucy's pioneering ministry which can continue due to this generosity. We in Liverpool have also been grateful for similar generosity. However, Oxford's bold generosity could not as yet come from its DSF.

Ideally, I would like this Measure to go further and be more radical than it is, but surely this is the minimum we must do. This is a very important and live issue for us in Liverpool. We are both the diocese with the lowest total capital and the lowest-ranking diocese by assets per capita. But I am not just asking for this because my diocese and my church are extremely poor. I very much hope that I would still argue as strongly for this were I in Oxford or Lincoln. That is for one simple reason. I believe, before God, that it is the right thing to do. Let us follow Paul in 2 Corinthians, as Bishop Pete reminded us earlier, deciding in our hearts to give, not reluctantly or under compulsion, but cheerfully.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Chair, I am a member of the Mutuality in Finances Group, a member of the Steering Group for this Measure, of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee, of Oxford's Bishop's Council and a trustee of the Parish Giving Scheme. It is all good fun.

This Measure is a result of a request at this Synod to bring forward legislation to encourage and enable generosity between dioceses, given the huge disparity in historic wealth in different dioceses. It is quite simple: it enables dioceses to give income from the diocesan stipends fund, which holds much of the historic wealth of the dioceses, to other dioceses, either directly or via another charity. The second option is when Oxford

chose to give the money away we did not want to choose the recipient dioceses ourselves, so we asked the Archbishops' Council to do it for us.

The legislation facilitates generosity between dioceses from historic wealth, which is so unevenly distributed. It is important to remove barriers to generosity. Jonathan de Bernhardt Wood, the National Giving Adviser, refers to this as "reducing the friction". If it is easier to be generous, people are more likely to be generous, and the same applies to dioceses. This is why the Parish Giving Scheme works so well. It makes it easy to give. This legislative change will make it easier for dioceses to be generous. I hope and pray that dioceses will use it.

As a part of the work of the Mutuality in Finances Group, we had a look at history of the diocesan stipends funds. I had naively thought that they sprang into existence as a result of the Endowments and Glebe Measure 1976 which transferred glebe endowments from parishes to dioceses and required the dioceses to pay the clergy. I was wrong. DSFs date back to at least 1944 and actually have their origins in the Union of Benefices Act 1919. Legislation trying to make Church finances more equitable goes back over 100 years.

It is time for the diocesan stipends funds to evolve a little more to enable dioceses to make gifts to other dioceses should they choose to do so. Please vote in favour of this Measure so that it can begin its legislative journey and ultimately facilitate inter-diocesan generosity.

Dr Ian Johnston (Portsmouth): This is my maiden speech. I suggest that one diocese donating to another in need is doing what can be done, while avoiding the greater problem of the viability of the receiving diocese, and such charity, I suggest, might be no more than a sticking plaster.

Our present initiative would reorganise some of the NCIs. I suggest they need to be more holistic with, crucially, the wellbeing of the parish at their heart. If we do this then our dioceses would be strengthened and would not need bailing out. What we need is a fundamental reconsideration of centralisation, delegation and subsidiarity. This is the analysis we should be doing and, in doing so, we will make redundant the proposals we are debating here today.

Also consider these points. The proposal would confuse the existing mechanism for Church Commissioners' support for low-income dioceses of which we have heard so much. Charity Commission guidance prevents donations to an organisation of questionable financial strength. The gifts would come from the donor's parish. Would this be its best use? Would its parishes be consulted? Remember Andrew Orange's plea when this matter was debated last. These proposals break the tight ringfencing established when money was first appropriated from parishes and they sever the link between those who originally gave the money and those who spend it. But most importantly, such donations would remove the incentive to correct whatever was ever

causing the problem in the receiving diocese. Dioceses need properly functioning and resourced parishes and sensible overheads to work well. Parishes generate over £1 billion in income a year. It is our collective overhead that is the problem. This is what the Dioceses Commission needs to sort out. This is the solution to our weaker dioceses and not, I suggest to you, this very well intentioned but misguided proposal. It is an easy short-term option and it misses the point.

I will urge you to vote against but, before that, while I am talking about the parish, let me say this, I am a newbie to General Synod. Fearing the worst, I have come to be impressed by Synod. It has weaknesses, there is absolutely no doubt about that. The Save the Parish Network of which I am a member welcomes all traditions. It has experts in non-theological subjects. It is interested in everything to do with the parish. Its rapid growth points to Synod's need for it in so many ways. It will be a positive contributor to the debate we are having and on the balance within our Church, and that includes this motion. I urge you to vote against.

The Chair: I will be reducing the speech limit to three minutes after this next speech.

Mr Clive Billenness (Europe): Members, I voted for the motion when it came before Synod and I certainly intend to vote for it again today. I support entirely the principle of better use of restricted funds, but I am an auditor and I can find the cloud behind any silver lining if you give me an opportunity to do so.

I stand here today simply to ask the Revision Committee to consider what risks might be created by this Measure, and to address them when the draft Measure is brought before us, hopefully, after you approve it at the next Synod.

If you wonder what risks I am talking about, I am asking the Committee to think about appropriate controls on limits on inter-diocesan transfers for issues such as the donating diocese already contemplating reductions in its stipendiary clergy, which a reduction in restricted funds might exacerbate. or perhaps limiting the duration of a grant of revenue income without a formal renewal. Just to remind you, we just limited Church Commissioners' powers to apply capital for seven years only before it comes back to us.

I do not ask you to vote against but the drafting committee, I do ask you please when you come back to have considered and explained how you will mitigate these kinds of financial risks.

Ms Sammi Tooze (York): This is my maiden speech. I speak as a diocesan giving adviser in York and, like Julie, I am also a trustee of the Parish Giving Scheme. In my job I spend a lot of my time encouraging church communities to become more the generous churches that God calls us to be. Generosity is at the heart of our faith and every way in which we live out our faith requires us to give of ourselves in some way. Crucially, I focus a lot of my time on culture change, helping to shape a refreshed culture where generosity is a joy, and is an expression of love and something which we rejoice in and embrace fully as

part of our faith. This is true on an individual level, a church level and an inter-diocesan level.

When working with churches, I frequently refer to Paul's writing in 2 Corinthians 8-9, which speaks of the churches in Macedonia giving a financial gift one to the other. Paul writes that this gift is a privilege to the giver. He writes that it is a privilege to give according to their means for the privilege of serving in the ministry to the saints. This for me speaks so wholly to this motion that it is our privilege to be the giver to the whole ministry of God.

And so, as we debate this motion, I am firm believer that a generous Church and a generous diocese is one which receives in order to give away. This motion is a beautiful outworking of this model of ministry, grace and generosity, which I fully support and I urge you also to do.

The Revd Sam Maginnis (Chelmsford): I just want to thank Bishop Pete for his inspiring speech. Of course, we all want to encourage generosity and mutuality in the Church, as St Paul did for us in the New Testament. I will just say at the outset that I will be voting in favour of the motion. However, alongside generosity and mutuality, if we do not have sustainability in our income, how can this Measure ever be anything but a sticking plaster, as we heard from Ian Johnston previously. Bishop Pete said that alongside making inter-diocesan generosity easier we need to continue encouraging individual giving within our parishes and church communities and also greater generosity and fairness within our dioceses through our parishes and deaneries.

I would just like to remind everyone there is already a form in which that giving from parishes is being pooled and can be distributed equitably within our dioceses and that is through our dioceses' glebe endowments, which were taken under diocesan management in 1978 under the Endowments and Glebe Measure. For, of course, if we do not have sustainable income within our dioceses. how can we ever actually develop long-term strategy and missional planning within our dioceses and parishes? It is a bit like with our Theological Education Institutions, which we will be debating shortly, and reforming their funding to be able to have better and more sustainable ways of doing long-term planning and, of course, as we discussed earlier about encouraging younger and more diverse clergy and ministry within the Church. If we do not have the posts and the money to fund those posts over a lifetime of ministry, how can we ever be the Church that we are meant to be in this land?

I have been working with the Save the Parish Network this year as a member of their financial scrutiny group. You have already heard from a few of the other DBF members of that group during this debate. Since January, we have been looking into DBF accounts, the Commissioners' accounts and the Archbishops' Council's accounts to see where the money is flowing across the whole Church. One area we have been looking at is the level of glebe endowments. On our estimates across the dioceses there is £9 billion worth of glebe assets held within the Church of England which is only bringing out about a 1.5% return annually. Something is not right at those levels of return. This is only an estimate

because, as we have been looking into it, some dioceses are not even sure of the full extent of the glebe they hold Synod.

All I want to say, Synod, is if this Measure is going to be more than a sticking plaster, we need central support from the Commissioners, who of course have the expertise to help the dioceses manage their glebe in a more sustainable way with better and more consistent returns so that we can ensure if we are going to encourage inter-diocesan generosity that there is enough money across our dioceses to be able to fund ministry both within and between our dioceses.

The Revd Canon Andy Salmon (Manchester): I was not planning to speak in this debate, but I wanted to respond to some of what has been said, particularly to the implication that this is about supporting weaker dioceses as one of our previous speakers said. The implication is that dioceses such as Manchester (and we are not by any means one of the poorest dioceses but we are pretty poor) have somehow failed and that we are no good. I want to refute that implication and suggest that, as our Prolocutor said in the first speech, we are in a situation where there are historic reasons why certain dioceses are weaker. We are in a situation where nationally our politics has failed us and some areas are much poorer than others.

We need as a Church to be more radical than this. I accept that and I have urged in previous debates on this subject that we do need to be more radical, but I want to firmly endorse supporting this motion because we need to move forward with this. It is a first step. It is one thing. It is one thing that we can do to address fundamental disparities that we have across our national Church. It is just one small step, but, please, I urge you to support this motion.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): I really just want to make a couple of comments relating to the presentation from Sam Maginnis. I must say that as the Deputy Chair of the Archbishops' Council Finance Committee I do not really recognise or understand the analysis of returns that he presented in his speech, and I would be very grateful on behalf of the Finance Committee if that analysis can be provided to us so we can actually have a look at it with the members of the finance function. Having made that comment, I would very much encourage Synod to support this enabling piece of legislation, which I think will actually help move us forwards in the direction that we want to go.

The Revd Marcus Walker (London): Like the Lord Bishop of Sheffield, I am delighted to support this motion and I am delighted that we have the opportunity to discuss the plight of stipends and stipendiary ministry, particularly among the poorer dioceses and, within those dioceses, particularly among the poorer areas. There is a serious problem in our Church with the fact that the areas that most desperately need priests cannot afford them. It is wonderful if areas that have got a superfluity of money can use that money to support priests in areas that desperately need them. But this cannot be it.

We have got to look at the ways that we can use the vast resources of the Church better to be able to funnel the money that we have into those poorest areas from all around the Church and, most especially, from the top, from the Archbishops' Council and from the Church Commissioners, to ensure that every corner of our country, and most especially the poorest corners of our country, are not left destitute of priests.

As we do this, we also have to be alert to how the dioceses are spending that money, the LInC money they already receive and all the other monies that they have, so that recipient dioceses should within this Measure when it finally goes forward have to guarantee that only a small proportion of the monies that they receive are spent on central costs and that most of that money is going to the frontline to support those who most desperately need it. I am sure this will happen and I am delighted to support this motion.

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Nottingham): I also support this draft Measure. I think it is very good. For the wealthier dioceses to offer their funds to the poorer dioceses, not the weaker ones, is a good measure. I understand that at First Consideration we are supposed to keep speeches to the general purport of the bill and not just specific clauses. There is only one substantive clause on this Measure and so if you will excuse a little leeway on that.

The clause proposes a new sub-clause (2)(b) which suggests that the money from the giving diocese could go directly to the receiving diocese or to a charity. The concern that I have is what controls do we have over that charity? The new sub-clause (3) says that the charity must give the funds on and so it is implicit in there that there is no top slicing for admin costs. I think I would be more comfortable if it was more explicit that there is no top slicing of admin costs from a charity. I think the money should go directly to the dioceses or through the Archbishops' Council rather than new structures or charities that we do not control.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I obviously strongly support this Measure and I think most of the speeches. I find myself in the happy situation of agreeing very warmly in many ways but not entirely with Marcus, who is an exceptional priest in his own right and does a wonderful job and it is a privilege to have him in the Synod and very overdue.

The business of generosity is at the heart of what it is to be part of the Church. We reflect in our generosity to one another the generosity that God shows to us and, therefore, in all the measures that have been passed - and I was an incumbent of a parish that had lost vast tons of glebe in the 70s, and many still remember that, and I have been in two dioceses that lost tons of investment, Durham and Canterbury - it is good that there was that generosity to enable there to be inequality or equivalence of income across the Church. But we must with generosity include trust.

One of the things that is slightly worrying me in some of the tones that I am hearing is that we need to control what is happening by these wicked bishops. Well, I think we are a bit

short of wicked, scheming bishops. I remember we used to have plenty but there are not many left. I speak not of Archbishops whose symbol is a double cross, of course, but I speak of the shortage of scheming bishops. They are, on the whole, generous, careful, faithful and prayerful.

This business of we have to make sure the money is being used right calls for immense centralisation. I am sorry, I am really - and this may surprise a lot of you, and particularly the *Church Times* - deeply against centralisation. I think it is entirely the wrong way to go. But what has been said by a number of people, including Fr Marcus, implies profound centralisation to make sure the right thing is being done. Finally, it needs faith because 90% of the Anglican Communion does not have a lifetime source of money. It has, if lucky, a month's source and they live by faith. To quote one of my closest friends who died of Covid in Eastern Congo - Archbishop Titre will know him well, Désiré Mukanirwa, he said, "I do what God enables me to do with His resources and I trust Him for the rest".

Mr Charles Houston (Hereford): It is really more of a point of information, if I may. Canon John Spence has confirmed to me that there is over £1 billion locked up in PCC current accounts mostly, possibly some hopefully deposit accounts, and I believe that the Church of England must do everything it possibly can to facilitate the release of the interest. Church Commissioners make 9%. That is £900 million per annum. Sorry, £90 million. It is a lot of money, £90 million. I am a surveyor not an accountant. What a difference that would make. The Church Commissioners under their remit, their licence, they cannot take loans from parishes, but there must be some reason with all the brains of the Archbishops and the lawyers here that we can make this work.

The Chair: I am just going to test the mind of Synod, I am afraid, Bishop, as much as I love you. I think that we have had a good debate so far and so I am going to test your mind, Synod, for closure of the debate on this item.

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

The Chair: I call on the Bishop of Sheffield to respond to the debate and, Bishop, you have up to five minutes to do so.

The Bishop of Sheffield (the Rt Revd Dr Pete Wilcox): I do not think I am going to need five minutes because I do not want to respond in detail to all 12 of those submissions, partly because this is now a continuing conversation. The Measure will come back at its Revision Stage. But thank you for those 12 thoughtful and generous in tone contributions to the debate and not least for the two maiden speeches. We have made a note of the areas of concern and caution that were being expressed and if you have items of detail that you want the process to take forward into the revision, could you please - are you going say this, in fact, Chair? Is there a date by which people have to make their submissions? Great. In which case, I think I just want to say thank you, Synod, for the debate.

The Chair. I now put Item 502 to the vote.

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

The Chair. The draft Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than - and here is what you were talking about, Bishop - 5.30 pm on Friday 9 September. Put it in your diary. That completes this item of business, thank you. We now remain for the next item.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 4.12 pm.

ITEM 30 RESOURCING MINISTERIAL FORMATION (GS 2271)

The Chair. We move to Item 30. The Resourcing Ministerial Formation Review has found that significant changes to the current system of funding for the training of ordinands are required and this item will enable members to shape the ongoing development of those proposals. Members will need GS 2271 for this item and I invite, without further ado, the Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich to speak to this item. He has up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley): Good afternoon, Synod, thank you. May I say how grateful we are to the Business Committee for giving us time to consider this work in progress so that we can hear the views of Synod to help us strengthen the provision of theological education in the Church of England. As you I think probably picked up in the questions earlier in this Synod, I ended my term chairing the Ministry Council a week ago. Bishop Mark Tanner has taken over.

Mark and I took on co-ordinating this review of ministerial formation - the old one was ministerial education, so that is where the acronyms have varied - and we took over in November and he has asked me to continue to be involved, which is why I am standing here. I recognise the paper has a lot of detail in terms of principles and just the beginnings of practical proposals. What I want to do now is draw out just a few - and I realise I am missing out a lot - key points as a prelude to hearing your thoughts and ideas that will help steer the work going forward.

First, at the beginning of our deliberations we were quite clear that the starting point is that theological education is for the whole people of God. It is not an exercise just for those preparing for public ministry. We as missionary disciples are all engaged in theological education as we learn and grow in faith. Theological education is about the formation and learning of all of us as we grow and deepen in faith and practice in what it means to be Christians in the world.

The theological education provided by theological education institutions - which I will refer to as "TEIs" - obviously contributes to this aim through the rigorous preparation of ordinands and some lay ministers who will be teachers and pastors, enabling the learning of the people of God building up the body of Christ. Theological education institutions can also contribute to the learning of us all through opening up access to courses and programmes, either specifically tailored or existing courses. The experience of the online offerings during the pandemic has opened up wider participation possibilities.

We have in our TEIs an extraordinary resource and particularly a resource for theological learning that we would want to see available more and more widely for ordinands, for lay ministers and for the whole people of God. One consistent theme through all this work has been how do we increase availability and access to a greater breadth of ordinands and lay ministers and widen the scope of those benefitting from the resources of our TEIs, including in the provision of continuing ministerial development, and then how do we build a funding model to enable that? We do recognise that this requires additional funding and the model needs to enable that, in the first instance, through ensuring that all of the Vote 1 allocation is spent each year rather than having, through the current formula, about a million a year remaining in dioceses unspent because of pathway choices by ordinands.

My second main point here is we are undertaking this process through building partnerships. For me, a key sentence in this present Report is the start of paragraph 2 and I quote: "Our task is to nurture a framework of relationships and expectations within which the funding of theological education can adapt and adjust to serve the Church in the longer term". This has not always been easy but it is fundamental.

As Synod knows, we undertook the review of the current funding model, the Resourcing Ministerial Education model, and the details of that were reported to Synod in November in GS Misc 1303 and are summarised in this current paper. Before the pandemic, we recognised that we needed to engage in a wider ranging exercise to build greater sustainability, collaboration and innovation into theological education and to respond to the need to increase participation. Then the pandemic hit. That presented and continues to present a number of challenges to the provision of theological education and we need to learn from the experience of those challenges, for instance, in terms of the possibilities and the limitations of online learning for ministerial formation and broader theological education.

Through all of this, we have sought to strengthen relationships between the TEIs and the dioceses and the National Ministry Team and the House of Bishops and the Archbishops' Council and Synod. We are seeking in this to build on the work of TEIs where adaptation and innovation which we have seen during the pandemic has characterised a number of those institutions. As I said before, this working in partnership has not been an easy path and we have made mistakes. I have made mistakes. But it is an important path to follow because we need all these partners involved if we are to have as our aim the learning and growth of the whole people of God for today's and tomorrow's Church.

As an example, therefore, the national Vision and Strategy process has been shaping our work in underlining the necessity of continuing to sustain and, indeed, increase ordinand numbers, stipendiary and self-supporting, and in enriching and extending the provision for the formation of lay ministers. This is being taken on board and has worked towards implementing the recommendations in *From Lament to Action*. While there is a great deal of work to do, monitoring progress has begun and in last year's and this year's annual self-evaluation where TEIs have to report on progress, they have been asked questions about *From Lament to Action* and this year are also being asked about engagement with the Vision and Strategy.

This is about collaboration. It is about sustainability. It is about innovation. It is about widening access. It is about building partnerships across the Church. We have got four very active working groups developing aspects of this work to try to enable this to happen. Out of that, we are, therefore, proposing a model of funding that has a block grant element for each institution with a smaller per capita element per student to enable better financial planning for those institutions. We hope within this to at least reduce the age banding element so there is greater ability to secure the best pathway for each candidate with less restrictions of options due to age.

In the maintenance area, which is about food, the board and lodging for residential and for non-residential candidates who have weekends and summer schools, including travel and books, this whole area has been an immensely thorny issue for some time, not least because the existing model, or should I say models, is very complex and for many candidates the true costs are actually hidden. Our aim is to somehow work towards a simpler and more transparent model that will present a more realistic picture for candidates and dioceses and enable greater access for an increasing diversity of candidates.

A second group is looking at service level agreements with institutions. I should say that this has been welcomed by the TEIs as a way of clarifying expectations and also providing a mechanism to set and provide additional support for new expectations. These service level agreements will be largely generic, expressing the Church's national and diocesan expectations for initial theological education. But there will be specific elements for individual institutions such as around the provision of continuing ministerial education or lay ministry formation.

I want to draw one particular point out of this area. You will see in paragraph 20(c) that we want to clarify what is expected in initial ministerial education (IME 1) and what is expected in curacy or equivalent first post (IME 2). Again, this is a thorny issue, but we need to clarify this because otherwise we will keep pouring more and more into the limited time of initial formation rather than taking a more complete view that incorporates IME 1 and IME 2. This will also help us focus further on the content of IME 1 and so maintain and deepen the quality of what is provided in both stages of formation.

Finally, we are clear how important it is to increase access to lay ministry formation. This is an issue that has come up already today. This means enabling more licensed lay ministry candidates to access courses provided by TEIs and building partnerships such as between dioceses and TEIs to enhance and enrich diocesan provision. The Lay Ministry Working Group is producing detailed proposals that will potentially expand access to Vote 1 and resource partnerships with dioceses and others as a first step. Mark and I are immensely grateful for the great number of people serving on the working groups and I now want to hear your ideas. Thank you very much. I move this motion in my name.

The Chair: The matter is now open for debate. Because there are a large number of people who want to speak, there is going to be a speech limit of three minutes from the outset. I am going to hear a few speeches first and then we will move very quickly to the amendments. We will then decide what happens to the amendments and then we will come back to the main motion, either unamended or amended.

Dr Ros Clarke (Lichfield): This is my maiden speech, Synod. 20 years ago, when I was considering my own calling to ministry, it was clear that I had no call to any form of ordained ministry and the path that was suggested to me was that of the accredited lay worker. For various reasons at the time, I did not pursue this particular path but I was glad to know it existed. Since then, as far as I can tell, funding for training lay people for ministry has been limited to diocesan provisions for Reader or licensed lay minister training. While these forms of lay ministry are, of course, important, they do not represent the full scope of lay ministry within our Church and certainly not the full scope of lay ministry as envisaged by the Vision and Strategy.

We need trained lay people able to work in our churches who have expertise in youth and children's work, evangelism, counselling and pastoral care and the theological and biblical foundations for those ministries. At the moment, lay people employed in these kinds of roles in our parishes and dioceses have often had to find their own funding for whatever training they have received - and, all too often, that is no training. Self-funding inevitably restricts the number and kind of people who are able to access training and, in turn, this restricts the number and kind of people available to do the work in our churches.

Therefore, I welcome this review, which makes repeated strong calls to extend the training of lay people beyond existing diocesan provisions. Many of our TEIs already offer excellent training to some lay people who are able to go and would love to be able to expand their offering in that way. But this will only be possible if funding is made available for suitably selected lay people in the same way that it is for ordinands. Please, could we consider, once again, making a formally, recognised pathway through training towards lay ministry.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): I have to declare an interest at the outset since I speak as a General Synod representative on the governing council of one of our TEIs. I very much support the idea of core funding, or a degree of core funding, through a block

grant because I believe it is better for forward planning and it also provides a context which better allows for co-operation between TEIs because the element of competition is reduced. This is advantageous and enriching both for the institutions and the students.

But I do have a question about the practicality of the timetable. It is suggested in the paper that implementation is to be by autumn 2023. It would be splendid if that was so, but is it realistically achievable bearing in mind the amount of work still to be done? I ask this question because the TEIs will begin their budgeting process well before autumn 2023 and this may involve decisions about hiring and firing staff with implications for course delivery and curriculum development. All of that begins relatively early in 2023, which I submit is where the planning deadline really lies and not autumn 2023. I would like to hear some clarification about the realism of the proposals. I do welcome them very much indeed. My question is simply about are they moving forward at a sufficient pace to be a realistic possibility for autumn 2023?

The Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Chelmsford): This may be maiden speech but my first experience of live Synod was way back in the last decade. In February 2015, there was a bit of a college trip to witness the debate on GS 1979, a sobering moment for me listening to discussion on the funding changes that, had I not already been a year post-BAP, would have effectively removed the choice for me of residential training and probably led to me withdrawing from the process altogether. So here I am again, but this time speaking on the topic. As this work is taken forward, I would urge that, as proposals are developed, maintenance funding for training is not based on the mythical ordinand who is average but that there is capacity for equitable treatment for those offering themselves for ministry.

We say we want a more diverse Church, how do the models of funding really encourage this? Do we understand the invisible financial barriers to people taking part? I have often wondered how one works a zero hours' contract or shift work or any unpredictable part-time job and trains part-time. How do you cope when your TEI forgets to put a week long residential in your calendar and you find out about it with a few weeks' notice? At the turn of the century, I was working in widening participation at the University of Nottingham and, although I have been through several changes of employment since then, a desire to see access to education and training for everybody is something I have carried forward. It is maybe no surprise that I am now back working in higher education as a university chaplain. That work has also shown me very clearly how staff teaching conditions are student learning conditions.

We must make sure that staff tasked with forming those in training, whether for lay or ordained ministry, are resourced properly and not left exhausted. After all, the worker is worth their wages. Ministry life is a challenge and involves sacrifice at many stages, but let us not make sacrificial equal to impossible. Four hundred odd different pathways for finance are impossible. That would not be simpler, but please I would urge that we have proposals that allow for flexibility and the ability to truly take an individual's background into account.

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE): I declare that I am a trustee of St Mellitus College. I have had the privilege over the last four years to get to know those who are undertaking the Peter Stream at St Mellitus College. The Peter Stream is a stream towards ordination for those who have not had a typical educational pathway. Listening to them recently, they spoke about how, although at the very beginning they discerned a sense of God calling them to ordained ministry, because they did not see anyone like them in the leadership of the Church they were unsure. If our vision is of a Church that reflects the body of Christ, the image in Revelation 7:9, in which every nation, every tribe and people and language worship, our leadership, both lay and ordained, needs to change.

That is not to say that we do not value those who are already here, but we do not reflect our communities or the diversity of the Kingdom of God. If we continue to do what we have been doing, we will get the same. I have some real concerns that what is proposed here is not ambitious enough. We say that we want to increase accessibility to learning and increase diversity of learners through innovative approaches to learning and formation, enabling people to be ordained. What the Peter Stream has taught us is that we also need a process in which they are loved and nurtured, where those who are present on this begin to see themselves as part of the priesthood. That means we need to simplify our processes, our processes for discernment, and properly fund flexible ordination training programmes which are nurturing. I am unsure that I see this adequately reflected in these proposals.

Alongside the Peter Stream, St Mellitus has also established the Caleb Stream for those who have been shaped and formed by their vocation to follow Jesus Christ in all different walks of life and within their Church. Now, more mature in years, they want to give their life to full-time ministry. They, again, are on a flexible discernment process and training. When ordained they will be self-supporting ministers in a range of settings and they hold the potential to support our parishes across a range of dioceses and a range of Church traditions, where they are so needed.

However, currently, candidates are funded through a partnership between the Church Revitalisation Trust and St Mellitus College who have pioneered the Caleb Stream in partnership. There are no maintenance costs for the Caleb Stream candidates and the cost of training falls outside the national funding system. The Caleb Stream is currently being piloted with the knowledge of the national team but with no formal approval yet. If the Caleb Stream were to gain national approval, they could become eligible for the national funding system, the block grant, and dioceses would be permitted to send candidates to TEIs for discernment and training. I would encourage us to look at ways in which we can speed up this process to enable this to happen.

ITEM 76

The Chair: I am going to call the mover, Sean Doherty, to speak to and move Item 76. You have up to five minutes.

The Revd Dr Sean Doherty (Universities & TEIs): I am the principal of a TEI and a member of the TEI Principals Steering Group who are united in seeking this amendment, namely that we leave out "updated with" and insert "invited to consider and endorse more developed" proposals prior to their implementation. I say this, that it is from the Steering Group, to emphasise this amendment is not about one type of TEI protecting its vested interests, but from right across the spectrum of TEIs in our varied traditions and different modes of training we offer. Indeed, my own TEI offers full-time residential training, mixed mode and part-time training. I have already done one advert today and so I will not proceed any further with that.

Everyone has a theology. You cannot avoid being theological. The question is whether the theology will be healthy and life-giving more or less, or whether it will be damaging and harmful more or less. Bad theology harms people and it harms churches. Good theology helps people and churches flourish. We need our leaders, lay and ordained, to know God and to be able to talk about God well to Christians and non-Christians alike. That is why the Church of England invests money in theological education, particularly for its ordained ministers. So, thank you, Synod, for all those times you vote for Vote 1, like we did this morning. In TEIs, we do not take for granted that national commitment to good theological study and this is an important opportunity to look at how that money actually gets used. Likewise, TEIs are very grateful for the extensive collaboration and consultation there has been between Ministry Council, the RMF Working Group, dioceses and TEIs to get us to this point.

Because of that collaboration, we believe that RMF has the potential to deliver some really good strategic outcomes in terms of better access for training and, therefore, greater diversity of those training, as others have mentioned; in terms of ensuring the different training needs of students are fully met, and in terms of ensuring that TEIs have the capacity and can deliver training of the quality that we need. So I will be supporting this enthusiastically.

Then, why my amendment? Well, whilst the direction of travel is very positive, the working groups on fees and funding, maintenance, service level agreements and lay ministry have not actually had the chance to report back yet. We think it is a bit premature to sign off these proposals whilst the working groups are still doing their work. There are a couple of problems, as Bishop Martin has alluded to, under the current RME system. Let us make sure the proposals resolve them. For example, GS 2271 states: "Under RME, the necessary funding has been provided for the training of ordinands over the last five years". Well, the necessary funding has been provided to dioceses but, as Bishop Martin mentioned, it has not always reached us in the TEIs. Some dioceses have built up surpluses of block grant, which is ringfenced - they cannot spend it on anything else - whilst other dioceses have spent more than the money they have received.

Likewise, RME has exacerbated the trend towards shorter pathways for ordinand training, while the Church quite rightly still expects the same quality of deacon and priest at the end. So the new proposals need to ensure that people get the training they need.

Second, the document refers to a standard maintenance grant. Dr Batts-Neale has already alluded to this. The current system involves means testing and differentiated levels of payment according to the needs and circumstances of ordinands and their families. We are concerned that a standard grant could lead to a system which disadvantages ordinands with greater financial needs which would then decrease access and reduce diversity. Hopefully, it will not have that outcome but until the working groups report we do not know what they are going to propose. I do not think it would be responsible to sign off these proposals until we know what they are going to be, hence I am suggesting that, instead of Synod being updated with proposals, we are invited to consider and endorse more developed proposals-. Not to micromanage every precise detail about those proposals, but at least to know more clearly the direction that they are travelling in. I ask to move this amendment, thank you.

The Chair: I call on the Bishop to respond to say whether he accepts or does not accept the amendment. You have up to five minutes, but I am sure you will not take that long.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley): We warmly accept this. It makes explicit what was implicit. We should have got this right in the first place. What it does do is underline the fact that I am not expecting - you have recognised the complexity of what we are trying to tackle - us to produce a whole bunch of proposals at once. I hope we will bring to February's Synod a set of proposals around one particular area and then to a later Synod around another area. We need to pace ourselves and do this right and this underlines the fact that that would be our intention.

The Chair: We are debating Item 76.

The Revd Mark Miller (Durham): Thank you for calling me for another maiden speech. I do not mean - I mean, it is my - you know what I mean. I must declare an interest, I sit on the Cranmer Committee. I do not act as a trustee but I act in an advisory capacity. I welcome the collaborative approach to the production of this Report and very much the direction of travel it contains, but I want to speak in favour of this amendment.

I am concerned about maintenance grants and how ordinands are supported. I submitted questions about maintenance payments to ordinands in light of the huge rise in the cost of energy and the high rate of inflation we are experiencing and I am grateful to the Bishop of Chester for his answers, although I have not been invited for a pint. I ask these questions after hearing of a current ordinand at Cranmer Hall who is getting into debt by simply heating their home. When they asked their diocese if an additional payment could be made to cover the increased energy costs, they were told that they - and, therefore, presumably their family - should expect to suffer hardship because that is the cost of following Jesus.

Friends, ordinands give up a career, a home, a former life to relocate to train at college, then relocate to serve their titled post, then relocate to serve their following curacy. Ours is a way of life that is a joyful sacrifice to make. It is a joy to follow Jesus and to serve him in his Church as an ordained minister, but I think we can make sure our ordinands can heat their homes without getting into debt. The paper refers to standard grants, but does not suggest an increase in the overall funding for grants which the proposer of the amendment mentioned. What is a standard grant? How will it be determined? How will it be applied when, for example, there is a spouse with a significant second income?

There are many charitable trusts which offer support to ordinands and these are so very welcome. However, I note that The Trussell Trust says no one should need to turn to charity to meet basic needs. How will we ensure that basic needs of ordinands are met without recourse to charitable funding which enables our ordinands - friends, I hope you consider them our ordinands - to focus on formation training and preparation for the vibrant ministry to which God is calling them? Let me end by repeating my thanks for what has so far been produced and my encouragement with the direction of travel, but I am asking that we have a more developed plan for Synod to consider and I urge you to support the amendment.

The Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): I too am supporting this amendment. I am very encouraged indeed by the new and refreshing tenor of these discussions about ministry training. For many years, decades even, these discussions have been beset by playing off vested interests with a lack of transparency and accountability and I welcome the change of tone. In this spirit, and within the recommendations of the amendment, could I make a plea for four issues to be considered. First, we desperately need to rediscover a depth of biblical and theological engagement in our pre-ordination training.

Everyone I speak to, trainee incumbents, bishops, even ordinands themselves, recognise the continuing decline in biblical and theological literacy in the newly ordained. This is not the fault of the candidates. It is a failure of our current system and we need to address it. Secondly, please can we find a common core for pre-ordination training. Deacons, priests and bishops are ordained using the same vows as each other to a shared ministry. It makes no sense that they do not cover much of the same issues in their training and, without this, we are continuing to sow division into the future of the Church. Thirdly, we must find a way of equalising hours of study across different pathways. I fear that, despite the benefits of different approaches to training, we are in danger of succumbing to a missional pragmatism in some of our pathways which undermines depth engagement with the key issues.

Fourthly and finally, please can we abandon the idea that formation is something separate from the study of Scripture and theology. Reading Scripture is deeply personally formational and learning how to read and study Scripture right is a preparation for a lifetime of continued formation. If we accept this amendment, and if we address these

things, I really hope that after RMF we can avoid RMG, RMH, RMI and RMJ in the years to come.

The Chair. I wish to test the mind of Synod as to whether we have sufficiently debated Item 76. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 76.

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

The Chair. That is clearly carried and so we move to vote on Item 76.

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

ITEM 77

The Chair. Item 76 is clearly carried and, therefore, amends Item 30. We move to the second of the two amendments. I call Sean Doherty to speak to and propose Item 77. You have up to five minutes.

The Revd Dr Sean Doherty (Universities & TElS): For those playing Synod bingo, I will be much briefer on this amendment which also helps address Professor Hill's concern about the perhaps rather ambitious timetable in relation to autumn 2023. We just agreed an amendment which, if the motion goes on to be carried, asks for this to come back to Synod when some more work has been done. That might mean some parts of this take a bit longer, but we think it is well worth the time to get this right.

In the meantime though, there is a minor danger of damage to capacity and quality in TElS because of the reduction in funding caused by the lower number of ordinands entering training in a few months' time, which Canon John Spence discussed this morning. The Archbishops' Council has kindly allowed for some funding to mitigate this this coming year but, of course, that lower number of first year ordinands entering training this year will become a lower number of second year ordinands next year and so on. We are not putting any figures on this, but we are asking Ministry Council to monitor this so we do not have TElS reducing capacity in a way that would be hard to replace in a long-term way and damages this sector strategically. We are confident, based on this very collaborative kind of work we are doing, that this is something Ministry Council would want to do anyway, but it seems only transparent to bring it to Synod and ask for Synod's support. I ask to move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair. I call on the Bishop to reply.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley): I am happy to accept this without further comment.

The Chair. Item 77 is open for debate.

The Revd Canon Mark Bennet (Oxford): General Synod, this is a maiden speech. I speak as honorary treasurer of Westcott House and incumbent of a parish where we have two ordinands at present - it was three until recently - all on different tracks and courses. Two years ago, I knew little of the finances of TEIs. Now I have been thoroughly inducted. My first conversation with my bursar was about the budget for the 2021-22 academic year starting on 1 September. I was told we will not be able to sign that off until September when we know the number of ordinands and their courses. There are always changes over the summer. Except, of course, that we have to employ good staff to teach them and staff take time to find and we have to treat them well if we want any staff at all.

I observe, therefore, that under the current arrangement the central Church is passing on substantial risk to smaller organisations on which it relies and this RMF review, although it addresses the risk, does not properly document it. I also look in vain for information which enables me and my bursar to look ahead to 2023-24 and plan for that. The fact that we are considering a position paper rather than concrete proposals mean we have no model even to make any plans at all, let alone medium-term plans or three-year financial forecasts which would be normal, for example, in a school. On a strategic scale, what is not fully addressed is whether the current level of funding overall is sufficient to maintain or deliver the quality of formation to which we aspire, the pipeline of teaching staff which needs to be a strategic resource priority or the capacity and stability of the system as a whole to cater for our ambitions for the number of ordinands we as Synod have in view.

What is urgently required is a good plan for the transition period rather than a last minute ad hoc arrangement as we have for the current year, welcome though that arrangement has been. In making this critique, I want to acknowledge the hard work of the Ministry Division Team in challenging times and also to commend the way in which our TEI principles across traditions and modes are working with Ministry Council and staff to meet the scale of the collective challenge we face. I urge you to vote for this amendment and also for the main motion.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Professor Helen King (Oxford): A declaration of interest, I am a recently elected member of Ministry Council. I support this amendment as I did the last one, because I think the capacity of TEIs is going to be further challenged potentially by their increasing involvement in lay training to meet the stated aim of a younger and more diverse body of lay ministers. If this funding goes ahead for lay ministry training, remember that LLM and Reader are national ministries. Lay people move dioceses, especially those younger ones. I suggest it is also the time to consider what we mean by lay ministry and to face the elephant in this particular room, the relationship between dioceses and the national patterns of ministry where people do not live their lives in just one diocese. How are TEIs to prepare people for lay ministry when this is the case?

When I have been involved in periodic external reviews for the Church of England, I introduce myself as what I am: an authorized lay preacher in Oxford Diocese. I am not a licensed lay minister. The lay people whose courses I am reviewing sometimes say they would love to have had the opportunity to explore their calling to that role but it does not exist in their diocese. I appreciate that different bishops identify different needs in their dioceses and that a fixed national pattern of lay ministries is probably impractical, but I would just ask one question here: does anyone currently have an idea which lay roles exist in which diocese let alone what training those called to the roles are currently receiving? I shall vote in favour of the amendment and of the motion as amended.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Synod, I want to speak in favour of the main motion as amended by number 77 but, Synod, I am conflicted. As Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, you have elected me to be part of the Archbishops' Council and so I am, therefore, a trustee. I am also on the council of Wycliffe Hall, a theological college. These should be very compatible but it does not feel like it. And here is my dilemma. I am not sure the system works as well as it could at the moment. It is not that great for TEIs. Many of them need significant investment. We have a building at Wycliffe Hall which needs major overhaul and we do not have funding for that. We spend much of our time as trustees worrying about having enough money. I do not think it is that great for TEI staff. They work incredibly hard. Our theologians are the core of our Church and we need to bless them and honour them and not overwork them. I am not sure it is that great for us, the Church.

As a trustee, I have to ask myself are we getting value for money? We have about 600 ordinands a year and we have 21 TEIs - I will leave you to do the maths. Is this as effective and as efficient as it could be or is there a better way of doing this for everyone? I do not want to blame anyone for the way things are. It is where we are because of history.

I want to thank Bishop Martin for his really committed work to this and thank Bishop Mark for being prepared to take this on and thank Sean and all of you here who work for TEIs. But I want to encourage us all to be more ambitious than just to monitor and support. I want us to work to see how we can ensure that TEIs are really at the cutting edge of higher education and thriving rather than worrying about how to pay their bills. Please, can we be more ambitious. Please, can we look to develop a world class vision for equipping the whole people of God through outstanding theological education.

The Chair: I am going to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 77 has been sufficiently debated and therefore I put a motion for closure on Item 77.

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

The Chair: The motion for closure is clearly carried and so we vote on Item 77.

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

The Chair: Item 77 is clearly carried and so we return to the main motion, 30, which has been amended, of course, by Items 76 and 77.

The Bishop of Leicester (the Rt Revd Martyn Snow): I am very grateful for those who have spoken already in favour of work around lay ministry which lies within this framework. As a Bishop charged with encouraging lay ministry, we have been doing quite a bit of work recently. I want to reassure a previous speaker that there is work ongoing about simplifying Canons and getting clarity about national framework. But I also want Synod to notice that this is a hugely significant moment because, combined with the proposals this morning, this is probably the first time that the national Church has looked to put significant funding into lay ministry training and formation. For a very long time, the Church has operated with a trickle-down principle. We put all our resources into funding the 2% of the Church which is ordained and trust that they will equip the other 98% who are not ordained.

Without wanting to get too much into the debates of the Conservative Party at the moment, trickle-down is a very particular approach to sharing wealth. In a Church which believes in everyday faith and the need for all the baptized to be equipped for living out their everyday faith, in all the varied contexts of life, I dare to suggest that lay ministers who are involved in the workplaces and social contexts where clergy rarely go are well-placed to enable the whole people of God for this work of living out our faith in the everyday. But they need to be equipped and resourced for this just as clergy do and it can be done without detracting from the training and formation of clergy. We can do both, we can do both well and we can do it in a way which helps all ministers to work well together and enables our TEs and dioceses to flourish.

The Bishop of Dudley (the Rt Revd Martin Gorick): Last week, I licensed Clare Billington as curate-in-charge of four village churches. I arrived three-quarters of an hour early to find the Church already packed with local people. "How could we not be here to support our Clare", they said. She had grown up in that village. She was married there 30 years before in that same church. She never imagined in a million years she would become their parish priest, but that is what they wanted her to be and she is a self-supporting minister. We need more Clare Billingtons in our churches.

This year, we are beginning an auxiliary pathway in our diocese based to some extent on that innovative scheme in St Edmundsbury & Ipswich Diocese itself. Though we will be using the national selection programme, much of the teaching will be locally based and sourced. To my surprise, we had 20 people coming forward; good candidates going through their initial selection at the moment. This will almost treble our usual number of SSMS, if all go forward, ordained each year. All I would say to Bishop Martin is that I encourage this motion and I really want to support it wholeheartedly; it is just a question of how we support these kinds of innovative local schemes, which I think are very much needed in the present day.

Mrs Clare Williams (Norwich): I too am grateful to Bishop Martin, whose report on lay ministry I will quote from later, and to my previous speaker. However, I want to go further as I believe there is significant work to be done to develop vocational pathways and paid posts for lay ministry. Training alone is not enough. I speak as a lay person not called to be ordained but seeking to live out a clear vocation within the Church of England, having fully funded my own theological training at undergraduate and postgraduate stage in order to minister within the Church and follow my calling.

However if the aim is to have - and I quote - "a younger and more diverse body of lay ministry across the church", training is not the only answer. I wonder if these people are actually out there exploring their call but also unable to afford to follow a calling due to a lack of paid roles for lay people in the Church. Voluntary lay ministry is unsustainable for many, myself included. There are many ways in which I may seek to fulfil my vocation. There are, however, far fewer ways in which I may be able to do so in a paid position. I quote from that report by Bishop Martin published today, talking of valuing lay ministry, based on research conducted by Ali Campbell, which found of lay ministers that, "Very few of those employed received anything like a basic clergy package. Most were expected to live on far less and funding is almost always short term". It is little surprise then that many specialist workers consider ordination as a route to sustained ministry over the longer term. More funding for lay ministry training is important and welcomed. However, this is not enough.

I support the aim and conclusion of GS 2271 of enhancing the theological education of the whole people of God, but I urge those responsible to provide ways for called theologically educated laity to serve the Church they love in sustainable, paid and therefore validated positions. I focus on payment as this is one of the ways we indicate value, but I concede it is not the only means.

My second point is that we need to value the diversity of ministry and expertise through opportunity. I believe this will significantly advance the bold outcomes of the Vision and Strategy. We need to value laity with expertise in areas of practice such as working with those on the margins and making the Church of England more ethnically diverse, and resource them to get on with these matters leaving the clergy more able to get on and work on the tasks they are called to do.

Training is important but I call upon the Ministry Council to prayerfully consider how this training could be structured towards vocational pathways and paid opportunities for a lay ministry which is truly valued and sustainable.

Mr Kenson Li (UKME co-opted): Friends, I must first declare my interest. I am an ordinand at Westcott House, Cambridge, and I am aware that my principal is here present in this room. I can assure you she did not write the following speech. I speak in support of RMF.

As someone originally from Hong Kong, the fact that I am here standing as a member of General Synod and a Church of England ordinand from the Diocese of Manchester is a testament to both the inspirational ministry of my parish priest and the loving and gentle companionship of Alan, the churchwarden, who died last year. Without their encouragement and their ministries, both ordained and lay, I would not be here today.

We need the inspiration of priests and lay people in the Church to ensure that more people like me come forward for theological training to be missionary disciples empowered to spread the Gospel with confidence and authority, with love and generosity. But to have the inspiration of priests and lay people, we need ways of funding training that is flexible enough to accommodate the contexts of potential new ordinands, which includes consideration for disabled candidates, and candidates like me who are not UK nationals, whose training may incur more costs. We need to fund TEIs in ways that give resources to equip people with different distinctive vocations, to make God's love visible everywhere, and to enable everyone to enter into a deeper relationship with Jesus Christ.

TS Elliot wrote, "Take no thought of the harvest, But only of proper sowing". In a church that is ambitious, a church that is striving to be simpler, bolder and humbler, a church that is striving to be younger and more diverse, Elliot's words may not sound entrepreneurial enough, but it is equally true that there will be no harvest if we do not sow properly, and if we do not train people fit to sow and to reap the harvest.

Better ways of resourcing ministerial training with greater agency given to TEIs, and particularly money allocated to encourage potential ordinands from ethnic minority backgrounds, will ensure that people like me feel encouraged and supported to come forward and test their vocation to lay and ordained ministry in the Church of England, to be formed in places and courses appropriate to them, and to know that the One who calls is faithful in every way. I urge the Synod to support the motion.

The Revd Miranda Threlfall-Holmes (Liverpool): In about three weeks' time my eldest son turns 21. Anyone who was at Cranmer Hall 21 years ago might remember me doing my end of first year exams absolutely enormously pregnant and hoping I was going to get through to the end of Bible 101.

I would like to ask that we are considerably more generous to our ordinands in their maintenance particularly in the area of childcare. We all gasped in horror at Mark Miller's story. When I got pregnant a few weeks into my first year of training I wrote to my diocese to explain that I had got pregnant and to ask about childcare payments, and the answer came back from my then Bishop, "You should have thought about that before you got pregnant". Due to the power imbalances in the bishop/ordinand relationship, I did not feel able to send the letter I wrote saying, "Is it then diocesan policy that I should have had an abortion?"

Childcare is expensive and I do not feel that paragraph 15 of the Report, which says that some contribution to the additional costs of children might be made, is good enough. I

particularly welcome that we are going to have the chance to endorse more developed proposals, and I would hope that the full cost of childcare might be included. Had I been still on my extremely small PhD stipend that I had just come off before going into training, the Research Council would have paid the roughly £8,000 cost of a full-time place in the university nursery. Had I been doing my first degree, the Government would have paid it, but because I was not in either of those positions and the Church was paying for my training, absolutely no help was forthcoming. There was a creche. It operated for about two hours a day and was clearly designed for the children of wives of ordinands.

We have heard about the number of women training. We have heard about the number of those under 30 training. What we did not hear in the Report from the Archbishops' Council was the intersection of those two figures. We know that we have a real issue with the number of women under 30 entering training. I fear that until we get generous realistic costs of childcare included in maintenance allowance, that issue is not going to be solved.

The Revd Chantal Noppen (Durham): I am tag teaming with Miranda it seems. I left home at 18 and I went to Newcastle to do my undergrad. My parents were not able to financially support me, despite me being an only child. Do not believe the rumours. I worked three jobs alongside my degree. In my third year I bought a flat. I had lodgers. I am financially savvy. Before I went to theological college I was told that my diocese would try to support me if I was to lose my tenants, so I was discouraged from delaying training by a year, as I had suggested so I could save money up, and off I went.

However, a few months in I did indeed lose my tenants, and my diocese was not able to offer support. The assurance had of course only been verbal. My flat was unrented for at least nine months. I applied for grants - many, many grants. I was mostly unsuccessful, too catholic for the evangelical ones and too female for the catholic ones. In the holidays I assumed I would be able to temp but, no, I had to do placements, and at Cambridge you are not meant to work during term time. I actually did pick up a few shifts at the local pub in plain sight, but let us not tell my principal, who is up there.

The strain and the financial burden on me was immense and affected my health and wellbeing. It was through the grace of God, sheer stubbornness and a very generous friend that I managed. Not all ordinands are the same, and if we want to become more diverse and genuinely open to those from more working-class backgrounds and self-sufficient backgrounds, this needs addressing. I hope this is going to be heard and acted on.

It is time to name the elephant in the room and that is the prevalence of pressure on women to be self-supporting. We need to be bolder and think bigger, and stop just scratching the surface on how we assess the training, formation and growth that we support and offer. Monitor and support absolutely, but also listen to the statistics and questions that are raised by groups such as WATCH around why are younger women not coming forward, why are more young women not coming forward; what maternity support

and childcare is actually in place, in reality, not just aspirationally. For young women ordinands will become young curates and biological clocks do tick down, and women need to know where they stand.

So let us be bold, invest and be transparent because women, both lay and ordained, are worth investing in, and sometimes we are the breadwinner for our family.

The Revd Liz Hassall (York): This is my maiden speech. I declare an interest as an occasional lecturer on the York School of Ministry, which is part of the Yorkshire Theological Education Partnership. I predominantly teach lay people who are training for Reader ministry. I particularly commend in this motion the commitment to greater investment in lay ministry training.

At this point I check my privilege. As an ordinand, I had the privilege of three years of full-time residential training, which enabled me to focus wholly on studies and formation. The students I now work with do not share that privilege. They make enormous sacrifices of their personal lives, their time with family, their professional commitments and their finances to be able to carve out enough time to engage with their weekly lectures and course work. I am in awe of all that my students achieve. They do all this often without easy access to books and other learning materials, frequently travelling long distances, even missing meals in order to come on lectures.

In the last two years, the move to online and hybrid teaching and learning has helped with some of these issues, but it is dependent on students being able to afford and access reliable technology. When I look at a room or a screen of students who are following the call of God and the Church, and offering themselves for lay ministry, I would like to be able to tell them that the Church values the sacrifices they make and is investing confidently and generously in their vocational journey, just as it has in mine.

I support this motion and I look forward to hearing those more detailed proposals of how lay ministry of all kinds can be valued and supported financially.

The Revd Jack Shepherd (Liverpool): When I went for my Bishop's Advisory Panel in Ely, I had to ask for directions back to the retreat centre as I had got lost, and the person I asked for directions was astonished that I was there for two nights for a job interview. The thing is we invest a lot of time in helping with the discernment process and then I would say very little time in helping people work out where to go for their theological training. This, for me, triggered a serious mental health experience. Subsequently, I greatly enjoyed my time at Cranmer Hall under Mark's leadership as the warden there. I am excited and thrilled that steps seem to be being taken for the Ministry Division to become more transparent and open.

I would want to ask how we are considering the mental wellbeing not only of those who are not selected at Bishop's Advisory Panel to train for ordained ministry, but how we are considering the mental wellbeing of those who are selected to train for ordination as part

of a BAP, particularly as we consider these wonderful schemes around encouraging the diversity of those who are being trained for different forms of ministry. I just think it is vital that we are considering people's mental wellbeing and forming channels which involve honest and transparent communication that help people choose modes of training which will allow them to flourish.

The Chair. The debate is coming to an end, so I call on the Bishop to reply to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seely): We have been taking notes and of course there is a recording of this. There is a huge amount of points which have been made through this great range of speeches, both in terms of the amendment speeches and in terms of the speeches to the actual motion, and I am incredibly grateful for the spirit in which this has taken place.

I am not going to go through all the speakers, but I will just draw out some themes. There is clearly an issue about timing which has come up, raised by a few speakers. It remains my hope that we will get the basic model which can be implemented in the autumn of 2023 to this Synod in February, and, if we are not able to do that, we will let everybody who is affected know in good time. In terms of taking this stage by stage, that is the core piece that we need to have in place.

The number of issues around lay ministry that we have heard, including how do we define what we are actually talking about here. I know Martyn, and his group has done a huge amount work on this. I would underline what Bishop Martyn said, and there are three Bishop Martins in the room, but the one who spells himself with a Y. To underline that, there is money through the Church Commissioners' allocations for the next triennium, money that is specifically allocated to the development of training for those in various lay ministries, including the various lay ministries that were named, such as youth and children's ministries. That is because Ministry, in the form of Chris Goldsmith, have worked closely with Vision and Strategy in the form of Debbie Clinton and Dave Male in drawing up those proposals. I take very seriously, and I think we all take seriously, the fact it is not a Ministry Council solely issue. It is an issue we need to get on to the agenda about decent payment for lay ministry roles for those who have completed that training.

The whole issue of maintenance, the Chair of the Maintenance Working Group is actually sitting in the chamber, she is a member of Synod, the Dean of Bristol, so do contact her if you have further thoughts and questions. We really want to make sure we are getting this right, and the stories that we have just heard, particularly around the support for women, and young women, are crucial in order to try to address the challenges here. We have to get this right. We know the model is based upon a particular demographic, and maybe even a particular gender, from some time ago, and we have got to work on making this as contemporary as possible.

In relation to the points that Bishop Sarah raised about the Peter Stream and the Caleb Stream, what I hope we will see is the Ministry Council will be working closely with those streams in looking at how they become, as it were, mainstreamed, in one way or another. It was interesting to hear the Bishop of Dudley's account of what happened picking up the scheme we have in St Edmundsbury & Ipswich, which we did without telling the Chair of the Ministry Council. It has worked rather well. We have about 50 people ordained through that scheme as self-supporting ministers. We are now going to follow the advice that we see from Worcester and start to integrate with the national processes.

I was struck by Jack Shepherd's comments about the care for those who are recommended for training as well as for those who are not recommended for training, and our engagement with the care of all candidates.

And let me finally touch on Ian Paul's comments. Ian knows that I agree with a number of points that he makes. In the delineation of what we do in IME1, that is the first step to looking closely at what we do in terms of theological formation, which is rooted in prayer and worship, and the study of Scripture and the learning of theology, what we do in this period.

I beg to move this motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Before the Synod is Item 30 which of course has been amended by Items 76 and 77. We proceed to the vote.

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

The Chair: That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 5.24 pm.

**SPECIAL AGENDA I
LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
ITEM 503
CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE
2022 (GS 2272)**

The Chair: We now come to Item 503. It is the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure which is before Synod for First Consideration. For this, members will need the draft Measure GS 2272, and the Explanatory Notes GS 2272X and the financial Notice Paper, Notice Paper IV, paragraph 14. I call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, Mr Stephen Hofmeyr, to move Item 503. He has 10 minutes.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): Every few years a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure is introduced. These Measures deal with matters that do not merit separate free-standing

legislation but they do contain some important provisions. You will need GS 2272 before you as we go through it.

Clause 1 amends the perhaps famous remote meetings Measure. That Measure was passed in 2020, for those who were on Synod then, during the height of the Covid pandemic. It enables General Synod to meet and conduct business remotely, including on a hybrid basis. It was intended to be a temporary expedient. It provided for the making of temporary Standing Orders for remote meetings. The current temporary Standing Orders will expire on 7 August. They can be revived by Synod after they have expired, but as matters stand they can be revived only for a further temporary period. We do not currently have power to put in place permanent provision for remote or hybrid meetings.

During the debate on revival in February there seemed to be strong support for some permanent provision to be made so that it would be possible for Synod meetings to continue to take place on at least a hybrid basis. That would ensure that those members who are unable to attend a physical meeting will nevertheless be able to participate as fully as possible in Synod's business.

Clause 1 of the draft Measure therefore amends the remote meetings Measure so that Standing Orders for remote or hybrid meetings can continue in operation indefinitely if the Synod wishes this to be the case. The remote meetings Measure also currently excludes certain types of business, known as Article 7 and Article 8 business, from being considered at a remote or hybrid meeting. Put very briefly, Article 7 business is concerned with matters of doctrine and worship. Article 8 business includes the making changes to the services of Baptism or Holy Communion or in the Ordinal, and the making of certain ecumenical schemes. Article 7 and 8 business is subject to special procedural safeguards detailed in the Explanatory Notes.

When the remote meetings Measure was passed we had no experience of doing synodical business using remote technology. In the view of many, remote and hybrid meetings have been quite successful, and, for the reasons already given, there is a good case for hybrid arrangements for members who need them. We cannot do that on an indefinite basis if certain important types of business are excluded from consideration when a meeting takes place on a remote or hybrid basis.

Clause 1 of the draft Measure would therefore remove the exclusion of Article 7 and Article 8 business from remote or hybrid meetings. Clause 2 makes another important change to legislation that concerns the way in which Synod conducts its business. The Legislative Reform Measure 2018 enables the Synod to make Legislative Reform Orders. These orders are used to amend Measures and other primary legislation to remove or reduce - bear with that - burdens that result from that legislation, not to introduce.

Some three Legislative Reform Orders have been made since 2018 and they have resulted in the removal of a significant number of administrative and financial burdens. The Legislative Reform Measure contains a sunset clause. The power to make

Legislative Reform Orders will expire in March 2024 unless it is extended. The Legislative Reform Measure itself provides for extension by way of special Order made with the approval of General Synod and both Houses of Parliament. However, the same result can be achieved by including provision in this draft Measure removing that sunset provision. That seems a more convenient way of extending the power to make Legislative Reform Orders. It will save time and expense and avoid the need to obtain parliamentary time for a separate affirmative Order.

I can comment more briefly on the remaining clauses. Clause 3 makes some amendments to the terms of service legislation. Clergy who are licensed to serve as members of religious communities are removed from the scope of the terms of service regulations which are not appropriate for their ministry. Like other non-parochial clergy, they will be subject to the rules and policies of the institution in which they serve.

Clause 4 develops existing provision for the delegation of episcopal functions by providing the Archbishops with a general power to delegate archiepiscopal functions in a similar way to that in which diocesan bishops can already delegate diocesan functions. It also removes provisions which prevent the making of applications for faculties under Canon C 4.5 from being delegated to suffragan bishops

Clause 5 enables a cathedral which wishes to do so to make provision in its constitution for lay residentiary canons. Clause 6 clarifies that where a Bishop's Mission Order terminates, any licences to exercise ministry under the Order will terminate with it. Clauses 7 and 8 make provision about the appointment, training and retirement of ecclesiastical judges in line with current standards and practices that apply to judges in the temporal courts. Clause 9 makes minor amendments to improve some existing provisions relating to disciplinary proceedings.

Clause 10 puts the broadcast of proceedings in ecclesiastical courts on a statutory footing broadly equivalent to those which apply to proceedings in temporal courts. Clause 11 amends the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 so that a person carrying out functions of care and conservation of a church building must have due regard to the importance of environmental protection. Clause 12 fills some gaps in the Church Property Measure 2018, including by enabling things that could normally be done by an incumbent to be done by a bishop if a benefice is vacant. Clause 13 fills a gap in the regime for the protection of objects of special interest in the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011.

Clause 14 updates the Church Property Measure 2018 in line with changes made by the Charities Act 2020. Clause 15 amends the Church Representation Rules. One of the amendments will enable the bishop in exceptional circumstances to waive the requirements that a person must be an actual communicant and have had his or her name on the electoral roll for six months to qualify for election to a parochial church council.

Clause 16 makes various provisions about the committee structure of the Church Commissioners. It also puts the legal position as to the Commissioners' borrowing powers beyond doubt by conferring on the Commissioners an express statutory power to borrow. Clause 17 enables various statutory bodies to meet and to conduct business remotely. Clause 18 gives the Measure its short title and provides for its coming into force and other technical matters.

Pausing there, please remember that this is stage 1 of the legislative process. There will be five further stages. If you can get proposals to us in writing by 9 September, that would be greatly appreciated. So this is not your last opportunity today to have a say. It is the first stage. If the motion is passed, members of Synod will be appointed to a Revision Committee and, together with the Steering Committee, they will go through the Measure clause by clause, making any amendments they consider should be made. Please, send your proposals so that they can be considered. The deadline is 5.30 on 9 September. The motion I am now moving is that the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure be considered for revision in committee.

The Chair. Item 503 is now open for debate.

The Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Because it is a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, this is at least a very slightly miscellaneous speech. One can hardly talk to the general import of so many separate items. I wish to say something about clause 5 and something that relates to section 11 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure. You all know what that is, I am sure, but I will explain it when I get there.

Clause 5 introduces a permissive proposal for cathedrals to be able to have lay residentiary canons and I have a particular reason to explain why this causes some concern to me and to speak now. Lay members, and certainly those who were on the last Synod, will recall that the governance of cathedrals was quite comprehensively revised by the new Cathedrals Measure which came into effect last year. I sat on the Revision Committee for that Measure.

This proposal, the possibility of lay residentiary canons, was introduced in the revision of the Cathedrals Measure and we were advised by the Legal Office that the principle of making an office a residentiary canon of a cathedral, which had always been an ordained post in the Church of England, not ordained was too significant a change to introduce within the Cathedrals Measure and so I was very surprised to find it in a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, which as you will have realised is intended to gather together a number of uncontroversial items.

The issue is that it does ask a fundamental question: is the office of a residentiary canon in a cathedral essentially ministerial in nature in the same way that the incumbent of a parish is or an archdeacon and all other such posts? In the history of the Church of England, we have an ordered polity in which certain roles are associated with the state of ordination which is not merely about performing certain liturgical functions or sacramental

functions that is built into the whole structure. The questions perhaps are worth asking and some people here may have very varied opinions on them but, again, I wonder if this is the place to make that change.

There is a more specific concern though in relation to the Cathedrals Measure itself. What the Measure did, as again most of you will recall, is set up a new and clear distinction between the chapter of the cathedral as a trustee body registered with the Charity Commission, whose members mostly are not engaged in doing the work of the cathedral, and a management team leading the cathedral staff in its ministry. That distinction, expressed clearly, was vital to the approval of the Cathedrals Measure by the Charity Commission as setting up the best form of governance for our cathedrals. The only crossover between the two levels is the dean and the residentiary canons in the expression of their core role as the heart of the life of the cathedral and as officeholders able, therefore, not to be employees of the cathedral. Do we wish to create a lay possibility in this space?

In the draft as we have it, there is no specification of the type of lay person. Lay people who may not be in any position to hold licence for the bishop, who may have no particular qualifications, it would seem, could occupy this role of a residentiary canon. I know that the Deans intend to bring an amendment to suggest that there should be that restriction so that only those in licensed lay ministry or Reader ministry might be able to hold the role. That would make a significant difference. But I still believe that a great deal more work may need to be done if this becomes a reality to make it compatible with the intentions and structure of the Cathedrals Measure, with the provisions for common tenure under which canons hold office and other relevant provisions.

That is the residentiary canons, what then about section 11 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure? This is a request to the Committee to potentially introduce an additional bit of miscellaneous business. That section provides for the process of naming or renaming sees of bishops. Having been - thank you - elected to the Dioceses Commission recently, I find it is an odd constraint on the work of the Dioceses Commission in the reviewing of suffragan sees. The name of a suffragan see can only be changed with the consent of Synod. Admittedly, it can be deemed business, but deemed business does not seem to do very well at the moment in staying deemed. Some of you will recall that we spent quite a long time in this busy chamber debating the change of the See of Richmond to the See of Kirkstall. I am not convinced that it was the greatest use of our time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Patterson.

The Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Oh, I have run out, sorry.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am going to respond to clauses 1 and 5 and it is good to follow Neil as a way into number 5. I think when we started having hybrid meetings, or actually we did not really start with hybrid meetings, we started with Zoom

meetings only, as the very beginning of the pandemic stopped us meeting, I think there was a reasonable feeling that did we want to enshrine that in our sort of permanent situation. Perhaps if funds were difficult we perhaps would not have a meeting together or maybe we thought we were not quite sure, was this pushing us into a direction we did not want and I think that was a perfectly reasonable fear. But now I think we have got used to the idea. It is becoming part of our DNA.

Most people who are on Zoom, I am sure, would like to be here but for various reasons cannot be. Looking ahead, the issue of Covid is still with us. I had an email from Susan Howdle this afternoon, who is our wonderful Methodist ecumenical representative. She has got Covid, as has her husband. They think they caught it at a Methodist conference which they consider might have been a super-spreader event, so be warned those of you wish to go in that direction in the future - no.

But I think what it shows us is that we have many people who are on steroid treatments and on cytotoxic cancer treatments who quite rightly do not want to be in this sort of place. February next year, we will probably have Covid and we might have really bad flu. I am a GP - you know, good work for us but not really. I think what I am saying is that maybe to enshrine this, as something that we should have as our normal position, seems to me quite sensible and it will be interesting to see how the Revision Committee deal with that. I am supportive of the remote meetings becoming indefinite and also including Article 7 and Article 8, which are such key parts of our work. That is clause 1.

Clause 5, which Neil alluded to, is around lay residentiary canons. I agree with him that this is very light about who might be a lay residentiary canon other than they will be a lay person. I do think we need to become a bit clearer about the sort of person who will be fulfilling that role. Certainly, I know the Deans are concerned, quite rightly, that the person they want will be someone who would participate fully in the life of the cathedral, in its liturgical life, in its teaching and preaching ministry.

Of course, we have in the Canons, E 4 and E 7, which relate to Reader ministry and other forms of licensed lay ministry, ways of thinking about how we might have that sort of person involved. I do think, as it goes to revision - and thank you so much to Stephen for all your work on this - I will be writing in and I think many of the Deans will be writing in about that so that we can show much more clarity about the sort of person who might fulfil this role, particularly about as part of their executive function.

I am an honorary lay Canon at Durham, which I greatly enjoy. I have no intention of becoming a residentiary canon, so I have got no conflict of interest. But many people would want to see how does this work and, again, Neil makes a very important point about how that fits into the governance of the cathedral. But that is for another day. This is First Consideration. We are just throwing a few ideas out. I do encourage those of us, as Stephen asked, to write in before that date in September so that we can move to a very effective Revision Stage.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London): Chair, it is good to be able to welcome this latest addition to the canon of Miscellaneous Provisions Measures and I am grateful for both the work it represents and the practical matters it seeks to address. If some members think that this is geek level Synod, let me explain that an issue I was teasing out on the phone with a colleague earlier this afternoon even will be happily resolved when the relevant section of the proposed Measure comes into force - not quite soon enough for me today I would, however, wish to raise one point.

The draft Measure makes permanent the basis on which the General Synod may hold remote meetings and it also provides for the Church Buildings Council, the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England, Cathedrals Fabric Advisory Committees and the Dioceses Commission to hold and conduct business at remote meetings. I would like to suggest that consideration be given to extending the proposals in the Measure so as to provide a statutory basis on which PCCs, deanery synods and diocesan synods and, in the Diocese in Europe, chaplaincy councils and also archdeaconry synods may sometimes meet and conduct business remotely.

At present, the Church Representation Rules contain a power enabling a bishop to make provision for such matters and I am not suggesting that power should cease to be available. But it seems to me that basic permanent provision across the Church of England would best be made by one set of arrangements applicable coherently and consistently across the whole Church of England rather than by a variety of different provisions contained in dozens of separate bishops' instruments made in different terms and for different periods. Chair, gone clearly are the days when Miscellaneous Provisions Measures (MPMs) were known as "more previous mistakes" and I gratefully support this helpful and practical set of proposals.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln): I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee for the Legislative Reform Measure and I was also a member of the Steering Committee for the Legislative Reform Measure when it was proceeding through Synod in 2016-17. I wish to speak about the sunset clause, clause 2, which is in the draft Measure. The 2018 Measure permits a fast-track legislation aimed at simplification of ecclesiastical law. There are safeguards in place which includes a strict statutory test of any amendments to legislation and there is also a Scrutiny Committee which is chaired by the Dean of the Arches which independently assesses whether that statutory test is met.

Some background. First proposals for the Measure were made here in York in 2016 and it then went into its Steering and Revision Committee stages and returned to Synod in February the following year. In the first draft of the Measure there was no sunset clause at all. All Measures are approved by Parliament and, of its type and purpose, this was a new piece of legislation for Synod. In the Committee stages there was some apprehension that some in Parliament may ask what are the schemers in Synod up to now? As a result, the Second Church Estates Commissioner, who at the time was Dame

Caroline Spelman, came and spoke to the Revision Committee and expressed concerns about how the measure may be viewed by our parliamentary colleagues. The inclusion of a sunset clause was her suggestion and so the Revision Committee considered that the Measure should be further amended to include that sunset clause to assuage any parliamentary concerns.

The current Explanatory Note for this draft Measure contains no exploration of the merits or demerits, save for future convenience, of keeping a sunset clause with a further time-limited extension and it does not explore the reasons for its introduction in the first place and why it is now thought that its permanent removal is the right way to proceed. Can I ask that this is looked at again and that at a future Synod full reasons are given for whatever the Committee think is the right way to proceed in the future.

Rt Worshipful Morag Ellis QC (ex officio): The Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure, it is not a scintillating title but I wish to draw Synod's attention to the significance of and rationale for three particular clauses, 7, 8 and 11, concerning ecclesiastical judges and ask you to support them at this first stage along with the rest of the proposed Measure. In the recent Report of the Racial Justice Commission, there is a call for the Church to consider how its consistory courts discharge their responsibilities, particularly with regard to the pressing issue of race. This is not the time to share with you positive work which is already underway - but I am prepared to do that over pints - but I am soon to give evidence to the Commission and am grateful for their invitation and for the encouragement and assistance of Dr Sanjee Perera, the Archbishop of Canterbury's Adviser on Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns.

The proposals in the draft Measure are detailed but important, not least because of their role in addressing the vital issues of raising up and developing the skills of leaders in our Church from all races, genders, orientations and physical abilities, reflecting as far as possible the image of God which resides, yes, even in lawyers. This is a responsibility which in part falls to the Dean and Auditor aided by other senior judges and clauses 7 and 8 recognise this as well as other important principles. Clause 7 is not a power grab by me or by the Chancellors. The proposed retirement provisions properly recognise that Chancellors are Her Majesty's judges, although appointed by bishops, and places their retirement provisions on an equal footing with secular counterparts, securing the important constitutional principle of judicial independence.

Tuning to the appointment of new Chancellors, the process is still intended to be collaborative, hence paragraph 6, but the ultimate responsibility for recommendation to the Lord Chancellor would now lie with the Dean and Auditor. This would enable the Dean and Auditor to have greater opportunities to shape the overall composition of a 21st century judiciary which is appropriately skilled and diverse. Clause 8 then carries that further. The role of Chancellor calls for a particular mix of legal knowledge, skill and pastoral insight. There is already good training on offer, but clause 8 would give scope for the Dean and Auditor to put training requirements on an equal footing with our secular colleagues and make them mandatory so we can have and make mandatory training on

all kinds of issues relating to diversity and unconscious bias along with updates on the law and training in judge-craft. The clause would give power to the senior judges to bring in that mandatory training.

The Chair: Synod, we do have another item of business to deal with before we finish at half past 6 and so after Amanda Robbie, who has a speech limit of three minutes, I am minded to take a couple of speeches at two minutes before putting a motion for closure.

Mrs Amanda Robbie (Lichfield): It is going to be nothing like a minute, I do not think. Clause 15, paragraph 2A, talking about changing the normal procedures for appointment to PCCs. Whilst that is done, consideration needs to be given to who is going to be responsible, therefore, for undertaking the safer recruitment procedures and the DBS checks, will that be for the PCC or for the bishop? Consideration needs to be given to that. That is my point.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of London (the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally DBE): I would like to speak to clause 5, lay residentiary canons, and I declare my interest that I have a cathedral in St Paul's. We have heard a great deal this afternoon about the importance of lay ministries. If this is going to be more than tokenism we will need to be intentional about what we change about the Church and about our cathedrals. Experience from St Paul's Cathedral where a lay person is in the post of Canon Chancellor highlights the importance of lay ministry in the life of not just the cathedral but also the diocese. Canon Dr Paula Gooder plays a full role as a licensed lay minister in the liturgical life of the Cathedral, leading morning prayer, acting as Canon in Residence and being a liturgical deacon at services of the eucharist.

This role is not just important symbolically, because it does demonstrate the commitment of the Cathedral to lay ministry, but it is practically important. As Chancellor, she brings her particular skills with her but, at this present time, she is unable to take her full place as part of the Chapter. Therefore, I support this clause and I would commend it to you. We do not need to fear it as ordained members of clergy. Whilst you may want to do more about the detail, I would urge you not to lose it.

the Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark): Yes, Paula Gooder is absolutely wondrous. Fortunately, she is not the only wondrous lay person who is around. Cathedrals need to benefit from the ministry of lay people. That is why we want this provision to go through, please. Yes, there is work to do with it at the Revision Stage and, yes, I chaired the Revision Committee for the Cathedrals Measure and we were advised, as Neil said, that it was too big to deal with it at that moment. This is the moment when we can actually open up cathedral ministry in this way and really benefit from the other Paula Gooders who are out there.

The Chair: I will now move to a motion for closure on Item 503.

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

The Chair. That is carried and so we move to a response, please.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): Well, thank you so much for those very, very positive contributions. I am most grateful indeed. Neil, thank you for your concern. Are we being too ambitious? Yes, that is something we will need to consider at the Revision Committee stage. We will need to balance that with those like Bishop Sarah and Andrew Nunn who have explained how significant lay people can be in the life and ministry of our cathedrals, but it is certainly something that the Revision Committee will need to look at particularly carefully. We take on board your point about the specification and the importance that if we go ahead with that to get the specification right.

Thank you to Jamie and your comments in relation to hybrid meetings. Yes, we were concerned at the outset but we have become accustomed with them and we have realised how significant they may be going forward. Aiden, thank you so much, a quite brilliant suggestion if I may say so. We need to tackle this more widely and not just in this context and so, again, I will urge the Revision Committee to look at that in the round. Carl Fender, concern about the sunset provision in the Legislative Reform Measure 2018 and why it was put in to that Measure. Thank you for that. If it is to be removed, we will certainly in the report to Synod give reasons as to why we consider it is now appropriate to remove that sunset clause, but we will revisit it again. Morag, thank you so much for explaining to members of General Synod the real significance of the proposed legislation at clauses 7, 8 and 11. Thank you in particular for explaining so clearly why they are significant.

Amanda Robbie, yes, of course, the Revision Committee will need to consider those matters and take them into consideration. Of course, they are very important indeed. I have dealt already with the importance of lay ministry in the cathedral, but thank you all for your interest and for your comments and please do remember there is a deadline, 9 September of this year, for further written comments which can be taken into consideration at stage 2. Remember, we are only moving now from stage 1 to stage 2, but thank you all very much indeed.

The Chair. We now come to vote on Item 503.

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

The Chair. The motion is carried. The draft Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than 5.30 pm on Friday 9 September. That completes this item of business and we will move on to the next one in a couple of seconds.

ITEM 504

AMENDING CANON NO. 43 (GS 2273)

The Chair. We come to Item 504, the draft Amending Canon No. 43, which is before the Synod for First Consideration. For this, members will need the draft Amending Canon, GS 2273, the Explanatory Notes, GS 2273X, and the Fourth Notice Paper with the financial implications at paragraph 14. I call on Mr Stephen Hofmeyr to move the item.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): I can take this much more quickly. I am not offering to buy anybody a beer, but perhaps you will get away quicker to have your beer. Having dealt with the draft Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, we now move to Amending Canon No. 43 which makes miscellaneous minor amendments to the Canons of the Church of England. Paragraph 1 deals with a lacuna that arises from amendments that were made by Amending Canon No. 39 and ensures that the Church is not simply closed without due process - a really rather important lacuna to be filled.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 bring the Canons into line with the recent statutory changes to marriage law which raised the minimum age for marriage to 18. Paragraph 4 makes provision for lay residentiary canons in line with the provision being made in the draft Miscellaneous Provisions Measure and, of course, those two will be considered together. Paragraph 5 enables a person other than a rural or area dean to deputise for the archdeacon in certain cases. Paragraph 6 makes it clear that a deputy diocesan or provincial registrar must be legally qualified and a communicant. Paragraph 7 extends a provision on interpretation in the Canons to instruments and regulations made under the Canons. Paragraphs 8 to 11 update some of the out of date statutory references in the Canons.

As with the draft Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, if the motion at Item 504 is passed, Amending Canon No. 43 will be considered by a Revision Committee paragraph by paragraph, together again with your proposals for amendment to be received by 5.30 pm on 9 September. So, please, get working. If you can get your proposals in by that date, it will enable the legislative process to proceed expeditiously and efficiently. Please do not delay thinking about these matters until the Revision, Final Drafting and the Final Approval stages, otherwise those can be delayed. I move this item standing to my name.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate. I can see no one standing, so I will call on Mr Hofmeyr to make any closing comments.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford): I was going to say "no comment", but I think I will say thank you very much indeed.

The Chair. We now put Item 504 to the vote.

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

The Chair. That item is clearly carried. The draft Canon is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than half past 5 on Friday 9 September. That completes this item of business and we return here for 8 o'clock, please.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 8.00 pm.

The Chair. Welcome back, Synod. Those of you who arrived a little early might have been treated to the rehearsal of the choir who are performing at Compline this evening. May I encourage you to stay? They are also performing at worship tomorrow morning. The Chaplain has asked that you make sure you do not miss that.

SPECIAL AGENDA IV

DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS

ITEM 31

REVIEW OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR PCC MEMBERSHIP AND ENTRY OF THE CHURCH ELECTORAL ROLL (GS 2254A AND GS 2254B)

The Chair. We now come to Item 31. Members will need GS 2254A and GS 2254B for this item. You will also need Notice Paper IV, the Financial Memo, as this item has financial impact. You can look to paragraphs 20 and 21. I am going to invite David Kemp to speak to and move the motion standing in his name. You have up to 10 minutes.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): Madam Chair, members of Synod, if you sit quietly here in York and listen very carefully you can just catch the hallelujahs coming from Canterbury Diocese. It has been quite an exciting week. Earlier on, our 2015 idea of having a CNC for the Bishop of Dover finally got over the line and here we are with our 2017 Diocesan Synod Motion, which has reached the agenda which dizzying speed. But we are here.

The motion comes from a little Kentish village called Smarden, which has a Fresh Expression in it, and has found that innovation and flexibility have run into the Rules. Something has to give. Fresh Expressions are fully churched. We are living in a mixed ecology church. The Church is changing and must change if the decline in membership is to be halted. Fresh Expressions need all the help they can get.

There are two parts to this motion, first, the question of qualification for membership of the PCC and, secondly, qualification for membership of the electoral role and its application form. But can I make it very clear we are not expecting answers this evening. We are simply asking for a review, a careful look at the issues and a thought-through proposal coming back to Synod.

Two of the amendments which have been tabled arise from real experience of either

people exploiting unexpected loopholes in the Rules or not observing the spirit of the Rules. On the question of PCC membership, there is an issue about whether members of the Church of England who are not communicants can be PCC members. There are Fresh Expressions across the country which are non-eucharistic but they are integral parts of their church. It is possible for their members to be on the PCC, but only if the bishop's council in the diocese agrees with a possibly time-consuming and complicated scheme proposed by the parish. It is not difficult to imagine the parish and the bishop's council having differing theological opinions on the matter. Underneath lies the question of where the decision should be made: in the parish or at the diocesan hub.

The question about membership of the electoral roll is probably more fundamental, particularly for a church that struggles to even define membership of itself. Perhaps we might leave that to any review. The application form is a nightmare. Two sheets of A4, "Are you this? Are you that?", and if I was pedantic I would not get past question 2(a) which raises a question of whether I am a member of the Church of England. The form was obviously designed with middle-class educated applicants in mind, but we are not solely in that world any more, and nor should we be.

Without prejudicing any review, can we not think out of the old-fashioned box and, for instance, radically simplify the form but have any supporting material easily available on an app which every clergy person and churchwarden can carry on their phone? There are enough barriers in the way of becoming a member of the Church of England. Let us reduce at least one form.

So, this motion is about a review to make our Church more accessible and its Rules more consistent with what is actually happening in the parishes. I beg to move.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate. There are a number of requests to speak from Zoom so I will be looking for them to indicate in the usual way. I call for her maiden speech Sandy Turner. You have up to five minutes.

Mrs Sandra Turner (Chelmsford): Thank you for calling me for my maiden speech. I was expecting a two-minute limit so you are in for a treat.

In our secular world, as has already been mentioned, it is increasingly anachronistic to assume that everybody on our electoral roll is a Christian, or even sympathetic to the mission and ministry of the local church. For example, in my own parish, one-third of our electoral roll are not invested in the life of our church socially, spiritual, or, sadly, financially, because they simply never attend. My reason for supporting this motion and this really worthwhile review is because I feel very strongly that we are to protect the gospel mission and ministry of our local church, which is our greatest asset.

Let me paint a picture for a minute, if I may. Your electoral roll officer receives application forms from 15 people. However, these are people with little or no connection to your church, but they reside in your parish and they have ticked the boxes declaring

themselves to be baptized and (that tricky one) a member of the Church of England, so they are duly enrolled. At your APCM, however, it becomes clear that this group are vehemently opposed to the mission and ministry of your church.

Next, one or two of them decide to stand for the vacant positions you have on your PCC. It is very difficult to prove if someone has been a communicant at least three times in the past year, more difficult as it could be in any church that is in communion with us, and even more difficult because of Covid. So, we take them at their word and they take their places on our PCC. At meetings these new members then work together to frustrate and oppose the gospel mission and ministry of your church, and there is actually very little you can do about it without making things worse. Far-fetched? Not really. This is my experience. This is my electoral role. This is my PCC. This is my church. And it has led to some very strained relationships and tricky PCC meetings, where we waste too much time fighting fires and, worse still, our efforts to be faithful witnesses to Christ whom we love in our local community are questioned and frustrated at every turn.

However, I do not want to leave you feeling sad for us because, despite the fact that we now know the cost of being salt and light, we continue wholeheartedly to offer ministry to anyone and to everybody who comes to us. We have learnt to cling on to Jesus alone. We have learnt to be bolder in how we speak the truth in love, and we have been ever humbled as we see Christ at work, even in these really difficult times because I was reminded that unless the Lord builds the house, those who build it labour in vain.

Synod, this could be your church in three or five or 10 years' time, so I urge you to vote in favour of this motion. Let us get this review and see where we go from there.

The Chair: I am going to take a couple of speeches from Zoom, first from Matt Beer, followed by Holly Adams for her maiden speech. You both have up to five minutes.

The Revd Matthew Beer (Lichfield): Whilst I broadly accept the motion for review for qualifications for PCCs, and can see the heart behind the motion from the Canterbury Diocese, and that of the St Michael's, Swarden PCC, I would however ask us to resist this motion for a number of reasons. If we pass this motion, we may be naïvely stepping into something that we may later need to fix. First, in the document GS 2254A the new forms of worship - Fresh Expressions, Messy Church, bishop's mission initiatives - are non eucharistic. Regular communicants is what the regulations call for. It does not state weekly, monthly, or just regularly. Why not make these vitally important expressions of Church eucharistic? If are not allowing these communities of people to receive Communion, are we truly showing them what it is to be part of the Church, and withholding the sacrament from them unintentionally, remembering that the first ever Fresh Expression of church was that of Acts 2:42, and it was a eucharistic community of faith?

Secondly, if the Fresh Expression of a church is within a parish context, why not encourage some of the PCC to join that Fresh Expression? That way, you have the representation needed. So many of the people in fresh expressions and bishop's mission

initiatives want to cut down on the bureaucracy and not become part of the perceived problem.

Thirdly, as the lead of an extra-parochial bishop's mission initiative, I would earnestly urge us to think twice about the inclusion of BMIs to be represented at PCCs, particularly as they already have articles of association, CIOs - charitable incorporated organisations - or the bishop, and they are held to account by episcopal visitations and reviews regularly. Please do not add to the burden by inclusion of the PCCs. For me, who serves in a BMI over three deaneries, an exceptional amount of work and frustration could be caused in needing to have representation in all those PCCs. Telford Minster, the BMI that I lead, is eucharistic, self-governing and, by the articles of association, deeply Anglican, and would not want that representation on PCCs; it is quite enough on its own to manage. Please by all means have a review, but think carefully about how we might include bishop's mission initiatives and how they will be affected. Please resist this motion.

Miss Holly Adams (Canterbury): I had rather hoped that my maiden speech would be on a slightly sexier topic than the wording of an electoral roll form, but this is Synod so maybe this is as sexy as it gets.

I find myself compelled to speak because I believe this motion asks us how much we are really committed to inclusivity and to mission.

There are two issues here that I would like to quickly address. First, the actual communicant criteria in the model rules, which means that we have a default which excludes people in non-eucharistic worshipping communities.

As encouraging as it is that parishes can make their own rules, I would like to challenge the fact that our model rules, which most parishes will continue to use, either because they do not know that they have a choice, or because they do not have the energy to go through the scheme, offer a default of exclusion. If we wish to be a church that values diverse expressions of worship equally, surely we need a default that is inclusive, not exclusive.

The second issue the motion raises around the wording of the electoral roll form as inaccessible and not serving us missionally is true not only in fresh expressions of church but also in traditional expressions of church.

Until this year, I had been electoral roll officer in my church for six years. Our parish is situated in the 10% most deprived wards in Kent and is among the most deprived in the country. Our community has many gifts but high levels of literacy and education is not one of them.

I have had so many conversations over the years with people who wish to join the roll as a way of formulating their sense of belonging to the Church, as well as to enable full participation in APCMs and on the PCC, who yet find the form inaccessible to the extreme.

Yes, I can help to fill out the form, and yes, I can apologise for how complicated it is, but, frankly, I am tired of apologising on behalf of a Church which makes it almost impossible for people who are unfamiliar with its practices to participate fully in its life.

So, we can choose to continue to enshrine our practices in inaccessible language and legalism which make people feel like our Church is not a place for them, or we can choose to find a way to do what needs to be done accessibly and inclusively. Like any issue of accessibility, this work will not be convenient for us. Adapting the forms and changing the language will take time and effort. We need to not simply settle for slightly improved and instead push the boundaries of what is possible, because if we are a Church that seeks to reach meaningfully engage with, and be changed by those at the margins, if we are truly a Christ-shaped Church, then we need to pay proper attention to the ways that our processes prevent diverse people from participating fully in our life.

I want to emphasise that the motion is not satisfied by or expectant of immediate answers, but asks for a comprehensive review of this small, not very sexy part of our Church life, in order to more faithfully and effectively be the missional Church we are called to be. Please, Synod, support this motion with me.

ITEM 78

The Chair: We are going to take the first amendment now so I would like to invite Mr Clive Scowen to come to speak to and move Item 78. You have up to five minutes

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I am really here speaking as the Chair of the Elections Review Group and a member of the Business Committee. This amendment is supported by the Chair of the Business Committee, he asked me to say so he does not have to get up and say it himself.

The purpose of the amendment is really very simple. It is really to address the request for review to the Business Committee rather than the Archbishops' Council, since the review sought falls within the remit of the Elections Review Group, which is a sub-committee of the Business Committee. The review group will shortly be agreeing our programme of work for this quinquennium, so it is timely for the request for a review to come at this point.

But with your permission, Chair, I would also like on behalf of the Group to comment more widely on the motion and on the amendments. The requirement for PCC members to be actual communicant members of the Church of England dates back to the setting up of the Church Assembly, the predecessor of the General Synod in 1919, but as recently as 2018 the Revision Committee for the Church Representation of Ministers Measure considered whether the requirement was still justified, and concluded that it was, a conclusion which Synod did not challenge.

It seems to me entirely appropriate for it to be the norm that those involved in the

governance of our Church should be participating in its sacramental life, feeding regularly on Christ at His table.

Should the Rules permit exceptions to that norm? They already do. Mr Kemp has referred to the fact, and it is also referred to in the Secretary General's paper, that it would be open to an APCM to make a scheme to disapply that requirement in whole or in part in that particular parish, subject only to the consent of the diocesan bishop's council.

The grounds on which a bishop's council can refuse to consent to such a scheme are actually quite limited. I am confident that if a parish made a compelling case they would be likely to get it approved.

There will probably soon be another route. The Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, which was given First Consideration this afternoon, contains a clause which would permit the bishop to allow an individual to serve on a PCC despite not being an actual communicant or even on the electoral roll. The dispensation which the sponsors of this motion seek is already in hand, and, frankly, the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure is likely to become law rather more quickly than the upshot of any review conducted by the Elections Review Group.

The motion seeks a wider review of qualifications for membership of a PCC and the review group stands ready to undertake such a review. A review by its very nature is open ended. There is no guaranteed outcome. The conclusion might be there is no change needed, or it might be that radical reform is required. We will need evidence to inform the review, which I hope members of Synod will be able to provide.

The electoral roll application form necessarily requires a lot of information, but it is appropriate from time to time to review whether it, and indeed any other forms that the Church's Rules prescribe, could be improved to make them more user friendly, particularly to a wider cross-section of society. The Election Review Group would be glad to consider it and again interested to hear any ideas that members, or indeed the sponsors of the motion, have for improving it. Again, there is no guarantee that we will succeed in that endeavour, but we should try.

Amanda Robbie's second amendment seeks to extend the review further to cover disqualification provisions and how they could be made more effective. Again, this is something that the Elections Review Group would happily consider as part of its ongoing responsibility to keep the Church Representation Rules under review and to seek to improve them.

Her first amendment seeks to remove from the motion the reference to the existence of bishop's mission initiatives. I feel that may be a wise thing, particularly having heard Matt Beer. The fact of the matter is that Fresh Expressions of church are enormously wide in their scope and size and what they are seeking to achieve. Clearly, the sort of mission initiative of which Matt is the leader would not be one that would be seeking representation

on the local parish's PCC, but Messy Church is very different. Thank you, Synod, please support the amendment.

The Chair: I now invite David Kemp to come and confirm whether he accepts or does not accept this amendment.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): Thank you, Clive, for a helpful addition to the debate. You know more about the Archbishop's Council and the Business Committee and Election Review Group than I do. I am happy to accept that amendment to the motion.

The Chair: So now Item 78 is open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): I understand what Clive has brought here, and I had not been intending to speak on the main motion, but as I listen to it and hear Clive, I am inclined to think this is not the right way. At the heart of the main motion we are considering is the mission of the Church, and then the continuation and strengthening of the mission the Church by bringing people into full membership. I think that is a mission issue and, as such, I would say it belongs in the Archbishops' Council and not in the Business Committee, which is more about process. It is part of the whole motion.

I do not come from a village, I come from a really deprived town in the home counties, from Luton, with a 900 year-old church which faces exactly the same issues in terms of bringing people in from our town centre community, as I am hearing and I know takes place in villages. As I say, this is a mission issue, let us keep it and let us look at how we bring governance at a local level within this exciting new dimension of church that we have. I would like to see the Archbishops' Council handling that.

The Chair: I see no one else standing to speak so we are going to put Item 78 to the vote by a show of hands.

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

ITEM 79

The Chair: We move on to the second amendment which is Item 79. Can I invite the Ven. Fiona Gibson to come and speak to and move the amendment in her name? You have up to five minutes.

the Ven. Fiona Gibson (Hereford): I would like to make clear at the outset that I am fully supportive of the general tenor of this motion. The time is ripe for a review of the qualifications for PCC members and of electoral roll application forms.

I recognise that people express their sense of belonging to a church in a variety of ways, whether that be attending what one might provocatively term a traditional expression like BCP Evensong or a Fresh Expression like Messy Church. I shall be voting in favour of the substantive motion irrespective of the outcome of this amendment.

I am, however, concerned about possible unintended consequences of the review if it was simply to propose removing the requirement for PCC members to be actual communicants and leave it there. This amendment therefore simply seeks to propose some parameters around the review. Under the Parochial Church Councils' (Powers) Measure 1956, part of the statutory functions of the PCC involve co-operation with the minister in promoting in the parish the whole mission of the Church - pastoral, evangelistic, social and ecumenical. It seems to follow from that that PCC membership entails more than simply being a trustee or custodian of an important heritage and community asset, although it certainly does include that. PCC membership involves exercising leadership of a spiritual dimension, specifically a Christian spiritual dimension, which needs to be upheld in any revision. The Secretary General highlights in his briefing note GS 2254B the potential consequences for House of Laity, deanery, diocesan and general synods of simply removing the requirement for communicant status without putting in place other safeguards.

As a rural archdeacon, I both know and understand the desire and need to involve members of the wider community; people who love, value and are committed to their church building as an integral part of the life of their village in making decisions about the church, but I think we need to find a new way to do that so that they are involved in genuine partnership and governance but not just adjust PCC membership requirement.

This motion, if we were to pass it unamended, would of course only call for a review, and that review is much needed, but given that Christian spiritual leadership is part of the statutory duties of a PCC, I firmly believe we need to set this specific parameter around the review. I beg to move the amendment at Item 79 standing in my name.

The Chair: I now invite David Kemp to come and respond to whether he accepts or does not accept the amendment.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): I am very grateful to Fiona for the conversations that we have been able to have in these last two or three days about the motion and about what lies behind her amendment and I am happy to accept it.

The Chair: We now begin a debate on Item 79.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr James Cary (Bath & Wells): I also represent the House of Laity on the Archbishops' Council who, until recently, were meant to be looking at this review should the Synod be minded to ask for it. I welcome the main motion, given our Vision and Strategy of a mixed

ecology which needs to be explored in terms of oversight and governance. This is a very serious thing. In Acts 14, we read how Paul and Barnabas appointed elders for each church and with prayer and fasting committed them to the Lord in whom they had put their trust.

I think this is inviting us to wonder in whom we will put our trust. How that passage relates exactly to PCC membership I will leave to the theologians and I do look forward to the moment in glory when someone explains the governance of the Church of England to the Apostle Paul. Can I be there when someone does that, please. But let us put it another way and a simpler way. My next biggest passion after the Bible is cricket. If you are running a village cricket club, would you wish to invite people to run the club who ultimately do not like cricket? Maybe they like TMS and tea and cake. Maybe they like short grass or white clothes. Maybe they are passionate about giving the kids something to do. But if they do not actually like the game of cricket - and many do not and that is fine - sooner or later there will be problems with the direction of that cricket club.

Many of us have witnessed organisations, clubs and societies disintegrate in that way and to see that happen in a parish church or some other fresh expression is heart-breaking and damages the mission of the Church in a community. So we need to be careful here in whom we put our trust, which is why I support this amendment of this really helpful motion in the context of reviewing what we do mean by Church membership so that we can be a welcoming Church for a nation that has no idea how much the Lord Jesus Christ loves them and so I support this amendment.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): I would like to speak in favour of the amendment and absolutely in favour of the original motion as well. I think we are perhaps overcomplicating this. I sense that for the Canterbury Diocese or the deanery that first brought this forward, the key word here is "review". The previous speaker used a cricketing analogy. I will also use one. I think we are in danger and it is like a batsman facing a spin bowler and wondering which way the ball is going to turn where actually this is going straight on with the arm. As I say, the key word is "review".

I would differ from some of the previous speakers and I think that certainly in my own parish we have had the opposite issue. We have three types of services: BCP, alternative worship and informal church. Many of the people involved with the informal church who regularly worship and have taken Communion have not been happy to complete electoral roll forms for the simple reason they say, "Well, where is the app? Can we download it?" I absolutely hope that the review comes up with creating an app like we have the excellent Synod App, like we have for many other things.

That is the sort of thing that the review should be doing, looking at ways of making the electoral roll form, even if we do not change the wording, make the way you complete it much easier and more straightforward. I think a review is really important here. I like the amendment because, as I said, it is putting it within the parameters of the Church. I hope

that we support this enthusiastically tonight, have the review and then let us look at ways of making this more straightforward.

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): I would love to be there when our blessed Lord explains cricket to St Paul. I would very much like to support this amendment and I would like to make three brief points about it. First of all, the amendment makes the point about habitual worship. Having attempted to do this, it is enormously difficult to start something in the Church of England because you need to have six months of habitual worship before you can have any governance, which is why you therefore need to start with the Bishop's Mission Order, which can have a CIO, which can have appointed trustees who can then morph into a church council which can then become some sort of elected PCC on the basis of habitual worship. That is an aspect that needs to be looked at because we are hardwired for decline and we need to be hardwired for growth.

The second point to make comes out of that, which is that one of the models that is used in the Bishop's Mission Order legislation is the Guild Churches of the City of London where the leader of the guild church, the guild vicar, has a right to place anybody whom he or she chooses onto the guild church role. That mirrors what I think might still be - although we have not had a new Measure and I have not followed the detail - the case in some cathedrals. That is another method for getting things going. We are talking here about PCCs, but there are lots of other church councils which are in our policy which in any review would need to be taken into account.

The third point that I would just like to make is that a church in our formularies is a place where the word of God is preached and the sacraments are celebrated. The Church which is the body of Christ, not a metaphor, is rightly formed of those who are sacramentally engaged. Why? Because sacraments make a difference. The Word of God inheres in the soul and leads us to Christ. The sacraments inhere in the soul and lead us to Christ. Both of those poles of our spirituality need to be engaged. Because we are not talking simply about the governance of a whole series of little charities but about the living breathing body of Christ, we need both sacraments and the Word in equal measure at the heart of what we do, which is why I would wish to see not only habitual worship living under the Word of God but also habitual, being busy about the sacraments, in order that that part of our spirituality also grows in our hearts and in the governance of our churches.

The Chair: As no one is requesting to speak, we are now going to put Item 79 to the vote.

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

ITEM 80

The Chair: We now move to Item 80, the amendment, and I will invite Amanda Robbie to come and speak to and move the amendment in her name. You have up to five minutes, Amanda.

Mrs Amanda Robbie (Lichfield): This is my maiden speech. What a strange thing, to make a maiden speech on an amendment, and so thank you for indulging me, Synod. I am really pleased that Canterbury Diocese has raised this issue of PCC and electoral roll membership in their motion asking for this review. My amendment seeks to expand the scope of the review they have asked for. Local church governance can be a lovely and precious thing, I am sure that you will all agree. However, churches can be hampered in their mission and ministry by broken or damaged people. Sadly, some individuals seek to hinder our work rather than build it up and so PCCs need better protection.

The Church Representation Rules are not robust enough and they clash with our Church safeguarding legislation, leaving PCCs actually unable to safeguard the Church. My amendment has two parts, if you look on your yellow sheets. Firstly, I have removed those phrases which begin "in the light of", and that is just about expanding the scope of this review that Canterbury have so wonderfully asked for in order for other input to be made.

I have a couple of things that I would like covered in a review. One would be to look at whether it is appropriate for PCC members to be nominated by close family members. The other is that a review should consider the use of the Return of Nomination system, known as RON, especially in student bodies. Other elected bodies use this mechanism to prevent unsuitable people from being elected, even if they stand unopposed, and this would protect PCCs who are struggling to find members from being hijacked by people with less good intent. Some members of this Synod may well have further suggestions for a review with respect to PCC membership and electoral roll registration and I urge them to send them in.

Secondly, I have added my third clause because I am seeking to move quickly with the substance of the Lichfield diocesan motion that I am sure you have all read lurking at the bottom of your full agenda for this group of sessions. The motion was submitted because the Church Representation Rules and Churchwardens Measure are out of line with the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 and the new Safeguarding E-manual with which I am sure you are all familiar. Provisions made under the 2016 Measure for the disqualification and barring from office of child sex offenders and fraudsters cannot be applied under the current Rules.

The Church Representation Rules incorporate some of the provisions made in the 2016 Measure, but the Rules have internal contradictions. The Safeguarding E-manual published in January this year states that current legislation relies on self-disclosure by an individual and so it is limited by its effectiveness at preventing individuals on any barred list from becoming PCC members and/or churchwardens.

Synod, our current Rules rely entirely on trust but, sadly, people lie. Those with backgrounds of child sexual abuse and fraud have strong motivation to lie and, sadly, trust cannot be enough in our Rules. This amending clause that I have put forward seeks

to address this problem by requesting a review of those legislative clashes which I understand the NCIs are aware of. Firstly, our Rules need to be brought into line with the 2016 Measure to allow safer recruitment and, secondly, additional legislation is going to be needed to bar or remove any disqualified person from holding office and, sadly, no such effective legislation exists at this time.

I know it has been a bit technical but there is a problem which needs to be reviewed and corrected. In order for our PCCs to be more effective, to be better protected, to do more work, ministry and mission in our parishes, through an expanded review and corrections to the legislation, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name.

The Chair: I now invite David Kemp to indicate whether you accept Item 80. Although, Amanda, you have helpfully spoken to them both, we are going to treat them separately. Item 80, as an amendment, do you accept it or not?

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): Yes.

The Chair: You do. Well, that was painless, was it not. In which case, Item 80 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Revd Timothy Norwood (Oxford): I am the Area Dean of Milton Keynes and over the last 40 years we have had 25 new congregations planted or grown in our city area. Only one of them is a Bishop's Mission Order. As I look back over the history, one of the things that we have been conscious of is the problems with membership, partly because so many of the projects that have been formed have been formed ecumenically in partnership with other churches. Not just in the distant past, but even now in the present there is a wonderful project called *Church Without Walls* which we are running with the URC. Look it up on the internet. It is a really brilliant project. But working in that way creates all sorts of difficulties in terms of membership and the amount of time that has been wasted trying to resolve issues of membership have created all sorts of problems in terms of conflict and inability to engage properly with new congregations.

I, therefore, welcome this amendment, Item 80, in the widening of the scope and the indication that there are other issues in terms of new congregations and growing communities which we must address in terms of membership in order to save time and make them much more effective. So please support this amendment. It will be very helpful for us.

Ms Mary Talbot (Europe): I was really delighted to see the general motion because if you think that these forms are incomprehensible in England, I can tell you they are absolutely gobbledygook if you live on the continent. Most of the people who come into our church in Geneva do not actually know what an Anglican Church is and many of our congregation come from different churches. I would really hope that if we pass this motion, which I

understand from Amanda's explanation is to open it further, that we do not lose sight of how complicated this is for people who are not cradle Anglicans to understand.

The Chair. I am now going to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 80.

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

The Chair. We now move to a vote on Item 80.

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

ITEM 81

The Chair. We now come to Item 81, where I am afraid you need to come and move the amendment in your name.

Mrs Amanda Robbie (Lichfield): I beg to move the amendment in my name.

The Chair. If David could come and indicate whether he accepts or does not accept the amendment.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): Madam Chair, you rather took me by surprise with your question about 80s and I replied too quickly. No, no, I meant yes, but I also wanted to say thank you very much to Amanda, again with whom I have had conversations. This seems to me to be complementary to our original motion. Our original motion is about opening things up and this particular amendment is about making sure we are protected even though we open things up and so I am very happy indeed to accept the amendment.

The Chair. Item 81 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I was really grateful for this amendment because it reminded me of my safer recruitment training when I found myself in a situation where we were discussing the safer recruitment of PCC members and others and it struck me that PCC members are elected by the annual meeting and churchwardens are elected by the annual vestry meeting - electorates that have no control and we have no control over who votes in those elections, particularly in the election of churchwardens.

I found myself wondering how on earth could I go through safer recruitment for people who I could not control the election of. It seems to me that this review will allow us to ensure that we ask the questions about how we can have properly democratic processes without putting ourselves in jeopardy with issues around safeguarding. I welcome this amendment and it will help me ease my conscience about how I can interfere in what is after all a democratically elected process.

the Ven. Paul Ayers (Leeds): I agree very much with what Simon has just said and I am very grateful to Amanda for bringing this amendment. I just wonder if it is possible that we could explore in the review even further. I really wish there was a code of conduct for churchwardens and PCCs. Many organisations have such a thing and, for serious misconduct or bringing the organisation into disrepute, there are penalties. Maybe this is opening up a can of worms but, sadly, as we have known for many, many years, bullying, harassment and narcissistic behaviour can occur by laity against clergy and by laity against each other. It has never been addressed. There has never been anything we can do about it. I just wonder if this might be an opportunity for the review to look in that direction.

The Chair: I would like to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 81.

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

The Chair: We will now vote on Item 81, the amendment.

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

The Chair: We now return to a debate on the main motion as amended.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Revd Dr Tom Woolford (Blackburn): I actually made my maiden speech on Saturday but I forgot to say so, so if you could give me the leniency that I should have had then. We are a Word and Sacrament Church: No Word, no Church; no Sacrament, no Church. I am grateful that the briefing paper that has been attached to this motion has raised a real and serious anomaly in our arrangements. The anomaly is there are highly engaged members of our Church communities, maybe even leaders of Fresh Expressions who do not meet the requirement for membership of our PCCs to be an actual communicant but who would make great additions to the spiritual and practical leadership of our churches.

But the remedy for that anomaly - and I suspect we are going to vote in favour of having this review, and so I guess I am speaking to the review that might happen - lies not with reviewing and potentially changing our canonical requirement, which emerges from our historic ecclesiology - oh, two minutes is very short, is it not. To make the change envisioned in the briefing paper concerning this motion dilutes the link between our historic formularies, a Word and Sacrament Church and our on the ground ecclesiology. In seeking to more fully embrace Messy Church, this review risks what we may define as a Church messy. That was the good line that I wanted to finish with.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I was very much involved, as some of you will know, in the 2019 Church Representation Rules and so I am speaking to this review too. First of all, Clive, I hope you will invite members of Synod to contribute to the review. Secondly,

I am hoping that some people are thinking, well, we have a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure already underway, so can we use that to get some of these changes done more quickly and use that route. When I was growing up, I was aware of a document in the porch of my parish church which said "Expectations of Members of the Church of England" which we have, sadly, lost. We could find that and put it up in our porches again and get that spelt out. That is an existing document. We are very keen on the electronic stuff - I have been asked to raise that by Charlton deanery. I am passionate, as you know, about the review of the 1956 PCC Measure and bringing that up-to-date.

The Revd Preb. Pat Hawkins (Lichfield): Let me begin by saying that I am in great sympathy with the thrust of this motion with the lowering of barriers and the simplification of processes. My sticking point is the second sentence of GS 2255A, which in referring to Fresh Expressions simply states that most of these forms of worship are non-eucharistic full stop. Accepting, as I do, that Fresh Expressions of church are church in their own right and not a route into traditional church, I am deeply worried by that full stop. The theological underpinning of that worry has already been set out eloquently. Let me simply add that we must be careful not to imply, I am sure unintentionally, that sacraments as opposed to the manner of their celebration are somehow problematic in mission terms. John Wesley spoke of Communion as a converting ordinance and there have been few people more able to bring the Gospel to the unchurched. Having said that, I am all in favour of review.

The Chair: I would like to put the motion for closure before you on this item.

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

The Chair: David, would you please respond to the debate.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): Madam Chair, it has been one of those debates, has it not? First of all, thank you to everybody who has come to take part in this debate. I have to say, had I been you I would have looked at the agenda and thought not the most exciting part of Synod, but thank you so much for coming and for taking part. Three and a half maiden speeches, wow, and remind me never to follow Tom Woolford. Sandra Turner, speaking from experience about the group opposed to the mission of the Church. Matt Beer, wondering whether there was a community of members and whether it could be non-eucharistic.

Thank you to Holly from Canterbury. There was a three-line whip on people from Canterbury actually supporting the motion - free and fair, obviously. Peter Adams, at the heart of the motion is the mission of the Church. I will leave others to decide whether it should be the Archbishops' Council or the Business Committee. We then had James Cary and cricket appeared. Oh, my heart leapt. The rules of cricket are very simple: there is one side that is in and another side that is out. Never mind, that is a tea towel. Any idea of cricket or the governance of the Church of England being explained to St Paul, thank you, James, it is a lovely idea.

Robin, I think you may be about five years ahead of your time asking where the app is, but it is a good question to ask. Luke, thank you, being hardwired for growth, that is a good phrase. Timothy, supporting the motion and the amendment from experience. Mary Talbot coming in from Europe, who what they do about cricket or St Paul I have no idea. Thank you, Simon, the business of safer recruitment is very serious and we take it very seriously when it has got safeguarding attached to it but not so seriously necessarily when it has got PCCs attached to it. The idea of proper process is good. Paul Ayers, the code of conduct, well, I think a lot of people would think that would be a very good idea and then would blanch at the bother of doing it.

We have already mentioned Tom and I was not sure where the speech started or ended, but it was great fun, thank you, Tom. Adrian, with his great experience wondering whether there should be a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure. And, Pat, bringing us back to earth again, just that niggle about non-eucharistic churches, yet it is there and we have to deal with it and we have to work with it. I am very grateful. Thank you, Madam Chair, for looking after me and telling me what to do at the right moments. I beg to move.

The Chair: We now put Item 31 as amended to the vote.

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

The Chair: The motion is carried. That concludes this item, thank you.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 9.10 pm.

ITEM 32

AGE VERIFICATION FOR PORNOGRAPHY WEBSITES (GS 2274A and GS 2274B)

The Chair: Thank you, members. We come now to the Diocesan Synod Motion on Age Verification for Pornography Websites for which you will need GS 2274A and GS 2274B. I call upon the Revd Jo Winn-Smith to move the motion at Item 32 on Order Paper VII. You have up to 10 minutes.

The Revd Jo Winn-Smith (Guildford): Good evening, Synod, and thank you for your engagement with this important social issue. Friends, age verification for accessing online pornography ought to be a no-brainer, so why are we here? Film certification has had long precedent, so why this omission in online regulation? The internet has capacity for great good, inspiring the imagination, knowledge sharing and friendship building, yet it is also a place where the darker side of life is prevalent, influencing and encouraging and shaping emotional and spiritual health. The Government is playing catch-up at present and pressure needs to be maintained on them to ensure these protections are enacted.

A little background. Research reveals that almost a quarter of young people have never spoken with their parents or carers about sex. Research also shows that the majority of young people have seen pornography online and a vast majority of older teens, whether seeking it out or not, have accessed it within the last week, when asked. This is an issue which parents and children themselves are highly concerned about and I am afraid I disagree with GS 2274B.

The research of both Dr Fiona Vera-Gray at Durham and Professor Jane Monckton-Smith, the expert on intimate partner violence, argue strongly for how easily accessible pornography is increasingly extreme and violent, misogynistic, objectifying women, normalising non-consent and coercion as well as promoting unrealistic attitudes towards sex and body image. Exposure to sexualised material is more likely to lead to young people engaging in more sexualised behaviour and to feel social pressure to have sex and to think that they can and should have sex in these unhealthy ways and relationships.

So what is the Government doing about this? The Online Harms White Paper has identified these risks and the need for the legislation and the Online Safety Bill intends to address it. The industry has even already begun to develop tools to address the matter. So why has the Leatherhead Deanery in Guildford Diocesan Synod brought this motion? This is a question of maintaining pressure on the parliamentary process because this was originally proposed by David Cameron back in 2013 and was supposed to become law in 2019. At first, it was delayed because of bungled administration. The EU had not been properly notified of the proposed legal changes. It was then postponed to ensure it was part of the wider Online Harms plans.

Friends, there is a time for reasonable patience and then there is time for principled frustration. The Church, with other churches and faith leaders, with children's charities like Barnardo's, the NSPCC, Save the Children, UNICEF and the Children's Commissioner are all concerned and have been working together to ensure that it maintains its place in the legislative proposals and is not omitted again. If we think of 2013, that is nine years ago; when you are a child that is a very long time. In that time, many children have gone from childhood to adulthood and will have experienced pornography in ways that have damaged them. These children have been missed out by the fact that these proposals have still not come through.

We need to be aware that some groups might seek to weaken or dismiss the proposals, again citing libertarian rights or concerns and privacy. Their user details from verification processes might lead to profiling or even to, they themselves say this, embarrassment or even hacking and blackmail. The protection of children must trump this concern and it is unacceptable that the loophole remains unclosed. Perhaps those who are embarrassed might prefer to simply modify their behaviour. After all, it is this kind of risky behaviour that makes it attractive to them and yet, at the same time, this is being put ahead of the needs of children, their embarrassment. We also have the reassurance that the UK

Gambling Commission has already put in place similar controls to protect people and so we know it is possible.

The need to safeguard children and young people is something about which we can all unite. We can acknowledge it is still not a silver bullet, but that does not mean that it is not an important part of a package of measures that can be implemented to safeguard them. The Online Safety Bill also looks at issues around pornography on social media and search engines. This is also important and we know that the bishops are on-side to encourage this going through in the House of Lords.

This is also something of concern. I personally know of young people who have been sent unsolicited photographs and how deeply distressing that has been to them. Our children need protecting from these images and from these films. Additionally, as parents, as communities, as churches and schools, we all have a part to play in seeking to support young people in their developing sexuality and as they start to experience romantic relationships.

If we are silent and inactive regarding sex ed and even just talking to our children about relationships, it leaves a void and that can and will be filled by others. Left unsupported and unguided, children are far more at risk from social pressure, exploitation or grooming by others and by systems that seek to abuse their curiosity. By engaging with them, teaching them, modelling to them healthy adult relationships, backed up by social structures like these age appropriate safeguards, including this essential measure of age verification, we can help young people to develop and grow and flourish as they mature.

Friends, we need to maintain pressure on Government to implement these important restrictions, acknowledging that they are part of a package of resources, but so that they can flourish and be blessed in their future relationships. I beg to move the motion that stands in my name.

The Chair: The motion is now open for debate. There are many people that have put in to request to speak, perhaps not surprisingly in view of the nature of the subject, and quite a lot of those are from people who will be making their maiden speeches. I shall be inclined to pay attention to those, not over and above everybody else but at least to give some space to people who want to make maiden speeches this evening. That does mean, of course, that recognition of faces is not so easy because there are people who we have not yet all got to know quite as well as we know some others.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Dr Julie Maxwell (Winchester): Thank you for calling me for my maiden speech. A bit late at night for me, so bear with me. I am a paediatrician and the welfare of children is my absolute priority. I also work for Lovewise, a Christian charity which produces resources on subjects of puberty, growing up, relationships and marriage. One of our most popular school resources which I have used to teach lessons in secondary schools

is entitled "Pornography: Dangers and Decisions". While teaching these lessons over the past 10 years, there has been a noticeable change in the attitudes of young people. Much of this is a result of increased accessibility.

More and more porn is available online and almost all teens and tweens have smartphones in their pockets, many of them without any restrictions on what they can access. Whilst in the context of a lesson, teenagers seem very well able to understand the dangers of pornography and they can articulate the many ways in which it can be damaging, it is increasingly evident that a majority of them are already accessing it or seeing it as normal. In the lessons that I have taught, boys will often attempt to justify why it is actually okay to watch porn. They will not really get addicted, they know it is not reality and yet they are still watching it. But, actually, what I found even more disturbing as a woman is the attitude of many of the girls, and we are talking 13 year olds here. Although they are very aware of how porn objectifies women and frequently involves degrading and violent acts, they seem to have come to a point where it has been so normalised that they accept their boyfriends will be watching it.

As a result of the widespread availability of porn to children and young people, they are growing up in a culture where violent, degrading and harmful sexual activity is being normalised. Both boys and girls are being led to believe that this is what is expected of them. This is actually made worse by some of the relationships and sex education teaching in schools which also normalises porn and some harmful sexual practices. There was a debate in Westminster last month which detailed some of the very extreme relationships and sexual education material that is currently being used in schools. Some resources tackling the issue of porn actually expose children to pornographic material and parents often are not aware of this.

Children are a gift from God and, as adults, we are responsible for their development and for protecting them from harm. Proverbs 22:6 says, "Train up a child in the way he should go. Even when he is old, he will not depart from it". What children are exposed to as they are developing develops them as adults. It is absolutely vital that under-18s, whose brains are still very much developing, are protected from accessing porn by age verification, especially as for many, many young people their first exposure is accidental.

It is also important that teaching in schools enables them to make good decisions about aspects of their lives which will impact on their future wellbeing. They need to be protected from anything which normalises violent, degrading and abusive sexual practices and relationships, whether this is material they are accessing themselves or what is being taught to them in schools. I urge you to support this motion in order to protect children, who are most vulnerable to the harms of pornography.

The Revd Steve Wilcox (York): Chair, sisters and brothers, like many who have spoken to topics that surprised them I never imagined my maiden speech would be in this debate, but perhaps it is appropriate because I too have a story to tell. I went to a boarding school as a teenager. So-called soft pornographic magazines were a form of currency. I saw

my share of images and the effect on me was corroding, devastating and addictive. To this day, I deeply regret those years, but I am also thankful that I did not grow up in the age of the internet and the smartphone - yes, I am that old - in which stronger forms of pornography are freely available to anyone of any age, as we have just heard.

In recent years, I have heard of the long-term damage that such access has done to many young people at such a formative stage of their lives and it makes me weep. When I came to faith at university, I came to realise for the first time that I personally had sinned against God, including in the area of lust, that in his love for me Jesus had died for me personally and that I needed to respond to his love in repentance and faith. I have since learned that repentance and faith is not a one-off event. It is a daily choice, as I choose to reject my variety of sinful tendencies to trust that God's ways are better and to follow Jesus by dying to self, taking up my Cross, following him and finding real life as I do.

I have come to learn and I am still learning that Jesus is the supremely beautiful one who satisfies in a way that nothing else on earth can. No relationship, no experience, no pleasure can satisfy or bring joy in the way Jesus does. I found, wonder of wonders, that I am God's precious deeply-loved child, not because of my past or my present or my future but because of Christ's death and resurrection for me. God looks at me and He sees Christ. All the shame and all the guilt are gone forever.

Why do I share these things? Well, first, in the light of the ongoing conversations around LLF, to observe we are all sexually damaged, every one of us. Jesus calls all of us to follow him to find he is more beautiful, more satisfying than that other thing we find attractive and to find our identity in him alone. Second, because I would wholeheartedly support the motion and I would encourage us to strengthen the theology in the paper. It is not just that children are made in God's image and that we need to care for them, that is true. It is that Jesus calls each of us to repent and believe, to follow him for His glory and our blessing. He calls each of us to gouge out our eye. He tells us that, if we look at another person lustfully, we have already committed adultery with them in our heart. He tells us, and many of us have found, that to drink from anything other than Christ is to drink from dry and cracked cisterns. Jesus warns us if anyone causes one of these little ones, those who believe in me, to stumble, it would be better for them if a large millstone were hung around their neck and they were thrown into the sea. Let us pass this motion and let us do all we can to stop the scourge of pornography in this land.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Guildford (the Rt Revd Andrew Watson): I am the man charged with explaining the governance of the Church of England to St Paul. Chair, thank you very much for calling me and thank you too especially to the Business Committee for squeezing this time-sensitive Diocesan Synod Motion into quite such a tight Agenda. As some of my fellow Bishops know, it is possible for a Diocesan Synod Motion to be passed with the bishops themselves not in complete agreement with it, but such is emphatically not the case with this debate. The impact of hardcore pornography as a whole, and

especially its objectification of women and normalisation of non-consensual sex, both degrades its viewers and those who produce it. It also has alarming connections with exploitation and modern-day slavery and, when accessed quite so freely and easily by children and young people, the harm it can do is incalculable.

I want to pay tribute this evening to the Revd Jo Winn-Smith whose maiden speech at General Synod has been delivered with such poise and assurance. And also to the Revd Charleen Hollington, one of our self-supporting ministers in the diocese, who first added this item to the Agenda of her deanery synod back in October 2021. Charleen would have been here sitting in the public gallery had she not been called to South Africa last week following the unexpected death of her mother. She has been campaigning on this issue for more than a decade, writing to MPs and seeking to bring it to the public's attention and it is often been an uphill battle despite the almost self-evident justness of her cause.

That has partly been due to practical concerns about just how age verification might be introduced and whether, as Jo has already raised and answered, it could aid hackers and potential blackmailers. But it has also reflected the fact that pornography as a whole is an issue we find very difficult to talk about, especially in Church circles, both because of and despite the cycle of addiction and chain in which a considerable number of our fellow believers, both young and old, and statistically a significant number within this Synod are currently caught up. How important that we talk into that silence among others to our children, yes, but also among others, not in some kind of self-righteous moralising way but in response to an industry whose bright side is pretty dark and whose shadow side is very dark indeed.

The main thing I would like to bring to this debate though is a personal commitment to seek to advance this cause in Parliament along with my fellow Bishops now that I am beginning to find my way around the House of Lords. As the paper makes clear, the argument here is far from won and a clause which currently sits within the Online Safety Bill could all too easily be amended out of it. Should we gain the overwhelming, hopefully unanimous support of this Synod, that eventuality would be reduced for those of us engaged at a Parliamentary level. One person's passion, a Deanery Synod Motion leading to a Diocesan Synod Motion leading to a General Synod Motion, leading to a tightening of the law, leading to considerably greater protection for our children and young people, leading to better sex and a happier society. Just think of that. It might even result in deanery synod elections being as tightly fought as the race to become the next leader of the Conservative Party.

The Revd Fiona Jack (London): Thank you very much for this opportunity to make a maiden speech, Madam Chair. In my other life, I run a qualitative market research business doing focus groups and in-depth interviews on a whole variety of topics for commercial companies. Two months ago, I was asked by, shall we say, a large well-known search engine and video platform company to conduct some research on precisely this topic, age verification amongst children online. I did some in-depth interviews with

children aged between 10 and 17, some young adults as well, to find out what they had done before they were 18 and so on.

Those of us who are parents may or may not be surprised to know that almost every child admitted to me that they had lied about their age or faked their age online and they were quite pleased to tell me how easy it was to do it. Several children said, "Well, actually for this one I have to my mum's email details, but I know what her email address is and I know her password so I can just pretend to be her". This is just to really highlight that age verification is very, very important but it is not easy to do in practice.

We have to be careful I think what we wish for and think very carefully about how we do this. It is not just pornography that is a danger. As we have touched on, there are violent videos, things like *Grand Theft Auto*. I had a 10 year old telling me that his 14 year old brother allowed him access to play that. It is a game which is 18, it is extremely violent and very unsuitable for a younger child. I really do support this motion. What I do think though is we need to be careful what we wish for. We need to work out how age verification can be done.

One of the things we actually did as part of this piece of research was we looked at different methods, but when I tell you about some of them they are very, very intrusive. For example, we explored tracking the other websites that people have visited to check their age. We also talked about biometric data - basically, you can tell people's age from their facial features and the way they look, their appearance and so on. I find these to be personally very intrusive. I wholeheartedly support this motion but I think more thought is needed about the extent of it. It is not just pornography, it is violence. Horror as well, that was also mentioned. We need to think very thoroughly and carefully about how age verification is done.

Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark): As the mother of three sons still at school, this is a topic I am increasingly aware has very real consequences for them and the conversations that I have with them. While I very much agree about the harms of online pornography and I welcome the requirement for more social and educational programmes to increase awareness, I have some serious concerns about section (b) of this motion, the emphasis on a legislative solution and specifically the proposal for age verification systems.

Synod, while this is a laudable aim in theory, this particular part of the motion, as with the Government's Online Safety Bill itself, will sadly not have the desired effect and may even cause more problems than it solves, providing little or no protection. This is Government legislation written by those who have no understanding of the way in which the internet actually works in practice. Perhaps given MPs' inability to Google tractors without coming across porn by mistake, this is less surprising than it might appear.

The UK is not China and we do not have a firewall in the middle of the English Channel. When you want to look at a website, it does not matter if the server is located in Cambridge or Cambodia, it is simply not possible to legislate for those websites not hosted in the UK,

which is the majority of them. The very nature of the internet means such legislation would require you to enter age verification to view the online version of Page 3 of *The Sun* but, sadly, would be simply ignored and likely unenforceable for the majority of hardcore material available on Pornhub or other similar international sites. This might well be actively harmful as parents who are tech aware or just avoidant will be lulled into a false sense of security believing that age verification has solved it and not realising this is merely a legislative fig leaf.

Synod, instead of just encouraging legislation which is sadly flawed, we need to focus our efforts on education both of our teenagers and young people but also of our parents, teachers, church leaders and youth ministers. We cannot turn back the tide of an open internet and we should not pretend that we can. I would love us to go far, far further than section (c) of this motion and not devolve responsibility by merely recommending more social and educational programmes, but each of us consider how as church leaders, youth workers, parents, lay workers, Synod members, we might teach and maybe even preach on this subject about what is out there online, about how to browse and behave safely and appropriately online and, above all, to be open, honest and realistic when the time is right about what real and fulfilling sex might actually be like.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Thank you so much to Guildford Diocese for bringing this really important debate. I spent the best part of four years as a member of the House of Lords Select Committee on Communications, where most of the work we did during that time was looking into the matter of how you could regulate the internet and make it a safe place for children and young people. As the Bishop of Guildford mentioned, the Lords Spiritual continue to take a great interest in this issue in the House of Lords, particularly in the Online Safety Bill.

Contrary to the last couple of speakers, I spent Tuesday afternoon after Tuesday afternoon speaking to people in the industry often asking them, “So, what could be done?” You know what, the very clever people who make those clever algorithms that are so good at selling us stuff say we could do something. Of course, we cannot live in an entirely safe world, but we can actually bring in age verification which will make the internet a lot safer than it is.

The fundamental point I wanted to make was more of a philosophical and ethical one about how we inhabit the internet full stop. People like Facebook and Twitter and other internet providers like to call themselves “platforms”. I think we really need to challenge this philosophically. The thing about a platform is it is something that you stand on and you, the platform, have no responsibility for what goes on. The fundamental corner we need to turn is to see that the internet is not a platform; it is a public space. Therefore, all the rights and norms of public behaviour that we expect in a public space should apply in the internet. It is not actually about protecting children from the internet. It is about making the internet safe by design. This could be done, but I think we need regulation to make it happen, and we need a code of practice and a code of conduct. That is what Bishops in the House of Lords are campaigning for, alongside others.

In the 1970s, we quite famously put fluoride in the water supply. The reason we did that was because we knew it would be great for dental health. Sisters and brothers, what we, the Church, need to be in the forefront of campaigning about is putting some fluoride in the internet to make it a safe place for everyone, and especially for our children and our young people.

Mrs Abigail Ogier (Manchester): Until a call to chaplaincy took my life in a different direction four years ago, I spent most of my career working for the excellent children's charity Barnardo's. The last five of my 16 years with them were spent as a regional lead for domestic abuse work, and in that role I worked as part of a cluster of managers managing specialist trauma services. In those services we really saw close up the impact of pornography on children and young people. We saw it in my own service when they started dating and reflected the unhealthy attitudes to sex and consent, or lack of consent, that they had seen online. We saw it in our child sexual abuse and child sexual exploitation services, where children were highly traumatised after being forced or coerced into watching pornography by adults.

The thing that I found most disturbing personally was how my colleague in the service for children exhibiting harmful sexualised behaviour spoke of the changes they were seeing in their client group. Historically, this had been made up largely of children who had themselves been sexually abused and had gone on to replicate that abuse towards their peers. However, they were starting to see a new category of children, children who appeared to have been exposed to a very happy and secure and safe childhood, but their behaviour changed after they started accessing extreme porn online.

Fiona, Jo and Rebecca have all pointed out that age verification on its own is not a silver bullet, although I tend to agree with Archbishop Stephen that there is more to be done than some like to think.

However, it is not the sole solution, and so I would particularly like to support the third clause of this motion, looking for education. I particularly want to think about what that might look like. Of course, in an ideal world, information about sex and relationships would be delivered by sensitive, well informed and open parents, but not all parents are like that. We need to ensure that all children have access to good clear information. It must not just be about sex and pornography. It must also cover consent and relationships and respect. It must be suitable to the needs of all young people, and that includes LGBTQI+ young people. It must be delivered in places that can be safe spaces for all young people, not just in the classroom but in a whole range of small groups.

To sum up, I urge you all to support this motion and particularly to give attention to the third point on how we can support our schools, our youth workers, and even our churches, to deliver that information and education.

The Chair: After Mike Tufnell, I will turn to one of our Ecumenical Representatives and invite the Revd Fr Stephen Maxfield to speak to us. The speech limit is still three minutes.

The Revd Mike Tufnell (Salisbury): Earlier this evening Holly Adams said she hoped to give her maiden speech on a sexier topic. I wish the opposite. Like Steve Wilcox, I am grateful that porn was not as accessible to me when I was a teenager. Here but for the grace of God go I.

I speak also this evening as a deeply concerned father, worried at what children can so easily access online today via phones, computer games, social media, YouTube, even Disney+ at times. For that matter, I am also deeply concerned about what they might be taught in schools as part of RSE lessons. I will come back to that later.

I speak also as a vicar to a church with significant numbers of young people who are or will be affected by this. I speak as a pastor who has seen marriages break down as a direct result of addictions to pornography that began as teenagers. Let us make no bones about this. These porn sites are among the most insidious drug dealers to the youth of our nation.

I would like to draw Synod's attention, too, to a member of my youngest brother's congregation, Miriam Cates MP for Penistone and Stockbridge in Sheffield, who recently gave an outstanding speech to the backbench Business Select Committee revealing the wild west state of some of our so-called RSE providers contracted by schools, leaving children as young as 10 to be exposed to radically age-inappropriate pornographic materials.

I am hugely grateful to those who brought this motion to Synod today, and to charities like Youthscape, Care for the Family, and we heard about Lovewise, which provide material to help in this area, to bring people to healing and freedom in Jesus.

Despite all the bad news, I am a glass half full person. I have only been on Synod for a few months so why would not I be? I always try to look, like the Archbishop of York, to prophetic and positive steps that we could take, and I would like to suggest a couple of crazy ideas as I finish.

One, imagine the day when a young person, or anyone for that matter, searches for sex or porn on Google and finds top of the list a paid-for link to a Christian (perhaps even Church of England) sponsored website that can help them find non-judgmental good Samaritan help to get free of addiction and learn of the beautiful vision the Christian faith has for love, sex and marriage. Two, why can we not become the preferred provider for RSE teaching in our schools, if nowhere else at least in our Church of England schools?

I support this motion with all my heart, although I hope it is only the start of the journey. If we want to reach our young people with the grace and truth of our faith, let us meet them where they are at, even if it is online, even if it is searching for porn.

Fr Stephen Maxfield (Ecumenical Representatives): I want to start with a slight explanation. In the Greek Orthodox Church confession is practised quite widely, not by everybody but by many. Only certain priests are allowed to hear confessions. They are ordained with the laying on of hands and then they may hear confessions. I am one of those, and I was ordained to do this, to become a *pneumatikos*, 32 or 33 years ago.

As a result, I hear confessions not only from my own community but from all over the place, where people come to repent of their sins. Thirty years ago I very seldom had a confession that was about pornography. This does not only affect men. It also affects women. There are women who look at pornography. Now it is not every confession, but it is most, and I hear many hundreds of confessions every year. This is a disaster. It is a disaster not just for children. It is a disaster for middle-aged people, even old-aged people. The men are filled with shame and self-disgust. They may be impotent as a result. The women or the partners that they are with are ashamed that they have been so unsuccessful as a lover. This is a terrible thing. It is a catastrophe for all of us. I would implore you to do everything you can to fight this devil in our midst.

The Chair: I shall be minded to test the mind of Synod for closure after the next two speakers.

Mrs Ruth Allan (Guildford): I would like to thank Jo for presenting this motion so clearly and also for representing our diocese. You will hear from an oldie and a newbie tonight.

In the excellent fringe meeting that some of us attended it was reiterated that pornography, as we have just heard, is a pandemic. We heard that it can start with just an innocent curiosity when a 12-year-old school boy was invited by his friend to view pornography images on his phone simply “just for fun”, and yet a dark trajectory began, becoming a gripping addiction.

Sadly, pornography has an impact on young girls and young women, too. This impact is deeply destructive and very sad. I have had the opportunity to listen to some young girls and young women where their boyfriend or partner has engaged in pornography. There is a trajectory, too, for young girls and young women. First, there is shock, a huge shock, that the person they like or love is engaging in pornography. Their discovery is shattering, even though they may know that everybody is doing it. The shock then leads to confusion, uncertainty and wavering commitment. After all, if everybody is doing it, should I accept this in my relationship? Then follows depression and anxiety, often leading to a need to seek professional counsel. A recent study conducted in the University of Exeter by a postgraduate just recently highlighted the most damaging consequence on young women. They lose their self-worth, their self-esteem, value and they struggle with their personal identity.

I call upon this Synod to support this motion. I am a retired dentist and I have seen the fantastic impact of fluoride in the water, so we can do this. Like Julie, Abigail and others I plead that we educate our children, we teach them from the pulpit, in our churches, in our youth groups and also around the table in our homes.

The Revd Fraser Oates (Worcester): Thank you for calling me, Chair, for my maiden speech. As a millennial, I am part of the generation of people who had this brief window of life without the internet, where football in the park was preferable to TikTok. We are a generation as well that became rapidly immersed in the digital world as it exploded into life. As has been said, the internet is both a wonderful gift but simultaneously a horrific and dangerous place to be.

My school friends and I were only 10 years old before we encountered this emerging world of online porn. Looking back now, as I think has been mentioned already, 10 is an incredibly young age. It is this unrestricted and often unmonitored exposure to such licentiousness at such a young and formative age in life which is deeply damaging.

The repercussions for people in my age bracket linger. I continue today to journey pastorally with people who are still psychologically and spiritually imprisoned by this. I agree that those younger than me are today saturated in the digital world and these issues have by no means gone away. Rather, they have become enormously exaggerated. Of course we have visions for the metaverse. These things show there is no desire to slow down our technological online ambitions. Unless we intervene now, advances in technology will only lead to more widespread exposure to deeply harmful and obscene material for future generations.

As this motion outlines, these issues have catalysed our hyper-sexualised culture and are having huge repercussions on how people see themselves, how they see other people, and how they see their relationships. It is one thing for me testifying to the realities of harm inflicted upon my generation, but what terrifies me more is having two children under 10 who will soon undoubtedly be exposed to this evil too. We need to act now to break this cycle and contend for change.

Saying this, and despite the issues raised by this motion, I have also discerned in the past few years an increasing level of positive support for porn and online sex work under the headlines of personal choice and female empowerment, justified by a prevalent amoral belief system around sexual behaviour. Our young people and children, like in many other areas of life, are pulled in so many different directions as to what is right and healthy and good for themselves, and wider society.

I wholeheartedly support this motion, but I also think that we could consider this more fully, more theologically so that such petitions from the Church of Jesus Christ find themselves shaped by a framework of Christian teaching and ethics contending for love and purity and holiness.

The Chair: I call upon the next speaker and then I really do think that I have to consider putting to Synod the proposal for closure.

the Ven. James Ridge (ex officio): Thank you, Chair, for calling me for what is also my maiden speech. Members of Synod, this is where it begins. Few of those who do not have any contact with our prison system are aware of the sheer number of people convicted of sexual offences currently held within our prisons. As well as my responsibilities across England and Wales, I have a regional responsibility for prisons in the east of England, where we have the largest prison for people convicted of sexual offences in the whole of Europe, around 1,400 people. There are numerous others across England and Wales, as well as those being held in normal location in the rest of our prisons, generally keeping very quiet about the nature of their offences.

You might imagine a group of elderly men such as those convicted by Operation Yewtree, the investigation which followed in the wake of the discovery of Jimmy Saville, and there are certainly those, but there are also a lot of young men in their late teens and early 20s and their story, by and large, is depressingly similar and it is this: "I started watching legal pornography and then graduated onto the illegal stuff".

Time and again, people fall victim to this slippery slope, and it is those who start watching when they are 12 or 13, or even younger, who by the time they are 16 or 17 are watching illegal pornography, and by time they are 20 are serving prison sentences. Those in prison are just the tip of the iceberg. There are many more who do not make it as far as prison. I have watched in horror and great distress as the teenage daughters of friends who I love dearly suffered the effects of having been raped by their boyfriends. It cannot be proven. It will never come to court, but it happened, and the story is the same: "We watched it on the screen; we can take what we want when we want. We want to do it."

Members of Synod, this motion is by no means the whole answer but it is a start. If it can save one young man from the slippery slope which leads to prison, one young girl from the horror of rape and sexual assault, then it is worth doing, and I urge you to support it.

The Chair: As I indicated, and conscious of the clock at the end of what is a very long day, I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 32 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 32.

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

The Chair: I call upon Jo Winn-Smith to respond to the debate. You have five minutes.

The Revd Jo Winn-Smith (Guildford): Thank you to all of you who have contributed so powerfully to this discussion and debate. Thank you to Julie Maxwell for her work with children and schools and her concerns there. To Steve Wilcox for his honesty and his witness to the freedom he has discovered in Christ. Thank you to Bishop Andrew for

giving us not just the background but your commitment with other bishops to take this forward and deal with it properly. Thank you to Fiona Jack for your concerns about how young people can circumvent controls, and that this is not straightforward, and there needs to be more research and work to ensure that it is not just seen as a single way of addressing the issue. Also to Rebecca Chapman, I recognise that the legal background of companies involved in this is often difficult to pin down, but that is not a reason not to make sure the loopholes we can close are closed.

I also thank the Archbishop of York very much for his insights into the algorithms that can be both unhelpful but also have potential to do great good. I hope we all pray that can be developed and enabled. Thank you for your image of fluoride in the water. I think we will all remember that one from this Synod. Thank you to Abigail Ogier for her work with Barnardo's and her insight, too, that this situation is getting worse. To Mike Tufnell, your insight around its similarity to being addicted to drugs, and your concerns about unregulated school sex ed, and view that the Church has the potential to make a difference here.

Fr Stephen, thank you for your insights, too, on the impact on porn on confessions, and the fact that so many are impacted about by this. The Church is not immune and it is a spiritual, physiological, physiological and relational issue which needs to be addressed, a grave harm, the devil in our midst. Thank you to Ruth Allan for your contribution regarding the impact on partners and for reassuring us that fluoride does work. Finally, to Fraser Oates for your concerns not just for your generation but for your children. I feel that very strongly too having a 14-year-old and a 10 year old.

Lastly to our Chaplain General, James Ridge, you have shown us where this can end up and yet you revealed to us that it is just the tip of the iceberg, and this is so important that we need to play our part.

This is not a silver bullet, friends, but it does not mean that it must not be done. Let us play our part in helping the future generations to grow up knowing about truly loving and caring relationships and that what they find on the internet, or in any other places, is not necessarily to be trusted, and let us protect them so they may grow and flourish. Synod, I beg you to vote for this motion.

The Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester): Chair, it is our practice not to applaud after a vote, but I wonder if you would allow us, and indeed invite us to stand after the vote for two minutes of silent prayer for our children, young people and indeed for the adults in our country.

The Chair: Yes. As has been pointed out to me, that is not actually a point of order, but I think I would be happy for us to remain silently in our places, or to stand if you prefer, in order to think about and hold before God the anxieties that we have and the trauma that other people live with, maybe some people in this chamber also themselves. We have had all kinds of experiences which we wish to hold up with them, and so we will do that

in silence after the vote. But at this point we need to deal with the voting. The Zoom people cannot hear what is going on if it is not on the microphone, I am afraid. It is one of those added complications of having a hybrid meeting.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): With my voice, Madam Chair, they can hear me back in Coventry without a microphone. Madam Chair, with your indulgence, on such an important issue for the nation, could we show the support that we show to the nation by having a counted vote, recorded vote, or whatever it is called?

The Chair: Yes. I presume you mean, and I do not wish to impute thoughts to anybody, a counted vote of the whole Synod?

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Indeed.

The Chair: Then I am happy to exercise the Chair's discretion in accepting that.

The motion was put and carried, 263 voting in favour, 2 against, with 3 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: The motion is very clearly carried. We did, I think, agree or I suggested that we should have two minutes of silent standing, or sitting quietly and praying, as you wish, and then we have Compline, which is a very good follow on.

The Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the Synod) led the Synod in an act of worship.

Full Synod: Fifth Day Tuesday 12 July 2022

OPENING WORSHIP

The Revd Andrew Hammond (Chaplain to the Synod) led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Dover (the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin)* took the Chair at 9.20 am.

ITEM 33 LOYAL ADDRESS

The Chair: We come now to Item 33. Members will need Notice Paper VII for this item, the Loyal Address. I call on the Archbishop of Canterbury to speak to Item 33. You have up to 10 minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I know that in what I am going to say today that I speak not on behalf of myself alone, but in general on behalf of Paddington Bear, who condescended to send me his thoughts - I will resist the urge to say what came to my mind - on the current situation.

The Queen was last here in the Synod, not in York but in London in 2015, for the opening of the Synod in that year. It was an extraordinary occasion. She spoke superbly on the basis of a speech that had been given to her, but which she adapted freely, and for those who remember, as always with her, with exquisite comic timing. She ended the speech and the mood of the Synod was seen in everyone getting to their feet and calling out, "God Save the Queen! Long live the Queen!"

As we went out and down the corridor she said, "Archbishop, I think I have lived long enough, don't you?" With the vision of Traitors' Gate before me, I said, "Ma'am, there is no answer to that question, apart from something that is either on the one hand treasonous encompassing the death of the monarch, contrary to section 1 of the Treason Act, or, alternatively, which simply sounds obsequious".

But that in many ways sums up why I am sure that our Loyal Address today is something that will be so sincerely and deeply felt. It is because in Her Majesty we have found someone who carries lightly her own importance, with a genuine humility, while knowing fully what her role is in Church and State.

Until the last opening of Synod, during a brief break in the Covid pandemic, she had opened the Synod herself in person on every occasion, since it started in 1970. Many of you will remember that. On each occasion she has left us with a memory and a thought of someone whose personal Christian faith is undoubted, and whose conviction as to the role and place of the Church of England in the realm is beyond question.

In 2012, at her Diamond Jubilee, she came to Lambeth Palace and gave a speech in which she reminded the Church of England of its development over the course of her extraordinary reign. I am sure Stephen has experienced this, when we are consecrating Bishops and the mandate is read out, and whoever is reading the mandate, presumably Louise Connacher in the Northern Province and Darren in the Southern, when they get to the end, "Given under our Hand on this, whatever day it is of this year, and in the Seventy-First Year of our Reign", there is a collective intake of breath across the country.

That was only the 60th year of her reign, and she reminded those there that the Church of England is, essentially, the Church for England; for every single person in England. She reminded us that we are there to defend the right of faith to be the people of Christ and yet generous in our hospitality. She showed in her speaking that profound sense of the hospitality of God, or the Triune God, and I deliberately refer indirectly to the icon.

And yet at the same time, and there is no contrast between these, she has been rightly described as England's greatest evangelist. Her Christmas messages are absolutely

what one might call, to coin a phrase, Christ centred - maybe that is where the Archbishop of York got the idea from - and Jesus focused.

When we meet, the conversation is not just about the functionality of the Church but the faithfulness of God. She is a servant of Jesus Christ first. At her Coronation, all those years ago, she came up the aisle of Westminster Abbey straight past the throne and knelt at the High Altar for silent prayer. That is a reminder that in our constitution the monarch gives their allegiance to God before anyone gives their allegiance to the monarch. We are a nation under God.

That is not interpreted triumphalistically by Her Majesty. It is interpreted generously by Her Majesty: hospitably, openly, gladly.

Over 70 years, she has adapted in ways that are extraordinary to an entirely different world. At her Coronation, which lasted over four hours, there were all the hereditary Peers from the House of Lords, no life Peers. She has adapted to the changes in culture. She has gone on journeying with God through all these years, in faithfulness, in loyalty, in devotion and in trust.

When her dearly loved husband of 73 years died, and I remember sitting in St George's Chapel, my seat pointing so that I could see her, she sat in perfect stillness, perfectly alone, her duty meaning that no one sat with her. That is her service, her humility, her respect for all that is good and beautiful and holy. She cared for others at that service more than for herself.

Perhaps apart from her father, the openness of faith, the dedication of life, the gift of service, the understanding of what it is to be Christ centred and what it is to live that out to all in the land and all around the world is why, when the Duke of Edinburgh died, the WhatsApp for the Primates of the Anglican Communion was instantly filled with messages of condolence around the world, heartfelt signs of sorrow; out of love for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Head of the Commonwealth. Because she is not only our ruler, the one to whom all bishops swear allegiance, she is also an eminent, perhaps the pre-eminent world leader in terms of moral influence. It is an influence which comes not just from her position in the realm, not even from her long service, but from the Christ-centred character to which we now send a Loyal Address, and which I now move.

The Chair. This item is now open for contributions. There will be an initial speech limit of five minutes. I call on Alison Coulter, Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): What an immense privilege to be able to add my thanks and express my admiration for Her Majesty the Queen, on this occasion of her Platinum Jubilee. There have rightly been many national and international tributes in the past months speaking of Her Majesty's exemplary leadership, her faithfulness to her vow of commitment throughout her life, and her selflessness and service, not only to our nation but to the whole world.

As Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, it is an inspiration and encouragement to me that the Head of the Church of England is a lay woman. I want to take this opportunity particularly to speak about her example to us as she lives out her Christian faith every day in her life and work. How she lives out her faith is both an encouragement and a challenge to me. I want to reflect on some of the things that I notice and celebrate and want to learn from.

As Archbishop Justin has already explained, Her Majesty takes the opportunity in her Christmas addresses to the nation to speak of her own personal faith and hope in Jesus Christ. She does this by sharing in a natural and straightforward way what her faith means for her in the context of her family and work. But she does not just talk about her faith; she demonstrates this faith clearly in her life of exceptional Christian service. Even at the age of 96 she is working hard for the benefit of others, and is committed to and concerned for all of us, her subjects, rather than herself. She has particular concern for those who suffer, or who are in need, and is generous and hospitable to all: those who share her faith, those of other faiths and those of no faith.

Her Majesty is celebrated as arguably the greatest leader in the world today and yet, as already been said, she is humble. As well as taking her responsibilities very seriously, she manages to maintain her sense of humour and not take herself too seriously. I loved the films with Paddington Bear and James Bond. I love the story too I have heard about some tourists in Scotland who met a lady with a headscarf walking her dogs. She said hello and then stopped for a brief chat, admiring the beautiful countryside and the nearby castle of Balmoral. The tourist then asked if she had ever met the Queen and the lady said no, she had never met the Queen, but pointing to her bodyguard nearby, said, "But he has".

She demonstrates how a life built on the rock of faith can give strength and hope even in the darkest times. Her dignity at the funeral of the Duke of Edinburgh spoke powerfully of her belief in the Christian hope of eternal life. She resources this faith by a lifelong habit of public worship and private prayer, everyday practices of faith and formation which have shaped her to be able to live out her Christian beliefs, and to be a living witness to the good news of Jesus Christ, even with the many pressures of being a monarch. God has indeed answered our prayers to save our gracious Queen and live long our noble Queen.

I give thanks today to God for Her Majesty's remarkable Christian life and I give heartfelt thanks to Her Majesty for her example to each of us of a deep Christian faith lived out in worship to God and in service to others. Synod, God save the Queen.

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): In speaking now to support the sending of the Loyal Address to Her Majesty the Queen on her Platinum Jubilee, I speak with the support of the Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of York.

Monarchy gives us a rule which is above the fray, given to us and not dependent on the

ability of the monarch to win an election, maintain popularity or sustain the approbation of others. Intrinsic to this is the fact that the loyalty of the subject is to something higher than to the individual, and for that reason is offered to both good and bad rulers. At least incumbent clergy have an infinity with this, for us as well. Our orders are of a character conferred at ordination rather than something hereditary, although for some of us who are the children of clergy there is a slight hereditary tinge to our life in the Church of England. For us as well the unworthiness of the minister hindereth not the Sacrament. In Her Majesty the Queen, we have the happy coincidence of a minister of sovereignty who publicly and faithfully stands by a commitment of service which we honour in her.

Our positive response to her springs from our recognition of the great Christian paradox that it is in the giving away of the self to others that we receive ourselves back, and our own personality forms and grows. Not like the personality cult of the dictator whose self-proclamation serves only to emphasise human vanity, but that self-emptying which is most perfectly seen in our Lord Jesus Christ and best done, as Her Majesty the Queen does, in explicit imitation of Him; that self-emptying which raises others and contributes to His Kingdom in the very act of sustaining our own. This again is the model, at our best, for the clergy in our attempts to serve our Lord, as it is indeed for all the baptized called to serve, or to lead, or to be, in any field.

In stepping forward, we will find ourselves most perfectly fulfilled when most focused on Christ. We are privileged in our time to see this being, under grace, attempted very much in public, very obviously and very prominently, in the service of Her Majesty the Queen, to her people, and to her Lord. The clergy of England are blessed in so many ways and this blessing is perhaps greatest among that we in our day are Elizabethans.

Mr Benjamin John (St Albans): You might be surprised to hear that I was not here in 1970 for her first address to the Synod, but I absolutely loved the Jubilee celebrations this year. I would not have normally considered myself particularly patriotic, but the joy of the community coming together to celebrate our Queen was something quite special for me, and something I had not seen much before, perhaps not for 10 years, although it was not something I celebrated then. The opportunity to go to street parties and celebrate our Queen, to get to know our communities, I felt like we could do with more street parties.

Our Queen, as we have heard, loves God and serves Him above all else. In Deuteronomy 17 is that not what we see regarding the laws concerning Israel's monarchs: someone who does not accrue horses or spouses; someone who is a humble, who serves God, who loves God's word.

At her Coronation the Queen was given a Bible and told these are the lively oracles of God. Here is wisdom, the most valuable thing that this world affords. We have been so blessed to have a Queen who serves God, that we are a nation under God, as our Archbishop said. We live in a time when the nations rage. We read about this in Psalm 2: "Why do the nations rage and the peoples plot in vain? The kings of the earth set

themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his Anointed ...” We see that in the world today; a world tearing itself apart.

It is something we have taken for granted, is it not, having a monarch who loves and serves God, who is (Psalm 2:10) wise: “Now therefore, O kings, be wise; be warned, O rulers of the earth Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling”. For we have a Queen who has served the Lord with fear, and who has rejoiced with trembling. “Blessed are all who take refuge in Him.” May we listen to our Queen, our servant Queen, and the King she serves, find peace in Him and may His Gospel go forth. Long live the Queen.

The Chair. The gentleman with the very generous beard and another gentleman there.

The Revd Tim Edwards (Rochester): I do hope to be as generous. Thank you for calling me for my maiden speech.

The Archbishop rightly referred to Her Majesty as our nation’s great evangelist. I am sure that I am not the only member of the clergy who on the Sunday after the Jubilee celebrations gave my pulpit over to her, as almost the entirety of my sermon was devoted to quotations from her, from her Christmas addresses and other occasions. I was especially struck by how frequently she has herself quoted Mark’s Gospel, chapter 10:45, “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many”.

I am struck by her example and how we can follow that and, by following that, live simpler, humbler and bolder. Bolder in the true profession of the Gospel; humbler in submitting to our King, the Lord Jesus; and simpler in simple trust of Him. God save the Queen.

The Revd Robert Thompson (London): Many of us will have been aware that there was a particular member of our Synod who wished to bring a debate about flags to this Synod, which reminded me of Fr Conrad Noel, a well-known Anglo-Catholic socialist of his generation, who also put flags into his church while he was the vicar of Thaxted in Essex. He put the Red Flag and also the flag of Sinn Fein. Eventually, the case went to a consistory court and of course he had to remove them.

I speak also as a socialist and as a republican, a convinced republican, and as an Irishman who holds an Irish passport. While I take my oath of loyalty to the Queen, as all of us are called to do as those ordained into this Church, I think in some of the speeches we have had there is a confusion between loyalty to the Crown and loyalty to a particular person and also loyalty to Christ.

I thank Justin Welby and Alison Coulter for all that they said about the Queen, and none of that I could contradict, but monarchy is not itself a given in scriptural traditions and, indeed, if we look at the first and second books of Samuel, we have a very interesting critique of monarchy. The monarchy we have of course is also the monarchy that was part of the colonialist and imperialist past, from which many in our own societies still suffer.

The reality of being faithful to Christ is about making sure that we are faithful to Christ's reign, which is a coming jubilee for all people. So whilst particular things have been said about Her Majesty's character, there are other things which could easily be said about the Crown. That wealth of the Crown and the wealth that the Crown holds is deeply contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, and to the concepts of jubilee and sabbath in the Scriptures.

We also see that in particular ways in which particular members of the Royal Family act without critique from those who are in power within our own Church: the heir to the throne receiving money in plastic bags from other monarchs; issues around the sexual impropriety of other members of the Royal Family and ways in which young women are exploited for sex.

I do accept this Loyal Address, but I also wish it to be noted that many in this chamber are of similar sympathies to myself. They may not be republican in the same way that I am republican and wish for a republic, but there are those in this chamber who would wish that those in authority in the Church could be more critical of actions of the monarchy which are contrary to Christ's reign.

The Chair: I see two people standing, and I think these are probably my last two calls.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Dr Simon Eyre (Chichester): One of the events of this year that has probably spoken most to my heart was the memorial service to Prince Philip. As the Queen walked in with Prince Andrew, it drew much and variable response, but for me that was very, very poignant. For me that spoke of three things. It spoke of forgiveness, it spoke of grace, and it spoke of restoration. Those are three things that this country needs so much. For me that was just a very, very practical way, some would say an erroneous way, to attempt to demonstrate that, and I am so grateful for that demonstration.

I want to say publicly how grateful I am to have lived all my life through her reign. She has been an amazing example to us all through that time, and I am grateful. Thank you, Your Majesty.

The Bishop of Dudley (the Rt Revd Martin Gorick): Many years ago I was Chaplain to the then Bishop of Oxford Richard Harries, and one day we went off to Milton Keynes, which is in Oxford Diocese, to dedicate the new Church of Christ the Cornerstone, the Cathedral as it was almost called, in the centre of Milton Keynes. Milton Keynes is a very ecumenical new town and Her Majesty the Queen came for that occasion.

As you often are as a chaplain, I was very well placed to see what is going on. The Queen was there. In front of her about 10 feet away were the then Archbishop of Canterbury,

the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the head of the Free Churches and so on and so on; every key ecumenical leader was there, and very proud to be so.

Finally, we came to sing “God Save the Queen”. They proudly stood to attention, singing right in front of Her Majesty, until it came to the second verse. They realised they had, of course, put their order of service behind them. Her face never cracked, although there was a slight twitch. They kind of thought they could remember the words and were roughly mouthing along with the rest of the congregation, and more or less got away with it - until the third verse struck up. Can you imagine yourself in that position?

There was a definite twitching from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and then he thought, “No, she is my Supreme Governor, I cannot do this. I have just got to stand and open and close my mouth.” Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster did make a grab for his order of service, but there was a stern look from Her Majesty, and he turned back. The head of the Free Churches of the United Kingdom just basically stood open mouthed. It was a moment of deep humility for all. It was probably the closest we have ever got in the United Kingdom to full ecumenical visible unity. God save the Queen.

The Chair: I no one else standing. I call on the Archbishop to reply. You have up to five minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I was tempted to suggest we all stand and sing three verses of “God Save the Queen”, but, as I cannot find the lyrics, I think we will skip that.

Thank you for those comments and thank you to Robert Thompson on the importance of hearing from a different view, and from an Irish view. My chief-of-staff David Porter is of course the holder of an Irish passport and would not be ashamed to say he is a republican, though he says he has put that in abeyance for the time being.

On one of my trips to Ireland, I had the privilege of meeting senior members of the Irish Government and members of Sinn Fein, who had been involved in the Troubles, at different meetings as it happens, and both of them spoke of the extraordinary impact of the Queen’s visit to Ireland a few years back for the 100th anniversary of the Easter Uprising, in which everything she did they spoke of with awe and gratitude.

One of her greatest gifts is that of reconciliation. She wore the right colour, Irish green, consciously. She spoke Irish at the beginning of her speech at the state dinner, which led Mary McAleese to turn to the person next to her, who happened to be one of the people I was with, and just go, “Wow”. It was a gift of extraordinary profundity, given that her own family had lost lives in the troubles. And from it came not anger nor even mere correct politeness but profound reconciliation.

We have the benefit not just of an extraordinary person but the benefit of someone who would genuinely defend to the death the right of people in this chamber and the others

who are republicans, to speak in such a way. There are so many countries where that is not the case. We know that should this country ever change its mind about a monarchy, which I hope it does not I have to say, but should it ever, that there would be no clinging to office, but a generous acceptance of the democratic will. We cannot say that even about known places of democracy in our world.

Let us, with thanks to God, vote for this Address, not because we are monarchist or republican, but because in Her Majesty we see the grace of God poured out on this country. I beg to move.

The Chair: We now come to vote and we will vote with a show of hands.

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

The Chair: Thank you very much, this item is now closed, we move to the next item.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 10.00 am.

60th REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDER COMMITTEE (GS 2249) PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SEE OF CANTERBURY CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2260) (RESUMED)

The Chair: Synod, we now return to the proposed changes to the Standing Orders relating to the membership of the See of Canterbury Crown Nominations Commission. Members should refer to the Second Notice Paper, as revised, for the text of Items 51 to 56. These motions for the amendment of the Standing Orders give effect to the decisions the Synod took on Saturday about the composition of the Crown Nominations Commission for the See of Canterbury and the suffragan See of Dover.

As no member has given notice of any amendment, or of a wish to speak against a specific item, I give my permission for motions 51 to 56 to be moved en bloc. I suspect that might be a relief to everyone. I call Dr Jamie Harrison to move Items 51 to 56. He has up to ten minutes.

ITEMS 51 - 56

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Welcome back to Groundhog Day. We are back in Canterbury CNC. I hope you have appreciated the way that this process has been conducted, in other words, having a really good, open and helpful debate on Saturday, to deal with the principles, so that we come today to look at the outworking of those principles in the Standing Orders. You will have seen the 60th Report of the Standing Orders Committee GS 2276 which pretty much covers, verbatim, in the same words as

we are going to be using all but the issues raised by the two successful amendments. So, if you want to see the whole text, you will need to find on the app, the Notice Paper section, you will find the Second Notice Paper revised near the top of the Notice Papers so you may want to find that, because that will give you the wording of the two amendments as they are then converted, as it were, into the Standing Order changes, the amendments to the Standing Order.

As the Chair has helpfully received our hope is we are going to deal with these in one block, in one package, so we are not going to go through voting on each item, I am asking you to vote for Items 51 to 56 in one go, as one, if you like, one effective amendment.

Just to pick up one or two things, and thank you again for your involvement and commitment on Saturday, I thought it was a very helpful and useful conversation and through that we clarified what we wanted and perhaps what we did not want at that stage. One question was raised in relation to the suffragan See of Dover - would there be confusion that that might be being put forward as a diocesan see, would that be something that people felt was being put forward? Well, I think as you see from Standing Order 51 and Standing Order 54, it is very clear that the word 'suffragan' appears, the suffragan Bishopric of Dover, so I think that does at least give a good signal of what we are doing. It is not to confuse it with being diocesan see.

As I say, all those early elements were received by the Synod unamended, so we only have to look, really, at the very end of Standing Order 139. You have got that on the app, you will see two additions of (c) and (d) in Standing Order 139 at (2)(a). But I will read them out for those of you who may not be able to access the app, so after (a) and (b), we add at (c), this is in relation to the five members coming on to the CNC in total from the Anglican Communion, "With at least two of those chosen to be male, and at least two to be female". This, if you like, clarifies the very helpful amendment from Nic Tall, where he used particular words that would have to apply to whether we had three people or five people. We have been able to translate that with the wonderful help of Chris Packer, our legal wizard on these matters, in the legal team, to give us the note that there will be at least two chosen to be male, and two chosen to be female. That just clarifies the wording of the amendment.

And then at (d), I will read out the text again, relating to the five from the Anglican Communion, "With a majority of those chosen to be persons whose ethnicity is commonly referred to as Global Majority Heritage". Now, that is a terminology that perhaps not everyone is familiar with, and certainly not across the Communion, and I have been given some very helpful advice by Gavin to say can we maybe help the community if they need it to explain what we mean by that in a worldwide context. And I am sure we will issue some guidance, as much as is appropriate.

But equally, the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates' Meeting of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council will be smart enough, I am sure, to

work it out in practice. As I said before, we do not want to be too prescriptive in what we are telling a very important body to do, but it may be that we can help with that.

So, I think, Madam Chair, that is all I really want to say, just to thank the Synod for its patience and care in this matter. The Standing Orders are very much part of what we do, they say what is going to happen, God willing at whatever stage that will be, and, as I say, it is not really Groundhog Day, it is the end of the Groundhog Day, hopefully, quite soon, but equally people may wish to speak and comment. Madam Chair, I move this amendment, with effect from 30 July 2022 standing in my name.

The Chair: This is now open for debate. We will have a speech limit of three minutes from the outset because we have spent quite a lot of time debating this already.

The Revd Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): Thank you, in that case I will be as swift as I can. It was very good, as Jamie said, on Saturday morning to debate some of these underlying implications of these new proposals, especially for our global relationships around the Anglican Communion. And you may remember that I and others appealed on that occasion for us not to bolster our own English primacy over the global Communion. We were not sufficiently persuasive, the mind of Synod has been made known, and therefore we must pass these amendments without a quibble.

But as we move today from principle to practicality, might I offer two appeals about how these Standing Orders will be enacted. First practicality is since we are planning to involve five global delegates, let us guarantee that they will be fully and actively involved in the process from beginning to end. We do not want tokenism, we do not want global Anglicans simply filling seats, they must be active in these CNC deliberations. Every CNC, you will remember, meets at least three times, on Zoom for the long listing, in person for the short listing and in person again for the interviews. Sometimes more than three times if a clear decision cannot be reached.

We must guarantee that for all the in-person meetings, our global friends will be in the room where it happens. That is going to be practically difficult, of course, because those meetings are usually at least six weeks, sometimes eight weeks, apart. So, Anglican reps, perhaps from Bolivia, Zambia, Singapore, New Zealand, will need to fly to London for the first meeting, perhaps here to York, then fly home again and, six weeks later, repeat the entire journey from the other side of the planet. It is no small undertaking.

Now, one or two English CNC members in recent times have Zoomed in for the short-listing meetings, for the sake of convenience, but it would massively disadvantage our global friends if they were on Zoom and not physically in the room, so please let us guarantee that we will pull out all the stops to make that happen.

The second practicality is we are asking the Standing Committee of the ACC to choose these five global reps, and I declare an interest as a member of the ACC, it is this wonderful microcosm of the Anglican family from every province in the world, Archbishop

Justin as our President, our last meeting was in Hong Kong, our next will be in Ghana in February 2023 hosted by the Province of West Africa, but the ACC Standing Committee is only 14 people, five of them Primates, but on the ACC as a whole, it is a body of about 120. It would be very easy according to these Standing Orders for the Standing Committee to choose five CNC reps simply by looking around their own committee and appointing themselves to it. That would be in line with our Standing Orders. But I hope they will be counselled to consult the whole ACC when we meet in Ghana, perhaps even to use that as an opportunity to elect the five CNC reps. We need this process to be transparent and equitable for the good of the whole Anglican Communion.

Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark): I will try not to take too long about this, Synod, but having tried to be called in the people's debate and failing, I feel very led by my conscience to speak, albeit briefly. Synod, I speak about my concerns on this motion, because while it can provide one kind of response, for me we have asked fundamentally the wrong question. The make-up of the Canterbury CNC is clearly intrinsically linked with the role of the Archbishop, both practically and symbolically. The consultation paper on this item itself said: "The big picture is perhaps too big for us to address and we have to start somewhere". Yes, this is a big issue, but we should start not at the end but at the beginning, and, for me, I wish this had started with a more blank piece of paper to allow for fresh ideas and creativity.

For me, we should not be changing our fundamental ecclesiology, our understanding of what it means to be a bishop, an Archbishop, and to be in Communion, without putting in a bit more legwork first. I worked for two very different Archbishops of Canterbury, and each of them has done the role very differently, and the next Archbishop and the one after that, their call and ministry will each doubtless look very different. I wonder what it says to the Anglican Communion and to our Church of England about process and indeed about discernment, when we consider replacing three elected members with those who may be appointed. Is what you know more important than who you are?

In our desire for this arguably minor, maybe not minor, change, I fear we are missing huge steps of process. And process matters, Synod. For me, there is a point of principle here, one of saying this might be right, but maybe the process used to get here was not, and process matters. Process matters when it comes to safeguarding, process matters when it comes to our financial scrutiny. It matters when we come to HR and to elections and process should matter here. For me, there is a temptation to ask in our Church at the moment to ask how do I get this through, rather than what is the right thing to do, a temptation to attempt to circumnavigate process, for very laudable reasons, I am sure, but process matters.

On a personal level, I and many others know what it is to experience pain and damage when process is not followed. Let us not risk that for a church in our Communion. So, whilst I am fairly sure this motion will go through, given the mind of Synod that was declared, but if you believe we should ask the right question, rather than asking the question designed to get the right answer, please consider if your conscience has moved

you in any of what I have said to consider voting against this motion, and use your voice to say that process does matter.

The Revd Mae Christie (Southwark): I want to think a little bit about the importance of listening, something that I have been thinking about particularly in the last week, and in fact particularly on Sunday morning when my son Walker, who is 19 months old, joined us at the Minster for Eucharist. He found the snare drums in the sacristy during Sunday School and listening was indeed very hard during that time. Let us listen better. Let us listen better and commit to asking questions about what the future of the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury is and how we select him, or, indeed one day, her.

I have to admit that I was genuinely disappointed at not being able to hear your thoughts on our amendment. I am sure that this is just me being a newbie, or spilt milk, but I was disappointed. I think that it is ironic that we were procedurally stopped from hearing about a process of listening - I would have liked to have heard those who disagreed and those who agreed - by a procedure that prevented that. But that is okay, I will recover.

I want to urge us all to commit to asking questions about how God might be helping us to give support to our leadership and to listen to the Spirit's wisdom in our leaders in the future. I am actually in two minds on the proposal. I think I will probably vote for it. In practice, I am thrilled about a more diverse CNC and surely you should all be so thrilled at that, that is a good thing. But ask yourselves why we have made diversity requirements on the Anglican Communion brothers and sisters that will be on that committee, and we do not make the same on the rest, on the other 12 that will be on the committee.

And where are the voices of working-class Brits on this committee, and where are the voices of the young who might indeed have a lot in common with that average Anglican that we have all talked about quite a lot? Is now really the time to rush? I do want to say, what about the question and the problem of secret ballots on the ABC CNC? So, while I will be supporting this, I do hope that we will ask ourselves some of these larger questions in the future, and in the very, very near future and perhaps listen to what the Spirit might be saying to the church.

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter): I will leave it to the *Daily Telegraph* to mull over what the definitions of male and female may be, but I think you will remember that there was a part of our original discussion which I raised anxiety about. What I would say, however, is that we have had the discussions, we have had the debates and this really is dotting the i's and crossing the t's on something that we at Synod have decided. So, I would really urge everybody to support the motion and to vote in favour of it.

The Chair: The Archbishop of Canterbury. I beg your pardon, the Archbishop of York. We have heard a lot from the Archbishop of Canterbury this morning, we will have the Archbishop of York this time. If there are other people standing, I will give it some thought, but we do need to keep a bit of an eye on the clock, there is still quite a lot of business to get through this morning.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Well, you managed that elevation without any process at all. I do apologise if I misunderstood one of the previous speakers. I do apologise if I got it wrong, but I thought I might have heard suggestion somehow that we might be circumventing process, because process really does matter, not just about this but in all our affairs, it really does. Of course, sometimes we may get it wrong, there is much to learn, and I am almost going to repeat a speech I made on Saturday, but I just think we do need to be clear that process has been followed here. It is actually a process that began a long time ago, over 20 years ago, in a process of reflecting, as a whole church and a whole Communion on the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to the Church of England and in relation to the wider Anglican Communion. That has affected the role that I now inhabit and it will now go on to affect the way we grow as a worldwide Anglican Communion with a particular focus and responsibility for the Archbishop of Canterbury here in the life of our national Church.

What this is, is the last step on a long process and we did indeed have robust conversation on Saturday and there is still now a chance to vote this down. I really, really hope that does not happen, but it could happen, so I think we must be clear – we do not always like the process but there is a process. Nor is it fair to say that it did not start with a blank piece of paper, because it absolutely did, it is just that that was not here on Saturday morning, that was with the other partners with whom this long, long conversation has been taking place.

So, I believe this is the right thing to do, I believe we have gone about it in the right way, and certainly over the course of this group of sessions, there has been a chance for alternative views to be aired and heard and debated, but I now welcome the fact that I hope we are about to say that we will be inviting other voices from around the Anglican Communion to help us discern under God who the next Archbishop of Canterbury will be.

The Chair: I see no one else standing, and so I can call upon Jamie Harrison to respond to the debate, please.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Andrew Atherstone kindly warned me he was going to speak, and not to panic, and I did not, despite what he might say. Very gracious and helpful, Andrew, in actually pointing out some of the practical details we need to get right. Issues around flights and Zoom and costs and looking ahead and getting it well planned. People have got to be in the same room, have they not, to make this sort of discernment, and we must get that right. I think he also volunteered himself to help the ACC to do this, given he is going to be there in Ghana, so it is over to you, Andrew, and we are depending on you.

In relation to Rebecca Chapman, yes, I mean in a sense we can argue whether this is the right process, whether we did the right work, whether we are changing ecclesiology, but we are where we are. I think, as the Archbishop of York said, we have tried to follow due process, we have tried to consult, there has been some listening, which was Mae Christie's

point, I think, about were we really listening, and I am very sorry, Mae, if you felt your amendment was not properly looked at or an amendment was in some way discarded.

When we do these pieces of work, it can seem quite technical, we are bound by Standing Orders, we are bound by points of order and so on, and that is the nature of the Synod. I think this is equivalent to legislation. It is not legislation in the same way, but our Standing Orders are very significant, and I suppose, inevitably, can be drawn into that sort of thinking and I think you are wise to warn us about that, and to ask us are we really being discerning, are we really listening to one another, and are we making the right decisions on the back of that. So, thank you for that.

And I am glad we have not got the drums, that would have been great fun to have the drums this morning, but I think we had the choir, and they were very good too, so there you go.

To Luke Appleton, thank you for your comments. Luke reminded us that we have made a decision and we need to implement it, and again, just to end, to the Archbishop of York - still the Archbishop of York, I gather, today - that we look forward to the future, but we do not know what the future will be or when it will be, but we think this will be a way of enabling us to do the right thing at the right time, so I do ask you, please, to support this amendment, Items 51 to 56, and help us to move forward, thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

The Revd Tim Edwards (Rochester): Point of order. Madam Chair, given the concerns about the transparency of process, I wonder if we might have a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The Chair: If 25 people indicate that they are happy for that happen, then we can have a counted vote of the whole Synod. If you stand in your places, and those on Zoom indicate by the green tick. We have 25 people standing, there will therefore be a vote of the whole Synod on Items 51 to 56.

The motion was put and carried, 254 voting in favour, 46 against, with 25 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: The Standing Order amendments to the Canterbury Crown Nominations Commission are carried. I now duly announce that the amendments to the Standing Orders will have effect from 13 July. That completes this business. Please do remain for the next item of business

THE CHAIR *Dean of Southwark (the Very Revd Andrew Nunn)* took the Chair at 10.29 am.

ITEM 34

REPORT BY THE CLERGY CONDUCT MEASURE IMPLEMENTATION GROUP (GS 2277)

The Chair: Good morning, Synod, we now move to Item 34, the Report of the Clergy Conduct Measure Implementation Group. Members will need GS 2277 for this item, and also need the Fourth Notice Paper, the Financial Memo, as this item has financial impacts.

I invite the Bishop of Worcester to speak to Item 34. Bishop, you have up to 10 minutes to do so.

The Bishop of Worcester (the Rt Revd Dr John Inge): If you are wondering how I came to chair the CCM Implementation Group, which came as a bit of a surprise to me, it is because Tim Thornton, then Bishop at Lambeth, asked me if I would join the Bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury on the Lambeth Group looking into reform of the CDM - then, all three of them retired. I am the last man standing. It is as simple as that. Having had misgivings about the role, it turned out to be a real privilege. It has been both enjoyable and fascinating.

I wish to record my heartfelt thanks to the Implementation Group. Its members have put a tremendous amount of work into these proposals. They have given their time and expertise freely and have produced what I hope you will agree is a really good and comprehensive vision for the future of clergy discipline. We have been greatly assisted by a group of consulting members drawn from the legal profession and parish clergy who have brought their wisdom and critical eye to our deliberations and I am also grateful to them.

It would be wrong to single out individuals, but I would like to mention three. The first is Professor Joyce Hill, the Vice-Chair, who took over the reins whilst I was on sabbatical earlier this year. Secondly, Peter Collier. Synod may recall Peter chaired a working party of the Ecclesiastical Law Society which produced a comprehensive report on the CDM last year. Peter has taken the lead on our consultations and I am hugely grateful to him for his work in this area. Finally, Edward Dobson, the officer who supported us throughout our work and has done a brilliant job.

Members will see the list of consultees in Annex C of the Report. In addition to those listed, a further consultation with survivors has taken place over the last month and I am very grateful to the National Safeguarding Team for their help in facilitating this. What you have before you is, of course, not a finished system. I want to emphasise that the remit of the Group was to bring legislative proposals to Synod. There is much detail that is not provided here. That is not because we failed to consider it, but because it properly belongs in the next stage of the process.

Why does the Church need discipline for clergy? I hope that is pretty clear but ordained ministry is, of course, something for which we are accountable ultimately to our Lord and

within our polity we need a fair and accessible scheme for the regulation of conduct. But, as Synod will appreciate, blindly applying secular employment models to the Church is problematic. The privilege of ordained ministry is governed not by contract but by the biblical model of covenant.

As it happens, I dislike the term "professional" applied to clergy. Professionals have clients. We do not. I believe we should be amateurs in the true sense of the word but held to the highest possible standards of conduct. But clergy are not superhuman. They are, as is true of all God's people, both human and sinful, reliant upon the grace and love of God in Christ. The Church must respond by providing a system of discipline that is flexible, proportionate and rooted in the pastoral. Whilst the critique of the CDM could be extensive, the principal failing of it as a piece of legislation lies in its inflexibility to respond to different levels of misconduct and complaint.

In meeting our objectives, the Implementation Group has sought to apply four fundamental principles. First, the process must provide for a proportionate and efficient way of dealing with a much wider range of grievances and misconduct. Secondly, the process must protect clergy from frivolous, malicious and vexatious accusations. Thirdly, there must be swift access to justice for both those who have been wronged and those who face allegations. Fourthly, the rules of natural justice must permeate the system as a visible sign of fairness.

Synod, I do not intend to take you through every detail of the proposals. I commend to you the flowchart on page 31, for those of you who prefer pictures to words, and that is a very useful visible aid. I will, however, highlight some areas of importance. First, whilst the Group strongly reaffirms that the role of bishops is central to the administration of discipline, it is of the view that a change is required and the proposed role will be to receive the complaint, support the parties and implement the outcome. This, we hope, will minimise the possibility of conflict over the role of the bishop. Secondly, the proposals include a provision that clergy may be able to self-refer to the system. This will not be a requirement, but it is intended to encourage personal reflection and insight as well as being a way of heading off the weaponising of complaints. Thirdly, the CDM operates to investigate and determine serious misconduct but, the vast majority of times, clergy fall-shorts do not constitute serious misconduct.

The proposals, therefore, separate out conduct into three categories. First, grievances, by which is meant a complaint about a minor matter that does not constitute misconduct; second, misconduct which is an allegation of wrongdoing that is unlikely to call into question the cleric's fitness to exercise public ministry; and, thirdly, serious misconduct, which is an allegation of wrongdoing which may call into question the respondent's fitness to exercise public ministry. As set out in the Report, each of these tracks will have a different way of investigating and determining the conduct in question. Fourthly, the Group is clear that, for this system to work, it must be properly resourced and embedded in the early stages of discernment, training and ministry. Finally, the commitment made

to IICSA to implement their proposals has been adhered to, including the reintroduction of the deposition from holy orders for the most serious of cases.

Should you endorse these proposals, and I very much hope that you will, the work will begin to turn them into legislation. I stress again that what we are debating today is not the last word. The Implementation Group is acutely aware that there are those who will wish still to have input into the reform and the legislative process that follows will provide for that. It will not have escaped your notice that the title of this Report is "Under Authority Revisited". It is exactly 30 years ago that the General Synod passed a motion to start the process of reforming the then system of clergy discipline.

The result of that work contained in the 1996 Report "Under Authority" became a CDM in 2003 and began to operate in 2006. We hope to be a bit more speedy than that. The time for change is overdue. In the novel, *Brideshead Revisited*, there is a moment where Lady Marchmain reads a story to her adult children. She quotes from a Father Brown novel where the eponymous detective explains how he caught the thief "with an unseen hook and an invisible line which is long enough to let him wander to the ends of the world and still to bring him back with a twitch upon the thread".

This image of God's grace as an invisible and inescapable line has provided a benchmark for the Implementation Group's work. We have seen and heard how the CDM has fallen short and the Group is confident that these proposals will redress this. At their heart, they seek to entwine that invisible line of God's grace with a visible line of natural justice, so as to create a golden thread that runs through the system. Synod, I commend these proposals to you and, Chair, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate. I need to warn you that we have had many requests to speak and quite a few of those are maiden speeches and so I will be trying to work through some of them. The initial speech limit is five minutes.

the Very Revd Nicola Sullivan (Dean of Southwell): I welcome and want to express my appreciation to the Bishop of Worcester - last man standing - and his group, recognising that this is a complex task with far-reaching implications for clergy and those who need to raise a matter of complaint or grievance. I have been alongside the Clergy Discipline Measure as a bishop's chaplain, later as an archdeacon and now as a dean. I have supported clergy through the process when they have been subjected to vexatious complaints. I have been a person with interest needing to raise a complaint and I have been a respondent. It goes with the territory, sighed my lawyer, when I settled the bill; it goes with being a senior leader in the current climate.

Archdeacon Alan Hawker back in the early days of the then new CDM, a neighbouring archdeacon, was confident that this legislation would deliver speedy resolution, open within the context of natural justice. He predicted that, after initial flurry in the use and the novelty of the new Measure, it would soon settle down. He could not have foreseen the changes in culture on the many occasions when this blunt instrument has caused untold

damage, mistrust, delay, caused conflict for a bishop as both pastor and judge and has as well created great expense.

We are grateful to the work that Sheldon has done for its work and contribution in this area. I welcome especially the distinction of a grievance for matters perhaps more of misjudgement or of a breakdown of relationship which will not need legal support but more effectively be referred to mediation early on in the process before battle lines are drawn. Clearly, serious misconduct does require a full process. Synod, please, like me, support the Report and encourage the Group to continue its vital work because it does, indeed, show the invisible line of God's grace amidst natural justice and gives us a way forward to the next process and the next stage of process.

Miss Kathryn Hubbard (Southwell & Nottingham): Thank you for calling me, Chair, for my maiden speech. I am glad of these proposed changes. However, my main concern about the current CDM and about anything that replaces it is that the respondent must also have adequate support themselves. There are times when the clergy person facing disciplinary procedures may need to access his or her bishop for the instructions and guidance that they would normally look to their bishop for. Let me explain what I mean with a real-life situation which I share with permission.

A former colleague of mine was put through a CDM and during the process the complainant regularly turned up at services in church, interrupting them and heckling during the sermon. The complainant sent sexually explicit emails to members of the church and even tried to find the home address of one particular member. My colleague was at an absolute loss to know what he should do when the church was under such harassment from the complainant and desperately wanted guidance from the archdeacon or bishop.

My colleague repeatedly attempted to get that guidance but was told that because of the CDM process neither the bishop nor the archdeacon was allowed to talk to him. He was without support from his bishop and archdeacon for over six months. He was given a CDM pastor, who was supportive and prayerful but, unfortunately, he did not have the experience or authority to help navigate this extremely stressful situation. The conclusion of the process was that the complaint was dismissed. The complainant appealed the dismissal but the dismissal was upheld by the President of Tribunals. After the process was over, the bishop was very apologetic to my colleague that he had not been able to offer the help during that time. But the impact of the situation was that some people left the church due to the stress of what they had been through and my colleague came very close to leaving ministry altogether.

In order to protect both clergy and churches from being unable to get the help they need, we need to ensure that future disciplinary processes allow clergy in such a situation to receive the advice and the guidance they need from someone with suitable experience and authority from within their diocese.

the Ven. Luke Miller (London): I speak as, at the moment, the Chair of the House of Clergy and I have the support of the Northern Prolocutor in what I am about to say. In paragraph 6 of GS 2277, the Working Group has invited the Convocations to consider revising the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the clergy. Yes, we will and, while the Convocations may need to act separately, we will begin this work as a House of Clergy. Paragraph 6 notes that the Guidelines along with Scripture, the Canons and the Ordinal come together to establish standards of behaviour for the clergy. In fact, they are used by many registrars to consider and define what conduct unbecoming of a clerk in holy orders might be and they are, therefore, coming to have a freight of import which is greater than they were designed originally to bear. This at least requires this work to be done.

Separately, but linked, is the issue of what a cleric is and what form discipline should, therefore, take. Is a cleric an independent officeholder - a life led and not a job done as I always used to say to my curates - disciplined, therefore, under Guidelines, the Ordinal and Scripture? Or are we like employees, with rights and duties for specific time off, parental leave, scope to keep our personal addresses and phone numbers private, whose discipline would look more like line management? Our experience is that we are neither and both. This impacts on our relationships with one another, with bishops and archdeacons, with our churchwardens and PCCs, and I think is the reason why we are more than a little in trouble over our wellbeing.

The Bishop of Worcester spoke of us being in the best sense amateurs, working under covenant to the highest standards, and I agree. But I have been reluctantly dragging myself to the point of thinking that we should clarify things by becoming employees. But, actually, in reflecting on this, I would like us to begin a conversation about something different, about something that perhaps could help us to have the best of both worlds. Do we need something that looks like - wrong phrase, I know - a professional association? We have models for this in doctors, lawyers, police and others who are officeholders but who need frameworks.

Could such a body support us with accreditation, discipline processes and professional conduct which would mean that bishops could, indeed, as the previous speaker said, be pastors and clerics, be both independent and have healthy frameworks, expectations and support? We would still need to be licensed or given permission to officiate by our bishops and we would still need holy order, but could we place accreditation and discipline somewhere else? It would, of course, be complicated and we would need to talk to many people and many stakeholders, unions, clergy, bishops, the Convocations and others, but a useful conversation I think. I understand something like this was thought about over a decade ago. It seems to me that this is a conversation which is now timely. We will do the proximate work and get on with that, as asked for in GS 2277, but I think starting something wider which would take more time but lead us to a better place could also be helpful.

Professor Lynn Nichol (Worcester): This will be my maiden speech. Members of Synod, I very much welcome this Report and I welcome it because, as raised in the previous debate, process matters. Process speaks to the internal context, so that we, the people of the Church, know that people are treated fairly and, to the external context, that we are seen to have fair, clear and accountable processes. I like to suggest that fairness, transparency and timeliness are all vital in any approach to the process of discipline and conduct. But perhaps what is required even more is trust. Both the complainant and the respondent need to trust in the validity of the process and procedures to deal fairly with the issue in hand.

We as members of Synod and the wider Church need to be confident that we can put our trust in this new Clergy Conduct Measure, to enable what are often seen as challenging issues to be examined in a proportionate manner, that recognises and respects that both the complainant and the respondent are children of God and should be treated in a fair manner with access to appropriate support. It is evident from many reports that many clergy in particular have lost trust in the validity of the existing procedures. The overwhelming stress of CDM cases, extended over a long period of time, has caused stress on the wellbeing of clergy and their immediate families. In the context of minor misconduct or grievances, the stress for the individuals, never mind the disproportionate amount of time, complexity and no doubt cost associated with the current approach, creates a situation where we can no longer trust the approach that we have been taking.

It seems to me the Report from the Clergy Conduct Measure Implementation Group has clearly recognised the need for reform and addresses many areas of concern in the existing procedures. In particular, the distinction between grievance, minor and major misconduct and, importantly for me, the requirement to provide support for both respondent and complainant and a process for dealing with vexatious complaints. I have to admit I was a little unclear about some aspects of the new grievance procedure in terms of impartiality of the assessor but the detail comes later.

Building back trust in our Church's approach to conduct and discipline requires any procedure to demonstrate the hallmarks of procedural justice: a fair process, transparent in action, gives voice to all actors in the case and is impartial in decision-making. It appears to me that we have begun to move forward in all these areas and we have a code in which we can begin to place our trust as members of Synod and has the potential to rebuild the trust of the clergy in a fair process. For these reasons, I will be supporting the motion and hope you can too.

In terms of due process, can I reassure Synod that, although this Report is presented by the Bishop of Worcester and I am a member from Worcester, the Bishop of Worcester has not bought me a pint or, even more preferably, a gin of tonic, to speak in favour of this Report.

Mrs Sian Kellogg (Derby): I also support this and I am grateful that it has come to Synod as I recognise the pain that the current CDM process is causing all involved. I just have

one query. In GS 2277, section 6 on page 13, the Report defines the various levels of offence with some examples on pages 14 and 15. Given that it will be some time before this deeply flawed CDM legislation is replaced, can the level of offence outlined in GS 2277, section 6, and the penalties for those offences outlined in 9.23, be taken into consideration until then and bishops asked to have a duty to offer support to the complainant victim, survivor and the respondent as prescribed in 7.8 of the same document?

Rt Worshipful Peter Collier QC (ex officio): I am a member of the Implementation Group and I also chaired at the Ecclesiastical Law Society Working Party on the same subject. Last July, your predecessors, having approved broad proposals to reform the CDM and to set up a group to take those proposals forward, then passed a following motion which urged the proposed Implementation Group to develop a system of initial assessment that distinguishes between, one, complaints not involving misconduct; two, misconduct that is less than serious; and, three, serious misconduct with only serious misconduct being subject to investigation by a national agency and a formal tribunal process.

The Group which I have been privileged to be a member of has delivered exactly that. For the last two years, ever since beginning the work of the ELS Working Party, I have been in touch with as many interested parties as I possibly could to seek their views about what a fit-for-purpose Clergy Discipline process would look like. Those discussions with others continued when I oversaw the consultation process referred to in GS 2277. It is now clear that, amongst the many different groups of people who have an interest in this subject, there is overwhelming support for the current direction of travel and the overall shape of the scheme proposed in GS 2277.

Dean Nicola has already referred to the Sheldon Hub and Sheldon was instrumental in raising many of the concerns on gathering the evidence about the issues that needed to be addressed. We should always be grateful to them for that costly work. Those of you who are familiar with the Hub will know how trenchant it has been over recent years in its criticisms of proposals about the reform of the CDM. What I have noticed since our Report was published is the very low level of noise on the Hub. In one sense, that does not surprise me as, during the consultation process earlier this year, there was huge support for this direction of travel and the overall shape of the suggestions that were being put forward.

There were a lot of suggestions though about the details that should flesh out that current broad shape and I expect a number of those will be spoken to in this debate. There is much work to be done in filling in that detail once Synod has approved that final shape, but I am encouraged that if the spirit and work that has driven us so far continues and if we continue to engage with people as we develop the Measure and the necessary associated rules and code of conduct, then I would expect that very soon we will have a draft Measure that will also commend itself to Synod and, hopefully, we will not get too bogged down in our own processes but move swiftly to bring it into effect.

We are already moving more slowly than many had hoped for last July when it was hoped we would have been at this point last November or even in February with no Synod this next November. I know that February will be very busy with LLF and other matters, but I do hope the Business Committee will be able to find space for a draft Measure in February. However, even if slowly, we are surely getting there. Please support this motion.

The Revd Dr Sean Doherty (Universities & TEs): I add my thanks to that of previous speakers for the Implementation Group and the Bishop of Worcester's work to bring us to this point. I will certainly be supporting the motion enthusiastically, not least because it requests that we receive the draft legislation and, as Lynn Nichol commented, we will be able to debate and look at the detail when we get to that stage. But if I might trail a detail that I think is going to be really important. It is in relation to the role of the assessors.

If I could just read from 10.2 of the Report: "The lead assessor for each panel will be someone with extensive relevant decision-making experience. It may be that they also possess a legal background or qualification, although the Group do not regard this as a prerequisite". That seems to me to be an area that we will need to look at very carefully, Synod. Of course, there may well be people with extensive HR experience and other kind of relevant qualifications but, clearly, the assessors are going to have an absolutely central and vital role in this process and so we will want to be really careful about exactly what kinds of qualifications, requirements, training and, of course, support those people will have.

In particular, it seems to me that the suggestion that they may not necessarily need a legal background is something that we should probe very carefully and possibly even change. Obviously, the detail of that is for another day but something for us to think about in the meantime.

Mrs Amanda Robbie (Lichfield): This was meant to be my maiden speech but actually I ended up speaking before, amending something. Let me speak to this though. It is very important to me. Throughout 2019, and well into 2020, I held on to a verse in Psalm 37, like a drowning woman clutching a life-belt, "Trust in the Lord and do good. Dwell in the land and enjoy safe pasture".

My husband had to answer a double CDM complaint that was being misinterpreted by those responsible for administering it. The legal process was excruciating. We suffered from unjustified delays, misapplied rules, and this was compounded for my husband by his dyslexia. We were the lowest we had ever been as a couple in ministry and our teenage children were also caught up in the pain. I clung to the Lord, trusting him, remembering our calling to that place, that land, and we continued to do good for our parish as far as we were able. But our pasture had been made unsafe by the failed Clergy Discipline Measure which, as we all know, has become a weaponised complaints system that punished us through its process without any finding of facts.

I so very warmly welcome this draft Clergy Conduct Measure and I thank the Implementation Group from the bottom of my heart for their excellent work so far in bringing it to Synod and for the proposals they have made.

As the Measure is developed I would like to urge the Implementation Group to consider thoroughly that the abuse of power from above by clergy can be matched by abuse from below. Clergy and their families can find themselves in a crushing grip between vexatious complainants, or those with a disordered personality, and the power of the bishop, and this has certainly been our experience.

I want to urge the Implementation Group to bring a full definition of vexatious complaints and to work out thoroughly how to handle repetitious, vague, changing and prolonged campaigns. I would like to see training for clergy and diocesan officers to raise awareness of personality disorders, which can so often be a factor in these vexatious complaints, as was mentioned in last night's PCC debate.

I have a couple more points. The first is about the use of registrars and the second about support. I would urge that bishops should not be instructing diocesan registrars to conduct work under this Measure, because most registrars have neither the training nor experience required to handle these cases. I would urge against the use of registrars in any capacity.

Finally, as has been mentioned a couple of times already, the support that is required for complainants and respondents. We were in a respondent situation and we really, really needed someone with a detailed understanding of the process. I think this is going to be necessary. The support needs to be practical, guiding people through the process as well as pastoral. Supporters again will need proper training. I would like to urge Synod to support this motion wholeheartedly. I am praying that as this Measure proceeds through the legislative process we can ensure the pasture will be as safe as it can be for clergy and for laity, so that we can all continue to do good for the glory of God. Thank you for listening.

The Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I am very grateful to Bishop John and his fellow workers for his Report and the serious improvements to the way the Church responds as pastor and as judge to complainants and to its other pastors.

I may have misunderstood something, and I say it quite genuinely, I have perhaps misunderstood something. I would like clarification, or perhaps even further attention given to the area which is specified in 4(5) where it is proposed "that the role of the bishop in discipline be modified". The direction of travel is clearly a good one. It strengthens the pastoral role of the bishop, which I think is much needed, and I am aware from many bishops of the pain that they were caused by not being able to be pastors to people they really cared about. That was a serious pain, one of the many defects of the old Measure.

Bishop John has spoken about the importance of minimising conflicts in the role of the bishop. I quote him and I think that is very important indeed. My puzzle is whether that has gone far enough or whether it has been made clear enough. There are three little rectangles below which specify the functions of the bishop: receiving the complaint, supporting the parties and implementing the outcome. All well and good. My involvement in this business is largely listening to clergy who are either the objects of complaint or who know people who are objects of complaint. The perspective from their point of view might well be different.

Their description of these three boxes might look rather different, I think even under the new Measure, especially the last one of implementing the outcome. It is that conflict between a pastor as somebody who is looked to as somebody to listen and guide and somebody who will be looked to as imposing a penalty. That is perhaps unavoidable, it is probably unavoidable, and it is not even necessarily in conflict, but how it is actually perceived does need, I think, quite strong attention. It may be that some pastors have to go and yank the sheep or lamb who is about to tumble off the cliff and those wonderful pastoral staffs, one of which Archbishop Stephen showed us the other day, are wonderful for catching things and dragging things, which is not very pleasant for the sheep, but rather good in the long run.

I am not convinced this has been teased out as well as it might be, but the direction of travel is brilliant and I hope we will pass this without dissent.

The Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds): I just wanted to respond to something the Prolocutor said about clergy perhaps moving to being employees and the revision of the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy. I just want to remind Synod that a lot of clergy like myself are self-supporting, and they too are subject to discipline, and also retired clergy are subject to discipline. Whatever support measures there are for clergy need to include all of those as well. Also, I would like to say the important thing is that whatever discipline is administered, it is administered with grace and justice to all parties.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (the Rt Revd Martin Seeley): First of all, I am hugely grateful to Bishop John and the work of the Group for the immense progress that has been made, and I strongly support this. I just wanted, as Joyce has done, to pick up on Luke Miller's comments and to let Synod know of a piece of work that is being undertaken at the moment to look at the wider picture within which issues of discipline also fall around our understanding of the role of clergy. This has been prompted and been on the agenda for Ministry Council and the Legislative Reform Committee. Some work began during the pandemic and we are just about to pick this up again with a group to look at how we understand the role of clergy in this current age.

Certainly as I look back to when I started as a curate in Scunthorpe more than 40 years ago, there was a sort of instinctive understanding of what you were as an ordained person and the culture around you instinctively understood what you were for and reinforced that.

Much of that has broken down in the time that I have been ordained, certainly in terms of the wider culture. This group is going to be looking at how we understand that today, and what that means in relation to, for example, as Joyce referred, the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy, and indeed whether there is a need, eventually, and I am in no hurry to do this, to revise the Canons. That is a chunky piece of work, but it is a piece of work within which these other considerations rightly fall.

The Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester): Thank you for recognising my pink shorts. I speak in support of the motion as a whole. It is vital not only to make the distinction between grievance, misconduct and serious misconduct, but that the clergy should know this from the outset, and should know the sorts of penalty and also the most serious penalty that they might expect if their category of complaint is upheld.

I have walked alongside a number of clergy against whom a formal complaint has been made. In every case it has proved traumatic. Wild ideas have raced through their head, of public disgrace, loss of job, loss of home, having to pull their children out of school, financial disaster and so on. Some I have walked with have considered leaving church ministry altogether. This is what the current system has done to clergy, who in the examples I know are faithful and conscientious pastors of their flock, and where the complaints were, after some harrowing months, largely or completely thrown out. The Annual Report shows that that happens - being thrown out or largely thrown out - in over half of cases. This proposal will go a long way to obviating much of that trauma by making clear the level of seriousness, the speed of resolution and the possible penalties.

One aspect of the proposals especially concerns me. The bishop communicates both the initial complaint and the outcome and penalty only in writing. We sometimes call the bishop our father in God and the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "For what son is there whom the father does not discipline?" Yes, but what father disciplines his son or daughter by sending them a written note? Surely, at beginning and end, the bishop should speak to their priest or deacon, ideally in person, or at least by Zoom, where the bishop can also read the body language, even though what the bishop has said will need to be confirmed in writing.

With this proviso, I hope we will support this motion.

Mrs Michaela Suckling (Sheffield): This is my maiden speech and not one I expected to make. As a nurse, I am bound by a code of conduct and I fully support this motion. I just have one concern. When we deal with safeguarding issues, which I have done as a forensic nurse in sexual violence and as a school nurse, the voice of the child or the voice of the survivor must be central to the decisions that we make.

The Church is very clear that marriage is sacred and I was concerned by some of the discussions around transparency and making serious misconduct public and in the public domain. I wonder if we have seriously thought about the voice of the survivor in adultery cases. Does that really help them to restore their marriage and aid reconciliation? I really

wonder if that is the case, because that is what we are hoping for as a forgiving church. I am not sure if this is the relevant speech to make, and in the right motion, but I have concerns about the issue around transparency and sharing that on a website when people are trying to restore their marriage.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Chair, this is not an easy speech to make. I very much welcome the proposals set out by the Implementation Group as someone who is a victim/survivor/claimant of clergy sexual abuse. I think we have a long way still to go in understanding the impacts and the difficulties faced by women, and indeed men, as adults in sexual abuse cases.

I very much welcome the removal of time limitation. For many of us it takes years to come to terms with the abuse that we have suffered, to deal with the shame that we feel, to deal with the belief that we have brought the incident on ourselves. In my case I should mention that many felt that was the reason I was gay, that I had been raped by clergy, as I have talked about on Channel 4, and I have also suffered a sexual assault by. I would say it was actually because I was so naïve and not reading the signals that I got myself into those situations.

It took me many years to find the courage to come forward. Indeed, it was only in 2017 with the Harvey Weinstein revelations and the #MeToo movement I felt that it was incumbent on me to speak out because if I felt too scared to speak out, what would it be for those in situations who had no voice with the media or friends to do so.

I picked up the phone and tried to talk to the safeguarding officer in the province of the clergy who had moved from England to somewhere else. The voice met me and said, "Is it urgent, I am going to go to the gym, can I talk to you in a few hours' time?" I said, "Well, it has taken me 20 years to pick up the phone, I suppose I can wait an extra hour." We have a long way to go with training, I am afraid, in dealing with these sorts of abuses. I went to the police and a horrendous year of waiting culminated in the decision that there was not sufficient evidence, which is the problem with the sexual assault on me, in a room not too far from this very building, back in 2004. It was as I left my time on the Archbishops' Council and it meant that I left feeling dirty, ashamed and very angry with the Church.

I put forward a CDM and the first thing I needed to do was to ask for an extension. That meant that my version of events was sent to the perpetrator. Then followed a whole period, as many of you know, of months of us having to deal with this, but the difficulty and the reason I am standing here today is that everyone involved in that process knew both me and the person concerned and yet I was not allowed to know who knew. To this day there are people here in this building who will know private things about me but I am not allowed to know, as a claimant, who was involved because the whole system is weighted to protecting the clergy person.

I do ask, Chair, that as you take your work forward that you look to the level of transparency that is required to allow the victim and the clergy person to feel safe, particularly when they are people who are well-known. Women, particularly in parish situations, dare I say, refuse often to come forward because they know the wife, the spouse, they know the bishop, they know all the clergy involved, and the cost, as we have already heard, of going public and trying to have some form of justice is so high. They know that their children may have to move school and houses will be lost.

I think we have a unique situation in this Church when dealing with sexual abuse cases of adults. I do hope that you will look at that separately and look at how best we can ensure that all parties are protected and yet justice is still done.

The Revd Sam Maginnis (Chelmsford): I just want to thank you, Bishop John, and all members the of the Implementation Group for their work over the past year in developing these proposals. Speaking as the Chair of CEECA, we welcome these proposals, of course, having worked closely with Sheldon over the past few years campaigning for the replacement of the Clergy Discipline Measure. I again would encourage all members of Synod to pass this motion so that the draft legislation can now be prepared and the new framework brought in as quickly as possible.

Members of Synod, we heard in the Canterbury CNC debates - all of them - that process is so important in embodying the culture that we want as the Church, as the people of God in the world. As we continue to develop this new framework for clergy complaints and discipline, I want us to be aware that as processing bodies our culture can be shaped by our processes for good and for ill. We heard Amanda Robbie earlier speaking about her and her husband's experience. In the *Church Times* on Friday, it led with the leader comment relating these new proposals to the tragic case of Fr Alan Griffin, who was subjected of course to unsubstantiated claims built upon innuendo, hearsay and careless homophobic stereotypes, denied a proper right of response and not given any clear timetable as to resolution and rehabilitation, which sadly led to him taking his own life. There are countless other cases like this that we have seen in the history of the CDM which have highlighted the fact that, even alongside the manifest failings of that Measure, there is that all-too-human tendency to hide behind our processes, especially when dealing with difficult situations or challenging situations beyond our control, which may reflect upon us, our own human brokenness and our inadequacy at being God's people and bringing Christ's reconciling love into the world.

As I say, with our clergy discipline processes and our current framework and our institutions we have seen our church leaders hiding behind those processes, not intentionally but still hiding behind them, which can only problematise and dehumanise these matters, when we should be focusing upon reconciliation and bringing people back together in the love of Christ.

Overcoming that tendency, healing our culture is a matter for prayer and humility and an institution, but to begin with we have this opportunity to put the right processes in place

to embody that culture and to encourage the culture that we want to be as a Church; to be God's people and to embody those principles of independence, transparency and fairness which will actually allow us to deal with clergy complaints and clergy misconduct in a way that brings true reconciliation and healing within our communities.

I would highlight again the main points of these new proposals. We have a triage system, a three-way triage seeking to identify, in a swift and responsive manner, grievances, minor misconduct and the most serious misconduct, which will go to a central tribunal. As I have already mentioned, these will be dealt with speedily. Also, we welcome in particular an effective response to vexatious and malicious complaints. We would call, of course, alongside the legal framework for that adequate training for the new regional assessors so that they will be able to identify problematic behaviour and the sorts of personality types that may lead to vexatious and malicious complaints.

Then of course we call for real pastoral support, not only for clergy respondents but also for complainants, to ensure that they feel truly listened to, to ensure that they feel the principles of natural justice are applied in their cases and that once complaints and misconduct have been resolved they can be once more rehabilitated into their church communities.

Members of Synod, I would call on you to support this motion.

The Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): I must take care not to overrun on this topic on which I wrote my thesis. I salute the hard and good work of the working party, although I have a slight concern about the supply of muggins willing to serve as independent advisers in the long term. I am mainly speaking on a wider global concern about the whole Measure and concept and a danger we have in dealing with this business in the Church.

It seems to me that division and conflict are inherent in the life of God's Church, until Christ returns. From the Acts of the Apostles onwards, we know that Christians have disagreed deeply in our imperfect understanding of God's truth, and we have had to find all through the centuries ways of holding those differences together, of which this Synod, for all its frustrations, is in fact I believe one of the best.

But the danger which I tracked in my study through three centuries is that we will always be tempted to use every mechanism at our disposal, including disciplinary and conduct processes, to fight our very real battles. As this Measure goes forward to drafting, we must make a choice to guard against this. The naming of what is now proposed as a Clergy Conduct Measure suggests an intention to do this, but there is little in the detail. We need to limit it to matters of conduct and not those of controversy in the life of the Church.

I think I have time for two little examples. In a town parish in my diocese I know there is a situation of conflict between a fairly new incumbent and the parishioners. He is leading the church in a new direction of which he is firmly convinced, and some of them do not agree. I do not need to name the parish or direction for you all to think of equivalent

examples in your own experience. I have heard one of the key laity, someone with a very senior professional career, say to me in conversation in another context, "Oh yes, we're going to see the bishop to get him to tell us how to sort out our vicar". That I think says something in itself.

The other question is what are the standards to which we look? The Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy are very good. They can be improved by revision, but we have to be careful the sources we look to. People say we should look to the Canons to tell us what we are to do. I think we know the Canons speak of many eras, not all of them so recent. To take perhaps a light-hearted example, the Canons decree that all clergy at all times dress to show their holy calling. I think that generally now means we should wear some sort of clerical collar. Behold, hundreds of clergy disobeying the Canons in my very sight, even bishops, unless, to think of the exception in the Canons, you are all here for leisure or recreation.

So, mindful that our sources of authority are many and contested and capable of multiple interpretations, I look forward to seeing legislation which I would be keen to support which defines clearly the scope of this new conduct Measure, so that it truly relates to matters where we can agree what is good and what is not in terms of practice and professional conduct, and not allow it to be turned into a tool, as has happened many times in the Church's history, for some of us to fight some others of us.

the Ven. Mark Ireland (Blackburn): Chair, I want to speak to paragraph 2.4.2 on page 7 on the duty to protect clergy from frivolous, malicious or vexatious accusations. Every time a bishop institutes a new priest in my archdeaconry, I am then asked to induct the new priest and to defend them so inducted. That charge, to defend the clergy so inducted, is one I take very seriously. Bullying in any walk of life is unacceptable and should be doubly unacceptable in the body of Christ, but the current system is unfair because it is one sided between priests and lay people. When a priest behaves in a bullying way, there are necessary processes in place and, as an archdeacon, I have had to use these and I am hopeful that the proposals for the new Clergy Conduct Measure will provide an improved procedure.

However, sometimes clergy are the ones being bullied by lay officers. Tragically, the threat of taking out a CDM can be weaponised against a faithful priest who is trying to bring Gospel life and change to a parish, sometimes by people who know that if a complaint mentioning safeguarding is made against a priest, that letter, even if unsubstantiated, will remain on a priest's file for 70 years after their death. In those extreme cases where a priest is hounded out and leaves the parish broken and dejected, there is nothing a bishop can do under the Churchwardens Measure or any other legislation to disqualify a bullying churchwarden from continuing to hold office. There was in the original Churchwardens Measure, but that provision was struck out by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. The result is that that pattern of behaviour can then be repeated and certain parishes get a reputation for repeated bullying and for

breaking clergy. Such parishes become impossible to fill and, sadly, there are places that archdeacons are reluctant to encourage people to apply for.

Members of Synod, this is wrong. It is a stain on the body of Christ and an impediment to the Church's mission. Whilst the conduct of lay officers is not part of the remit of this Report, I believe that until this issue of the imbalance of accountability is addressed clergy will struggle to have confidence in the reform of the clergy conduct and discipline process, whatever the merits of the proposals before us. I, therefore, give notice that, in consultation with others, I am planning to put down a Private Member's Motion on the bullying of clergy after this group of sessions. I ask all members of Synod, lay and ordained, to consider that motion and consider supporting it with your signature so that we can ask Archbishops' Council to work on legislative proposals to make sure that bullying behaviour is not tolerated in the Church of Christ, whether it is by clergy or by lay people.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I would like to make a recommendation to the party investigating clergy misconduct. I would like for you to look at the website for "Teacher Regulation Agency" which gives extremely clear advice to members of my profession, former profession, who are involved in misconduct. The clarity of advice that is given on that website indicates both to the people who are complaining and to the complainant the process that is going to take place. It is a triage process for this. I would like to reassure everyone here that in cases of serious misconduct that teacher or member of staff is conducted away from the premises immediately.

I would like to assure everybody here that, in dealing with vulnerable people all the time, which is part of our profession, and 30 of them in a room at one time and having dealt with young people who have been involved in paedophile rings, young people who have been involved in sexual abuse, young people who have been stabbed, young people who have been burnt by cigarettes, I know quite a lot about the way in which misconduct can take place across all communities. We are bound as a profession within our policy. We are bound by a code of conduct. We take that very seriously. I was very alarmed to hear in the pornography debate about the level of abuse which is taking place if people are using unregulated materials in the classroom and I can assure you, if that is taken to the governing body or the headteacher, action will be taken.

We have been, and we always are, in a very vulnerable place in the classroom and the things that bind us as a profession together are some things which may be useful within the clergy profession. We are *in loco parentis* in a classroom, which means we have the role of a parent. In many instances I feel the clergy are in those similar roles and they have to discern for themselves how to operate within their own legal responsibility. I do feel for those who are suffering under this current CDM. Teachers also suffer when complaints are made. The difference for us is the decisions are made more swiftly. They are made with regulation already in place. They are made with support from our colleagues. They are made with headteachers' advice. They are made with union advice, if necessary. It gives clear pathways for people. I would encourage you, please, to look

at that advice. I feel for everyone who has spoken today. I think all our hearts are moved by the distress that has been caused by some of the complaints that have been made.

The Chair. Synod, I want to test your mind now as to a motion for closure as we have had a good hour of debate on this.

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

The Chair. I, therefore, invite the Bishop of Worcester to respond to the debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Worcester (the Rt Revd Dr John Inge): Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you very much indeed to everyone who has spoken. I am grateful for the tone of the debate and the welcome that has been offered to this vision. I will whisk through a few responses and, if I run out of time, it may be that I will not get to yours. Thank you to Nicola Sullivan, a maiden speech. Things did not work out as Canon Hawker had hoped because, as you rightly point out, of the immense changing culture that has happened in our society.

Thank you to Kathryn Hubbard for her maiden speech. In these proposals, you will have noticed that the bishop will be under a statutory duty to provide support. That is, really, a very important part of the proposals. Thank you to Luke Miller. I am delighted to know that the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy will be revisited, as we have recommended. Speaking personally, I would be really very sad if we were, as clergy, to become employees and work on the basis of contract rather than covenant, but others can argue about that. I am thankful to Lynn Nichol for her important points about trust. I did not offer her a drink beforehand because I did not know what she was going to say but I will willingly buy you one now, Lynn.

Thank you to Sian Kellogg. The Code of Practice in the present CDM does put an obligation on bishops to offer pastoral support. It does not always happen but I do hope all bishops will. Thank you again to Peter Collier and for the mention of Sheldon. We are grateful for the catalyst that they have provided to these proposals. Thank you to Sean Doherty for pointing out the importance of having assessors who are properly qualified - that needs much teasing out. Maybe some of you here will be approached, so keep your heads down when the time comes. Amanda Robbie, a moving testimony and I do very much hope and pray that what we are working on now will mean that such things do not happen again. Could I make clear that there will be a legal definition of vexatious complaint in the new legislation.

Thank you to Fr Thomas for your positive comments. Can I say that the idea is that the bishop should implement in the sense that the bishop simply tells the person in a pastoral manner what the outcome is and that enables the role of pastor to be maintained. Thank you to Joyce Jones, self-supporting ministry is clearly very, very important and included in our proposals. Thank you to Bishop Martin, I am delighted about the work that is going

on alongside this. Thank you to Andrew Cornes. Perhaps you could tell us where you bought your pink shorts, they look rather good. I am sure lots of us would like them. I do hope that the proposals we are working on will lessen the pain of which he talked. Can I make clear that the idea of people being informed in writing, that is simply so that there is a record but, of course, we would hope that the bishop at all times, because the bishop, - he or she - will be freed up, they will want to speak personally to the person concerned.

Thank you to Michaela Suckling, the voice of the child or survivor is clearly desperately important. Thank you for the bravery of your speech. To Jayne Ozanne, the time limitation removal is clearly essential and it is one of the recommendations of IICSA. Thank you to Sam Maginnis, we are grateful for the welcome that CEECA have given these proposals. Thank you to Neil Patterson. I have to confess we did not read your thesis in our work, but maybe sometime. I am sure it was excellent. Important points about not using a disciplinary process to fight over issues of contention, but I am pleased to be able to be clear that I am not here either for leisure or recreation.

Thank you to Mark Ireland for those important archidiaconal points and it is good to know that you are proposing something to look at conduct of the laity to work alongside our proposals. Thank you to Penny Allen, we looked at several other systems, not those for teachers, but it will be very possible and indeed I am sure we will want to look at those as we go on. Thank you very much indeed, Chair, and, Synod, I beg to move.

The Chair. Thank you, Bishop. I now put Item 34 to the vote.

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

The Chair. That is very clearly carried, thank you very much for that and for the debate. We now move to the next item of business, which is the Announcement of Election of Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission.

THE CHAIR *Canon Izzy McDonald-Booth (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 11.43 am.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ELECTION OF CENTRAL CNC MEMBERS

The Chair. Good morning, Synod. We come to the announcement of the elections of Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission. I would like to remind Synod that we will hold our applause until the end so everyone has been announced. I would like to invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to announce the results of the election in the House of Clergy. The Archbishop of York will announce the House of Laity.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): These are the results of the election of Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission for the House of Laity and I will read out each pair and the dioceses from which they come. The first pair to be elected is Christina Baron from the Diocese of Bath & Wells paired with Venessa

Pinto from the Diocese of Leicester. The second pair elected is Debbie Buggs from the Diocese of London paired with Prudence Dailey from the Diocese of Oxford. The third pair elected is Temitope Taiwo from the Diocese of London and Clive Scowen from the Diocese of London.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): From the House of Clergy, the first pair are Claire Lording from the Diocese of Worcester and Jo Stobart from Bath & Wells; Esther Prior from Guildford and Liz Goddard from London; Paul Benfield from Blackburn and Andrew Cornes from Chichester.

The Chair: Would Synod like to congratulate those members.

ITEM 35 FAREWELLS

The Chair: We now come to Item 35, Farewells. I would like to invite the Chair of the Business Committee to deliver a farewell to Dr Jacqui Philips, Clerk to the Synod.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Dr Jacqui Philips joined the NCIs in 2014 as Clerk to the Synod and Director of the Central Secretariat. Over her eight years with us as Clerk to the Synod, she worked closely with my predecessor as Chair of the Business Committee, the Revd Canon Sue Booy, to introduce and develop the Synod app, moving us away from paper to being a more sustainable electronic Synod, delivering the first couple of remote and hybrid Synods and managing all the complexities of that. She led the Synod Support Team and was a huge support to the work of all of us on the Business Committee. Jacqui has a flair for design and style and had a constant desire to increase the professionalism in our Church. This is evidenced in a very physical change she introduced here in our Synod: this lovely professional white set that we are using here in York.

When I was elected Chair of the Business Committee, Jacqui was brilliant at helping me understand what I had let myself in for, selfless in her time for me and also making sure I met the people that I needed to but, more importantly, supporting me as I settled into the role. But Jacqui was not just Clerk to the Synod. She took a significant role in the heavy workload of the Archbishops' Council. She played an instrumental role in the Governance Reform Group. She was a champion for the improvement work of Archbishops' Council, Effectiveness and Culture. She took a lead role in safeguarding, taking over responsibility for safeguarding within the Central Secretariat when it had fewer than one full-time equivalent member of staff as recently as 2013. She identified this had to change and set up what is now the National Safeguarding Team.

Jacqui was a real champion for women in the National Church Institutions, a friend and mentor to colleagues and to many Synod members. In thanking Jacqui, who is not with us today, for her time as Clerk to this Synod and her significant work for the National

Church Institutions and the national Church, we wish her all the very best for the next step in her career.

The Chair. I would now like to invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to deliver a farewell for the Bishop of Birmingham.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Actually, I am going to do Peterborough now.

The Chair. The Bishop of Peterborough.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): We are going in reverse alphabetical order of dioceses. If your name begins with W, you would understand why.

Bishop Donald, who is online rather than physically present, is someone who is going to be remembered for his generous, kind and principled, humble, unassuming and personable character. Being in his role, he was someone who has never stood on his own dignity, and his devotion to his family through many demands from illness and other challenges has been extraordinary.

He is a man of wisdom, expressed in profound faith. He is someone who lived out the opening words of the hymn, *Amazing Grace*. He was someone who knew the grace of God and knew himself to need the grace of God, but knew himself to be loved, forgiven and a child of God. In his ministry, he was someone who was deeply committed to relationships. Several diocesan officers have returned from networking events having heard Peterborough described as the relational diocese and, certainly, in my experience of a diocesan visit there, that was very clear indeed. It is how the teams, deaneries and structures are aimed to work together, but it took its cue from Bishop Donald. He knows his clergy well. He is an encourager. He trusts others to carry responsibility and is clear in his public support. He was someone who laughed easily in his ministry. He was serious about getting things done, and done well, but always in meetings encouraging laughter and a relaxed tone, taking time to work out how people were not just what they were doing.

He is a people person. His leadership was an out-working of his security in enabling the leadership of others, sharing the spotlight. I thought there were some slides around. Yes, I thought so. Let them catch up a bit. I suppose they will. I will just keep wittering gently on until they do. You will not notice the difference. He was a talent spotter - he might well say unlike his main football team, but I will come back to that at the end. He spotted talent in lay and ordained and was great at building teams - oh, it has appeared in front of me, thank goodness - developing those who might otherwise be overlooked. He encouraged others into ministry, lay and ordained, and has made ministry amongst young people one of his priorities. His colleagues comment that they have enjoyed huge growth

in the numbers training during the past decade. That is one, it seems to me, of the key examples of strength and we praise God for that. He was an example of a servant leader.

But what mattered to him most was not his own position, but developing a missionary vocation at every level. "The centre of the diocese is the parish church" was one of his early slogans. Covid, that great crisis, brought out the best in his relational leadership. He was always on top of the often changing advice, clear in his direction and also clear about what should be decided locally. He wrote weekly to clergy LLMs and churchwardens - even when there was nothing especially new to say, but simply to keep in touch. He displayed tremendous emotional intelligence in those letters, acknowledging the varied experience of Covid for people and parishes as they experienced it and always containing gentle words of hope, lament and encouragement. The dioceses felt held and felt held together. Donald is, above all, a teacher and a preacher. Through Covid, he has prepared, preached and posted a weekly sermon on the Gospel reading and another on the Psalms. They have been hugely appreciated, to support teaching ministry across the dioceses and by church members for personal devotion and learning.

His preaching and teaching are highly accessible, yet we know that it comes from deep and learned and rigorous study, often from both the Greek and the Hebrew directly. Someone commented from one of the congregations in Peterborough, "He sounds just like one of us but I've learned so much". He was one of those who sounded simple but the more you thought about it the deeper it was. The Annual Bishops' Bible Day is a major event in the diocesan calendar both at the pre-Covid gathering, with up to 600 people in two venues for Bible teaching and workshops, and during Covid. One of the clergy in the diocese remembers inviting Bishop Donald to preach, having just been invited by Bishop Donald to consider becoming Director of Ordinands. He asked a church member later that day what she thought of the Bishop's sermon that morning. "It was great", was the answer, "it made me want to give up my job and go to work for him". The vicar became the DDO and the church member became an ordinand. Bishop Donald is clearly focused on the local church but, like so many of the Bishops, he has also cultivated wide interests.

He has worked with ecumenical groups, the Council of Christians and Jews, developed close relationships with faith leaders across the City and Diocese of Peterborough, champions the work of the Leprosy Mission, in the area of mental health and takes a lead in the work of prisons and prison chaplaincy. In the link diocese he has been linked to the Diocese of Seoul in south Korea, where, as well as some parish links, there has been good experience in lay ministry training. In schools, there has been priority given to children with young people and families, emphasised in a letter accompanying every parish profile. He was awarded an honorary doctorate from Chester in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Christian education.

Peterborough is a trailblazer diocese for the *Growing Faith* initiative and the Internship Scheme provides the template for the now national Ministry Experience Scheme. He loves the Holy Land and has shared his love through leading pilgrimages, often life-

changing experiences for those with him. He prepares his companions attentively. One of them said, "On his most recent pilgrimage he happened to mention that in the many pilgrimages he had never yet witnessed a storm on the Sea of Galilee". Not two hours later, having safely disembarked from the Jesus boat in bright sunlight, the group experienced a storm out of nowhere feeling every bit as powerful as the storm the disciples must have been through. Suffice to say, they reminded him that whereas Jesus had calmed the storm he had started one. He is willing to think differently. "Tell me if I am wrong". At some point in most meetings, this catchphrase will fall from Bishop Donald's lips. Sometimes, it will be the first sentence when he introduces an item where he is tossing an idea out of the clear blue sky. The joke is that, whilst he is unafraid to be told if he is wrong, our exercise is that he is not very often - that comes from one of those who worked with him.

On a different level, you could choose random sub-clauses of most of the Canons of the Church and Donald would seem to know not only which page it is printed on but also the date it was last revised and the reason why. That will be a loss to us. Donald has paid real attention to the history and culture of Peterborough. He has developed a strong sense about what is best for Peterborough to grow. This has meant he has been willing to buck trends and to do things differently and also inspire the missional imagination of others. He is going to be sadly missed both from the House of Bishops and thus from this Synod but also from all his ministry in the Church of England and we wish him a very warm future when he gets there - which will not be until next January - in his retirement in Scotland.

The Bishop of Peterborough (the Rt Revd Donald Allister): Thank you, Archbishop. Thank you, everyone.

The Chair: I would like to invite the Archbishop of York to deliver a farewell for the Bishop of Blackburn.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): Sisters and brothers, it is my really happy privilege to offer a heart-felt thank you to our dear brother in Christ, Julian Henderson, Bishop of Blackburn, who is here with us in the chamber. I first encountered Julian when I was new to Synod 12 years ago and he was a very, very able Chair of the Business Committee, steering this Synod through all kinds of issues with a cool head, a deft administrative touch and a heart which was very evidently in the right place, wanting only to serve the Church and to help it be better at witnessing to Jesus. Those same skills that made him such a good Business Committee Chair have now been the foundation of so much joy, missional endeavour and creativity in the wonderful, wonderful Diocese of Blackburn where he has served for nearly 10 years. Julian's journey to ministry began at Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

He was a curate in London before moving further south to Chichester. He then served in Guildford Diocese for 20 years where, notwithstanding the busy demands of parish life and duty as an archdeacon, Julian committed himself to a number of other roles, mayor's

chaplain, chair of the penal affairs group and the housing advisory committee, plus - wait for it - the diocesan adviser for paranormal enquiries. I do not think that is a typo, yes. When writing a reference for Julian many years ago, an ecumenical colleague said this: "We have been waiting to hear where Julian might be called next: archdeacon or bishop?" Well, it turned out it was both and, since 2013, when Julian became Bishop of Blackburn, he has worked tirelessly to shape the narrative and vision of the diocese in reaching people across Lancashire.

Just recently, I was able to visit the diocese and experience at first-hand the great work that is taking place. Three things struck me in particular: first, an unwavering and joyful focus on evangelism and witness; secondly, a high doctrine of mutual flourishing; third, a bias for the poor. These are tremendous things and it was tremendous for me to be alongside a diocese that was so clear in its Gospel priorities and this, for me, in those few days culminated in a wonderful Saturday night evangelistic event at the gloriously seedy, beautiful Blackpool. I cannot remember the name of the place, what was it Julian?

The Bishop of Blackburn (the Rt Revd Julian Henderson): The Pleasure Beach.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): The Pleasure Beach. It was simply wonderful. In the three days I was there, I was praying on the streets, visiting the University in Lancaster, spending time with civic leaders in Burnley and witnessing the renewal of the retreat centre at Whalley Abbey. Julian, dear brother, as the diocese looks forward to its centenary in 2026, I want you to know that we know that the time and energy that you have invested will continue to bear fruit. In fact, a recent diocesan consultation showed parishes overwhelmingly energised to continue in the work which you have led and embedded.

Julian, you are respected by those who hold a diversity of theological views. You are at ease establishing good relationships with civic and other faith leaders. You have that particularly useful skill, empathy, whilst maintaining the correct level of objectivity. Your continued leadership and ministry with the Church of England Evangelical Council is hugely valued. You have not been afraid to hold firmly to your views, but always with sensitivity and always listening to others and I know that there are many clergy within the CEEC who have been so grateful for your pastoral care, and all of this with humour and kindness.

Julian, you do not take yourself too seriously, but you do take the Gospel of Jesus Christ very seriously indeed and with confident joyfulness. Colleagues talk fondly that you regularly tease them with your observational insights and, although, unfortunately, I do not have photographic evidence - at least I do not think I do - I understand that during the Northern Bishops' Mission in 2016, you confidently waltzed your way across the dance floor at the Tower Ballroom in Blackpool. If anybody has the photographs, we need to see them.

The Bishop of Blackburn (the Rt Revd Julian Henderson): That is not a good idea.

The Archbishop of York (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Stephen Cottrell): But you are also known for your integrity. When playing the familiar game, "Two truths and a lie", you were, I am told, the worst competitor ever and on one occasion, preaching at Sandringham, you confessed to Her Majesty your recent attendance on a speed awareness course. Despite being a self-identified southerner, Julian, you have been adopted by the North, not least your deep desire to champion the North West. In your final speech in the House of Lords you reminded the Government of the importance of levelling up and how vital it is to bring equality and opportunity to the regions that we have served. In response, a fellow Peer remarked, "The Lord Bishop of Blackburn is genuinely humble and totally determined. He really does live his faith". Synod, we say amen to that.

Julian, throughout your ministry, you have had many supporters. However, and I do hope you will pass on our best wishes, today we want to extend particular thanks to your wife, Heather, and to your two children. We want them to know how much we appreciate the love and support that they have given you and the good things that have happened because of that in making Christ known. Julian, as you leave the Red Rose County of Lancashire, I note your recent comments to the clergy you serve, "That, whenever you leave a place, as a priest or a bishop, a bit of your heart remains".

So, please, dear brother, go with our warmest best wishes, our thanks and our prayers and thank you for giving your heart to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to the service of the Church of England in this land. We have no doubt of your continued faithfulness and that God will continue to use you in many ways to make Christ known, but at the end of this chapter we simply say, dear brother, thank you, and Godspeed.

The Chair: I now invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to say a farewell to the Bishop of Birmingham.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (the Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): The ninth Bishop of Birmingham, 16 years, now the longest serving Bishop, born and educated in Scotland near Pitlochry and later at Rugby School. I think he was captain of school and one of those sort of distinguished things, were you not? Yes. During a gap year in Uganda, he went working, rather like me, I think with CMS or something? Yes, with CMS, the same scheme as me. And like me - well, he was invited to preach, which I never was for obvious reasons. He tells a story of the interpreter who was interpreting for him saying after about 10 minutes to the congregation, "This young man does not know what he is talking about so I am going to give the sermon", which indeed was true because David, as a result of his experience in Uganda, was one of those like a number of us here who owes his conversion, his finding of living faith in Jesus Christ, to the East African revival and to the life of Christians in that part of the world.

He came back, went to university and then joined BP - poor chap. He served in commercial management in what was called the downstream area - that means flogging

the stuff rather than producing it - in London and in Belfast, I think, where he was the sort of manager for that part of the world. But he left there and trained for ordination at Wycliffe Hall in Oxford before he was ordained as a deacon in 1984. He served his title parish, his curacy and his years of ministry in parishes in Hull and then to Coventry where he became Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Coventry and later an Honorary Canon at the Cathedral and where his friendship with both bishops under which he served was something that they appreciated exceptionally.

That is one of the first things I want to draw out about him, that David has an extraordinary gift for friendship. All over the place, you find people who have found him to be a faithful and longstanding friend. He is someone who gives himself to people and continues to do so and to keep in touch with them and pray with them. He became Chair of Trustees for CMS in 1994 and remained so in 2008 and it was during that period that he began to find an interest in China.

He became Bishop of Birkenhead in 2000 and then Bishop of Birmingham in 2006. On appointment to Birmingham in 2006, he is quoted as saying, "I want to stay in Birmingham until I retire". And this he has achieved. In Birmingham, his work in the inter-faith area and the ecumenical work has been absolutely extraordinary. He has transformed the diocese in many, many ways but drawing together its leadership in a diocese in a city that has historically been one of the most secular in the United Kingdom. He started with a challenging place for the Church and has worked tirelessly and brilliantly both with the leaders of other faiths and ecumenically and in reshaping the diocese for mission.

In the last few years, since 2015, seven years, he has been convener of the Lords Spiritual. That means he tries to shepherd those bishops that are part of the House of Lords. He has not succeeded in that, but nor has anyone before and nor will anyone in the future. He has been a member of the House of Lords since 2010 and has been someone again who has built up enormous friendships there with everyone from the doorkeepers and those behind the bars - especially with those behind the bars - almost exclusively with those behind the bars. Did I say that aloud? I will come back to that in a minute when mentioning China again. He has shown his interest and understanding in foreign policy and his leadership on economy and business as well as local and regional government.

He has been President of the Friends of IPASC, which is a community health training programme in DR Congo; he is a board member of the Birmingham Hippodrome Theatre; council member of the Chamber of Commerce; a Church Commissioner, and Chair of Ridley Hall. He has also been our, and is for the Church, the main envoy to the international mining companies. That has been work that has laid behind the work of the Transition Pathway Initiative, which has been extraordinarily effective and has resulted in several heads of mining companies looking very differently at Christian faith and being revived or drawn towards Christian faith. It has also had a huge impact on the major companies' attitude to their social responsibilities. He has worked tirelessly with Archbishop Thabo, the Primate of Southern Africa, on extraordinary work which is having

a transformative effect in a whole industry. I am very glad that he will continue to do that in his retirement.

He will retire in October, which means he will be in post for the Commonwealth Games in August in Birmingham and will be part of the welcome to Birmingham. The Commonwealth Games, obviously, take second place to the much more important event in Canterbury, which is absolutely literally the same two weeks, which is called the Lambeth Conference. He will obviously be present at the Lambeth Conference for almost the whole time of that - not. I cannot think why he would think it would be more interesting. He went walkabout in Birmingham in 2006 and he met a disabled athlete there, Mark Southern, aged 33, from Erdington, who said, "I reckon he'll change Birmingham a lot", and he has indeed done so. He is going to relocate to London where he will take up the role of Assistant Priest of St Mary-at-Hill, the church for Billingsgate.

A couple of final stories. He is someone who, having done a lengthy trip with him in China, is absolutely tireless. He goes to bed very, very late. He has got up long before any of the rest of us and usually been running. That is regardless of the events of the previous night. For example, when we went to China we were beautifully received by the minister at the time - he has retired since then - for religious affairs. We had a banquet. At a banquet in China, as soon as the relevant minister gets bored with talking to whoever the principal guest is - which in my case took him about a minute and a half - you start getting the toasts and you have these small shot glasses of rather strong pale liquid and they say *ganbei*, which means bottoms up, which means you have to drain the glass. Quickly, the rest of us learnt that one of the most important techniques when saying *ganbei* is the quick flick of the wrist. David did not.

He ended the evening in a sort of undeclared *ganbei* because then everyone moves round the table. You go from place to place going *ganbei*. David did this with the best of us except that he and the minister swapped *ganbei*-ing jugs of this pale liquid quite early on in the dinner. Don't shake your head, I remember every moment of it - at least for the first half of dinner. The minister was last seen being helped out by two of his colleagues - he would no doubt claim he was helping them, but I am not sure it looked like that - and subsequently retired. The only difference I noticed in David was that his Scots accent began to emerge slightly more strongly and he was still up at 5.00 and running the following morning.

He is tireless. A friend of mine, whose children are his godchildren, says that whenever they go on holiday together David takes the children clubbing and the children always come home before David. But the interesting thing is that all those children and his other godchildren and those many others who have been lost sheep come to know and love Jesus Christ. He is an evangelist of extraordinary skill, whose affection and friendships are genuine and whose sacrifice for others is continual. I am so glad that he will continue to do some work in the Church and I am so grateful, as we all should be, for his extraordinary ministry in Birmingham, his dedication and the giving of his life in every moment and every way. David, thank you very much indeed.

The Chair. We now move to the next item, prorogation.

ITEM 36
PROROGATION

The Archbishop of York prorogued the Synod and dismissed it with a blessing.