

GENERAL SYNOD

**DRAFT BISHOPS AND PRIESTS
(CONSECRATION AND ORDINATION OF WOMEN) MEASURE
AND
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 30**

**REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE
ON THE REFERENCE TO THE DIOCESES**

1. Article 8 of the General Synod's Constitution states that a Measure or Canon providing for permanent changes in the Services of Baptism or Holy Communion or in the Ordinal shall not be finally approved by the General Synod unless, at a stage determined by the Archbishops, the Measure or Canon, or the substance of the proposals embodied therein, has been approved by the majority of the dioceses at meetings of their diocesan synods (or, in the case of the Diocese in Europe, of the bishop's council and standing committee of that diocese).
2. In September 2010 the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 30 were referred to the dioceses under cover of GS Misc 964.

Voting on the draft legislation

3. Diocesan synods were asked to consider and vote on this motion (without amendment and as a single motion):

‘That this Synod approve the proposals embodied in the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure and in draft Amending Canon No. 30.’
4. The results of the voting in the diocesan synods and in the bishop's council and standing committee of the Diocese in Europe are set out in **Annex A**.
5. Under Rule 34(1)(h) of the Church Representation Rules, if the votes of the houses of clergy and laity of a diocesan synod are in favour of a matter referred under the provisions of Article 8, the matter shall be deemed to have been approved for the purposes of that Article. (Similar provision is made in relation to the bishop's council and standing committee of the Diocese in Europe by s.3(2) Diocese in Europe Measure 1980.) It should also be noted that, for a motion to be carried in any house, the majority of those present and voting must have voted in favour. (An abstention from voting is not a vote, and if the numbers voting for and against a motion are equal, a majority has not voted in favour.)
6. The draft Measure and draft Amending Canon were approved in forty-two dioceses and not approved in two dioceses. *The majority of the dioceses have therefore approved the draft Measure and the draft Amending Canon.*

7. Under Rule 34(1)(j) of the Church Representation Rules, the diocesan bishop has the right to require that his opinion on any question shall be recorded in the minutes of the diocesan synod. *The Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Coventry, Exeter and Sheffield all exercised that right.* As required by Standing Order 91(b), their statements are set out in **Annex B**.

Following Motions

8. GS Misc 964 recognized that it would be open to diocesan synods to consider motions arising out of the draft legislation, in addition to the motions required to indicate whether they approved it; a number did so. The motions considered by the diocesan synods, and the voting upon them, as reported to the Clerk to the Synod, are set out in **Annex C**.
9. In summary:
- Motions calling on the House of Bishops to amend the draft legislation in the way proposed by the Archbishops at the July 2010 group of sessions were carried in 6 dioceses and lost in 4 (in one case, as a result of a tied vote in the House of Laity). In five cases the motions passed called on the General Synod to debate a motion to that effect. Any motion which the General Synod has been called on to debate in that way constitutes a ‘diocesan synod motion’ for the purposes of its Standing Orders.
 - Other motions calling on the House of Bishops to amend the legislation were carried in 5 dioceses (including one in which the diocesan synod motion was also carried) and lost in 27 (including one in which the diocesan synod motion was carried).
 - Of the two dioceses which voted against the legislation, one passed both of the above motions and one passed neither.
 - A motion calling for the General Synod to debate a motion inviting the House of Bishops *not* to amend the legislation was carried in 1 diocese.
 - Motions concerning the Code of Practice were carried in three dioceses (including one in which a motion calling for amendment of the legislation was also carried).

Deanery Synods

10. In GS Misc 964 the Business Committee strongly encouraged dioceses to consult the deanery synods about the draft legislation. Many diocesan synods did this. However, others invited them to discuss the legislation without asking them to vote upon it, and some did not seek to involve the deanery synods in the process at all. Furthermore, some deanery synods appear to have voted not on the legislation but on the principle of the ordination of women to the episcopate.
11. The Business Committee considers it inappropriate, therefore, to include the results of the voting in deanery synods in this report, because a table of results could be both misleading and misinterpreted

The Armed Forces Synod

12. The Armed Forces are not a diocese and consideration of the draft legislation by the Armed Forces Synod (formerly the Forces Synodical Council) is therefore not relevant to the requirement of Article 8 that it must have been approved ‘by the majority of the dioceses’ before it can receive Final Approval. The Armed Forces Synod did consider the draft legislation, however. Its voting figures, and the following motion that it passed, are reported in **Annex D**.

On behalf of the Committee

JULIAN HENDERSON
Acting Chair

21 December 2011

VOTING ON THE DRAFT LEGISLATION

DIOCESE	BISHOPS			CLERGY			LAITY			C/L
	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	
Bath and Wells	2	0	0	52	9	0	55	10	3	C
Birmingham	2	0	0	39	1	3	34	3	3	C
Blackburn	1	3	0	36	34	0	33	30	4	C
Bradford	1	0	0	22	9	1	22	14	3	C
Bristol	1	0	0	22	0	3	25	0	1	C
Canterbury	1	0	0	42	8	0	52	6	2	C
Carlisle	1	0	0	30	8	0	45	10	2	C
Chelmsford	2	0	0	44	11	5	44	16	1	C
Chester	2	0	2	46	21	3	50	15	3	C
Chichester	0	2	0	30	35	0	37	41	0	L
Coventry	2	0	0	35	2	4	34	4	1	C
Derby	2	0	0	18	7	1	27	10	3	C
Durham	1	0	0	34	5	1	55	6	0	C
Ely	2	0	0	39	6	1	30	10	2	C
Europe	0	2	0	10	4	0	6	3	1	C
Exeter	1	2	0	30	18	0	45	16	0	C
Gloucester	2	0	0	55	5	0	44	5	0	C
Guildford	2	0	0	31	10	2	36	15	3	C
Hereford	2	0	0	27	5	0	42	2	1	C
Leicester	1	0	0	35	9	0	56	3	3	C
Lichfield	3	0	0	45	13	0	46	18	2	C
Lincoln	2	0	0	39	9	3	40	5	2	C
Liverpool	2	0	0	40	8	0	26	12	2	C
London	2	1	0	39	41	0	45	37	0	L
Manchester	3	0	0	41	13	2	38	26	4	C
Newcastle	2	0	0	34	10	1	28	7	1	C
Norwich	3	0	0	33	12	2	31	11	0	C
Oxford	4	0	0	46	19	0	55	15	2	C
Peterborough	1	0	2	37	10	2	30	14	5	C
Portsmouth	1	0	0	36	2	0	36	6	0	C
Ripon & Leeds	2	0	0	42	3	0	30	4	2	C
Rochester	2	0	0	36	12	0	34	11	2	C
St Albans	3	0	0	43	10	0	52	7	1	C
St Eds. & Ipswich	2	0	0	41	3	2	51	2	3	C
Salisbury	1	0	0	37	2	1	48	6	1	C
Sheffield	1	0	0	13	12	5	23	16	1	C
Sodor and Man	1	0	0	14	2	1	33	8	0	C
Southwark	2	0	0	50	14	0	38	13	3	C
S'well & N'gham	1	0	0	31	6	2	39	2	0	C
Truro	1	0	0	26	3	1	33	6	1	C
Wakefield	1	1	0	24	14	0	23	10	2	C
Winchester	2	0	0	23	21	2	37	23	2	C
Worcester	2	0	0	31	1	1	34	3	0	C
York	3	2	0	25	14	1	42	8	0	C
TOTALS	75	13	4	1,503	461	50	1,664	489	72	

* C = Carried L = Lost

RECORDED OPINIONS OF DIOCESAN BISHOPS

The Archbishop of York

‘As a Diocesan Bishop, now that the motion has been voted on, I have the right to put on record a distinct opinion – the reasons why I have voted for the motion.

In doing so, I must explain to Synod that my voting *Yes* does not mean that I am 100% satisfied with the draft Measure as it stands. I voted *Yes* because the Measure is in draft – final drafting will take place in February. The vote is not for final approval, and my hope is that a minimal drafting will be possible to make the likes of me find it 100% acceptable.

I am fully committed to seeing nominated women ordained to episcopal ministry, as well as those who are nominated, though opposed, ordained to episcopal ministry. I am further committed to the provision of appropriate nominated episcopal ministry to those who are opposed.

May I remind you all that on 8 July 2006 I moved a motion, in the General Synod, that,

‘This Synod welcome and affirm the view of the majority of the House of Bishops that admitting women to the episcopate in the Church of England is consonant with the faith of the Church as the Church of England has received it and would be a proper development in proclaiming afresh in this generation the grace and truth of Christ.’

A further motion was moved on 10 July 2006 that ‘This Synod, endorsing Resolution III.2 of the Lambeth Conference 1998 “that those who dissent from, as well as those who assent to the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate are both loyal Anglicans” and believing that the implications of admitting women to the episcopate will be best discerned by continuing to explore in detail the practical and legislative arrangements.’

When the draft Measure from the Revision Committee was made public, the Archbishop of Canterbury and I were concerned that the Measure did not fully meet the two objectives the General Synod had set for itself:

- First, that all orders of ministry are equally open to all men and women without equivocation or qualification.
- Second, to include within the breadth of the Church of England those whose understandings of Scripture and Tradition make them unable to receive the episcopal ministry – or indeed the priestly ministry – of women. (Some at this present time cannot receive the episcopal ministry of the likes of me who have ordained women to the priesthood. I do not see this as a rejection of my episcopal ministry, but rather as calling for gracious generosity and magnanimity. Besides, all ministry comes from Christ and I rejoice that those parishes that have petitioned for extended episcopal care receive the ministry of Christ that will feed them.)

The General Synod has consistently said that it wants to try and find a way of achieving both objectives. Yet every attempt made so far, including the Draft Measure as revised by the Revision Committee, has been found wanting on one side or the other, either because it appears to alter our understanding of the episcopate and divests a diocesan of part of his or her jurisdiction, or because it offers those with theological objections arrangements that do not properly meet their concerns.

The question still remains for me, while still desiring to proceed, of finding a way, without going back to options already considered and rejected by the Revision Committee, of trying to reconcile these two objectives. Many in the Church still believe that there must be a way, especially when so much is at stake for the unity and well-being of the Church of England, and are still desiring to proceed in a way that will maintain the highest possible degree of communion for *all* loyal Anglicans: those in favour and those who are opposed. My view is that the Measure as it stands, though I voted for it, still does not adequately meet these two objectives.

What is important is that the exercise of juridical authority by the diocesan bishop, whether male or female, should remain intact, and that the nominated bishop exercising aspects of episcopal ministry to parishes who have passed letters of request ought to do so through legal authority derived from the legislation itself, in other words from the whole church, rather than by way of delegation from the diocesan bishop.

In my view, jurisdiction should be by operation of law, as the House of Bishops said at para. 7 of GS 1707. The scheme for each diocese would be drawn up by the diocesan bishop. He or she retains the right of initiative. The diocesan bishop would remain legally entitled to exercise any episcopal function in any parish of the diocese. For me, any further revision should not necessitate any change in relation to duties and Oaths of Obedience.

But to make delegation an Article of Faith, given the fact that some clergy and parishes who dissent from the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate find delegation unacceptable, is in my view a burden too hard to bear both for the delegating bishop and those receiving the delegation. Hence my preferred proposal that jurisdiction should be by operation of law.

Finally, the arrangements in the Measure are for the whole of the Church of England and are not for a particular group or section. Legislation is a statement of public policy. We are legislating for how best we should live together as the Church of England. It is not a question of what will be best for women to become bishops or how far can we go to include those who are opposed to their consecration.

A Statutory Code of Practice to which diocesan bishops must have due regard concerns me on two counts. First, those whom it is intended to safeguard have consistently told us that the statutory Code of Practice will not do. Secondly, a Statutory Code of Practice is enforceable by the secular courts. Do we want bishops to be made accountable to secular courts? The Clergy Discipline Measure avoided this nightmare by creating Tribunals. Those are not secular courts. For a litigious age this is a recipe for reputation damage to the Church.

We are the Body of Christ and therefore must strive to live together in peace and in the bonds of affection. We are each other's keeper.'

The Bishop of Coventry

- '1. I have voted for the Draft Measure because I want to signal my full support for the ordination of women to all three orders.
2. However, I am not convinced that in practice the provision for those against the ordination of women is sufficient and I believe that there is need for amendment to the Draft Measure before it returns to General Synod for approval.
3. This explains why I voted for the whole of the Following Motion proposed by the Revd Canon Martin Saxby.'

The Bishop of Exeter

‘General Synod has asked for legislation to enable women to become bishops. Such legislation has been put before us and today it comes to us for further discussion and a vote. This vote does not concern the principle of the ordination of women to the episcopate, but the specific Measure before us and whether it commands our support. For me it does not and you have a right to know my reasons for this. From my experience on General Synod and in the House of Lords, I am well aware that it is easy to pass a Bill or Measure which commands broad assent, but which contains fundamental flaws in its detailed provisions. Such flaws are only exposed as the legislation is put into effect. I believe that the Measure before us contains such flawed provisions which make it unfit for purpose and unlikely to serve the Church well.

I am very appreciative of the women in this Diocese who have been ordained priest and in whom I can clearly see the priestly face of Christ. I am also clear that the Church of England at large has come to a view that women should be appointed to the episcopate. It would be a disaster for the whole Church if the legislation were to fall at the last hurdle especially when this outcome might have been prevented by amendments to the Measure which would also have produced a better piece of legislation.

My first problem is that the Measure embodies gender discrimination in a way that the Church has not hitherto allowed. Section 3 of the Measure allows a PCC to refuse the ministry of a bishop on the grounds of gender, namely that she is a woman, and request that episcopal ministry and pastoral care should be provided for them by another bishop who is a man. This is a major change of understanding and practice. Since the ordination of women to the priesthood, it has been possible for parishes to request extended episcopal care, not on the basis of gender or personal beliefs, but because of the participation of a bishop in the ordination of women to the priesthood. For many people, although not all, the issue is not primarily one of gender, but one of authority and the rightness of their consecration, and they will experience difficulty in receiving the ministry of all those who have participated in that action, irrespective of their gender.

I therefore see the Measure as flawed in three ways. Firstly, it is unfair to women, being sexist and discriminating against them, but not their male colleagues who have participated in those same actions. Secondly, because of this discrimination, the church could be judged to be in breach of anti-discrimination legislation, with unintended consequences given our exemptions from the Equality Act. Thirdly, it is unfair to those who are not able to receive this development, imputing to them a difficulty with gender which is not the primary problem. I hope for an amendment that enables parishes to petition any bishop for the provision of episcopal ministry and pastoral care by a bishop who has not participated in that action which is the major source of their difficulty.

This would then be consistent with section 2 of the measure which imposes on all diocesan bishops, both male and female, a duty to delegate their episcopal ministry, of the celebration of the sacraments and the provision of pastoral care, to a male bishop who is a member of the House of Bishops of the Diocesan Synod of that or another diocese. There is fairness here, but also a problem. Every diocesan bishop is required to make provision of a male bishop for those who are unable to receive this new development. However a diocesan bishop is prohibited from naming himself as that bishop. He must nominate another member of the House of Bishops of his own or another diocese.

This may not be a problem in a diocese with two suffragans. However in a diocese with a single suffragan, the diocesan bishop will either have to nominate that one suffragan bishop,

automatically ruling out the appointment of a woman suffragan colleague, or he would need to turn to a bishop in another diocese.

There are therefore two issues where the Measure needs amendment. First, I see no reason why a male diocesan bishop should not be permitted to declare himself to be the bishop available to care for petitioning parishes, thus allowing him to appoint a woman suffragan colleague. Second, if the result of this Measure will be the emergence of a group of bishops across the country exercising episcopal care for petitioning parishes, then I would prefer to see such provision on the face of the legislation rather than it being left to local custom and subject to a Code of Practice.

This brings me to my difficulty with the Code of Practice required in the measure under section 5. The nature and standing of such a Code is widely misunderstood with both too much and too little being claimed for it. Too little is claimed by those who suggest that provision for those who are not able to receive the ordination of women as bishops should be seen as a matter of grace rather than law. My understanding is that this does not recognise the legal force of a Statutory Code. Whilst the recommendations of a Code do not have the force of law, they are taken into account and used by tribunals and courts in considering questions and proceedings arising from the Measure itself. The Code will therefore come to have considerable weight, with consequences in any tribunal or court of law. However, this will leave secular courts to decide on matters which should have been dealt with in the Measure by the Church.

On the other hand, there are people who claim too much for the Code, suggesting that it is hardly different from anything contained on the face of the legislation, but has greater flexibility for review and amendment. This is not the case because the Code may be amended by the House of Bishops with only a simple majority required in General Synod. The draft Measure is therefore insufficient to reassure those who are not able to receive this development in the life of the Church that they remain loyal Anglicans and have equal honour with those who hold a different view. I believe that the Measure requires amendment, probably along the lines of that put to the General Synod by the two archbishops. There is also the problem that although the Measure is entirely dependent upon the provisions of the Code, we cannot examine the Code before we vote on the Measure.

I shall vote against the Measure today, but in the hope that it will be amended in a way that will enable it to command greater assent when it goes forward in the General Synod to final approval stage.

I trust you to vote with integrity, according to conscience, and after prayer. But I ask that you recognise this integrity and conscience in all your brothers and sisters too. Unless I am willing to un-church one person against another or to dismiss certain groups, I have to believe that the word of God is being presented to me through the convictions of us all. If God is speaking to us, and through us, in such a differentiated way, this must have something to say to us about the nature of the church we are called to be and how that nature is to be expressed in the legislation we pass to shape our common life in Christ.’

The Bishop of Sheffield

‘The Bishop’s Council agreed some time ago that the most helpful role I could play as Bishop in this Synod would be to chair this debate.

I remain content with the wisdom of that decision and I will aim to do so impartially and as well as I can.

It is however important at the beginning of the debate as Bishop of the Diocese to state my own views on the questions before us briefly and as a matter of record. What I say will not, I think, be news to anyone but I hope this short statement will communicate where I stand both personally and as your Bishop.

Personally, I have been convinced for many years of the rightness of ordaining women as deacons, priests and bishops. That conviction has deepened through many years’ study of the scriptures and, latterly through reflection on the nature of the church and on God’s mission in the contemporary world. That conviction has been carried through in teaching and support of many women ordinands and clergy, particularly as Warden of Cranmer Hall. In recent years through membership of the House of Bishops I have become convinced more deeply than ever that the counsel and perspective of women is needed there for the health and good of the church. For more than 25 years of ordained ministry my position has been broadly consistent and grows deeper by the year. I am therefore broadly supportive of this current legislation and of the Measure before us.

However, I have also been called and ordained as a Bishop in the Church of God and as Bishop of a Diocese in which there are many clergy and congregations who take a different view. These are people whom I respect as sisters and brothers in Christ. I am looking forward to attending to their views carefully today and in the future.

The Church of England has been wrestling for some time with the very difficult question of how to make adequate provision for those who cannot accept the ministry of women bishops whilst preserving the integrity and office of those women who are ordained to this role.

The debate will continue this morning and through the coming year. I will play my part as best I can in a way which accurately reflects the range of views in this Synod and Diocese.

It is not my intention as Bishop to vote on any following motion presented to this Synod. This is because the purpose of the following motion is to petition the House of Bishops of which I am myself a member. I have a particular concern as Bishop for the unity of the church and the unity of the Diocese.

In the debates and conversations which will follow this Synod at national level, I will do my best to reflect the diversity of views presented here faithfully at every stage.

Whatever the outcome of this Synod debate and of the legislative process, I will continue to uphold the ordained ministry of women. I will also continue to ensure that those who cannot accept these developments have the best possible provision and are able to play as full a part as possible in the life and ministry of the Diocese.’

FOLLOWING MOTIONS

I: Motions in Support of the Archbishops' Amendments

1. A motion for debate by the General Synod was considered in eight dioceses. In six, it was moved in the following form:

‘That this Synod [i.e. the Diocesan Synod] request the General Synod to debate a motion in the following form:

“That this Synod [i.e. the General Synod] call upon the House of Bishops, in exercise of its powers under Standing Order 60(b), to amend the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure in the manner proposed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York at the Revision Stage for the draft Measure”.’
2. It was carried in the Chichester, Manchester, Wakefield and York diocesan synods. It was also carried in the Diocese of Exeter in the form ‘desires that all faithful Anglicans remain and thrive together in the Church of England and therefore requests the General Synod to debate ...’, and with the text of the amendments included (see para. 4 below).
3. The motion was lost in the London and Newcastle diocesan synods. It was also lost, by reason of a tied vote in one house, in the Diocese of Chester, having been moved in the form ‘desires that all faithful Anglicans remain and thrive together in the Church of England and therefore requests the General Synod to debate...’.
4. A motion calling on the House of Bishops to amend the legislation was passed by the bishop’s council and the standing committee of the Diocese in Europe in the following form:

‘This Bishop’s Council

 1. desires that all faithful Anglicans remain and thrive together in the Church of England and therefore
 2. requests the House of Bishops in exercise of its powers under Standing Order 60(b) to amend the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure so as to incorporate the amendments proposed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York at the General Synod Group of Sessions in July as follows:

“In clause 2(1) *leave out* the words ‘way of delegation to’ and after clause 2(1) *insert*:

(2) The episcopal ministry referred to in subsections (1) (3) and (5) shall be exercisable by virtue of this section and shall not divest the bishop of the diocese of his or her functions”.

The clauses referred to are the draft legislation.’
5. A motion to the same effect was rejected by the Birmingham diocesan synod (for the text, see para. 15).
6. Thus, following motions in support of the Archbishops’ amendments were carried in six dioceses and lost in four. The voting on them is set out in the table which follows.

MOTIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' AMENDMENTS													
	Whole Synod			By Houses									
DIOCESE	Aye	No	Abs	BISHOPS			CLERGY			LAITY			
				Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	*
Birmingham	<i>on a show of hands</i>												L
Chester				3	1	0	36	31	1	34	34	1	L
Chichester	87	50	–										C
Europe	13	10	3										C
Exeter				3	0	0	33	13	0	26	23	0	C
London				2	1	0	34	38	1	33	41	2	L
Manchester				2	0	0	31	21	3	47	20	1	C
Newcastle				1	0	1	14	24	4	15	15	8	L
Wakefield				2	0	0	20	19	0	20	12	1	C
York	62	24	6										C

* C = Carried L = Lost

II: Motion Calling for Amendments to Confer Jurisdiction

7. A motion calling on the House of Bishops to amend the legislation so as to confer ordinary jurisdiction on bishops giving episcopal oversight to those unable on theological grounds to accept the ministry of women bishops was considered in 32 dioceses – in 28, in the following form:
- ‘That this Synod
- (1) desire that all faithful Anglicans remain and thrive together in the Church of England and therefore
 - (2) call upon the House of Bishops to bring forward amendments to the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure to ensure that those unable on theological grounds to accept the ministry of women bishops are able to receive episcopal oversight from a bishop with authority (i.e. ordinary jurisdiction) conferred under the Measure rather than by delegation from a Diocesan Bishop.’
8. The motion was carried in 5 diocesan synods: Blackburn, Bradford, Chichester, Sheffield and Winchester.
9. The motion was lost in 27 diocesan synods: Bristol, Canterbury, Carlisle, Chelmsford, Derby, Durham, Ely, Exeter, Guildford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Liverpool, Newcastle, Norwich, Peterborough, Portsmouth, Rochester, St Albans, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Sodor and Man, Southwark, Southwell and Nottingham, Truro. It was also lost in the London diocesan synod (having been moved with a different first clause), and in the Ripon and Leeds diocesan synod (with the insertion of the phrase ‘in exercise of its powers under Standing Order 60(b)’). The Coventry and Oxford diocesan synods voted separately on the two parts of the motion: in both cases clause (1) was carried and clause (2) was lost.

MOTION CALLING FOR AMENDMENTS TO CONFER JURISDICTION

DIOCESE	Whole Synod			By Houses									C/L
	Aye	No	Abs	BISHOPS			CLERGY			LAITY			
				Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	
Blackburn	79	55	0										C
Bradford	41	18	5										C
Bristol				0	1	0	4	20	1	2	21	2	L
Canterbury	18	87	4										L
Carlisle				1	0	0	8	29	1	16	37	1	L
Chelmsford				0	2	0	20	42	0	24	37	2	L
Chichester	80	52	0										C
Coventry	<i>clause 1 carried unanimously</i>			1	0	1	8	29	1	8	29	1	L
Derby				0	2	0	8	18	0	12	27	1	L
Durham	16	77	7										L
Ely	12	72	6										L
Exeter				2	1	0	15	32	0	14	44	0	L
Guildford				1	1	0	16	27	1	23	26	2	L
Lichfield	37	72	0										L
Lincoln				0	1	1	18	27	5	13	38	4	L
Liverpool	16	61	8										L
London				2	1	0	37	38	0	36	39	2	L
Newcastle				0	2	0	11	33	3	5	30	2	L
Norwich				0	1	2	21	22	3	17	24	1	L
Oxford	<i>clause 1 carried*</i>			0	4	0	19	43	1	15	52	1	L
Peterborough				0	1	2	9	35	3	20	27	2	L
Portsmouth	13	66	1										L
Ripon & Leeds	12	71	0										L
Rochester				0	0	2	10	31	8	13	32	3	L
St Albans				0	3	0	6	39	3	5	52	4	L
St Ed & I				0	2	0	7	36	2	5	41	9	L
Sheffield				0	0	1	22	8	0	20	15	3	C
Sodor & Man	20	36	2										L
Southwark				0	1	1	15	49	0	19	34	0	L
S & N	8	69	4										L
Truro				0	1	0	5	25	0	4	34	1	L
Winchester	61	36	8										C

*Oxford	<i>clause 1:</i>			3	0	1	59	0	3	56	1	6	C
---------	------------------	--	--	---	---	---	----	---	---	----	---	---	---

III: Motion Calling for the Measure not to be Amended

10. A motion for debate by the General Synod was carried by the Southwark diocesan synod in the following form:

‘That this Synod, recognising the significant degree of compromise the draft Measure asks of all parts of the church, whole-heartedly supports the consecration of women to the episcopate, and requests the General Synod to debate a motion in the following form:

“That this Synod:

- (a) noting the significant support the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure has received in the Houses of Bishops, Clergy and Laity of diocesan synods; and
- (b) desiring that the draft Measure be returned to the Synod for consideration on the Final Approval Stage substantially unamended so that it can be seen if the proposals embodied in it in the form in which it has been referred to the dioceses can attain the level of support required to achieve Final Approval

request the House of Bishops not to exercise its power under Standing Order 60(b) to amend the draft Measure”.’

	For	Against	Abstentions
Bishops	1	0	1
Clergy	43	14	3
Laity	29	20	4

IV: Motions Concerning the Code of Practice

11. A motion concerning the Code of Practice was passed by the Bath and Wells diocesan synod in the following form:

‘This Synod, supportive of women in the episcopate, urges General Synod to expedite the production of the Code of Practice by the House of Bishops and to take seriously its role in debating and approving the contents with due regard to those who find the consecration of women to the episcopate unacceptable.’

The motion was carried *nem. con.*

12. A motion concerning the Code of Practice was passed by the Coventry diocesan synod in the following form:

‘This Synod

- (1) Desires that all faithful Anglicans remain and thrive together in the Church of England
- (2) And supports efforts being made by the Diocese to achieve reconciliation and therefore
- (3) Calls upon the House of Bishops to ensure that sufficient provision is made within the Code of Practice for those who cannot in conscience agree with the Measure.’

Parts 1 and 2 of the motion were carried unanimously, and part 3 by a majority (For 70; Against 3; Abstentions 4).

13. A motion was passed by the Bradford Diocesan Synod in the following form:

‘This Synod deploras the exemption in the Measure from the Equalities Act, and requests the House of Bishops to produce a Code of Practice or other measure which does not require the Church of England to continue legal discrimination against women.’

The Motion was carried by 51 votes to 4 with 12 abstentions.

VI: Motions Considered but not Passed by Diocesan Synods

14. It was reported to the Clerk to the Synod that the following motions were considered by diocesan synods but were not carried:

- Birmingham:

‘That this Synod call upon the House of Bishops, in exercise of its powers under Standing Order 60(b) of the Standing Orders of the General Synod, to amend the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure in the manner proposed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York at the Revision Stage for the draft Measure, so that there is sufficient provision and care made for those clergy, of whatever churchmanship, who are unhappy about serving under a woman as their Bishop, to enable them to remain within, and feel a valued part of the Church of England.’

The motion was lost.

- Birmingham:

‘That this Synod is disappointed that the contents of the Code of Practice will not be detailed until after the legislation is passed and ask that improved provision be made, if possible, for those who dissent on theological grounds.’

The motion was lost.

- Bradford:

‘This Synod request the House of Bishops to make long-term provision, for those requesting it, for episcopal oversight by bishops whose orders remain consistent with the position in the Church of England before the introduction of the ordination of women as bishops.’

The motion was lost (For 23; Against 32; Abstentions 12).

- Bradford:

‘Any bishop given oversight of a parish requesting a male bishop shall first have been appointed an Assistant Bishop in the diocese concerned. Retired bishops shall be eligible for such appointment.’

The motion was lost (For 8; Against 37; Abstentions 24).

- Guildford

‘This Synod:

1. supports the proposals embodied in the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure and in draft Amending Canon No.30.;
2. sees the proposals as a significant demonstration of the culture of the Church of England as an organisation that is able to introduce change and to develop over time to continue to serve the needs of its members and the wider communities, in a changing world;
3. calls upon the House of Bishops to ensure that any arrangements that are proposed so that those unable on theological grounds to accept the ministry of women bishops may receive episcopal oversight from a male bishop are time-limited to a reasonable period following the introduction of the Measure; this Synod proposes that a period of twenty years would seem reasonable.’

The motion was lost.

	For	Against	Abstentions
Bishops	1	1	0
Clergy	0	38	0
Laity	9	37	0

- Guildford

‘This Synod:

1. considers that if the issue of a Letter of Request by a parish is deemed to be necessary, then it be issued not merely by a decision of the PCC, but by consultation and majority approval of those on the Electoral Roll of the parish;
2. we are aware that this amendment would necessitate subsequent changes to the draft Measure, and asks the General Synod to make the necessary changes.’

The motion was lost.

	For	Against	Abstentions
Bishops	1	1	0
Clergy	0	34	4
Laity	3	38	0

- Leicester

‘This Synod requests the House of Bishops to consider amending the proposed legislation to ensure that those loyal Anglicans who are opposed to the ordination of women to the episcopate could, with a good conscience, remain within the Church of England.’

The motion was lost (For 26; Against 64; Abstentions 1).

- Lincoln

‘That this Synod call upon the House of Bishops to bring forward amendments to the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration of Women) Measure to ensure that the Measure contains only a single clause permitting the ordination of women to the episcopate in the Church of England.’

The motion was lost.

	For	Against	Abstention
Bishops	0	1	1
Clergy	5	38	8
Laity	3	41	10

- Portsmouth

‘That this Synod

- (1) Thanks all those that have enabled the draft Measure to be considered by the dioceses for their commitment and contribution.
- (2) Recognises that the draft legislation is a compromise for all who have deeply held convictions about the ordination of women.
- (3) Urges the House of Bishops and the General Synod to move as swiftly as possible to pass the draft legislation unamended with a Code of Practice that undergirds its aims so that mission and evangelism can be focussed more fully.’

The motion was lost (For 13; Against 66; Abstentions 1).

- Rochester

‘That this Synod expresses the hope that the House of Bishops will bring forward proposals which will meet the legitimate needs of those opposed in conscience to the ordination of women to the episcopate, so that they may remain fully part of the Church of England.’

The motion was lost.

	For	Against	Abstentions
Bishops	1	0	1
Clergy	18	26	5
Laity	20	17	10

- Southwark

‘This Synod urges that those drafting the code of practice will do so with fairness and transparency ensuring that women Bishops’ authority is not undermined.’

The motion was lost.

	For	Against	Abstentions
Bishops	0	0	2
Clergy	14	24	24
Laity	7	30	13

THE ARMED FORCES SYNOD

The Armed Forces Synod voted on the draft legislation as follows:

	BISHOPS			CLERGY			LAITY			C/L
	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	Aye	No	Abs	
Armed Forces Synod	0	1	0	5	5	0	5	2	0	L

A motion concerning the legislation was considered by the Armed Forces Synod in the following form:

‘That this Synod affirms the decision of the Church of England to enable women to be ordained to the episcopate, but encourages General Synod to develop further the amendment proposed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in July 2010 as a means of implementing it.’

The Motion was carried unanimously.

**Published by the General Synod of the Church of England
and on sale at the Church House Bookshop**

31 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BN

Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2011

£3