

GENERAL SYNOD

JULY GROUP OF SESSIONS 2023

SEVENTH NOTICE PAPER

ITEM 5

SPECIAL AGENDA III: PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

CHURCH OF ENGLAND YOUTH SYNOD GS 2298A AND GS2298B

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry) to move the following amendments:

'After paragraph (d) *insert*:

"() request the Business Committee to bring a report to Synod with recommendations that increase the voice and representation of young people within Synodical bodies and through Synod elections and detailing how the above has progressed enabling children and young people's opinions and concerns to be heard. ".'

'*leave out* paragraph (g) and *insert*

"() appoint three young adults to attend General Synod in accordance with Standing Orders".'

ITEM 10

SPECIAL AGENDA IV: DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS

THE CONTRIBUTION OF FAITH TO THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS (GS 2294A AND GS 2294B)

Mr Andrew Cornes (Chichester) to move as an amendment:

‘At the end *insert*:

“() call on dioceses to enable a swift welcome of offenders after release into an appropriate church community, subject to agreed and clear safeguarding boundaries; and to make this part of the brief for their Diocesan Safeguarding Team.”.’

ITEM 16

NATIONAL CHURCH GOVERNANCE (GS 2307)

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (a), at the end, *insert*:

“() except in respect of recommendation 13, where a majority of the CENS board should be made up of members of General Synod directly elected by and from their respective Houses;”.’

Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark) to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out* paragraph (b).

Insert:

“() request that each of the proposed recommendations be considered for approval in turn at the November 2023 group of sessions prior to the introduction of draft legislation at the February 2024 group of sessions.”.’

Mr Ian Johnston (Portsmouth) to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (a), at the end, *insert*:

“except in respect of recommendation 3, where specific statutory provision should be made so that Synod has

comprehensive, timely and effective oversight of CENS, a charity”.’

ITEM 507

SPECIAL AGENDA I: LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION (GS 2313)

Mr Clive Billenness (Europe) to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph 2, in the inserted paragraph (3A), leave out paragraph (c).’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment forms part of a package with amendment [2] in the name of Mr Clive Billenness. See the explanatory statement to that amendment.*

‘In paragraph 2, after the inserted paragraph (3A), insert—

“(3B) Each vote under paragraph (3A) is to be given on a voting paper signed on the back by the voter; and for that purpose—

- (a) paragraph (7) of this Rule does not apply,
- (b) the annual meeting must appoint a presiding officer, with that person not permitted to be a candidate in the election, and
- (c) in Rule M11, paragraphs (1) to (3) do not apply and paragraphs (4) to (6) apply on the assumption that each person entitled to vote is entitled to do so by means of a postal vote.

(3C) In conducting a vote under paragraph (3A), the presiding officer must give each candidate the opportunity to submit an election address within the three days following the annual meeting; and the rules for the time being in force under Rule 56 apply to an election address submitted under

this paragraph as they apply to an election address submitted under those rules with whatever modifications are necessary.”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would provide that a confirmatory vote of the kind provided for under the new paragraph (3A) for insertion in Rule M9 is to be carried out by voting papers, with each voter entitled to vote by post and with each candidate entitled to submit an election address.*

ITEM 26

ELECTIONS REVIEW GROUP: REPORT FROM THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2312)

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford) to move as an amendment:

“At the end *insert:*

“save that, in respect of recommendation (b), it shall be a requirement that all diocesan electors be contacted by post and email.”.’

ITEM 27

REVITALISING THE PARISH FOR MISSION

Mr Robert McNeil-Wilson (Gloucester) to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (b) *leave out* “a central” and *insert* “the central”.’

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford) to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out* paragraph (d) and *insert:*

“() welcome the increasing emphasis on lay ministry and the expansion of Licensed Lay Ministers in many dioceses, and call

on the Church to commit to increasing overall numbers of both ordinands and parish clergy.”.’

ITEM 28

REVIEW OF THE MISSION AND PASTORAL MEASURE (GS 2315)

Mr Ian Johnston (Portsmouth) to move as an amendment:

‘Leave out paragraph (a) *and insert:*

“() receive the Report GS 2315 on the review of the Mission and Pastoral Measure as a basis for further discussion.”.’

‘Leave out paragraph (b) *and insert:*

“() seek further proposals from the Project Board to address more holistically the issue of the trust deficit relating to our parishes, specifically:

- i. between a diocese and its parishes;
- ii. to provide effective oversight of any decisions that would affect our parishes and an appropriate de minimus for the same;
- iii. representation of our parishes in the central administration”.

Insert:

“() ensure that the issue of the trust deficit is central to these conversations.”.’

ITEM 29

SPECIAL AGENDA IV: DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS

REDUCE PAROCHIAL FEES FOR MARRIAGES (GS 2282A AND GS 2282B)

Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter) to move as an amendment:

‘After “minimal amount” *insert* “for a simple 'basic' marriage service”.’.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry) to move as an amendment:

‘After “That this Synod call on the Archbishops’ Council:”

insert:

“(a)”, and

after “marriage and pastoral care” *insert*: “; and

(b) to bring forward a national package of financial and other support for Parishes who will be adversely affected by such a change (i.e low-income parishes, and those with large numbers of wedding ceremonies)”.’

ITEM 507

SPECIAL AGENDA I: LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

FACULTY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) RULES 2023

The Rt Worshipful Peter Collier KC (*Ex Officio*) to move the following amendments:

In rule 4, at the beginning insert--

“(1) In rule 3.4 (additional matters which may be undertaken without a faculty), after paragraph (1) insert–

“(1A)An additional matters order may, by virtue of section 78(2A) of the Measure, specify a matter referred to in section 77(7)(k) of the Measure (introduction of monument etc.)”.

(2) In rule 3.5 (excluded matters: general), in paragraph (1)(k), before “the introduction” insert “subject to rule 3.4(1A),”.

(3) ”.

Explanatory statement

This amendment inserts an amendment to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules so that they will be in line with an

amendment being made to section 78 of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 by clause 13(5) and (6) of the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. That amendment extends the power of the chancellor to specify matters where a faculty is not required to cover the introduction and carrying out of works to monuments in churches and churchyards.

In rule 1—

(a) in paragraph (2), after “These Rules” insert “, except for rule 4(1),”;

(b) after paragraph (2) insert—

“(3) Rule 4(1) and (2) comes into force immediately after the commencement of the amendments made to section 78 of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 by the Measure resulting from the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure given First Consideration by the General Synod on 11th July 2022.”

Explanatory statement

This amendment is consequential on the previous amendment and provides for the amendments to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules to come into force on the coming into force of the relevant provisions of the current draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure.

AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS

Miss Debbie Buggs (London) to move:

‘In Standing Order 78, the existing text becomes paragraph (1) and after paragraph (1) *insert*—

“(2) Any form of service (within the meaning of Canon B1) which arises from the process within the Church of England known as “Living in Love and Faith” (including any form of

service intended to be used under Canon B 5) and which is the subject of a motion before Synod, or any other consideration by it, is to be deemed to have been introduced as liturgical business.”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would provide that a form of service arising from the Living in Love and Faith process and before Synod for consideration is to be deemed as having been introduced as liturgical business.*

‘In Standing Order 120A, after paragraph (3) insert—

“(3A) An Anglican Communion representative may, despite paragraph (3)(c), move a motion calling for an item of business that is in the agenda for a group of sessions and is concerned with liturgy to be designated as one or more of the following—

- (a) liturgical provision that would be subject to the procedure in SOs 79 to 88;
- (b) Article 7 business;
- (c) Article 8 business.

(3B) If a motion under paragraph (3A) is carried, the question of whether the item of business concerned is capable of designation in the terms specified in the motion is to be conclusively determined by the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity acting jointly.

(3C) Where an item of business is determined under paragraph (3B) as capable of designation in the terms specified in the motion under paragraph (3A), that item of business is deemed to be automatically designated in those terms.

(3D) An Anglican Communion representative is, for the purpose of moving a motion under paragraph (3A), to be treated as being a member of Synod; but the requirement in SO

10(6) (notice to be supported by two members) does not apply to the motion.”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would entitle an Anglican Communion representative to call for a particular item of business to be designated as liturgical business or as Article 7 or 8 business, with the determination of its capability to be so designated to be made by Business Committee*

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell & Notts) to move as an amendment:

‘In Standing Order 107, after paragraph (5) insert—
“(6) Where a presentation other than one relating to a report under SO 105 or 106 has been completed, a motion arising out of the item of business to which the presentation relates may be moved by any member who has given due notice; and the notice must include details of the member’s points of concern.”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would give a member the right, where a presentation (other than one relating to a report) has been made, to move a ‘following motion’ arising out of the presentation.*

‘In the proposed Standing Order 107A, in paragraph (1)(c), leave out “or (5)(b)” and insert “, (5)(b) or (6)”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment is consequential on amendment [1] in the name of Mr Gavin Drake and would ensure that the proposed Standing Order 107A in item 35, which would make procedural provision about ‘following motions’, would apply also to the new category of ‘following motion’ proposed by Mr Drake.*

‘In Standing Order 117, in paragraph (3), leave out “the answer must be included in” and insert “the question and answer must be included in an annex to”.’

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would, in the case of questions asked between groups of sessions, provide that the text of each question and answer is included in an annex to the report of proceedings for the next group of sessions.*

‘After Standing Order 117, insert the following—

“117A Questions: supplementary information and corrections

- (1) Where the answer given to a question under SO 112, 115 or 117 is to the effect that further information will be provided to the member who asked the question, the text of that further information must be included in an annex to—
 - (a) in the case of a question under SO 112 or 115, the report of the proceedings relating to the group of sessions at which the answer is given;
 - (b) in the case of a question under SO 117, the report of the proceedings relating to the subsequent group of sessions.

- (2) Where it transpires that the answer given to a question under SO 112, 115 or 117 was to any extent incorrect, the text of the required correction must—
 - (a) be sent to each member of the Synod,
 - (b) be published on the Synod website, and
 - (c) be included in an annex to the report of the proceedings referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b).”

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would provide that, where a member asking a question (including a supplementary question) is told that further information will be provided in reply, the text of that further information must be included in an annex to the relevant report of proceedings. This amendment would also require any correction required to an answer already*

given to be circulated to members, published online and included in an annex to the relevant report of proceedings.

‘After Standing Order 152 insert the following—

“CONTACT BETWEEN SYNOD MEMBERS

152A. Contact between Synod members

- (1) The Clerk must ensure that, on the election or appointment of each member to the Synod, that member is given a list of all the members of the Synod; and the list must, for each member, specify the following—
 - (a) the House to which the member belongs,
 - (b) the diocese which the member represents or, if the member does not represent a diocese, the basis on which that person is a member, and
 - (c) a postal address, an email address and a telephone number for the member, except in so far as the member has informed the Clerk that the member does not wish that information to be included on the list.
- (2) The Clerk must ensure that the list is kept up-to-date and that, if there is a change in the membership of the Synod, each member is informed of the change.
- (3) A member may use the information about another member that is included under paragraph (1)(c) for the purpose only of communicating with that other member on matters relating to Synod; but that does not prevent two or more members agreeing between themselves to use that information for the purpose of communicating on other matters.”

Explanatory statement: *this amendment would ensure that each member of Synod has an up-to-date list of all Synod members, including contact details except in so far as any particular member has told the Clerk that certain contact details are not to be included.*

Mr Gavin Drake (Southwell and Nottingham), pursuant to SO 107(4)(b) to move a further motion arising out of Item 17 as follows:

This Synod -

1. notes that the Archbishops' Council cites the establishment of the Independent Safeguarding Board in September 2021 as a 'Key Management Action' in response to the Principle Risk of "*failure to deliver core safeguarding projects and to properly embed safeguarding policies and practice across the Church*" (page 47 of the Archbishops' Council Annual Report for 2022, GS 2308);
2. further notes:
 - (i) as stated in paragraph 6(a) on page 4 of GS 2307, the Report and Recommendations from the National Church Governance Project Board, that the Governance Review Group had: "identified Safeguarding as a significant governance failure of the National Church, defining it as '*the most tragic example of the human cost of governance failure that can be imagined*'" [emphasis in the original] and that "the historic failure at a National Church level to have recognised and prioritised the significant risks posed in relation to safeguarding and to invest appropriately has damaged the Church reputationally but more importantly contributed to significant harm both to individuals and communities";

- (ii) as reported in paragraph 3.5.5 of GS Misc 1340, the Annual Report of the Archbishops' Council Audit Committee 2022/23, that the Archbishops' Council did not agree to a request In Autumn 2022 from members of the Audit Committee for an internal audit review into the formation and governance of the Independent Safeguarding Board;
- (iii) as recorded in the Report of Proceedings for the February 2023 group of sessions of Synod, that in answer to a supplementary question by Professor Helen King related to Question 56, the Chair of the Audit Committee said that they "*do not have the ability [to audit the Independent Safeguarding Board]. We are not the Audit Committee of the ISB. We are the Audit Committee of the Archbishops' Council*"; a statement that was later corrected by a letter to Professor King dated 1 March 2023 and noted in an Annex to Report of Proceedings, stating that "*The Archbishops' Council's Audit Committee does have the ability to commission an internal audit of all or of aspects of the work of the ISB, but it has not done so...*" and
- (iv) in answer to a question (Question 85) at the February group of sessions the Bishop of Rochester informed Synod that the unaudited expenditure of the ISB for 2022 was £472,000 and that the Archbishops' Council 2023 approved budget for 2023 included £465,000 for the ISB;

3. further notes that the creation of the Independent Safeguarding Board and details of its operation does not feature in any detail in the Annual Report of the Archbishops' Council;

therefore –

4. is dismayed by the recent decision of the Archbishops' Council to disband the Independent Safeguarding Board and terminate the contracts of its members;
5. notes that a Serious Incident Report has been made to the Charity Commission in respect of this governance decision;
6. recognises and laments that any working relationship between many survivors and victims with the Archbishops' Council has been broken;
7. in consequence, calls upon the Archbishops' Council, working with its Audit Committee, to commission an independent inquiry led by a senior lawyer (judge or King's Counsel) into the safeguarding bodies, functions, policies and practice in and of the Church of England, to report within a maximum period of 12 months, and
8. requires that the report of that Inquiry be fully debated by the Synod to enable it to make decisions about future safeguarding in the Church of England.