

Questions 40 /41

Supplementary 1

Thank you for calling me Chair.

Having asked two linked questions I have two supplementaries I will use the first to outline a procedural question and the second touching the substance. I shall be as succinct as is commensurate with the seriousness of the issue.

Synod needs to know a very short time line:

I filed two questions on **21 June** they were allocated two early consecutive internal numbers 34 /35 and I was told if there was a problem someone would get back to me.

The Q& A paper was delivered late and I was shocked to read that my questions purportedly 40/41 had been altered in material substance as to context without any liaison with me and without my consent.

I immediately raised the issue in the proper quarters as I believe you are now aware.

Accordingly two questions I asked have not been listed but two questions chosen by someone in Church House have been tabled and answered.

Is it the case that you knew nothing of the original questions, had no part of this unfortunate episode and have delivered the prepared answer in innocence of my disquiet as to how many other questions receive this treatment by the Secretariat?

Supplementary 2

My Questions touched upon a promised review arising out of the complaints of Dr Martyn Percy. I made no imputations; I simply described in Dr Percy's own words the substance of his complaint ie

“the deliberate weaponisation of safeguarding allegations, with intent to cause harm to me , perpetrated by senior clergy, church lawyers and church PR” ,

This has been excised within the Secretariat and in its place the words

“A review into the response to a complaint **against** Dr Percy”

The change of the context from “**by**“ Dr Percy to “**against**” Dr Percy is material and serious.

My question is short.

Are you and your colleagues committed to an open independent inquiry into allegations of malpractice within the Church Institutions Secretariat and associated servants and agents?