

GENERAL SYNOD

FEBRUARY GROUP OF SESSIONS 2025

SEVENTH NOTICE PAPER

MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

Amendments will subsequently be marshalled in the order in which they are to be taken on the relevant Order Paper.

SPECIAL AGENDA I: LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 512: VACANCY IN SEE COMMITTEES REGULATION (GS 2397)

Mrs Jennifer Fellows (Gloucester) to move as an amendment:

“Leave out paragraph 5.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the requirement for at least one lay person and at least one cleric from those elected from a vacancy in see committee to the CNC to be female.”

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln) to move the following amendments:

1. After paragraph 4 insert—

“(4A) In paragraph 13(7), for “Neither the chair of the Committee nor a” substitute “No”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the prohibition on the chair of the Vacancy in See Committee from elected membership of the CNC but would retain the prohibition on bishops from such membership.

2. Leave out paragraph 4.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the proposed requirement for the chair of the Vacancy in See Committee to be elected from the lay members of the Committee.

SPECIAL AGENDA I: LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

ITEM 502: NATIONAL CHURCH GOVERNANCE MEASURE (GS 2360A)

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to move the following amendments:

- 1) Clause 4, page 2, line 34, leave out “CENS” and insert “the Appointments Committee”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require the two independent members of the Governance and Nominations Committee to be appointed by the Appointments Committee instead of by CENS.

- 2) Schedule 1, page 17, line 7, leave out paragraphs (a) to (c) and insert—

“(a) three persons elected by and from the House of Bishops;”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the two Archbishops from ex officio membership of CENS and would increase from two to three the number of members of CENS elected by and from the House of Bishops. Each Archbishop would accordingly be eligible for elected membership of CENS.

Consequential amendments to amendment (2)

- 3) Schedule 1, page 18, line 19, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 4) Schedule 1, page 18, line 25, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 5) Schedule 1, page 18, line 32, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 6) Schedule 1, page 19, line 2, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 7) Schedule 1, page 19, line 22, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.

- 8) Schedule 1, page 19, line 24, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 9) Schedule 1, page 19, line 31, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 10) Schedule 1, page 19, line 44, leave out “1(2)(c)” and insert “1(2)(a)”.
- 11) Schedule 1, page 17, line 26, after “Archbishops” insert “, if either of them is elected under paragraph 1(2)(a)”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would provide that neither of the Archbishops, if either of them is elected to CENS as provided for by amendment (2), is eligible for appointment as deputy chair of CENS.

N.B. This amendment would not be moved if amendment 2 were not passed.

- 12) Schedule 1, page 17, line 10, leave out “two” and insert “three”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would increase from two to three the number of members of CENS elected by and from the House of Clergy.

- 13) Schedule 1, page 17, line 11, leave out “two” and insert “three”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would increase from two to three the number of members of CENS elected by and from the House of Laity.

N.B. This amendment and the next one would not be moved if amendment 12 were not passed.

- 14) Schedule 1, page 17, line 13, leave out “six” and insert “five”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would reduce from six to five the number of members who are to be appointed by the two Archbishops and each of whom must be a member of the Church of England or of a Church which subscribes to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Mr Ian Johnston (Portsmouth) to move the following amendments:

1. Clause 20, page 12, line 41, after subsection (9) insert—

“(9A) Where a report is made in accordance with Standing Orders under subsection (8), each National Institution must, in so far as the report relates to that National Institution—

(a) as soon as is practicable and in any event within three months, publish its response to the report, and

(b) in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the report.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require each National Institution to publish its response to the Synodical Scrutiny Committee’s annual report within three months and to have due regard to that report in exercising its functions.

2. Clause 20, page 13, line 1, leave out subsection (10).

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the provision which states that the Standing Orders on the Synodical Scrutiny Committee may not have the effect of invalidating anything done by a National Institution or restricting the exercise of its functions.

3. Clause 22, page 14, line 3, after “response” insert “; and the National Institution must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the report”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require a National Institution to which a report of the Committee of Inquiry relates to have due regard to the report in the exercise of its functions.

4. Clause 22, page 14, line 11, leave out subsection (8).

Explanatory statement: this amendment would remove the provision which states that the Standing Orders on the Committee of Inquiry may not have the effect of invalidating anything done by a National Institution or restricting the exercise of its functions.

5. Clause 23, page 14, line 17, leave out “before the end of the following year” and insert “within six months of the end of that year”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require each National Institution’s annual report to be laid before Synod within six months of the end of the year to which it relates.

6. Clause 23, page 14, line 19, leave out “before the end of the following year” and insert “within six months of the end of that year”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require each National Institution’s audited accounts to be laid before Synod within six months of the end of the year to which they relate.

7. Clause 23, page 14, line 27, leave out paragraph (c) and insert—

“(c) to consider such other matters as the Standing Orders may specify that are laid before the Synod under this Measure (other than a matter referred to in paragraph (a) or (b));

(d) to question representatives of a National Institution in connection with a matter referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c);

(e) to resolve, on a counted vote of the whole Synod, that a National Institution to which a matter referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c) relates must—

- (i) have due regard to the views expressed by the Synod on its consideration of the matter, and

- (ii) before the Synod next meets, lay a report before Synod explaining how it has done so.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require the Standing Orders to give the Synod an opportunity to consider matters put before it under the Measure other than a matter already covered by this clause and to question representatives of a National Institution accordingly. The Synod would also have an opportunity, on its consideration of the matter in question or a matter already covered by this clause, to resolve that the National Institution concerned must have due regard to the views the Synod expressed and report back to Synod on how it does that.

8. Clause 23, page 14, line 28, at end insert—

“(5) The Standing Orders of the General Synod must include provision enabling the Synod to resolve, in such circumstances as are specified in the Standing Orders, that a report be made to the Charity Commission on the compliance by a National Institution with its duties as a charity.

(6) But provision may not be made in Standing Orders under subsection (5) without the consent of the Charity Commission having been obtained in accordance with the Standing Orders.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require the Standing Orders, provided that the Charity Commission has agreed, to give the Synod a power to decide that a report should be made to the Charity Commission on a National Institution’s compliance with its charitable duties.

Mr Ian Boothroyd (Southwell & Nottingham) to move as an amendment:

Clause 20, page 12, line 36, at end insert—

“(6A) The committee is to have the power to establish one or more sub-committees and to delegate functions to them; and the membership of a sub-committee so established is to consist of—

- (a) at least one person to be appointed by and from the committee, and
- (b) no more than four other members of the General Synod to be appointed by the Appointments Committee.

(6B) For each sub-committee it establishes by virtue of subsection (6A), the committee is to publish—

- (a) the terms of reference of the sub-committee, and
- (b) if the committee is to delegate functions to the sub-committee, a statement of those functions.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require the Standing Orders to give the new Synodical Scrutiny Committee a power to establish sub-committees to which it may delegate functions and the membership of which is to consist of at least one member of the Synodical Scrutiny Committee and up to four other members of Synod. The Synodical Scrutiny Committee would have to publish terms of reference for each sub-committee it establishes.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury) to move as an amendment:

Clause 24, page 15, line 3, after “otherwise)” insert “; and in the case of members of the Church of England or of a Church which subscribes to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the differences between those individuals include, for example, differences of tradition within that Church.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would provide that the references to "diversity" in the Measure are, when applied to members of the Church of England or of a Church which subscribes to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, to include differences of Church tradition.

Mr Andrew Orange (Winchester) to move the following amendments:

1. Clause 8, page 5, line 33, leave out “its functions” and insert “ ”
 - (i) the functions transferred to CENS from the Archbishops’ Council under section 10 which were transferred to the Council from the Church Commissioners under the National Institutions Measure 1998, and
 - (ii) the functions transferred to CENS from the Church Commissioners under section 12”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment would restrict the functions of CENS for which the Church Commissioners would provide funding to those which were transferred from the Commissioners under the National Institutions Measure 1998 and those which are to be transferred from them under this draft Measure.

2. Clause 8, page 6, line 9, leave out “its functions” and insert “the functions referred to in subsection (1)(a)”.

Explanatory statement: this amendment is consequential on amendment [1].

3. Clause 8, page 6, line 20, at end insert—

“(5A) CENS must, within 30 days of submitting a certificate, statement or other information under subsection (5), publish whatever it has submitted.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require CENS to publish whatever information it submits to the Church Commissioners about its use of the money the Commissioners have made to CENS.

The Revd Marcus Walker to move as an amendment>

‘Clause 8, page 5, line 46, at end insert—

“(2A) In using an amount paid by the Church Commissioners under subsection (2)(b) or required to be paid by them under this section by virtue of a subsequent Measure, CENS must (as it is required to do with amounts under subsection (2)(a)) have particular regard to the requirements of section 67 of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840 relating to the making of additional provision for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is most required, except, in the case of an amount required to be paid by virtue of a subsequent Measure, in so far as a subsequent Measure provides otherwise; and “subsequent Measure” means a Measure passed after this Measure.”

Explanatory statement: this amendment would require CENS, when using any amount paid by the Church Commissioners, to have particular regard to making additional provision for the cure of souls where most required unless, in the case of payments made to CENS by the Commissioners from a different funding stream, a later Measure provides that that is not to be the case.’

SPECIAL AGENDA IV: DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTION

ITEM 21: REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS (GS 2396A AND GS 2396B)

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

‘*Leave out* everything after “That this Synod” and *insert*:

- (a) reaffirm its commitment to conserve the underlying value of the Church Commissioners assets in order to support future generations of the Church and thanks the Church Commissioners for their ethical stewardship of assets in supporting the ongoing mission and ministry of the Church of England;
- (b) endorse and affirm the Commissioners' disbursement to the Church of £1.2 billion during this triennium and their intention of maintaining similar disbursement during the next two triennia;
- (c) recognise the catastrophic and rapidly deteriorating picture for diocesan finances outlined in GS2396A and the highly detrimental impact that this is having on the life and viability of the parishes and dioceses of our whole Church;
- (d) call upon the present and future Triennium Funding Groups, or their equivalent, to prioritise within their proposals to be brought to Synod the provision that at least one quarter of the sum (currently £400 million p.a.) disbursed to the Church during this and future funding cycles be paid directly into the stipend funds of the dioceses as a means of best supporting the charitable objects of the Church Commissioners to promote the mission and ministry of the Church of England;
- (e) call upon the House of Bishops to lead on the agreement of a formula for the distribution of such funds that will reflect
 - i. the amounts that individual dioceses have paid in pension costs since 1997; and
 - ii. a balancing moderation that takes into account the comparative wealth of dioceses.
- (f) request the House of Bishops, in consultation with Diocesan Secretaries and the Archbishops' Council, to devise means of accountability through regional peer support, planning and scrutiny to ensure that funds will be used to enable growth in parish ministry and church flourishing."

ITEM 9 FUTURE OF CHURCH SAFEGUARDING (GS 2378)

The Bishop of Blackburn to move as an amendment:

'In paragraph (c) *leave out* the words after 'Church of England' and *insert*:

"and, noting the significant reservations around model 4 in paragraph 62 of GS2378 and the legal advice from VVV dated 31st January 2025, endorse model 3 as the way forward in the short term and call for further work as to the legal and practical requirements necessary to implement Model 4.'."

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to move as an amendment:

'In paragraph (b) *leave out* "greater" and *insert* "total".'

Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester) to move as an amendment:

'*Leave out* paragraph (c) and *insert*

"Thank Professor Alexis Jay and Mr John O'Brien, as well as the Safeguarding Response Group for their generous work to propose new structures for their work to improve the Church's work on Safeguarding."

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford) to move as an amendment:

"In paragraph (c), *leave out* "model 4" and *insert* "model 3".

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

'At the end *insert*:

"() Noting that the work of the Response Group is now concluded, request that the Archbishops' Council take the necessary steps to secure from His Majesty's Government the creation of a public body, to be known as "The Church of England (Safeguarding Independence) Transition Board", comprising an independent chair and eight other members appointed by the Secretary of State and three members elected by the General Synod, one from each of its

Houses, the purpose of the Board being to develop the structure of a new independent body to oversee safeguarding activities on behalf of the Church of England to the extent defined by Synod and

() Request the Archbishops' Council to consult with the Church Commissioners about how provision might be made to fully fund the costs of operating the Church of England (Safeguarding Independence) Transition Board.”.’

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

‘In paragraph (a) *leave out* “support them in dioceses” and *insert* “provide support in dioceses”.’

‘In paragraph (b) *leave out* “greater” and *insert* “full”.’

‘At the end *insert*:

“() call on His Majesty's Government and the Prime Minister in consultation with the Charity Commission to bring forward legislative changes to enable Church Safeguarding measures that are fully independent.”.’

‘At the end *insert*:

“() lament and repent of the failure of the Church to be welcoming to victims and survivors and the harm experienced and continue to experience in the life of the Church.”

65th REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Dr Lis Goddard (London) to move the following amendment to amendment 7 in the Annex to GS 2387:

Leave out “for “two-thirds” substitute “60%” and *insert* “at the end
insert.”

“Provided that in the event of a two-thirds majority not being achieved, a name may nevertheless be submitted if it has received the support of—

(a) in the case of a vacancy other than in either Archbishopric—

(i) a simple majority of those who are members under SO 137(1)(a)(b) and (c) who are serving on the consideration of that vacancy, and

(ii) a simple majority of the members elected by and from the Vacancy in See Committee under SO 137(1)(d);

(b) in the case of a vacancy in the Archbishopric of Canterbury—

(i) 60% of the total number of voting members of the Commission who have been serving on the Commission’s consideration of the vacancy,

(ii) a simple majority of those who are members under SO 137(1)(a)(b) and (c) who are serving on the consideration of that vacancy together with the person appointed under SO 138(6),

(iii) a simple majority of the members elected by and from the Vacancy in See Committee under SO 137(1)(d), and

(iv) a simple majority of the representatives of other Churches of the Anglican Communion who are voting members by virtue of SO 139(2)(a)(ii);

(c) in the case of a vacancy in the Archbishopric of York—

(i) a simple majority of those who are members under SO 137(1)(a)(b) and (c) who are serving on the consideration of that vacancy together with the person appointed under SO 138(7), and

(ii) a simple majority of the members elected by and from the Vacancy in See Committee under SO 137(1)(d).”.”

Explanatory statement: *This amendment would change the effect of amendment 7 so that the threshold for submitting a name to the Prime Minister remained two-thirds but with a fallback so that where the threshold was not met, a name could be submitted if it had the support of a simple majority of the (usually) eight central members of the CNC and the support of a simple majority of the (usually) six diocesan members. It would make different provision for vacancies in the Archbishopsrics of Canterbury and York to take account of the way in which the CNC is constituted in those cases. The amendment would provide for the fallback by inserting the words beginning “Provided that” at the end of the existing SO 141(6).*

ITEM 5 MAKIN REPORT (GS 2376)

Professor Helen King (Oxford) to move as an amendment:

‘After “report, “*insert* “(a)” and at the end *insert*:

“; and

(b) at the specific request of victims and survivors of John Smyth QC, recognise that the institutional failure to enact adequate disciplinary process means that this and other cases cannot simply be labelled ‘historic’ as they have continuing effects on the lives of those victims and survivors who suffer the consequences of the prolonged cover-up by the Church of England.”.’

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

‘After “report,” *insert* “(a)”’; and at the end *insert*: “;

(b) request that action be taken to remove anyone highlighted for safeguarding failures in Makin from holding any church offices or having membership of any committees, boards or councils; and

(c) call on those who currently hold an office or have such a membership to resign”.’

ITEM 13 SPORTS AND WELLBEING MINISTRY (GS 2381)

Mr Christopher Townsend (Ely) to move as an amendment:

‘After “That this Synod” *insert* “(a)”;

leave out the words from “through its ability” to the end; and
insert:

“ministry to reach people in every demographic, to generate opportunities to introduce people to the Christian faith, and to transform lives and communities;

(b) call upon all dioceses, in partnership with church schools and Christian organisations already active in this field, to develop a coherent and resourced mission strategy for sport and wellbeing ministry; and

(c) ask the Archbishops’ Council to consider what steps should be taken at a national level to facilitate and coordinate diocesan development of sport and wellbeing ministry and ask the Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment Board to look favourably on diocesan bids for such ministry.”.’