THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

First Witness Statement of Archbishop Justin Welby

I, Archbishop Justin Welby of Lambeth Palace, London SE1 7JU, SAY AS FOLLOWS:

1. I make this witness statement in response to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse's (the "Inquiry") Rule 9 Request dated 21 November 2017 addressed to Mr Peter Frost of Herbert Smith Freehills LLP (the "Request").

2. Save where I say otherwise, the matters set out in this witness statement are within my own knowledge and are true. Where I refer to matters that are not within my own knowledge, they are derived from the sources stated and are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. Given the breadth of the matters touched upon by the Inquiry's Request, I have received assistance through the provision of information from a number of other individuals in the course of preparing this statement, including Bishop Tim Thornton, the Bishop at Lambeth, Stephen Slack, Head of the Legal Office of the National Church Institutions of the Church of England, and Graham Tilby, the National Safeguarding Adviser.

3. I attach an index which sets out the key documents referred to in this statement with their corresponding URN numbers. When I refer to this index I do so in the format: [JW-1/tab; ACExx].

4. As appears from what I say below, the information I have learned about the abuse of children and vulnerable adults by people within the Church of England (also referred to in this statement as the "CofE") and elsewhere is very distressing and I was one of those who called for a public inquiry (or Royal Commission) to examine the issues. I am therefore pleased that such an inquiry has been set up and remain deeply committed to assisting it in any way within my capacity. The failures that we have
seen are deeply shaming, and I personally find them a cause of horror and sadness. These reactions are intensified by the difficulties that there are in finding a good approach that brings justice to all involved. In this context the recent Carlile report has been distressing, in that it suggests that in our eagerness to ensure that we did not cover up harm, we may have caused harm through some of our processes being insufficiently robust. Any resolution of the failures of the CofE must ensure that there is transparency, clarity, care and above all justice. I am filled with a deep sense of guilt at my failure, in five years in office, to have resolved all of this, and yet looking back I cannot see any simple solutions. I very much hope that the Inquiry enables us to consider how we can continue to change our ways so that safeguarding is an instinctive and normal part of the life of every single part of the CofE. The CofE is God’s creation, but it is a human institution. It is my duty (and that of all in the CofE) to ensure that it is a safe place for all. The complexities of achieving such a goal are considerable in England, as we and other institutions have showed. They are infinitely more so across the Anglican Communion, with its realities of conflict, persecution and intense poverty. We must be a church and Communion where all feel safe within its care, even when exposed to terrible dangers and suffering outside its shelter. We must be a church that makes flourishing a reasonable aspiration that overcomes the human evil that assaults each of us from within and without.

Introduction

My career

5. I started my career working in the oil industry, based first in Paris and then in London, for 11 years ending as Group Treasurer of Enterprise Oil plc, a significant British company. In 1989, I left to train for ordination. I obtained a theology degree at St John’s College, Durham. After being ordained Deacon in 1992, I spent 15 years serving in Coventry Diocese. The first three years were at All Saints Chilvers Coton, Nuneaton with St Mary the Virgin, Astley. It was here that I had my first exposure to issues of safeguarding as we now call it. This was especially in the context of preparing for and leading children’s holiday clubs on a large scale (with up to 100 children of primary age) and the introduction of new procedures to protect them. Subsequently I was Rector of St James, Southam from 1995-2002 with St Michaels, Ufton from 1996. In 2002, I was made a Residiary Canon of Coventry Cathedral, where I ran the reconciliation work based there, but spent much of my time working in areas of conflict, mainly in sub-Saharan Africa. On 8 December 2007, I was installed as the Dean of Liverpool (responsible for the Cathedral and on the senior staff team of the Diocese) and on 2 June 2011, I became the Bishop of Durham. On 9
November 2012, it was announced that I would become the 105th Archbishop of the See of Canterbury. I officially became Archbishop of Canterbury (also referred to in this statement as the "Archbishop") on 4 February 2013, succeeding Dr Rowan Williams who retired at the end of December 2012. I began to have operational responsibilities as Archbishop from this date onwards. I was installed at Canterbury Cathedral on 21 March 2013.

The role of the Archbishop of Canterbury

6. It is important to explain the role of Archbishop of Canterbury. I am the Diocesan Bishop of the See of Canterbury, where the overwhelming bulk of the work is carried out by the Bishop of Dover (the suffragan bishop) under a legal delegation from me. I am Metropolitan (senior Bishop) of the Province of Canterbury which contains 29 dioceses, including the Diocese of Europe, stretching right across the Continent. I am Primate of All England, and thus the senior Bishop of the Church of England, with significant consequent constitutional and religious responsibilities including in the House of Lords. This post also brings with it an unspecified but real responsibility to speak first for Christians and secondly for those of other faiths, especially when they are or feel threatened. I am an 'Instrument of the Anglican Communion', with almost 1,000 dioceses in 165 countries grouped into 39 provinces, each with a Primate (see further paragraph 126 below). The average Anglican, of the over 80 million worldwide, is in fact a sub-Saharan African woman in her thirties on less than $4/day, with a high probability of living under persecution and/or in a zone of conflict. Thus a good deal of my time and energy is spent in encountering those who have suffered hugely, through murders, extreme sexual violence and abuse, terrorist attacks and so on. In addition to these roles I have legal responsibility (delegated largely but not entirely to the Bishop at Lambeth) for armed forces chaplaincy. I have shared responsibility with the Dean of the Chapels Royal for relations with the Royal Family and senior political figures of all parties. Finally, I speak for the CofE on any number of issues, a role shared as much as possible with the Archbishop of York and others.

7. In light of these responsibilities, it is difficult for me to devote a high proportion of my time to any single issue or aspect of church life, however important, or to be fully apprised of all the detail relating to it. I therefore rely extensively on others to assist me in exercising my role. I see one of my main roles as seeking to ensure that there are appropriate people in place, with appropriate specialist and professional expertise, who can oversee the day-to-day operations, whilst I keep an overall eye on developments within the CofE.
8. My responsibilities do not include the line management of diocesan bishops in any sense that would be the case in other organisations. The CoE has a complicated structure in which diocesan bishops have a largely autonomous role. In normal circumstances the Archbishop is not in direct control of the diocesan bishops in a management sense. Diocesan bishops in the southern province (Canterbury province) take an oath of due obedience\(^1\) to the Archbishop of Canterbury but that is limited in its effect. I have no legal power to direct that bishops take specific action or to dismiss a bishop. However, I do have significant influence over my fellow bishops, as does the Archbishop of York. I understand my role as being able to influence and shape culture which is of great importance in an organisation such as the CoE particularly in relation to safeguarding where it is paramount that everyone understands that they have a role and responsibility for safeguarding children, young people and vulnerable adults in the context of the CoE and its teachings.

**My safeguarding experience**

9. I have attended a number of safeguarding sessions over the course of my service. In 1993, when I was a curate, I was involved in running a holiday club for children (see paragraph 5 above) and had to attend the requisite safeguarding training in advance of assuming this position. I attended "child protection" training in 2000 whilst I was Rector of Southam & Ufton. Although I cannot recall the precise date, I recall attending a day's safeguarding training when I was Dean of Liverpool. I had no specific safeguarding training before becoming Bishop of Durham or Archbishop of Canterbury, something that I have sought to rectify by making it a requirement that all prospective bishops undergo safeguarding training before they can be consecrated (see further paragraph 22 below). Since becoming Archbishop, I have attended the C4 module training (i.e. senior staff safeguarding training) in December 2014 and July 2017 which included training on handling disclosures. There is an expectation in *The Safeguarding Training & Development Practice Guidance, January 2017* ("Safeguarding Training guidance") [JW-1/33; ACE025227] that the C4 module is refreshed every three years, therefore my next round of training will be in the year 2020.

10. I did not have any involvement or role in the "national church's" development of safeguarding policy, prior to assuming the role of Archbishop. However, I have always been aware of safeguarding issues and have sought to implement relevant policies, as far as I am aware, in the right manner, in my various roles. I recall from

---

\(^1\) Canon C.14.1.
my early days in the CoE when I worked as a curate at my parish, the vicar and a visiting children’s worker made sure that all those in the parish were aware of the risks of child abuse and the need effectively to combat it which helped to strengthen my awareness. As a parish priest, I was involved in seeking to ensure that the safeguarding policies and practices were applied appropriately in the parishes in which I served. I implemented the Diocese of Coventry's policies on child protection whilst Rector of Southam & Ufton. In my roles at Coventry and Liverpool Cathedrals and as Bishop of Durham, I was aware of the safeguarding policies and practices of the CoE at both a national and diocesan level. I tried to ensure they were properly implemented. As Dean of Liverpool, I made a point of strengthening the cathedral’s implementation of safeguarding policies; for example I ensured that members of the Cross Guild\(^2\) who were still involved in running services and related events and worked extensively with young people underwent the appropriate Criminal Records Bureau checks.

The Archbishop of Canterbury’s role in safeguarding in the Church of England

11. I take seriously my role as set out in section 1.1 of the *Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance* ("Key Roles Guidance 2017") [JW-1/34; ACE025247] to "provide leadership and direction in promoting a Safer Church" which includes ensuring that we keep the welfare and protection of children central in our work.

Change in approach to safeguarding since assuming my position as Archbishop

12. I have, of course, become much more aware of the nature, scale and scope of the safeguarding issues within the CoE since becoming Archbishop of Canterbury. This has not led to a fundamental change in my personal practice as I had already been aware of the role that senior officers, and indeed anyone, within the CoE must play in relation to safeguarding. This is something about which I have sought to be rigorous, informed both by experience and by a deep sense of shame at past failures within the CoE.

13. However, since 2013 I have become much more aware of the need for change across the CoE as a whole. As detailed in paragraphs 52 to 54 below, I have ensured that safeguarding is at the forefront of the CoE’s agenda which has resulted in some significant, new safeguarding developments. One of the by-products of this has been the improvement of safeguarding infrastructure within the CoE. In my

\(^2\) The Cross Guild is Liverpool Cathedral’s Old Choristers’ Association. After leaving the choir, many of the choristers join the Cross Guild which continues to play a role in services at the Cathedral by, for example, providing ceremonial aspects of the Sunday morning Eucharist and other special services.
opinion the establishment of the National Safeguarding Team ("NST") in particular was a pivotal development as it has been responsible for introducing a raft of reforms, policies and guidance. Further, in recognition of the excellent assistance which Kate Wood was providing on a part time basis as an independent safeguarding consultant to Lambeth Palace, I thought it was important to strengthen the safeguarding support available to myself and the Archbishop of York to ensure our offices properly address safeguarding issues (see further paragraphs 23 and 24 below).

14. In addition to internal reforms, following meetings I had with victims and survivors of abuse within the CoE, I thought it essential to add my voice to the calls for an independent public inquiry or Royal Commission into issues concerning the sexual abuse of children in public institutions including the CoE over the last few decades. I therefore sent a letter to the Home Secretary to this effect on 5 June 2014 [JW-1/9; ACE026002] to which the Home Secretary responded on 18 July 2014 [JW-1/10; ACE026009]. I subsequently met with the Home Secretary, her adviser, Bishop Paul Butler, the President and the Assistant Secretary of the Methodist Conference and the Director the CoE Central Secretariat to discuss the call for an inquiry. As noted in my letter, I believe that "[public institutions] all need to be open about our own failures and not to be perceived as hiding in the undergrowth of other institutions' shortcomings". We need to face and deal with these past failures in a way that "enables survivors to move forward and institutions to be more effective in setting a better path for the future".

My main role in relation to safeguarding

15. A brief description of the role of the two archbishops in relation to safeguarding is set out at section 1.1 of the Key Roles Guidance 2017 [JW-1/34; ACE025247]. In summary I believe my role can be divided into four specific areas: (1) using my influence to help ensure that necessary reforms to legislation, guidance or practice take place; (2) providing leadership and raising awareness across the CoE; (3) ensuring resources at Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Palaces and more generally are adequate; and (4) overseeing any disciplinary proceedings against bishops.

(1) Using my influence to help ensure that necessary reforms take place

16. One of the ways I have sought to ensure that the necessary reforms take place is through my role on the Archbishops' Council which is generally responsible for introducing Measures and Canons to the General Synod for approval. The meetings of the Archbishops' Council are chaired by either myself or the Archbishop of York. I
have sought to ensure that safeguarding is always given the appropriate attention at these meetings.

17. In May 2013, shortly after the publication of the Final Report by Bishop John Gladwin and Chancellor Rupert Bursell QC (the "Commissaries") who conducted the Chichester Visitation (the Final Report and the Chichester Visitation are defined in paragraph 81 below), the recommendations of the Final Report were discussed in the Archbishops' Council and House of Bishops meetings. The Archbishops' Council (which I chaired) considered both the legislative and non-legislative steps to deal with the concerns raised by the Commissaries. In addition, the Archbishops' Council agreed additional funding of up to £100,000 to support the implementation of the non-legislative initiatives.

18. As part of the process of implementing these legislative changes the Archbishop of York and I presented a document entitled "Safeguarding: follow-up to the Chichester Commissaries' Reports (GS 1896)" to the General Synod in July 2013. As set out in the foreword of this paper "since the publication of the interim report much work has been done by the National Safeguarding Adviser, the Joint Liaison Safeguarding Group, and the Clergy Discipline Commission, along with officers, exploring how best to respond to and enact the Commissaries recommendations." [JW-1/39; ACE026005] The General Synod passed a motion which included an invitation to the Business Committee of the Synod to put forward for First Consideration the necessary draft legislation as soon as the responses to the Archbishops' Council’s consultation document had been assessed, with a view to securing final approval for the legislation in the lifetime of that Synod.

19. Given the importance and range of the proposals, the General Synod was given a preliminary opportunity in February 2014 to consider the proposed package ("Proposals for Legislative Change in Response to the Report of the Archbishop’s Chichester Visitations", GS 1941) and following debate endorsed the proposals. The proposals took into account not just the recommendations of the Commissaries but also other submissions made in the course of the Archbishops' Council’s consultation. The legislative package was contained in two different instruments. Draft legislation, in the form of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 ("2016 Measure") [JW-1/32; ACE002233] and Amending Canon No. 34, was introduced at the July 2014 group of sessions. Final approval for both instruments was given by the General Synod in July 2015.

20. Adrian Iles and Stephen Slack have set out in their witness statements further detail on the 2016 Measure and Amending Canon No. 34 (and the changes which they
introduced). As Mr Slack has noted, "Prior to the introduction of Canon C 30 there were no Canons which dealt expressly with the issue of safeguarding or with the welfare of children or vulnerable adults – the Church’s response to such matters having previously been contained solely in the House of Bishops’ guidance."

(2)  Providing leadership and raising awareness of the issue across the CofE

21. Since I became the Archbishop of Canterbury, safeguarding has been discussed in 8 of the 10 House of Bishops meetings which have taken place and I have taken the opportunity to voice my commitment to strengthening safeguarding at 4 of these meetings. For example, at the recent House of Bishops meeting in December 2017, I urged the members of the House of Bishops to take away a clear set of commitments on what they should do to live out and express a collective leadership role on safeguarding. Separately, safeguarding related legislation has been put forward in 6 of the 13 General Synod meetings. As set out above, I helped to drive forward the legislative changes at the General Synod following the Chichester Visitation and have spoken at the General Synod meetings in support of improving safeguarding and shifting the culture in the CofE. For example in my statement to the General Synod on 7 July 2013 I emphasised that “there has to be a complete change of culture and behaviour”.  

22. I also provide ongoing support to individual bishops in relation to their safeguarding role. One of my responsibilities as set out in the Key Roles Guidance 2017 is to ensure that diocesan bishops engage in safeguarding induction and training. I have made it clear that I will not consecrate a bishop in the Province of Canterbury unless they can show that they have undertaken appropriate safeguarding training.

(3)  Ensuring resources at Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Palaces and more generally are adequate

23. I have significantly strengthened the safeguarding resources available to the archbishops to ensure that Lambeth Palace and Bishopthorpe Palace are properly equipped to address safeguarding concerns. In September 2016 a Provincial Safeguarding Advisers ("PSA") were appointed in both Bishopthorpe and Lambeth and at the same time I ensured that oversight of all safeguarding matters was delegated to the Bishop at Lambeth, previously Bishop Nigel Stock and now Bishop Tim Thornton.

3  http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/5100/general-synod-archbishop-justins-statement-on-safeguarding
24. I am also responsible, alongside the Archbishop of York, for appointing the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding, who at present is the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Right Reverend Peter Hancock. Since becoming Archbishop, I have made sure that he has appropriate support from other bishops to help with his heavy workload. At present, the Bishop of Horsham (the Right Reverend Mark Sowerby) and the Bishop of Crediton (the Right Reverend Sarah Mullally - now Bishop of London designate\(^4\)) assist him in matters relating to safeguarding. In addition, I agreed a fixed term of three years with Bishop Peter Hancock for him to assume the role of Lead Bishop on Safeguarding both because I want to encourage distributive leadership in relation to safeguarding and because I am conscious of the size of the workload and the personal impact of the position, and think it is important that no one takes on the role for too long.

25. The Church Commissioners are also funding additional posts from 2018. Following Dame Moira Gibb’s independent review into Peter Ball, we have appointed a Safeguarding Support Officer to provide direct support to the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding, who is due to start her post in early March. We will be appointing a similar post at Lambeth Palace. Both posts are part of the NST and have been developed in recognition of the high levels of relevant communications that both the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding and Lambeth Palace receive and the need to respond to these in a more timely way. Furthermore, the Archbishops’ Council has also now recruited a Safeguarding Casework Officer to work closely with the Senior Casework Manager and the PSAs to manage and coordinate complex casework.

(4) Disciplinary role

26. As mentioned in paragraph 108 below, I have a role in respect of disciplinary processes in relation to bishops in the southern province, the Archbishop of York and other bishops in the northern province when the Archbishop of York cannot act (eg because of some prior involvement in the matter). Additionally, I can also direct that the Archbishop of York or any bishop in the southern province undergo a risk assessment.\(^5\)

\(^4\) Bishop Sarah Mullally was originally appointed to receive the Elliot Review in light of Bishop Paul Butler’s (the previous Lead Bishop on Safeguarding) involvement with the survivor, but has since stayed on in a supporting role to the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding and she has played an important role with a number of survivors.

\(^5\) Canon C30 (of Safeguarding), paragraphs 2(1) and 2(2) which came into force on 1 March 2017. It has not yet been necessary for me to exercise this power.
My involvement in the day-to-day running of safeguarding within the CofE

27. I do not normally become involved in individual safeguarding cases. These are handled at a diocesan level and the more complex cases are taken on by the NST. Matters relating to safeguarding issues can be and are referred to me or brought to my attention in a variety of ways. I sometimes receive information through my staff here at Lambeth who have themselves reviewed correspondence addressed to me, or been contacted by a victim or survivor, or had a matter referred to them. On other occasions I have received information via other clergy or bishops. All matters brought to my attention are now sent immediately to either the PSA or the Bishop at Lambeth (as appropriate) who will address them on my behalf and ensure they are referred to the appropriate diocese or the NST.

28. I will usually only become directly involved in a safeguarding case if there is a disciplinary matter as set out at paragraph 26 above. However, there have, of course, been cases where I have felt that it was incumbent on me to commission a review and/or write to the survivors whose cases may have previously been mishandled by the CofE, such as in the case of Peter Ball. I have also had meetings with representatives of MACSAS and other survivors (see further paragraphs 73 to 78 below).

29. I always make myself available to meet with the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding when he would like me to support various safeguarding initiatives. I often meet with him at the time of meetings of the House of Bishops. We would typically meet a few times each year.

30. I also work with the lay leadership team in Church House. I meet with William Nye, the Secretary General of the Archbishops' Council, whose staff includes the NST, once every two months, during which we will usually discuss safeguarding issues. I am briefed by members of the NST as and when required and I am very clear that as bishops we should take advice from the lead professionals in this area, both at national and diocesan level. The Bishop at Lambeth, Bishop Tim Thornton, has delegated responsibility for more regular meetings and meets with members of the NST and the PSA on a weekly basis. The Bishop at Lambeth is also a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group ("NSSG") and the National Safeguarding Panel ("NSP") and is generally responsible for reporting any safeguarding issues back to me. I do not attend the NSP or NSSG meetings but I am responsible for agreeing the appointment of some of their members.
How safeguarding should be managed within the Church of England

National and diocesan involvement in safeguarding

31. I frequently encounter the question whether safeguarding responsibilities should be in the hands of the dioceses or "national church". I believe there is a role for both which needs to be effectively balanced and managed.

32. I believe that the main implementing bodies in the CofE, in terms of safeguarding culture and practice are, and need to be, the dioceses and parishes as this is where the day-to-day contact and the work in practice happens. Dame Moira Gibb noted in her recently published report, in relation to the case of Peter Ball, that safeguarding is most effectively implemented at the diocesan and parish level. It is the parishes and dioceses which need to know how to identify and properly escalate safeguarding issues and deliver training and advice to promote cultural awareness across the dioceses.

33. However, the "national church" plays an important leadership role in ensuring that legislation, policies and guidance are in place in a form that can be implemented at a diocesan level, led by the bishops and their Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers ("DSAs") and supported by the NST and the NSSG and that there are clear messages about the importance of safeguarding across the CofE. A key example is the introduction (through the 2016 Measure) of a new legally binding duty on bishops and others to have "due regard" to the House of Bishops' guidance on safeguarding and the drafting by the NST of a wide range of detailed policy and practice guidance. Further, the NST plays an important monitoring role by coordinating and collating the annual diocesan safeguarding self-assessments, and commissioning independent diocesan audits which were carried out by The Social Care Institute for Excellence ("SCIE") in 2015 – 2017 and are now intended to take place every five years.

34. The Inquiry has asked whether I consider that there should be a national service to investigate and provide redress and assistance to adult survivors of non-recent abuse. I am uncertain whether the Inquiry is referring to a national service to be provided by the state, or to one that would be run by the National Church Institutions ("NCIs"), but I shall respond on the basis that it is the latter.

35. The investigation of alleged sexual abuse by church officers is currently governed by Responding to, Assessing and Managing Safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers (2017) ("Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017") [JW-1/36; ACE025256]. This sets out in detail what should be done at a diocesan
level when an allegation of current or past abuse is made and when it should be referred to the NST for their involvement.

36. Redress in the form of support and assistance is also covered in Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017; this sets out when apologies should be made to survivors and governs the provision of pastoral assistance. As Mr Tilby explains in his statement, redress in terms of financial compensation is not addressed in this guidance as it was considered important to keep civil claims separate to the support and assistance which is provided by the dioceses. I understand that Mr Tilby has set out the processes in place for handling civil claims in his statement, along with further detail about the provision of support and assistance.

37. My present view is that the current arrangements appropriately allocate responsibility between the dioceses and the "national church". I appreciate that the guidance is relatively new so we are still taking stock of its effectiveness; I would hope that any issues would come through feedback from dioceses in the course of their direct contact with survivors for the purposes of referrals and support. Such feedback may also be raised during the regular self-assessment and diocesan audits on safeguarding which are now in place.

38. Nevertheless, I am personally open to the idea of a "national" scheme, if it would serve survivors more effectively. I would however want to see evidence that a centralised investigation and redress scheme would be more effective before supporting it. My main concern is that any centralised system may be overly bureaucratic and less effective; I believe that it is crucial that we ensure that all CofE officials take responsibility for their part in building a safe church and therefore have a role in safeguarding (rather than it being the sole responsibility of the "national church") in order for safeguarding to work properly. I would therefore prefer, if possible, to introduce any changes which would help make our current system work more effectively.

39. I understand from Mr Tilby that the CofE, through the work of the NSSG, is keeping the matter of investigation and redress under review. Any changes to the system would not be a decision for me to make; the NSSG would need to recommend such an approach and, since giving effect to it would be likely to require legislation, it would then have to be considered by other bodies with an interest in the matter (notably the House of Bishops, the Archbishops’ Council and the Church Commissioners).
National helpline

40. The Inquiry has asked whether the CofE should run a national helpline to deal with current and non-recent abuse and to provide a professional counselling and sexual violence service to those abused by individuals within the CofE. I understand that the NST is in the process of developing the Safe Spaces Project in collaboration with the Roman Catholic Church. Safe Spaces will develop a single national resource that victims and survivors of church context abuse can access swiftly and easily when they require it. The intention is to commission an independent organisation to deliver a helpline response to victims and survivors and make arrangements for the assessment of their needs and identification of appropriate services to meet such needs. I understand that an outline of the Safe Spaces pilot project is provided in the second witness statement of Bishop Peter Hancock. I believe that the national helpline which is currently in development and support provided at the diocesan level are both important.

The role of the Government in safeguarding

41. The Inquiry has asked whether I think the "State" should regulate or provide oversight of the safeguarding activities of the CofE and whether I consider it appropriate to make it a criminal offence not to report allegations of sexual abuse.

"State" regulator

42. I am not entirely clear on the precise role the Inquiry envisages that a "State regulator" might play, nor whether the Inquiry is contemplating the extension to the CofE of some form of state regulation that already applies to other institutions, or whether such a regulator would simply govern the activities of the CofE. I would therefore have to reserve my position on such a suggestion (which would not of course be solely a matter for me in any event). I am open to consideration of such possibilities, although I believe that any general regulatory framework would need to allow sufficient flexibility for the organisations to which it would apply to implement policies appropriate to their particular structures. I would also wish to await the conclusion of the further work that the House of Bishops has agreed should be undertaken (see paragraph 55 below), on options for strengthening independent scrutiny and oversight of the CofE’s safeguarding practices, before forming a final view on any such issue.

Mandatory reporting

43. In my view it is primarily for the Government (no doubt informed by any recommendations made by the Inquiry) to consider whether and in what
circumstances it should be a criminal offence not to report allegations of sexual abuse. This is a matter which would no doubt require careful study in light of the available evidence, and which I imagine would also raise questions of legal definition. I understand that those with specialist knowledge in this area have strong views both for and against the introduction of such a requirement. In the context of ministers of religion, and regardless of what general position the law might take, it would be necessary to consider also the very complex issue of the seal of the confessional. I recognise this is an important issue and a group is working on a report concerning the seal of the confessional and issues relating to safeguarding. This group is specifically addressing the matters raised in the Australian Royal Commission and anticipates reporting its findings to the House of Bishops in May 2018.

44. I am told by the NST that the Government initiated a consultation on the issue of mandatory reporting in 2016. The NST submitted a position paper, which had been considered by the NSP and NSSG, in response to the consultation [JW-1/43; ACE026003].

45. In terms of our internal CoFE guidelines, I understand from Mr Tilby that the NSSG will be commissioning further work in this area, supported by the NSP, to inform the CoFE as to whether it should strengthen its position further. Our current policy, "Promoting a Safer Church" [JW-1/35; ACE025431] states that "all suspicions, concerns, knowledge or allegations, that reach the threshold for reporting to the statutory authorities, will be reported via the diocesan safeguarding adviser or designated safeguarding adviser/officer in another church body". More specifically, section 2.1 of Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017 provides that a church officer must notify any safeguarding concern or allegation to the DSA within 24 hours of receiving this information. Within 24 hours of receiving notification of the concern or allegation the DSA will conduct an initial internal review of the information received to establish if the requirement for referring to the statutory agencies (including the police) has been reached and refer, as required.

Other steps which the Government could consider taking

46. I have not at this stage attempted to think systematically about what else the Government or other state agencies might be able to do to assist safeguarding within

---

6 As I have already indicated earlier in paragraph 33, the 2016 Measure introduces the duty on clergy and licensed readers, and lay workers, church wardens and Parochial Church Councils to have “due regard” to House of Bishops guidance on safeguarding (including the expectation to report safeguarding concerns to DSAs). Ordained and licensed ministers who do not comply may face disciplinary measures.

7 An amendment to the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors Regulations in 2016 makes it clear that the DSA may make a referral to the police where he or she is of the opinion that this should be done. This is regardless of whether or not there is agreement from the Bishop (or anyone else).
the CofE, and others who are closer to the day-to-day issues may be better qualified to do so. However, one point that has impressed itself upon me is that the police investigation process, and the subsequent wait for a charging decision, can often be traumatising for victims and survivors. There have also been cases where complaints have been dismissed, but only after a long period during which the person against whom they were made (or, where deceased, those close to them) had to live with the suspicion for a prolonged period. I do therefore feel that it would be helpful if anything could be done to speed up investigations and charging decisions, and if there was effective and clear communication at the various stages of the investigation to those involved.

Changes within the Church of England

47. In my view, cultural change needs be brought about by a variety of different means. Leading figures in the CofE must promote the importance of safeguarding and raise awareness about the personal dignity, bodily integrity and rights of children and young people and children's equality with adults to address issues of power and control which we know underpin the sexual abuse of children and is at the heart of what makes children so vulnerable to abuse. This is important to ensure that all clerics and lay workers within the CofE see safeguarding as a key aspect of their role. In addition: the theology of safeguarding (described further below) must be developed; and the appropriate training, regulations and policies must be in place coupled with the monitoring of adherence to these rules. It is also important to note that the CofE does not operate in a vacuum and it is greatly impacted by cultural changes in the wider society to which it continuously needs to respond. The CofE is aiming to reach a position where it leads proactively or at least helps to influence these cultural changes, rather than merely responding to them.

48. I do believe, from my own experience and from my discussions with others, that there has already been significant cultural change in the CofE in relation to safeguarding. That change flowed in particular from the recognition – reflected in the Chichester Visitation and the Cahill and Gibb Reports – that the CofE’s existing systems had failed in too many cases, or were not sufficiently just. These reports led to what I believe to have been a "step change" in the safeguarding culture of the CofE, even though there is still more to do.

49. It is the "national church" which has responded to these reports by instigating a set of reforms. However, the changes must be implemented at a diocesan and parish level. The progress made so far is set out in detail in the introduction to Bishop Peter Hancock’s second witness statement which I have read and with which I agree. I
have picked out below what I consider to be some of the main drivers of change. I accept that many of the changes described are ones which should have been implemented earlier. As I stated at the House of Bishops meeting in December 2017, the increased activity in relation to safeguarding has come out of a deep sense of conviction that there needed to be repentance for our past failures and a consistency and quality of practice on safeguarding at all levels of the CofE.

50. Safeguarding resourcing and bodies at both the national and diocesan level have been significantly enhanced. In particular:

50.1 The NSP was approved by the House of Bishops in December 2013 and was established in 2014. The NSP was established to support the CofE's development of national safeguarding responses and has performed a key role in the development of national policy and guidance and more recently has started to perform a more independent scrutiny and challenge function to the NST and its work to promote a safer church.

50.2 In December 2014, the House of Bishops approved the development of an independent programme of diocesan safeguarding audits. SCIE was commissioned to deliver this programme and by the end of December 2017, all dioceses had been independently audited. Plans are now under development to extend independent audits to all cathedrals and the two Palaces (ie, Lambeth Palace and Bishopthorpe Palace).

50.3 The NST has evolved significantly since the appointment of the CofE's first full-time National Safeguarding Adviser in February 2015. I believe that, even though progress was made before that appointment, and more still remains to be done, this can be seen as a critical moment in the evolution of safeguarding practice within the CofE.

50.4 In May 2016, the House of Bishops approved the creation of the NSSG which is a committee of the House of Bishops and has subsequently been given delegated authority from the House in relation to safeguarding matters. It makes significant decisions relating to safeguarding issues, including the approval of guidance.

50.5 In December 2016 the House of Bishops made the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors Regulations 2016 under Canon C 30, making provision for the appointment of DSAs and conferring functions on them.

51. There has been a substantial increase in funding for safeguarding across the dioceses in the years since 2013-4. According to figures compiled by the NST, the
total spend on safeguarding resources across the dioceses in 2012 was approximately £1.2 million, whereas the total spend across the dioceses in 2017 was £5 million. In addition, the Archbishops' Council budget for safeguarding was over £1 million in 2017. At the House of Bishops meeting in December 2017, I noted that in 2018 the CofE would be spending £7 million on safeguarding nationally and at diocesan level.

52. In part at my instigation, a lot of work has been done to raise awareness across the CofE and to reinforce the need for transparency and good safeguarding practice. Safeguarding is now discussed at nearly every House of Bishops meeting. For example, at the House of Bishops meeting in December 2017 on safeguarding, I reiterated that the CofE needed to have a system in place which was quick, just and fair and which ensures that everyone involved feels that as far as possible they have been treated with integrity and transparency. Diocesan bishops’ senior staff meetings now reserve a slot to discuss safeguarding. Bishop’s Councils⁸ should also have a regular safeguarding update and report.

53. The work I have described above has been underpinned by the development of theological teaching on safeguarding (see further paragraphs 65 to 67 below).

54. These changes in thinking, teaching and culture have been instrumental in the following reforms (amongst other matters):

54.1 A suite of relevant legislation, policies and guidance has been introduced. In particular, Canon C 30 makes it mandatory for all dioceses to appoint a DSA and the Key Roles Guidance 2017 has confirmed the role that parish safeguarding officers should undertake for each parish.

54.2 There is now a greater focus on safeguarding training both for ordinands and candidates for the Reader ministry (through the Theological Education Institutions or in the dioceses) and those employed by, or volunteering in, the CofE in lay and clerical positions (through the Safeguarding Training guidance [JW-1/33; ACE025227]).

54.3 As a result of the Safer Recruitment Practice Guidance 2016 [JW-1/31; ACE025228] interviews for all posts within the CofE now include safeguarding questions.

⁸ The Bishop’s Council is usually the standing committee of a diocesan synod. It consists of a number of representatives; some ex-officio (i.e. senior clerics within the dioceses) and some clergy and lay representatives who are elected by the diocesan synod. Its main function is to advise the diocesan bishop on key policy issues and plan the business and agenda for the diocesan synod meetings.
54.4 Efforts have been made to put survivors at the centre of the CofE’s safeguarding response through policies such as Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017.

55. As I have already stated, there remains work still to do. At the most recent House of Bishops meeting in December 2017, Dame Moira Gibb presented some of the headline messages from her independent review into Peter Ball. Following group work discussions, a number of key areas were identified by the House of Bishops for further work:

55.1 The establishment of an Episcopal Working Group on cultural change;
55.2 The development of proposals to deal with non-current abuse cases;
55.3 The development of proposals for working with and dealing with trauma;
55.4 The development of proposals for supervision of senior clergy; and
55.5 Work in respect of options for strengthening independent oversight and scrutiny of safeguarding practices, arrangements for the funding of safeguarding and options concerning operating models.

56. More work also needs to be done on ensuring that our legislation governing clergy discipline is as efficient and transparent as possible, whilst at the same time being fair to all involved (see further paragraphs 110 and 111 below).

57. In addition to the further areas for development identified above, the focus must be on embedding the policies and guidance which have been introduced over recent years. In other words, the guidance has to become properly understood and implemented and supported by good quality training in order to enable people to develop the skills and confidence they need, not only to recognise abuse but to respond and to and report it. The size and nature of the CofE inevitably mean that it will take time for the new policies and guidance to take full effect. It will take time to recruit and train the staff who need to be at the forefront of safeguarding at the parish and diocesan level. The CofE also needs to train and educate its current clergy and lay staff, the vast majority of whom (at parish level) are volunteers. However the advantage of the CofE’s devolved structure is that, once this has happened, the requisite cultural change will be embedded at the local level of the church where it is needed most. I understand that this is addressed in more detail in Mr Tilby’s witness statement.

58. The Inquiry has asked whether differing views within the CofE on the ordination and consecration of women and its teachings on sexuality and same sex relationships
might present or have presented barriers to change and inhibited the CofE's response to abuse. It is easy to conflate all of the doctrinal and cultural issues which the CofE has faced and still faces and speculate on their interdependency. I do not think one can draw a simple correlation between these issues and safeguarding issues.

59. In my view some of the biggest contributors to safeguarding issues in the past have been:

59.1 a culture of clericalism which resulted in a general deference within the CofE towards clergy (especially charismatic clergy who were in senior positions). This led to some misusing and abusing their power without the appropriate checks and balances, vulnerable children being exposed to abuse and victims/survivors being marginalised or silenced;

59.2 a culture of "forgiveness" and "restoration" which allowed certain identified individuals to continue to offend; and

59.3 poor safeguarding practice and a lack of awareness of the importance of safeguarding across the CofE.

60. The CofE approved the ordination of women to priesthood and the consecration of women to the episcopate in 1992 and 2014 respectively. Whilst there has been improvement in safeguarding within the CofE since 1992, as far as I am aware, there is no evidence that this is linked to the ordination or consecration of women. I have also not seen any evidence to suggest that safeguarding issues are more likely to arise in connection with those clergy who do not accept the ordination or consecration of women.

61. The CofE's teachings on sexuality have not changed; it has always taught that sexual relations outside of marriage are wrong. Views on homosexuality within the CofE remain divided. I do not believe that the CofE's teachings on sexuality and any differences in views on same sex relationships have inhibited the progress made in the CofE's approach to safeguarding.

62. I believe that one reason why the issues mentioned in paragraph 58 above have sometimes been conflated, is that some of those who have held particularly strong views on certain issues (which may have included the ordination of women, and/or sexuality and same-sex relationships) may have tended to band together within a

---

9 I note that I have initiated work to produce a major teaching document on questions of sexuality and theological anthropology with the aim to facilitate discussions which can address these issues within the CofE.
diocese, leading to the formation of groups based upon close personal ties. The existence of such groups does not encourage a culture of openness and honesty, the absence of which is the very environment which could discourage survivors from coming forward, or could lead to the story of the alleged abuser being preferred over that of the survivor without the proper scrutiny being applied.

63. Similarly, in relation to Chichester, it seems that differing views held amongst the bishops and clergy in Chichester (the last two bishops of Chichester were Anglo-Catholic, whereas the former suffragan bishop of Lewes was of an evangelical persuasion) may have led to polarisation amongst senior clerics and disputes within the diocese, which may in turn have led to important issues such as safeguarding being marginalised, and to a lack of effective episcopal supervision over certain parts of the diocese.

64. I believe that the changes which I have explained elsewhere in this statement, including a suite of safeguarding measures, along with a greater culture of transparency and a greater emphasis on assisting survivors would now make it very difficult for any cleric to ignore safeguarding issues, whatever differences between different members of the CofE may still exist on other issues.

Theology and safeguarding

65. Given we are a Christian Church it is vital that our approach to safeguarding reflects our theology - that is, our understanding of what God is doing in His world and the interface between the human and the divine. I believe that it is very important to provide a theological as well as a practical response to safeguarding issues. The previous Lead Bishop on Safeguarding, Bishop Paul Butler, therefore asked the body responsible for helping with our theological thinking, the Faith and Order Commission ("FAOC"), for its assistance. Two documents have been produced by FAOC as a result: The Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church: A Theological Resource for the Local Church (2016) (the "Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church") and the paper on Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse (2017) (the "Forgiveness and Reconciliation")\(^ {10} \). Both documents were intended to be used by those who teach, preach and exercise pastoral duties within the CofE. As noted in the minutes of the meeting of the NSP on 13 October 2015 [JW-1/42; ACE020523], the Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church was intended to be "theological with adherence to practice guidance and compliance" and the Forgiveness and Reconciliation "was to be more of an exploratory document concerned mostly with"

\(^ {10} \) I note that in its Request the Inquiry has referred to the draft version of this document. The final version was published in September 2017 and is exhibited at [JW-1/37; ACE025399].
the theology". The documents have been well received by many and have proved useful in helping people think through the issues from first principles.

66. According to the minutes of the meeting on 13 October 2015, Forgiveness and Reconciliation is not meant to be "an authoritative statement from the church, but was to be used as a document to open up conversation and raise awareness in clergy who preach, that forgiveness is not an easy process for the survivor of abuse", it was intended to help clergy and others to begin to understand "the complexity of forgiveness". Any Christian’s understanding of God is that God is a God who loves us and forgives us. Given that, within matters of safeguarding, abuse has been perpetrated which leaves people feeling violated and less than whole, in so many ways, it is crucial that we, as a church, reflect on what all of this means regarding forgiveness. As provided above, Forgiveness and Reconciliation recognises the complexity of forgiveness which involves both therapeutic forgiveness and interpersonal forgiveness (i.e. forgiving the individual who has wronged you). However, Forgiveness and Reconciliation also recognises that the "church's primary pastoral task is to listen with care and sensitivity to those who have been abused, supporting them on the road towards healing and in taking steps towards the achievement of temporal justice". The material in Forgiveness and Reconciliation deals mainly with "interpersonal" forgiveness, "without wishing to imply any devaluing of the healing process." It is also the case that the Christian gospel teaches us that Jesus Christ came into the world to reconcile the world to himself. Reconciliation, that is being made whole or one, is a core element of the Christian gospel. No matter how complicated it is, especially in relation to safeguarding, it is important that as Christians we keep working on what reconciliation can mean.

67. By addressing six related questions on forgiveness and reconciliation in the aftermath of abuse, Forgiveness and Reconciliation is intended to help dioceses and parishes address the issue both from a theological perspective and in their direct and practical responses to abuse. Two of the key questions ask how the CoE should speak of forgiveness to those who have committed abuse, and of forgiving by those who have suffered abuse. Forgiveness and Reconciliation includes case studies intended to stimulate reflection and discussion. It was developed in collaboration with survivors whose input, particularly on these two questions, was vital. The intention is that it should be used by clergy and others involved in safeguarding work within the CoE, in particular in their conversations with victims and survivors. It is recognised that the engagement with survivors of abuse may occur in many contexts, and that there may
often be occasions when a survivor of abuse is present in a congregation without the knowledge of those exercising ministry.

68. The Inquiry has asked what further spiritual assistance I think the CofE should provide. The two documents mentioned above are not the final word because, as with all theology, there is a debate that will continue as we consider these matters and the changing context in which our lives unfold. There is still a need for further theological work and reflection and it will be essential to include survivors and their experience in our ongoing theological work. I am actively considering setting up a group to help the CofE in our thinking which will include a range of people including survivors; this and other work by the wider church will no doubt lead to further publications.

69. The undisputed doctrine within the CofE is that all kinds of abuse are a sin. Additionally, the CofE’s teachings emphasise the importance of recognising the power imbalances on which abuse depends, stresses the need for particular care for the most vulnerable, the value and dignity of every human being and the responsibility of those with power and authority to prevent and challenge abuse. This is the theology (which is reflected in in the House of Bishops Promoting a Safer Church Policy statement 2017 [JW-1/35; ACE025431]) that assists all of us in our day-to-day work to prevent and manage abuse and empower children and young people to speak up and seek help.

70. However, when it comes to the theological concepts that assist those affected with dealing with such abuse the CofE should not give definitive answers on how to deal with these issues but help facilitate the process through which each individual can heal. Hence the theological papers referred to above are intended to provide a basis for discussion with parishioners rather than to be authoritative documents on key theological issues. I believe there is a need for greater training of clergy not just about safeguarding policies which the CofE has in place but also the need to ensure the spiritual well-being of those impacted by child sexual abuse through liturgy and prayer. As (I understand) Bishop Peter Hancock has noted in his second witness statement, the Liturgical Commission has been asked to develop a suite of resources to support those working in safeguarding and those who have experienced abuse. The first phase of this work (which has been developed in collaboration with survivors) has now been circulated to the NSSG and College of Bishops for comment and will be disseminated more widely once finalised. It includes prayers, psalms and short readings. I understand that some parishes and dioceses have also started to hold a “Safeguarding Sunday” which provides an opportunity to teach and discuss
abuse and pray for those directly affected by abuse and there have also been specific services for survivors of abuse.

71. We must ensure that the CoE is a safe church for all and therefore the atmosphere and assumption will be that all are not only welcome but able to find their place and the support and assistance they need in developing their sense of discipleship.

Survivors

72. In an email dated 2 April 2015 to the Bishop of Durham in the context of discussions regarding communication protocols [JW-1/17; ACE013722], I described the need for the CoE to be "survivor centred" to "atone for the vast cover ups and appalling abuse perpetrated on so many by such a large part of the establishment". By this I meant that the CoE has a great deal to apologise for with regard to what happened in the past. I have stated on numerous occasions how shocking and sad it was that such abuse took place within the CoE and by senior people; bishops and priests and others across the country. I believe the CoE does need to keep ensuring that survivors and their voices are not only heard clearly but do indeed shape significantly the way we work and respond to the issues of abuse.

73. I have on certain occasions sought to set up meetings to listen to survivors' / their representatives' concerns and have become specifically involved in the cases of certain victims or survivors. The Inquiry has asked me to address a number of documents as detailed below.

Email exchange regarding a meeting

74. The email chain exhibited as [JW-1/5; ACE008552] shows that in around April 2013 Andrew Nunn engaged in email correspondence with Lucy Duckworth (irrelevant and member of MACSAS), Phil Johnson (survivor and member of MACSAS) and Anne Lawrence (a member of MACSAS and part of the working party for Stop Church Child Abuse) to try and set up a meeting with me. I understand from this correspondence, that the parties in fact wanted two separate meetings for two separate purposes: the first was a meeting to discuss the development of reconciliation processes which was requested by Anne Lawrence and the other a more general meeting with these individuals as survivors which was requested by Lucy Duckworth. It appears from the correspondence that the first of these meetings was prompted by a conversation I had with Anne Lawrence in Coventry in February 2013 regarding reconciliation in the Diocese of Chichester among others.

75. Later, in December 2013 [JW-1/7; ACE026011], the efforts to organise the meeting with Phil Johnson and Anne Lawrence were renewed through a request to Bishop
Paul Butler, the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding at the time. I suspect part of the reason for the gap between the request and the meeting itself was that I was not enthroned until late March 2013, and that I was seeking to come up to speed with a large number of very complex issues. In addition, the demands of the Anglican Communion were very heavy at that time. I responded to Bishop Paul’s email saying that such a meeting was very important and should displace a number of other appointments in my diary [JW-1/7; ACE026011]. I met with Anne Lawrence and Phil Johnson on 6 March 2014 during which we discussed a number of issues including, the CoE’s response to survivors, the need for the CoE to support the call for an Inquiry and the need to consult survivors in relation to the development of safeguarding processes within the CoE. Following the meeting I wrote to MACSAS offering the opportunity of a “fringe” event at the July Synod at which both archbishops would be present. I wanted to give MACSAS the opportunity to present its work and then enter into a discussion with myself and the Archbishop of York. The advantage of holding a meeting outside of the formal business of the Synod was that it would provide a setting which encouraged dialogue, rather than a “set piece” in a formal Synod meeting to which only members of the General Synod would be able to contribute.

76. After the MACSAS presentation at the fringe event on 11 July 2014, I met with Lucy Duckworth and [AN-A48] in September 2014 during which a number of issues were discussed and agreed (see note of meeting exhibited at [JW-1/40; ACE026004]) As promised at the meeting, I sent a follow-up letter to Ms Duckworth in relation to the behaviour of a convicted abuser who was disqualified from holding office in the CoE in 1999, in which I addressed her concerns about this individual’s behaviour.

Email exchange between myself and Kate Wood in August 2014

77. I note that in one particular instance I also sought to ensure that survivors received the correct treatment from the relevant authorities where the situation had been specifically flagged to me. In the exchange between Kate Wood and me in August 2014 [JW-1/12; ACE011721] regarding the treatment of two female survivors by the police¹¹ Ms Wood used my name to arrange a meeting with the relevant senior officer at the police to ensure there was better support for these victims. I note that such occasions are rare and cannot recall another instance in which I became similarly involved.

¹¹ I note for completeness that although the Peter Ball investigation is referenced in the email, this concerned a separate incident involving another priest.
Letter from survivors in June 2015 requesting a meeting

78. On 12 June 2015 [JW-1/18; ACE013781], I received an open letter from "survivors, whistleblowers, legal experts, clergy and campaigners on abuse". I took all of the matters raised in this letter very seriously and set up a meeting on 7 July 2015 with a group representing those who had written. I exhibit to this statement a note of the meeting [JW-1/41; ACE026010]. At this meeting I stressed my commitment to addressing safeguarding in the CofE.

79. In relation to some of the particular issues raised by the letter which the Inquiry has flagged:

79.1 Failure to publish Anglican Past Cases Review ("PCR"): I regret mistakes which have been made in relation to the PCR. I have supported the independent review of the PCR which is currently being carried out by Sir Roger Singleton and is due to be published shortly. However, in response to the Inquiry’s specific question, it is not clear to me that this letter was calling for publication of the PCR as such, or indeed what that would have meant in the context of the PCR as a process – as opposed to making a general complaint about the lack of transparency.

79.2 Failure to set up an independent and externally audited inquiry into allegations of child sexual abuse in the CofE. By the time this letter was sent I had already sent a letter to the Home Office calling for an independent inquiry (see paragraph 14 above).

79.3 The engagement of reputation management firms: As explained above, I have no power to direct dioceses and therefore cannot tell them who they can and cannot employ. The engagement of such firms is a decision for the dioceses. Clearly they need support and advice on a wide range of issues. However, they must follow the policies of the CofE with regard to the proper and just approach to all questions of safeguarding and to those impacted, especially victims and survivors. Where this is not the case, for example a firm simply sees its job to protect the diocesan reputation by pushing away survivors, it is something I positively discourage. In a number of my speeches on safeguarding I have emphasised a survivor centred approach to safeguarding which I expect all dioceses now to follow. For example in my statement to the General Synod on 7 July 2013\(^\text{12}\) (referred to above) I called

---

for a culture "that looks first to justice for survivors, to clarity, to transparency, to admission of where we have failed."

79.4 Comments about being "powerless to speak out publicly...or express criticisms to his autonomous bishops": I do not think that the letter was suggesting that I had said I was powerless to do these things, as opposed to attributing such views to others. I do not think that I am powerless to do these things, although I do have to be properly careful when it comes to publicly criticising bishops or indeed anyone else (and in the case of bishops, not least because I am responsible for disciplinary matters affecting them). Where appropriate, I have not hesitated to speak out about issues affecting certain dioceses. I would also not hesitate to have private conversations with bishops if there were matters about which I was concerned.

80. I note that survivors have a range of different opinions about what action the CoFE should be taking to combat abuse. My priority is to give a voice to these survivors by making sure they are properly heard by the CoFE through various forums and that, so far as possible, the CoFE is transparent in relation to the handling of their specific cases and safeguarding more broadly within the church.

**Chichester Diocese**

81. In December 2011 my predecessor, Lord Williams of Oystermouth, appointed the Commissaries as commissaries on his behalf to conduct a visitation and to carry out an inquiry into the operation of the diocesan child protection policies in the Diocese of Chichester (the "Chichester Visitation"). The Commissaries were tasked with advising the Archbishop on any steps that needed to be taken to ensure the highest possible standards of safeguarding in the diocese. The Commissaries’ interim report was published on 30 August 2012 (the "Interim Report") and their final report was published in May 2013 (the "Final Report"), shortly after I became the Archbishop of Canterbury.

82. I was briefed by Andrew Nunn, the General Correspondence Officer at Lambeth Palace, regarding the Chichester Visitation before my installation in a memo dated 5 December 2012 [JW-1/12; ACE011721]. I do not recall receiving a more detailed briefing, however during this time I was given a number of briefings on a range of issues and therefore it is possible that there could have been a further briefing. As far as I can remember, I was not specifically briefed about the correspondence with East
Sussex County Council which the Inquiry has asked me about, and I did not see that the correspondence prior to the Inquiry’s letter.¹³

83. I understand that during the Chichester Visitation the safeguarding powers and authority of the Bishop of Chichester were taken over by the Archbishop of Canterbury. During this time, however, diocesan safeguarding officers continued to undertake their duties. Whilst the day-to-day responsibilities were delegated back to Bishop Mark Sowerby anything relating to safeguarding concerns and clerical appointments had to be referred to Lambeth for a final decision. By the time I became Archbishop, the Commissaries were reaching the end of their Visitation and I do not recall having any active involvement in relation to the Chichester Visitation.

84. I have set out at paragraphs 17 to 20 above the steps I personally took and directed to be taken in order to meet the criticisms in the Commissaries’ Final Report once it had been published.

85. My meetings with survivors and their representatives referred to in paragraphs 73 to 78 above involved survivors from the Diocese of Chichester and dealt with issues relating to the handling of child sexual abuse cases in the Diocese of Chichester. Indeed the meeting in March 2014 with Anne Lawrence and Phil Johnson was set up following a conversation I had had with Ms Lawrence in the Diocese of Coventry in February 2013 regarding reconciliation in the Diocese of Chichester after the Visitation.

86. Separately, the Diocese of Chichester put in place processes to review and enhance the safeguarding systems across the diocese. Although I was not involved with the day-to-day matters of the Diocese of Chichester (nor any other diocese), I did on occasion meet with Bishop Martin Warner to discuss the progress being made in his diocese.

87. The Inquiry has asked me about the Commissaries' recommendation of a form of Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I understand that Chancellor Bursell has clarified in his statement that when they referred to a “Truth and Reconciliation Commission” the Commissaries did “not especially have in mind a process such as that which occurred in South Africa...[they] had in mind a more general culture in which the Church is entirely open about what has occurred and acknowledges from the outset any mistakes that have been made”. As set out in the minutes of my meeting with the Church Reform Group on 7 July 2015 [JW-1/41; ACE026010], I was

---

¹³ I note for completeness that contrary to the suggestion in the Inquiry’s Request, these letters concerned the handling of safeguarding issues in the Diocese of Chichester, not the Diocese of Canterbury.
receptive to the idea of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. However, I now feel that this Inquiry (whose establishment I strongly supported) is doing much of the work that such a commission might have done. Meanwhile, I am working to ensure that the CofE adopts a more transparent approach in relation to past abuse by continuing to review its actions through the commissioning of independent audits and lessons learnt case reviews (during which survivors are approached for their input) and issuing apologies. I have myself apologised on a number of occasions and made it clear how seriously I take these matters so that other bishops follow suit. Nevertheless, after the Inquiry has issued its report, I would certainly be open to considering whether it would still be helpful for the CofE to set up some further process to take forward any aspects of the work of seeking truth and reconciliation.

Charity Commission

88. The Inquiry has referred me to three letters from the Charity Commission to the Chichester Diocesan Board of Finance ("DBF") \(^{14}\) respectively dated 7 June 2011, 11 September 2012 and 2 January 2014. I did not know at the time about these letters as they were addressed to the Diocese of Chichester (and two of them predate my time in office in any event). I was not in fact aware of them or their contents until they were provided to me by the Inquiry.

89. As has been set out in the witness statement giving a general overview of the CofE, the CofE is composed of quasi-autonomous legal entities and office holders\(^{15}\). Those entities include Parochial Church Councils, DBFs, the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops’ Council. Many of those entities, including the Chichester DBF, are registered charities. I am advised that the trustees (or equivalent) are subject to the same law as other charity trustees, and that those individuals are required to exercise independent judgment in the best interests of their charity, and must put in place appropriate mechanisms to ensure that the charity and its trustees comply with their obligations as such. I am myself a trustee of a number of registered charities including the Lambeth Palace Library Trust Fund, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Canterbury DBF. In those cases, along with my fellow trustees, we take appropriate professional advice to seek to ensure that the charity complies with its legal obligations.

\(^{14}\) I understand that witness statement giving a general overview of the CofE explains the role of a DBF.

\(^{15}\) I understand that it is therefore not right to speak of "the Church" as such having "obligations towards the Charity Commission".
90. I am advised that guidance from the Charity Commission emphasises that charities have a duty of care towards those who use their services\textsuperscript{16} and such guidance highlights the importance of charities adopting and implementing appropriate policies on safeguarding, including a duty to report "serious incidents" which do, or which may, result in or risk harm to a charity's work, beneficiaries or reputation. These duties, and links to the relevant Charity Commission guidance\textsuperscript{17}, are set out in section 8.2 in the House of Bishops' guidance Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017. I am told by the NST that in light of the Charity Commission's latest reporting requirements, the NST and Legal Office will be updating section 8.2 of Responding to Safeguarding Concerns 2017, which will include the strengthening of processes to monitor compliance. The NST currently plans to present the proposed amendments to the NSSG at its meeting in April.

The Elliot Review

91. The Inquiry has asked me about an email dated 3 November 2015 [JW-1/27; ACE019988] in which a survivor criticised me and other senior clerics for a failure to respond appropriately to his concerns. To the best of my recollection, I was not aware at the time of this individual's attempts to contact me.

92. I have written to apologise to this person [JW-1/30; ACE026007] and, as mentioned above, steps have been taken to review and amend the systems in Lambeth Palace to handle correspondence of this nature.

93. I am unfortunately unable personally to review all correspondence which is addressed to me. It was the role of the General Correspondence Officer at Lambeth Palace to note any communications I received and refer them back to the relevant diocese so that they could be dealt with appropriately. I understand that Mr Nunn did respond to the survivor and would also have known and taken into account that the survivor was in contact with his diocese. However, I have since recognised that all correspondence relating to safeguarding should be dealt with by a safeguarding professional, hence the appointment of a PSA at Lambeth Palace. We are also now appointing another member of staff to work with her. The Bishop at Lambeth (a senior member of my staff) line manages the PSA in Lambeth and has regular meetings with the PSA and members of the NST to discuss all safeguarding matters, which are reported back to me.

\textsuperscript{16} I have been informed that the Charity Commission's strategy for dealing with safeguarding issues in charities was updated on 7 December 2017.

\textsuperscript{17} Albeit prior to its recent amendment.
94. I also understand that one of the reasons that the survivor may not have had the continuing pastoral care which the CofE should have provided was because in light of his financial claim it was thought prudent that all further correspondence about the claim should (in the normal way with litigation) be conducted via the insurers rather than the bishop or those at Lambeth\(^\text{18}\). I am told that the Ecclesiastical Insurance Group ("EIG") has now introduced guidance entitled "Our guiding principles for the handling of civil claims involving allegations of sexual and physical abuse" which specifies on page 3 that, "it is important that policyholders understand that offering an apology or offering pastoral care and/or counselling sessions to the claimant can be extremely important steps to help the claimant and can be offered without prejudicing insurance cover" and on page 4 that, EIG "will not prevent an apology, either oral or written, being made by a policyholder".

95. I hope that these reforms will prevent anything similar from occurring in the future.

**Peter Ball**

**Investigation into Peter Ball**

96. I understand that in March 2012, my predecessor, on advice from the CofE’s National Safeguarding Adviser, Elizabeth Hall, ordered all of the files relating to Peter Ball to be brought to Lambeth Palace and reviewed centrally. I am not aware of the events which led to Ms Hall providing this advice. After the review of these files, I am told that Ms Wood and Ms Hall decided to seek advice from the then Director of the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre, Peter Davies, who confirmed the seriousness of what had been uncovered (I am not familiar with the reasons why Ms Wood and Ms Hall decided to take this route but I have been informed that Ms Wood sets out the reasons in detail in her statement). It was Mr Davies who referred all these matters to the Chief Constable of Sussex. In July 2012 the police commenced Operation Dunhill.

97. Prior to assuming office, I was sent briefings on developments in relation to the Peter Ball investigation (see memo from Bishop Paul Butler to former Archbishop Rowan Williams, Chris Smith, myself and others dated 16 November 2012 at [JW-1/1; ACE007724] and a memo from Mr Nunn to myself and Chris Smith dated 5 December 2012 at [JW-1/2; ACE007873]). After I became Archbishop, the relevant people continued to keep me updated on the key developments in relation to the investigation including the work of Ms Wood, cooperation with the police and the

---

\(^{18}\) I note for completeness that the Legal Office and NST are still trying to ascertain exactly what advice was given and how this was communicated to the survivor.
Crown Prosecution Service, the trial itself, its outcome and the sentencing [see JW-1/16; ACE013279; JW-1/6; ACE009068; JW-1/3; ACE008465; JW-1/11; ACE011644; JW-1/8; ACE010504].

98. I generally did not play an active part in the investigation unless I was specifically asked to get involved. For example, I sent a letter to the Lord Chancellor at the time, Christopher Grayling, on 19 November 2014 [JW-1/13; ACE026008] to express my concern about the delays in the prosecution of the case, to which the Attorney General responded on 18 December 2014 [JW-1/14; ACE012942]. I was prompted to write by the fact that Bishop Nigel Stock's similar enquiries to the Crown Prosecution Service had gone unanswered.

99. In October 2015, after Peter Ball's sentence was handed down, I wrote a letter to Bishop Martin Warner, thanking his safeguarding team in Chichester including Colin Perkins and Gemma Wordsworth for their work on the Peter Ball case [JW-1/23; ACE003221]. Although I did not have personal knowledge of the specific work carried out by these individuals, I was aware that it was a complex prosecution which would have required a vast amount of work and therefore thought it appropriate that they were thanked for this work. I believe I would have asked Bishop Martin Warner for the names of the key people to mention in the letter.

100. Similarly, I felt it was appropriate as the Archbishop of Canterbury to write letters of apology to those who were victims and survivors of the abuse carried out by Peter Ball when the sentencing decision came out (see for example [JW-1/22; ACE003179]). I was generally kept updated throughout the investigation on the CofE's interaction with victims and survivors of Peter Ball. For example, Mr Nunn sent me an email update about a message that was being passed on to victims regarding a development in the case in March 2013 [JW-1/4; ACE008466] and in March 2014 Mr Nunn let me know that Ms Wood was planning on contacting the victims before any public announcement on the charging decision was made [JW-1/8; ACE010504].

CofE review of events relating to Peter Ball

101. I understand that following the conviction of Peter Ball, the Diocese of Chichester recommended looking into the files relating to Peter Ball so that they could answer any questions raised by the press and public. The NST suggested that this should be a review to learn lessons from past mistakes made by the CofE. I was supportive of this type of review and suggested splitting the costs equally with the Diocese of Chichester [JW-1/19; ACE014949]. Subsequently the core group within the CofE
which had been formed to look into the Peter Ball allegations and liaise with the police in relation to Operation Dunhill recommended that the CofE establish an independent review or inquiry into its handling of the Peter Ball case, of which I was fully supportive. I therefore commissioned a review which was announced on 5 October 2015. The NSP was consulted on the terms of reference and I signed off on them. As set out in an email from Jane Dodds, Senior Safeguarding Caseworker in the Archbishops' Council, to Julie Jones dated 29 October 2015 [JW-1/26; ACE019758], it was important to us that the review was independent, transparent and conducted by safeguarding experts, with survivors at its core. The chair of the review would also have access to me and my office.

102. In an email dated 26 September 2015 concerning the review, I noted that I was "concerned about how my predecessor responds (Lord Carey)" if he were to be criticised in the review [JW-1/21; ACE015940]. I was aware that this review would look into matters relating to my predecessors and in particular to matters relating to former Archbishop George Carey. I was clear that this needed to happen but that a fair process should always be in place for all people concerned and that he should be given the opportunity to comment on any criticism which the report might level.

103. Initially John Alpass CB, a retired Intelligence Coordinator and former Deputy Director General of MI5, was put forward as a candidate to lead the review. However the NST was concerned that he would not be seen as sufficiently independent from the CofE; at the time he chaired the CofE’s Fees Advisory Commission and was on the Bishop's Council in Guildford. The NST was also keen for someone with a safeguarding background to lead the review. Mr Alpass was therefore given the role as a researcher on the review (he was in charge of putting together a detailed chronology), but he was not made chair. I see from contemporaneous emails (to which I was not copied) that at an NSP meeting on 13 October 2015, Mr Tilby asked the panel for recommendations as to who could potentially independently chair the review [JW-1/24; ACE019239] and four members of the NSP separately recommended Dame Moira Gibb. Dame Moira had been Chief Executive of Camden Council for 8 years until 2015 and prior to that she had been the Head of Children’s Services at Hammersmith and Fulham. Jane Dodds emailed Dame Moira on 28 October 2015 to ask if she would consider chairing the group [JW-1/25; ACE019636]. In early December 2015 I approved the NST’s recommendation for Dame Moira Gibb to lead the review [JW-1/28; ACE020745] and I am reminded by

---

the documents that I met with her briefly to discuss the review on 17 December 2015 [JW-1/29; ACE020832].

104. When the review was first suggested, there was initially some concern on behalf of the Church Commissioners regarding the funding of the review as the CofE was also at the time in the process of requesting funding for the review of the PCR [JW-1/20; ACE015896]. However, I was adamant that this needed to go ahead and personally intervened to explain to the Church Commissioners the need for the review and to ask them for their financial support. In the end the Church Commissioners funded the entire review.

105. I understand that the steps taken in response to Dame Moira Gibb's report have been detailed in both Mr Tilby and Bishop Peter Hancock's witness statements on safeguarding and that in particular Mr Tilby addresses a number of steps in response to questions 122 to 123 (paragraphs 408 to 411). I therefore do not propose to repeat them here. I presided over the Archbishops' Council's meeting in which the draft action plan arising from Dame Moira's review was considered in September 2017. The Lead Bishop on Safeguarding and the NSSG are monitoring the development and progress of the work.

Complaints against senior clergy

106. I am committed to ensuring that all safeguarding complaints against clergy are treated seriously and that senior members of the clergy are treated in the same way as everyone else in respect of any complaints against them. The Clergy Disciplinary Measure 2003 ("CDM") applies to bishops and archbishops in the same way as it applies to priests and deacons, albeit with some small necessary differences in procedure which, I understand, are set out in the witness statement of Adrian Iles dated 9 November 2017.

107. The Inquiry is aware that in direct response to the Chichester Commissaries' reports of 2012 and 2013, the CofE drafted legislation to implement a number of the recommendations including the 2016 Measure, which received Royal Assent in March 2016. The provisions are dealt with in the witness statement of Adrian Iles.

108. In line with the CDM and its Code of Practice, complaints about bishops in the Province of Canterbury are made to me, along with any complaints about the Archbishop of York or CDMs which he cannot oversee in the northern province. I have received and dealt with a number of such complaints, some of which included issues relating to safeguarding. I have also been involved in disciplinary proceedings relating to bishops that involve safeguarding issues. I take all these matters very
seriously and I am always concerned to ensure that I maintain my objectivity throughout the process.

109. I do have some concerns about the CDM process, including the length of time it takes to complete and its impact on both complainant and respondent; and that there is no prior or intermediate procedural step to enable earlier resolution of complaints. I am personally profoundly committed to principles of transparency, and it seems to me that very often these processes disappear into the undergrowth and no-one, including both complainants and respondents know what is happening. I also have to ask myself whether a more independent process which would enable the bishop to maintain a pastoral role would be more effective and would serve truth and justice more properly.

110. To this end, I have commissioned a review of the CDM including the approach to safeguarding related complaints, to address concerns about delays and lack of transparency and justice. The review will be informed by the outcome of a consultation process which the NST has recently undertaken with a view to obtaining views on changes that might helpfully be made in relation to safeguarding. I understand that the consultation started on 25 October 2017 and ended on 22 December 2017 and that the responses are now being analysed. The consultation questions have been provided to the Inquiry and include the matter of effectiveness as well as the issue of timeliness. I understand that the outcome of the consultation will be presented to the April 2018 NSSG meeting for consideration of whether, in the light of the responses to the consultation and our analysis of them, there is a case for any further changes to the CoPE’s disciplinary processes.

111. I imagine that the issue of whether bishops should continue to be involved in making decisions about the investigation of complaints may well have been raised in responses to the consultation, in which event it will need to be considered carefully as part of the review I have commissioned. I therefore await the outcome of the review and the proposals to be presented to the NSSG in due course.

Insurance and senior clergy

112. The details of insurance arrangements and the reasons for them are not matters within my expertise, so the content of this section of my statement draws heavily upon information provided to me by the Legal Office of the NCIs.

113. As I have emphasised above, the CoPE is effectively composed of quasi-autonomous legal entities and office holders. It follows that there is no sense in which the CoPE as a single body is covered by insurance in respect of claims which arise from child
sexual abuse whether made against bishops or senior clergy (or, in fact, in any other respect).

114. The nature and availability of insurance cover hinges on the nature of the claim or alleged wrongdoing in question and the identity of the office holder or legal entity which is alleged to be at fault or liable for another’s wrongdoing (for example, on the principle of vicarious liability).

115. Where a claim is brought against a parish or a parish office holder (for example an incumbent, church warden or choir master), insurance cover is usually available to meet such claims. Frequently, such cover is offered by EIG but other insurers also provide cover to parishes. Equally, I would expect that cathedrals should also maintain their own policies of insurance to cover any claim made against the cathedral corporate body or a senior cathedral cleric.

116. Where, however, claims are brought against bishops, I understand that, as I explain below, the legal position is more complex. I should say, however, that I am not aware that any claim, in which child sexual abuse has been alleged, has been unsatisfied because of the lack of insurance cover or a failure by the Commissioners to exercise their powers in the case of a claim against a bishop. I have consulted the Legal Office and NST who are also not aware of any such claims.

117. I understand from my colleagues in the Legal Office of the NCIs that, in practice, claims alleging abuse have been made against diocesan bishops either (i) on the basis that a bishop is vicariously liable for the conduct of another whom they, or a predecessor, have "clothed" with the requisite authority to commit abuse; or (ii) on the basis of actual wrongdoing by a bishop or former bishop. As I understand has been set out in the corporate witness statement given by William Nye, diocesan bishops are "corporations sole". As explained in that statement, this is a legal mechanism which allows for the rights and obligations of a particular office to pass continuously from office holder to office holder. Accordingly, it is possible, in principle, for the office of a bishop to be liable for the wrongdoing of a former bishop.

118. EIG provides public liability insurance to most, if not all, DBFs. It has recently clarified to the Legal Office of the NCIs that it will operate on the basis that public liability cover provided by them to DBFs from 2007 or thereabouts that is, for policies which commenced in 2007 or thereabouts (the exact date depends on the date of each particular policy), extends to cover senior clerics, including bishops and archdeacons, where it is claimed that they are vicariously liable for the harmful actions of another (on the basis which I explain above) including acts of abuse.
119. On the other hand, claims alleging deliberate wrongdoing by a diocesan bishop (or former bishop) cannot be met under insurance policies in the name of a DBF. The Legal Office has informed me that it is normal insurance practice that a company or an individual cannot be insured for their own deliberate wrongdoing. However, in such instances, the Church Commissioners have power under the Episcopal Endowments and Stipends Measure 1943 (the "1943 Measure") [JW-1/38; ACE026006] to meet expenses of the bishop or any suffragan bishop in connection with the performance of the duties of their offices as the Commissioners think fit. I understand from the Legal Office that this enables them to make payments in relation to legal costs incurred by bishops and to claims for damages or compensation against them. The Church Commissioners have exercised this power to meet, for example, the costs of the Bishop of Chichester and damages and compensation arising from the wrongdoing of Bishop Peter Ball. They consider the merits of each claim on a case by case basis and in the light of appropriate professional advice. This is not, however, a contractual indemnity in the nature of insurance cover. I should emphasise that, as far as I am aware, claims brought alleging abuse by bishops or former bishops are, by their nature, exceptional.

120. The Inquiry has referred me to a letter from Bishop Paul Butler to myself dated 17 February 2015 [JW-1/15; ACE021371] which recommends that the Church Commissioners put aside £200 million to cover any shortfall in respect of claims which might be brought by survivors as a result of the Inquiry. I do not believe that this was a formal proposal, but intended to instigate discussions on the issue and the figure chosen by Bishop Paul was not scientifically derived. This letter does not in fact reflect how the Commissioners operate. The Church Commissioners are not formally able to act as an insurer because they lack the powers to do so and, as a consequence, they cannot and do not put aside reserves in the nature of an insurer against potential claims. It follows that the Commissioners have not put aside reserves against claims which survivors may bring. Rather, as I have set out above, the Commissioners consider each claim on its merits in light of professional advice as and when a claim is made and in light of the available evidence.

George Bell

121. My understanding of the issues relating to the claim made against Bishop George Bell and how they arose is reflected in the chronology set out by Lord Carlile in his review. As I have set out above, I became Archbishop on 4 February 2013. I am now aware that the former General Correspondence Officer, Mr Nunn, had been in contact with [Name Redacted] prior to and after that date but I was not aware of that
correspondence at the time. I cannot say for certain when I was first made aware of the allegations made by [redacted] but I expect that it would have been in some point in 2013 after Bishop Nigel Stock was made aware of the allegations. I was certainly aware of her allegations prior to a meeting of archbishops and diocesan bishops which took place on [redacted] in Leeds. So far as I recall, I was not aware of the specific details beyond the fact that an allegation of child sexual abuse had been made against the late Bishop George Bell. I was also aware that the Bishop at Lambeth, at that time Bishop Nigel Stock, and Ms Wood were involved in the core group which was convened to manage the issues arising out of [redacted] disclosure of abuse and claim. I was in turn aware in 2015 of a press release issued by the Bishop of Chichester and the NCIs following the settlement, and of subsequent disquiet in some quarters about that settlement.

122. The Diocese of Chichester was taking the lead in responding to [redacted]'s allegations. Consistent with what I would have expected, I am now aware that [redacted]'s email to my office in April 2013 was passed to the Diocese of Chichester and that [redacted] received support offered by the diocese. As I have set out above, I was aware that a core group had been formed which included representatives of both the NCIs (including the National Safeguarding Adviser and the Director of Communications) and the diocese, and that [redacted]'s disclosure and claim were going to be managed by that group. I was kept informed of material developments about the progress of the matter by Bishop Nigel Stock and Ms Wood. I did not play any part in the decision-making process myself but, once the core group had recommended that [redacted]'s claim should be settled, I was of the view (particularly in the light of the response to the Peter Ball disclosures) that it was vital that CofE institutions were open and transparent about such matters and I fully supported the decision to make open apologies.

123. The process of commissioning the George Bell review was in accordance with the House of Bishops guidance on the handling of complex cases. The review was commissioned by the NST on the recommendation of the Bishop of Chichester. The Carlile Review was commissioned with my full support in order to review the process which had led to settlement and to make recommendations as to whether, and if so how, the process could be improved in future. It was agreed that the report, when complete, would be provided to the NSSSG and the Inquiry. The Archbishops’ Council and Church Commissioners shared the costs of the report and it was undertaken in accordance with agreed terms of reference.

124. I am informed that Lord Carlile had his own office and employed an assistant to help him with the process of the work, and that the NST made available the services of a
senior NST caseworker who Lord Carlile could approach if he had questions relating to safeguarding policy and practice.

125. I am told that the Inquiry has recently raised some additional questions concerning Lord Carlile’s report and its recommendations. The CoE is presently considering its detailed response to the Carlile report, and I do not wish to pre-empt that consideration. Bishop Peter Hancock and I have, however, both already publicly accepted, in the light of the report, that there were serious deficiencies in our process, and Bishop Peter Hancock has indicated that the main thrust of most of Lord Carlile’s recommendations is accepted. We have indicated that we disagree with the suggestion that confidentiality provisions should be attached to payments of compensation where settlement is without admission of liability. I understand that suggestion, but I also believe it to be the case that the existence of such agreements often emerges, and leads to suspicion of a "cover up", and that publication is often the way in which other complainants are given the courage to tell their own stories. The dilemma can be profound, and we shall have to consider in due course anything that the Inquiry has to say about such matters, but I think that justice is better served by transparency. Subject to that, and for my own part, I do believe that, in future, more stringent steps will need to be taken to ensure that the interests of the person complained about (alive or dead) are protected.

The Anglican Communion

126. The Anglican Communion is a collection of autonomous and interdependent Churches united by being in communion with the See of Canterbury, whose doctrinal and ecclesiological boundaries are set out in the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886-8. There are at present 45 different churches in the Communion, comprising 39 provinces and 6 other local or national churches. Each church or province is made up of one or more dioceses which themselves, depending on the governance structure of the church concerned, have some degree of autonomy. The Archbishop of Canterbury is not ‘the Head’ of the Anglican Communion in a legal sense. The Archbishop of Canterbury is one of the four Instruments of communion within the Anglican Communion (the others being the Lambeth Conference, the Primates Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council). In addition, the Archbishop of Canterbury is the ‘Focus of Unity’ of the Anglican Communion. The fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury is one of the four Instruments of communion and the Focus of Unity means that the role of the Archbishop has a great deal of moral authority but

---

20 For the avoidance of doubt, I note that the Methodist Church is not part of the Anglican Communion as the Inquiry’s Request might suggest.
in fact and in internal church legislation it has no legal or direct authority over the autonomous but interdependent Anglican churches around the world. My role is mainly one of influence where I seek to create the right culture and a model of good practice for other provinces to follow. The exercise of that influence, however, which varies from province to province, involves much direct work with provinces and dioceses, and a strong representative role in times of difficulty and areas of persecution or conflict.

127. I have spoken about the importance of safeguarding at meetings of the Primates from across the Anglican Communion. They meet from time to time, ideally at least every two years; the last meeting was in Canterbury in October 2017. I am very open to learning about the impact and influence of safeguarding issues in the various churches across the Anglican Communion and have spoken with individual archbishops about the matter in their own churches. In particular I have been instrumental in starting the Safe Church Network (see further paragraph 130 below).

128. I note for completeness that I have no separate oversight over the Church of Wales and all of my interactions with this church would form part of my interactions with the Anglican Communion more broadly.

The approach to safeguarding by other churches within the Anglican Communion

129. I am not personally aware of what safeguarding practices have been adopted by other churches within the Anglican Communion and therefore do not feel able to comment on them. I however do encourage the work which the Anglican Communion is currently undertaking to share and create safeguarding practices and guidelines and do encourage the sharing of safeguarding practices between the CoFE and other churches within the Communion.

130. The Anglican Communion has recognised that it is important to draw on their communal experiences of safeguarding to strengthen their approach to safeguarding. Hence we have set up the Safe Church Network. The network is a growing international group of people committed to the welfare and safety of all individuals involved in churches throughout the Anglican Communion. Members of the network provide educational resources about abuse and misconduct and support people working to make their churches safer. Following a report produced by the Safe Church Network, the Anglican Consultative Council (“ACC”) established the Inter-

21 http://acscn.anglicancommunion.org/
Anglican Safe Church Commission ("ASCC"), at a meeting in April 2016 in Lusaka through ACC Resolution 16:25\(^22\). According to the resolution ASCC's role is to:

130.1 identify policies and procedures currently in place for the safety of persons in the provinces of the Anglican Communion;

130.2 develop guidelines to enhance the safety of all persons especially children, young people and vulnerable adults, within the provinces of the Anglican Communion for consideration by the ACC at its next meeting, and thereafter for implementation, as far as practicable, by each province; and

130.3 develop resources for the effective implementation of the guidelines in the provinces.

131. I am supportive of the ASCC’s work to develop a set of guidelines which can be used across the Anglican Communion. The inaugural meeting of the ASCC took place in London in October 2017 at which the CofE was represented by my PSA, Caroline Venables.

132. I also hope the CofE can learn informally from other churches within the Anglican Communion. In 2017 I arranged for the Lead Bishop on Safeguarding in the CofE to visit Australia with the National Safeguarding Adviser to learn from the experience of the Anglican Church there.

133. However, it is important to note that each church within the Anglican Communion is an autonomous but interdependent body and their approach to safeguarding needs to be tailored to their particular structure. It will also be influenced by issues such as culture, poverty, war, systems of justice (or their absence) and persecution in the province or diocese in which they operate.

**STATEMENT OF TRUTH**

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed: [DPA]

Dated: 5 February 2018
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Email chain from Arun Arora to Alisa Anderson re Safeguarding-Peter Ball</td>
<td>26 September 2015</td>
<td>ACE015940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Letter from Archbishop Justin Welby to Missing</td>
<td>7 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE003179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Martin Warner</td>
<td>8 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE003221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Email chain from Graham Tibby to Graham Wilmer re National Safeguarding Panel Papers for 13 October 2015</td>
<td>20 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE019239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Email from Jane Dodds to Moira Gibb re Church of England – Confidential Case</td>
<td>28 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE019636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Email chain from Jane Dodds to Julie Jones re Terms of Reference PB review - Confidential</td>
<td>29 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE019758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Email chain from [name] to Ian Elliot (and others) re background material for EGM review</td>
<td>3 November 2015</td>
<td>ACE019988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Email from Jane Dodds to Graham Tilby re a date for Chichester</td>
<td>7 December 2015</td>
<td>ACE020745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Brief for Thursday 17 December 2015 re Moira Gibb meeting (PB inquiry)</td>
<td>10 December 2015</td>
<td>ACE020832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to [name]</td>
<td>8 November 2017</td>
<td>ACE026007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies and Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>House of Bishops Practice Guidance: Safer Recruitment Practice Guidance</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>ACE025228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ACE002233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies Practice Guidance</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>ACE025247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Promoting a Safer Church: The Church of England's Safeguarding Policy for children, young people and adults</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>ACE025431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Responding to, Assessing and Managing Safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers (2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>ACE025256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the aftermath of abuse</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>ACE025399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Episcopal Endowments and Stipends Measure 1943</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>ACE026006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Foreword by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York: &quot;Safeguarding: Follow-up on the Chichester Commissaries' reports – General Synod (GS 1986)&quot;</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>ACE026005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>File note of informal meeting between Archbishop Justin Welby, Lucy Duckworth and [AN-A48] from MACSAS</td>
<td>12 September 2014</td>
<td>ACE026004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting with the Church Reform</td>
<td>7 July 2015</td>
<td>ACE026010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Minutes of the meeting of the NSP on 13 October 2015</td>
<td>13 October 2015</td>
<td>ACE020523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Church of England statement on mandatory reporting (NSP(17)10)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>ACE026003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>