

# **DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT PALMERSTON PLACE CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 11<sup>th</sup> TO 13<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2009**

## **Freshers' Meeting**

At meeting was held prior to the start of the Synod to introduce new members to the programme and to the Synod's business procedures.

## **Opening Eucharist**

The Synod was constituted at the celebration of the Eucharist in Palmerston Place Church, Edinburgh at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist.

The Primus referred to the song from *South Pacific*, "Happy talking, talking happy talk – talk about things you like to do. You've got to have a dream, if you don't have a dream how you gonna have a dream come true?" which in biblical terms might equate to the text "Where there is no vision, the people perish". He had been asked by a vestry earlier in the year to share his vision. He believed growth was possible (indeed without growth there was only death) but expectations had to be realistic and achievable. By God's grace, things which might seem inspirational could be achievable. His vision for the Church was to see it and its members living a life in conformity to the life of Christ with each congregation living out its witness to the love of God and each member of Christ being a faithful disciple. The forthcoming Synod was unlikely to be described as "ground-breaking" but it would certainly be "ground-clearing" since it would prepare the ground for work that would come in the following years. Part of that would be the election of a new Primus which, though not a work of Synod, would involve the witness and prayers of Synod members. The Primus wished to place the discussions at Synod in a wider context by referring to remarks in a paper by the Bishop of Clogher, at a recent Porvoo consultation on diaconal ministry, that the Millennium Development Goals could be innovative in equipping people to tithe their time in missional service to local communities. There was a need for a tremendously centripetal church to become much more centrifugal. In seeking to address the mission of God, the Church could not allow itself to be strangled by financial constraint.

Referring reluctantly to the national atmosphere and the question of MPs' expenses, the Church needed to offer encouragement and support to people of honour and to urge the higher human values – Christian values – on all who served in public life. Increasingly, it was a climate which allowed the powerful to inherit the earth and the weak to go to the wall. Under pressure from Government, local authorities were looking to make provision for the homeless with a reduced budget. The example of Christ and His kingdom was a direct contradiction to allowing the successful to take all. The call to the Christian community was to witness to the example of Christ by the norms of its own common life. That witness did not come by being quick to point the finger so much as by absorbing the meaning of the response "let the one among you without sin cast the first stone". The incarnation of Christ invited the Church not to withdraw but to engage with the mess in the world and find an opportunity to serve God and forward his purposes of love. What was needed was not for Christians to withdraw from involvement to form their own little group so much as for those

who were overtly Christian and who had the necessary abilities to join political parties across the spectrum.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken for the appeal of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for Zimbabwe which amounted to £1,620 (including tax reclaims).

## **SESSION ONE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair**

### **1.1 Welcome**

The Primus welcomed all members of Synod and the following delegates representing other Churches and Faiths:-

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church), the Rev Patrick Coltman (United Free Church of Scotland), Major Alan Dixon (Salvation Army), Mrs Jenny Easson (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev David James (Religious Society of Friends), the Rev Muriel Pearson (Church of Scotland), the Rev Donald Reid (Scottish Inter-faith Council), the Rev Lindsey Sanderson (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Rev Andy Scarcliffe (Baptist Union of Scotland), Dr Gillian Todd (Church in Wales) and the Rt Rev Joseph Toal (Roman Catholic Church).

The Primus offered the congratulations of Synod to the Very Rev Clifford Piper who had won the Primus' Championship Cup the previous day and which had been generously sponsored by Ecclesiastical Insurance.

At the Primus' invitation, the Synod agreed that a message of goodwill be conveyed to Ms Pat McBryde, former Deputy Secretary General, who was unwell and to the Rt Rev Edward Luscombe.

### **1.2 Election of Prolocutors**

The Rev Dr Alison Peden and the Rev Canon David Bayne were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

Mr Nicholas Bowry and Miss Hilary Gibson were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

### **1.3 Election of Tellers**

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, Mrs Elspeth Davey, Mr Leo Lanahan and Mr John Payne were appointed Tellers for the meeting.

### **1.4 Assessor**

The Primus announced that the Rev Paul Romano had been appointed as his Assessor.

## **1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2008**

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 12-14 June 2008.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

## **1.6 Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

## **1.7 Elections**

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by General Synod comprised the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, one vacancy for a General Synod representative on the Administration Board, vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee for three members, one alternate member and the secretary to the Committee, one clerical vacancy on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal and one vacancy for a General Synod Trustee.

In relation to the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, nominations had been received of the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth and the Rev Robert Warren. No nomination had been received for the General Synod representative post on the Administration Board and Synod agreed to extend the time for receipt of nominations until 11.15 the following morning. The nominations for the vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and Clergy Discipline Tribunal were set out in the Synod Papers and the nomination for the vacancy on the General Synod Trustees was the Hon Lord McEwan.

## **1.8 Roll Call**

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 140 members attended.

## **1.9 Permission to Speak**

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of Synod: the Rev Robert Anderson, Dr Elaine Cameron, the Rev Marion Chatterley, Ms Chloe Clemmons, Mr Simon Mackintosh and the Secretary General. The delegates from other denominations and faiths were also welcomed to speak.

## **1.10 Standing Committee**

### **1.10.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008**

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008.

The Accounts showed two key things: a healthy surplus for the year 2008 and a severe decline in the value of the General Synod's investments. A surplus of £190,965 had been returned for the year. This represented the total surplus on all funds and a large part of the surplus was derived from the restricted funds. Of greater significance to the health of the Synod's finances was the surplus on the General Fund of £67,160. The intention of the Standing Committee was not to return surpluses but to use the funds in furtherance of God's work. Traditionally, it had been possible to budget for a deficit on the basis that some grants were not always taken up in full, or at all, within the year for which they had been allocated.

As explained in the Report, the transfer of Braeburn Care Home had been completed and progress had also been made in moving forward the transfer of St Serf's Care Home to which a modest loan had been made in 2008 for essential health and safety works. Two further items of expenditure were incurred (but had not been specifically provided for in the budget because it was not known how much would be required) namely software for the General Synod Office's finance systems which would enable efficiency gains in future, and the funding of the Child Protection Historic Case Review. Professor Peattie expressed gratitude to those who had carefully managed their affairs so as to produce a surplus. As far as investments were concerned, the drop in the balance sheet value reflected the current global situation. It had had no real impact on the financial performance during 2008 but would have an impact in future years. In presenting the Report and Accounts, Professor Peattie expressed thanks to her colleagues on the Standing Committee and the officers of the General Synod Office.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

*"That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2008."*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*.

### **1.10.2 Budgets**

Professor Peattie referred to the budgets contained in the Synod Papers for 2009 to 2011. The figures were not intended to frighten but were intended to give a true picture of the size of the task facing the Synod. She reminded the meeting that at General Synod 2008, she had indicated that the budget deficit for 2010 was unsustainable and that dramatic steps would be needed. In the budget setting process in the autumn of 2008, whilst the anticipated expenditure of the work of boards and committees for 2009 was acceptable, the ongoing effects of what was proposed for future years would incur an unacceptably high level of deficit. This was particularly the case in the light of the results of the then prospective Pension Fund valuation and the worsening financial situation globally. Cuts were therefore made in the proposed allocations for 2009 which, if all other factors had remained the same, would have produced very modest surpluses for 2009 and an acceptable level of deficit for 2010 and 2011 such that a break even position for those years could have been expected.

However, circumstances had changed. The Investment Committee had managed the level of UTP distribution to avoid unhelpful peaks and troughs. As a result, the income for 2008 had been unaffected. However, it was recognised that changes in the investment climate would affect income in 2009 (though the extent of the effect was unknown). The budgets shown on page 49 of the Synod Papers assumed a 51p distribution from the UTP for 2009 which was 10% less than the previous year and thought to be prudent. Since the budgets had been prepared, however, the first half-yearly distribution for 2009 had been determined by the Investment Committee at 24p and if the second distribution were to be at a similar level, this would produce a further reduction in income of £60,000 for the year as compared with that shown in the budgets. In addition, bank interest rates had dropped. The risk of exposure to the banking sector for the Church had been severe and steps had been taken to open accounts with other institutions in order to spread risk and maximise yields. These arrangements added further complexity to the managing of cash flow and Professor Peattie expressed gratitude to the Treasurer, Mr Malcolm Bett. Professor Peattie also expressed gratitude to those who made gifts or legacies to the General Synod. Smaller gifts were taken to revenue whereas larger ones were capitalised.

The budgeted deficit of £131,466 for 2009 shown on page 45 of the Synod Papers might, on present calculations, need to be increased by a further £60,000. Boards and committees had therefore been instructed earlier in the year to curtail all spending that was not already committed for the year so that the deficit could be reduced as much as possible. Efforts would, however, mainly be directed towards reducing deficits for future years. Some surpluses had been made in recent years and some of that could be used to alleviate future deficits but it was not intended that all such surpluses should be so used. Professor Peattie explained that the Pension Fund valuation had now also been received and the figures from 2010 onwards took account of the increased impact on staff costs resulting from that valuation. This had a significant effect on the budget of the Standing Committee and on those other board budgets which included staff costs.

The budgets presented, therefore, were to illustrate the size of the problem if no action were to be taken. Such budgets were clearly unsustainable. Standing Committee had agreed that, apart from the measures which she had outlined for 2009, the concentration should be on a new zero-based budgeting approach from 2010 onwards. Restricted funds would continue to be available as before but would also be adversely affected by investment returns and interest rates. There were, therefore, likely to be major changes and cuts in all budgets in order to meet obligations to the Pension Fund (which would be discussed in further detail by Synod the following day). In the past, it had been possible to budget for a deficit of up to £50,000 on the basis that this normally produced a break even out-turn. In more stringent times, this was less likely to be the case.

The Standing Committee recognised that financial pressures also affected dioceses, charges and many individuals. It was nevertheless the case that many individuals were benefiting from lower mortgage rates and Standing Committee hoped that efforts in relation to stewardship would continue to bear fruit. Against that background, a 3% increase in provincial quota for 2010 was considered reasonable.

Despite the current situation being painful and negative, Professor Peattie wished to affirm to the Synod that the finances were not “broke”. Whilst it might be necessary to realise some capital, there was no desire to do so where this could be avoided at a time when capital values were low. The necessary belt tightening, however, came at an opportune time since it would lead to a revisiting of priorities. She hoped that by General Synod the following year, the economic green shoots talked of by economists might have produced more than one leaf and that, as the Primus had referred to in his charge, the ground might have been cleared to allow for decisions to be made in the light of the forthcoming debate on matters of mission and ministry. The financial situation would improve but the question was “when?”.

The Primus invited comment but there was none.

## **SESSION TWO – Mr Ian Stewart in the Chair**

### **2.1 College of Bishops**

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones (Primus) welcomed Mr Michael Harvey, of Back to Church Sunday, who had convened a lunch time session for Synod members. A number of congregations were involved in the Back to Church Sunday initiative.

In opening the College of Bishops session, the Primus explained that during the previous year the Bishops had processed a significant volume of work and a number of areas had been tackled in some depth. He expressed thanks to the Secretary General for the support given to the College.

In the light of the prospective retirement of the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles in September 2009, the Primus paid tribute to the Rt Rev Martin Shaw and his wife Elspeth. The Bishop of Argyll had kept the College focused on the spiritual aspects of Christian discipleship. The Primus expressed warmest wishes to them both for their retirement.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) then gave a presentation on aspects of ministry. He explained that the College of Bishops was aware of his general approach but not of the specific material which he would deliver. The ministry of the Church was founded on that of Jesus Christ. The basic unit in Anglicanism was a Christian community with a shepherd whose function was to guide and lead that community and who delegated that office to others, whether ordained or lay. That shepherd was the bishop. The ecclesiology of the Church was based on the three-fold order of ministry. The Scottish Episcopal Church was catholic but reformed. It held to evangelical truth and apostolic order. In looking at where the Scottish Episcopal Church had come from, it was also important to note the history of the Church and the implications of its involvement with the Jacobite rebellions.

In considering where the Scottish Episcopal Church was at the present time, it was important to recognise that it had been shaped by the recent past (over the previous 50 years). The problems of church decline had begun before the First World War but in fact the ordained ministry expanded in the years after the Second World War. The highest number of ordination candidates after the Second World War had come from the services. Despite increasing numbers, however, there was a difficulty in relation to deployment because numbers were not evenly distributed (Bishop Mantle was referring essentially to the position

in the Church of England). Projections in the 1960s envisaged significant increases in the number of ordinands. However, they proved to be completely wrong to the extent that it had been indicated to clergy in training in the 1980s that they were “the last generation of stipendiary clergy”. In fact, vocations had not decreased. In England numbers had risen between 2006 and 2008 and the age profile had reduced. The same was true in the Scottish Episcopal Church. There was also a healthy lay ministry. There were 84 lay readers across dioceses as well as many eucharistic assistants and other forms of lay ministry. Whilst the annual directory suggested there were currently 512 clergy available in Scotland, the collation of statistics from dioceses suggested that there were currently 150 full-time and part-time stipendiary clergy, 250 non-stipendiary ministers and 147 retired and semi-retired clergy. He suggested that the total number of available clergy was 377. The clergy in Scotland comprised approximately 75% from Scotland, 17% from England, 7% from overseas and less than 1% from each of Ireland and Wales. In the Diocese of Brechin, all recent posts had been filled from England.

In turning to look to the future, Bishop Mantle considered that the current statistics suggested that there was a need to produce more candidates for ministry, especially stipendiary candidates. Between 2009 and 2015 approximately 33% of stipendiary clergy would reach the age of 65, representing a possible loss of some 50 stipendiary clergy. It was a fact that the Scottish Episcopal Church would not be able to replace stipendiary clergy at a rate that would meet the number of vacancies and would therefore have to recruit from outside Scotland. It was important to be bold about different kinds of ministries, both lay and ordained, and to encourage younger candidates, especially for stipendiary ministry. A balance needed to be maintained between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministries. The only qualification for priesthood was holiness of life but it was important not to be hidebound by a political correctness which said that there was no difference between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministry. At the point of service and deployability, there could be significant differences. He believed that the answer to the difficulties he perceived in relation to the administration of Communion from the Reserved Sacrament was for there to be more non-stipendiary ministers. It was also important to be able to provide ministry in colleges, the services, hospitals, prisons and classrooms. Above all, there was a need for younger candidates to carry on the learning and teaching for the future.

It had been suggested to him that it was the duty of archbishops and bishops to provide clergy. In fact, ministers for the future came from the pews. He encouraged Synod members to return to their dioceses and charges, to talk to people there and prepare for the church of tomorrow.

## **2.2 Faith and Order Board**

### **2.2.1 Introduction**

The Primus presented the report of the Faith and Order Board. He explained that for as long as the Primus chaired Synod he could not, as Convener of the Faith and Order Board, present motions to Synod. Now that Synod chairing was shared, he was able to do so and in so doing wished to emphasise that the material which came to Synod under the heading of the Faith and Order Board had been agreed by the Board. He outlined the areas of activity falling within the remit of the Board namely Doctrine, Liturgy, Canons and Inter-Church Relations (including the Anglican Communion).

### **2.2.2 Inter-Anglican Women's Network/UN Commission on the Status of Women**

Dr Elaine Cameron explained that she was the Scottish Episcopal Church link on the Inter-Anglican Women's Network. The Network had been established in 1996 and facilitated networking amongst women and women's organisations both within the Church and beyond. It built on the work of the Mother's Union. The Network was for all women in the Church and for those prepared to speak about injustices in their own country. Some spoke at considerable personal risk.

Political and social concerns were at the core of the Network. The provincial link people on the Network sought to build awareness of the social focus of the Network (best defined as the promotion of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals). Dr Cameron highlighted in particular Goal Three (The Empowerment of Women and Gender Equality). The focus of work for the next triennium would be the elimination of violence against all women and children. The Network was also concerned with Church structures especially with the promotion of ACC Resolution 13-31 which sought equality of representation between men and women in all decision-making units responsible for policy design in the churches. She had submitted a report to the Network on the progress of the Scottish Episcopal Church in implementing that resolution. She identified a continuity with the former Movement for Whole Ministry which had promoted the opening of the priesthood and episcopate to women.

Dr Cameron considered it important to support the work of the Network because the meetings of the provincial link people made the personal contact real. People in one part of the globe knew that they were being prayed for around the Communion. The Network also was one way of increasing awareness of the international and inter-Communion aspects of current issues.

Dr Cameron then turned to the question of gender audit. The Scottish Episcopal Church was proud of its mission. Any institution was best placed to fulfil its objectives when its members were able to acknowledge their gifts and talents fully. The Anglican Consultative Council had urged full implementation of its Resolution 13-31 and had requested a further report from provinces. The best way of working towards the goal of equal representation was in the execution of a gender audit. So-called "gender issues" related to both men and women, boys and girls and their promotion sought to uplift the disadvantaged gender. The Church in Wales had completed a gender audit during the course of the previous year and the Scottish Episcopal Church had access to its methodology. She commended the motions which would be proposed shortly by the Primus regarding commitment to the work of the Inter-Anglican Women's Network and to the undertaking of a gender audit.

The Rev Marion Chatterley thanked the College of Bishops for the opportunity to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church at the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women meeting in New York earlier in the year. The written report contained in the Synod Papers summarised that meeting. Globally, women had fewer opportunities than men. In some cultures female children were valued less than male ones and in some cultures girls were not allowed access to education. Many women lived in abusive relationships and more women than men were used in the production

of pornography. Female genital mutilation was still very common in some parts of the world. Seventy percent of the world's poor were women. The status of women, therefore, had to be of concern both within society and within the churches. Essentially, it was an issue of justice and she considered there was a straightforward gospel imperative not to discriminate. Nevertheless, the Church failed to challenge that injustice. Exploitation by women was felt by men as well as women and, consequently, addressing gender issues meant addressing the status of both women and men.

Ms Chatterley highlighted the effects on women of issues such as sexual violence in the areas of conflict and climate change, including the availability of water. Similarly, the economic crisis was more likely to affect women than men. The Millennium Development Goals most likely not to be met were those which applied to women and girls. The picture was complex and, therefore, the place to start was within the Scottish Episcopal Church. At present, it was simply not known whether women were discriminated against in the Church and that was the reason for a gender audit. Ms Chatterley then invited Dr Gillian Todd, the representative from the Church in Wales, who had also been at the United Nations meeting, to speak to the Synod because she had been involved in the Church in Wales' gender audit.

Dr Gillian Todd (Church in Wales) explained that approximately three years ago a working group had been set up by the Church in Wales to consider the question of representation of women. The working group had had two members per diocese, one male, one female. She had acted as Chair of the group. The group had determined that the real issue was "gender blindness", namely using everyone's skills in the right way. The group's report was available from the website of the Church in Wales. The report recommended monitoring gender equality and moving towards equality over a period of time. Other recommendations dealt with inclusive language and the need for those who were involved in training or work with young people and clergy to be fully conversant with gender equality issues. The report had been accepted by the Governing Body of the Church in Wales in September 2008. The first step had been a gender audit, the results of which had been very eye-opening. Many people had assumed that there was equality of representation. In fact, it had emerged that there were very few women throughout the Province on finance committees and some dioceses had almost no representation of women in their decision-making processes at all.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rev Eileen Thompson (Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*"That this Synod confirm its commitment to engage with the work of the Inter-Anglican Women's Network, as appropriate."*

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Primus proposed, and the Rev Eileen Thompson (Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod, affirming its commitment to the Millennium Development Goals, invites the undertaking of a gender audit within the Scottish Episcopal Church in time to report to General Synod 2010.”*

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 10 abstaining.

The Chair expressed thanks to Dr Cameron, Ms Chatterley and Dr Todd.

### **2.2.3 Anglican Covenant – St Andrew’s draft**

The Primus referred to the response to the St Andrew’s draft of the Anglican Covenant which had been submitted on behalf of the Province earlier in the year.

The Ridley Cambridge draft had subsequently been published. The Secretary General would speak to Synod shortly about that. In summary, the first three sections of the Covenant had been accepted by the Anglican Consultative Council but provinces were being consulted on Section 4. Provinces were asked to respond with comment on Section 4 by the middle of November 2009. The Primus wished to suggest to the Synod that consideration of the draft be remitted to the Faith and Order Board (and the Board’s Working Group on the Anglican Covenant) so that a response could be made within the requested timescale.

## **2.3 Standing Committee**

### **2.3.1 Report on Anglican Consultative Council–14**

Mr John Stuart (Secretary General) reported on his attendance, as the Scottish Episcopal Church representative, at ACC-14 in Jamaica the previous month. A written report had been circulated with the Synod Papers and he expected that the resolutions which had been passed at the meeting would be remitted by the Standing Committee to appropriate boards and committees of the General Synod for consideration. Whilst he had been the sole Scottish Episcopal Church representative, Miss Sarah Tomlinson had also been present as one of the two Anglican Communion Youth representatives co-opted to the ACC and Mr John Rea had also been in attendance for part of the meeting in relation to some of the Anglican Communion Networks.

On the question of the Anglican Covenant, Mr Stuart explained that the suggestion for an Anglican Covenant had been one of the recommendations of the Windsor Report of 2004. Since then, there had been three drafts of the Covenant: the Nassau draft, the St Andrew’s draft and, most recently, the Ridley Cambridge draft. The General Synod had in the past debated both the Nassau and St Andrew’s drafts and these had also been discussed in dioceses. The hope of the Anglican Communion Covenant Drafting Group had been that ACC-14 would remit the Ridley Cambridge draft to provinces for adoption. However, there had been a feeling at ACC-14 amongst a number of representatives that it would be appropriate for further consultation to take place, especially on Section 4 of the Covenant. This was probably the most contentious part of the Covenant. In the Ridley Cambridge draft, there had been a

move away from more directly “punitive” measures to a greater recognition of the autonomy of provinces. However, the principle of “autonomy” was balanced by the concept of “communion” and, in particular, the relational consequences of communion. In one sense, because the principle of autonomy was respected, churches were free to make their own decisions (subject to the obligations under the Covenant to seek a shared mind with others, engage in theological debate etc). Ultimately, however, if a church took steps in terms of its own polity which were not compatible with the Covenant, then under the proposed Section 4 the matter would come before the Joint Standing Committee of the Communion (to be known in future simply as “the Standing Committee”). The Standing Committee would have power to make a request to a covenanting church to defer action until various processes had been completed and it could take advice from bodies such as the ACC or the Primates’ Meeting. Having taken such advice, the Standing Committee could make a declaration that a church had acted in a way which was “incompatible with the Covenant” and could make recommendations about the “relational consequences” which would flow from such action. Under the Covenant, it would be for each Instrument of Communion to make its own response to any recommendation emanating from the Standing Committee in such circumstances. As a result, there was a degree of uncertainty as to what those consequences might be. Mr Stuart suggested that an obvious question might be whether a province which had acted incompatibly with the Covenant, would continue to be entitled to enjoy membership of a body such as the ACC or whether its Primate and bishops would be invited to the Primates’ Meeting and the Lambeth Conference respectively. As far as continued membership of the ACC was concerned, the ACC had a constitution which listed the member churches. The Communion’s Standing Committee had power to alter the list of membership but only with the assent of two-thirds of the Primates of the Communion. Therefore, one-third of the Primates exercised a right of veto over any change being made to the membership of the ACC.

Mr Stuart explained that the Covenant addressed the question of a province wishing to withdraw (which, for practical purposes, would be dealt with in a similar way to a province “acting incompatibly” with the Covenant). The Covenant did not, of course, address the situation where a province decided not to sign the Covenant in the first place since the Covenant could only bind those parties who had signed up. His expectation, however, was that if, after a reasonable period, a province either decided actively not to sign the Covenant or simply did not take a decision about signing, then the separate Instruments of Communion would need to arrive at their own decision in much the same way as would be the case if a province had acted incompatibly with the Covenant. Whilst many provinces undoubtedly would sign the Covenant, if some did not, there would be a two-tier Communion and the nature of relationships within such a two-tier arrangement could only be speculated upon. Over time, it was possible that there might be a “cooling” of companion link arrangements. Another factor might be whether mutual interchange of ministry between provinces would or could continue as it did at the present time.

The Agenda and papers for the Synod had had to be prepared and sent to the printer before ACC-14 had taken place. As a result, there was no motion in the Synod Agenda concerning the Covenant. Since returning from Jamaica, Mr Stuart had discussed the matter with the College of Bishops and, as had been the case with previous drafts, he would arrange for the Ridley Cambridge draft to be sent to

dioceses for their consideration and comment. A response had been asked for by the Anglican Communion office by 13<sup>th</sup> November 2009. The comments received would be considered by the Communion's Standing Committee in December 2009 and he thought that provinces could expect to be invited in the early part of 2010 formally to commence a process of consideration of the final version of the Covenant and for a decision on acceptance of it. The specific request received from the Anglican Communion office since ACC-14 was for provinces to consider Section 4 of the Ridley Cambridge draft and to identify issues of "unclarity or ambiguity". He would be writing to dioceses with the draft Covenant and inviting comments by mid-October so that those comments could be considered by the Provincial Faith and Order Board in late October. The Board had previously indicated that, until the final version of the Covenant were available, the precise process to be followed in the Scottish Episcopal Church for consideration and possible adoption of the Covenant could not be finally determined. He expected that the Covenant might come before General Synod 2010 at least for initial consideration. He invited members to comment on the Ridley Cambridge draft since these would be helpful to the Faith and Order Board.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the College of Bishops had issued the statement a couple of months previously responding to requests from the Anglican Communion for various moratoria. He indicated that not everyone could affirm what the bishops had said nor feel happy about their statement. He had a specific question regarding the comment made by bishops that none of them ever attended same-sex blessing services. In the interest of transparency, he asked whether the bishops could indicate which of them had themselves blessed or taken part in any liturgy of blessing of a same-sex couple at any time in their ministry and which of them, since becoming bishops, had attended civil partnership ceremonies and blessed them, if not with their prayers, at least by their presence. He also asked whether those bishops who had taken part or been present at such ceremonies would give consideration to using their teaching ministry to explore what they had learned by their participation. He had given a couple of days' notice of the question to Secretary General and hoped that an answer later in Synod would be appropriate.

The Primus responded that he was not in a position to give a detailed answer at the present time but the College of Bishops would examine the question and give a considered response.

The Rev Martin Robson (Edinburgh) expressed personal unhappiness at the way in which the Anglican Church was being steamrolled to meet timetables regarding the Covenant process. He considered that not only the Scottish Episcopal Church, but also other provinces, had had insufficient time to weigh and discuss the issues in question. He was also unhappy with limits being placed on the scope of the response. His concern was not so much with Section 4 specifically but rather with the entire Covenant which evinced a highly deficient theology of revelation. As a result, he was unhappy with the Covenant being remitted to the Faith and Order Board because more time was needed.

The Primus responded that the question of timetable had been raised previously with the Communion and that the response to the St Andrew's draft had specifically referred to that. It appeared, however, that some other provinces did not share that view.

In response to a question, the Chair clarified that the Ridley Cambridge draft would be sent to dioceses for comment with a view to the Faith and Order Board considering such diocesan comments and making a response to the Anglican Communion in November 2009. The Primus emphasised that, as before, if any individual members of Synod or congregations wished to submit comments or proposals they were welcome to do so. There was no intention to foreclose the expression of opinion but it would have to be done in such a way as to meet the timetable. The reason the Covenant process was continuing was because a very large number of provinces wished it to do so. The Rev Martin Robson (Edinburgh) asked for clarification of the process. The Primus responded that dioceses would be invited to express opinions and that they would be collated by the Faith and Order Board. The Chair sought the Synod's acceptance to the process which had been outlined and this was agreed.

### **2.3.2 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults**

Ms Lexy Plumtree (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) presented the report of the Committee. Commenting on the written report contained in the Synod Papers, Ms Plumtree indicated that the final report on the Historic Cases review prepared by Helen Kenward, the Independent Reviewer, had been received earlier that week. Ms Plumtree had not had an opportunity to consider it in detail but the recommendations had not changed from those contained in Ms Kenward's interim report. If any Synod member had specific questions regarding the report since they might relate to confidential material, such questions should be addressed to the provincial officers. The Committee was next due to meet in the autumn and would consider the report in detail at that stage.

Ms Plumtree then referred to recent issues concerning the obtaining of disclosure certificates from Disclosure Scotland for persons working with "adults at risk". Since March 2009, it had not been possible for the Church to obtain enhanced disclosure certificates in such cases. This was beyond the control of the Church, it having been an internal decision of Disclosure Scotland. All other Scottish churches were similarly affected. The Scottish Government had now put down a Statutory Instrument for Parliament to adopt and this was expected to come into force at the end of June 2009. The effect of this would be to allow enhanced disclosure certificates for those working with adults at risk to be available once again.

Questions were invited but there were none.

## **2.4 Information and Communication Board**

The Very Rev Clifford Piper (Convener, Information and Communication Board) referred to the written report of the Board contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. He also referred to the brief report in the notes to those accounts regarding the dissolution of Scottish Episcopal Church (Newscan) Ltd. The winding up of Newscan had considerably streamlined the production of *inspires* magazine. The budget of *inspires* had now been brought within the Information and Communication Board.

In the previous year, the Board had continued to implement its communications strategy. That strategy identified the need for clear objectives and priorities, the need for the support of the Information and Communication Board, the College of Bishops, the Standing Committee and the General Synod and for the strategy to be regularly evaluated. Dean Piper outlined the objectives of the strategy which included raising the profile of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the “messages” which the strategy intended to convey and the resources which could be used to do so, including the Provincial website, *inspires*, diocesan and church magazines and newsletters, mailings, blogging, exhibitions and resources such as Flickr, Facebook, Twitter etc. The website had been launched two years previously and had gone from strength to strength. The site averaged 250 hits every day and in the period from 8<sup>th</sup> May to 8<sup>th</sup> June 2009, there had been 6,632 hits. The agenda and papers for the General Synod could be downloaded from the website and, once again, comprehensive coverage of the Synod was available. There were exciting plans for further development of the website which might include a monthly electronic newsletter, the development of “Red Book plus” to include wider information that the general public might wish to know, a wedding section and general information about the sacraments. There was increasing evidence that many visitors now researched and decided their place of worship through the internet. If General Synod members came from congregations which did not have their own website, he encouraged them to take action. The most popular pages on the website included the church directory, the liturgies and the Scottish Episcopal Church blogs page. The new diocesan website and the Theological Institute website which were now hosted on the provincial site were also very popular. A significant development in the past year had been that the Dioceses of Aberdeen and Orkney and Edinburgh had both decided to host their diocesan websites on the provincial site. Whilst electronic means of communication advanced significantly, there was still a strong sense that there was a place for the printed medium. He invited Synod members to take every opportunity to support and promote *inspires*. The major burden of production was carried by the Communications Officer, Miss Lorna Finley, who was helped by a small editorial committee. In closing, Dean Piper explained that he had served on the Board for 13 years. It had been an amazing experience and he had enjoyed immensely the privilege of working with many talented people, not least Miss Finley. He thanked the Synod for its support and urged members to “keep communicating!”.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Dean Piper then proceeded to present an album of photographs and tributes to the Most Rev Dr Idris Jones who was due to retire as Primus the following day. The album included contributions from a number of people including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of Wales, the Bishop of Gothenburg, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow, a former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Chief Executive of the Scottish Inter-faith Council.

In closing the session, the Chair expressed thanks to Dean Piper who had left a tremendous legacy as Convener of the Board.

## **SESSION THREE – The Rev Dr Alison Peden in the Chair**

### **3.1 Standing Committee**

#### **3.1.1 Response to General Synod Review Group Report**

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod Papers which represented the response of the Standing Committee to the recommendations contained in the report of March 2006 of the General Synod Review Group. She reminded Synod that comment had been made at General Synod over the course of several years on a number of the recommendations contained in the 2006 report. She noted that the Provincial Conference planned for October 2009 had had to be cancelled but the concept of a Provincial Conference would be kept on the agenda. Issues relating to the Rule 10 motion passed in 2006 had been the subject of separate consideration by Standing Committee and the College of Bishops and would be commented on towards the end of the current General Synod. In any event, there appeared to be little desire for a reduction in the number of dioceses although Standing Committee had been considering the question of diocesan and congregational viability. A further result of the continuing consideration of the General Synod Review Group Report was that an improved evaluation form for General Synod had been developed. The Standing Committee received a report on the completed evaluation forms each year and, therefore, there was no need for the Organisation Review Committee to continue to meet annually. It was proposed that it would continue to meet in future but less frequently.

Comments were invited but there were none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee regarding the report of the General Synod Review Group of 2006.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

#### **3.1.2 Electronic Communication**

Professor Peattie turned to the proposal in the Synod Papers that facility be included in the Canons to allow for the initial notice convening the meeting of General or Diocesan Synods, under Canons 52 and 50 respectively, to be sent electronically. This would be a more effective means of communication as well as saving expense on postage. The main Synod papers would continue to be provided in hard copy.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) asked why the proposed change to Canon 57.3 envisaged that material posted by second class would be deemed to have arrived within 48 hours when the Royal Mail undertook to deliver within three days. It was agreed that in proposing the amended Canon 57 for first reading, the reference to “48 hours” in Section 3 should be deemed to be a reference to “72 hours”.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion (incorporating the change from 48 to 72 hours referred to above):-

*“That the amended text for Canon 57, Sections 1 and 3 be read for the first time.”*

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy unanimously and in the House of Bishops *nem con*.

### **3.1.3 Practice Note for Diocesan Synods**

Professor Peattie spoke to the Practice Note dated December 2008 which had been prepared by the Standing Committee to assist Diocesan Synods in the handling of business intended for General Synod. In consequence, it was proposed to make a small change to the Appendix to Resolution 9 under Canon 52 in particular so that the voting figures taken in relation to Canons should include reference to the vote of the Diocesan Bishop.

Professor Peattie proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for the Appendix to Resolution 9 under Canon 52 be adopted.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

### **3.1.4 Standing Committee Membership**

Professor Peattie reminded General Synod that the composition of the Standing Committee had been expanded in 2006 and this had proved a most helpful development. However, at that time, it had not been immediately apparent that if the additional members elected to the Standing Committee thereafter soon ceased to be members of General Synod, this could present a risk of frequent change to the Standing Committee membership and limit continuity. The proposals now being brought forward were, therefore, to enable members elected to the Standing Committee to continue as members of General Synod until the completion of their term of office on the Standing Committee. Since Canon 52.3 also referred to the Principal of the Theological Institute (an office which no longer existed), opportunity was being taken to update the Canon but the Mission and Ministry Board had also been invited to consider whether it would be appropriate to include reference to the Pantonian Professor becoming a member of General Synod *ex-officio*.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 3 be read for the first time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed unanimously in each House.

## **SESSION FOUR – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair**

### **4.1 Response from the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles**

The Rt Rev Martin Shaw (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) responded to the thanks expressed to him by the Primus earlier in the meeting. One of his greatest privileges had been to work in Argyll and The Isles. He encouraged Synod members to visit the small charges in the diocese whenever they were able in order to experience “the inexpressible”. He encouraged use of the Retreat Houses on Cumbrae and Iona since they would only survive if use was made of them. In the words of St Columba, he exhorted Synod members “be the great God between your two shoulders”.

### **4.2 Administration Board**

Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) referred to the reports of the Board and its committees in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. He explained that the only conveners who had been invited to address Synod were those whose committees had specific matters to bring before Synod. However, all conveners were present and were happy to answer questions.

### **4.3 Investment Committee**

Mr Graeme Thom (Convener, Investment Committee) reported on the work of his committee. He explained that investment conditions had continued to be difficult with investments generally having lost a third of their value in little more than a year. There had also been a significant reduction in dividend payments which had affected investment returns. In relation to the Unit Trust Pool, it had become clear that it would be impossible to maintain previous levels of distribution and that was likely to be the case for the foreseeable future. In those circumstances, the Committee had worked hard on the asset allocation of the Unit Trust Pool in order to limit the damage. The investment policy of the Fund had been altered. The scope of investments had been widened to include more fixed interest and overseas investments and a “total return” policy had been introduced where both income and capital gain would be used to provide the necessary funds for distribution. It would take some time for the new policy to show results. The distribution level for 2009 had been given consideration. The Committee was well aware of the need for income on the part of unit holders but this had to be balanced against the actual returns made by the investments. If the distribution exceeded the actual return earned, this would reduce the value of the investments and affect future investment returns. It had been decided that the distribution in August 2009 would be at the level of 24p per unit (compared with the distribution in August 2008 of 28.25p). The distribution in February 2010 would be decided later in 2009 in the light of investment conditions and returns.

Mr Thom explained that the performance of the Fund Managers had been disappointing and a review had been initiated. Whilst the underperformance of the current managers had been a factor in deciding to undertake a review, the Committee was, in any event, due to carry out a review at the end of the year.

Questions were invited but there were none.

#### **4.4 Finance Committee**

The Rev Canon David Bayne (Convener, Finance Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. He reminded Synod that the Committee principally dealt with the allocation of certain grants, and not with finance generally. The previous year, Synod had been invited to make suggestions for an alternative name for the Committee but the response had been “underwhelming”. Referring to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008, Canon Bayne pointed out that approximately one-third of Scottish Episcopal Church congregations had benefited from one form of grant or another from the Committee.

Each year, the Finance Committee recommended the level of stipend to the Administration Board. For a number of years this had been tied to the Benchmark Stipend of the Church of England. It was understood that the relevant meeting of the Church of England had taken place the previous day but there was, as yet, no announcement. He expected that any increase was unlikely to be large.

There would be very significant provincial deficits in 2010, 2011 and possibly thereafter. Of all the Synod’s boards and committees, the Finance Committee had by far the largest discretionary spend and, therefore, the Committee’s budget was likely to take the largest hit. In considering the latter, the Finance Committee had noted that the Grants for Ministry Fund had already had its budget cut by £25,000 for 2010 and £50,000 in 2011. This was a source of concern to the Committee and it had decided to try to protect the rest of the Grants for Ministry budget. The Committee was therefore proposing to the Administration Board that there would be a two-year moratorium on buildings grants so that in 2010 and 2011 there would be no Maintenance and Development grants nor any Dunderdale Buildings grants. A small contingency fund would be retained for genuine emergencies. Over two years, the saving would be of the order of £300,000. Canon Bayne recognised that this would be difficult for those planning major buildings projects and for those hoping for more modest support from the Dunderdale Building Fund for matters such as the creation of toilets for the disabled. He acknowledged that there would be congregations which would find themselves in need of Grants for Ministry support simply because of the increase in Pension Fund contributions but the view of the Standing Committee was that such congregations would need to look to their own dioceses for assistance (in view of the fact that a substantial upfront capital contribution was proposed to be made to the Pension Fund out of General Synod funds). There would be no transitional relief as there had been at the time of the last significant Pension Fund contribution rate increase. He considered there was more work to be done on this area.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Brechtin) accepted the dire financial situation but expressed concern that the single reference to expenditure cuts appeared to be in relation to disabled access. She referred to the charge of the Primus at the beginning of Synod where he had pointed out that those most affected by the financial crisis were likely to be the most vulnerable. She was concerned that the Church should be looking at how it could act to include the most vulnerable in its life and worship.

Canon Bayne responded that his reference to the creation of toilets for the disabled had simply been an example. He agreed with the comments made by Ms Waller. He reminded

Synod that the Disability Discrimination Act had been passed in 1995 and if some congregations had not yet complied, then it was necessary to ask why they had not. He regretted the fact that there would be a lack of provincial resources available in the following two years to assist those who needed to catch up in implementing changes to their buildings.

#### **4.5 Buildings Advisory Committee**

Permission was given to the Rev Canon James Milne to speak during the debate. As a member of the Committee on Canons, he had been involved in the redrafting of Canon 35 which the Synod would be invited to consider shortly.

The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Convener, Buildings Advisory Committee) referred to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. He invited any questions on the report.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Brechin) asked whether it would be possible for obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act to be included within the Canons which dealt with buildings matters. There were still churches which had not complied with the legislation and she wondered what consideration had been given to this within the Buildings Advisory Committee.

The Rev Canon James Milne explained that it was not generally the case that all legislation was reflected in Canons. The assumption was that, generally speaking, the Canons dealt with matters which the Church required its members and congregations to comply with and that state legislation applied anyway without the need for incorporation into Canons.

Dean Duncan reported that the Buildings Advisory Committee had considered disability issues and intended to keep the matter on their agenda for the Committee meeting in the autumn. The guidance notes which had been prepared on the Disability Discrimination Act and issued in 2003 would be placed on the provincial website to enable wider distribution. The Committee also had an access audit checklist which would be placed on the website and was already being used within the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. The Committee was also engaged with the Information and Communication Board whose proposals in relation to the "Red Book plus" would allow more information about disability access to be included on the provincial website.

Dean Duncan then turned to the proposals for alteration to Canon 35 set out in the Agenda and papers for Synod. The Synod was being invited to give a first reading to the text of Canon 35. The Resolutions which had been reproduced in the Synod Papers would be voted on only if and when the Canon returned for a second reading at General Synod 2010. The Buildings Advisory Committee and the Committee on Canons were happy to note any comments on the Resolutions.

Canon 35 was the law which determined how the Church controlled alterations to the interiors and exteriors of buildings in ecclesiastical use. Its present form had been in use for nearly a decade and had proved effective and successful. It was designed, by ensuring a credible process of consultation and decision-making, to preserve the exemption from Listed Building Consent for alterations to interiors. More importantly, it was intended to encourage creative approaches to the use of all church buildings which were based on proper consent and consultation. Experience within the dioceses during the previous 10 years suggested that

the Canon needed some minor alteration to improve certain aspects of its operation. The proposals before Synod were the result of a careful process of consultation with every diocesan building committee and with Historic Scotland as well as with the Committee on Canons. Dean Duncan highlighted two significant changes in particular. The first was that Section 1 of the new Canon and the proposed new Resolution 6 would empower the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee to issue a list of minor works which would not require canonical consent. The Committee had begun work on this and intended to finalise a draft list at its meeting in the autumn so that it could perhaps be made available to Diocesan Synods in early 2010 and certainly for General Synod 2010. Secondly, Resolutions 3 and 4 would clarify the distinction in procedures as between listed and non-listed buildings. This was in response to clear representations during the consultation process.

Questions and comment were invited.

Miss Lisbeth Thoms (Brechin) spoke in support of the proposal. She considered that the reference in Resolution 11 to the Voluntary Scheme to apply Listed Building Control to the Exteriors of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use would be better incorporated in Resolution 3 under the Canon (perhaps as a Section 3.2). Also, she was concerned at the possibility of confusion about advice on listed buildings. In the booklet published by Historic Scotland, it was stated that there was no need for consultation in relation to interiors. She appreciated that for the purposes of the Canons, it might be advisable to retain the requirement to engage in such consultation but she suggested that the Committee might consider the issue of guidance to avoid misunderstanding.

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) supported the remark made by Miss Thoms in relation to Resolutions 11 and 3. He was concerned that if Historic Scotland changed its mind in relation to buildings interiors, the process for altering Canons and Resolutions would inevitably take time before the Church could “catch up”. He suggested that consideration might be given to exploring whether the matter might be dealt with in a way which did not involve incorporation in the Canons. He also noted that Resolution 9 made provision for a full or partial reinstatement if works had been carried out without the necessary consents. He considered that this could be a cause for significant disagreement in future and queried whether it was appropriate to include such provision in a Resolution.

The Rev Ursula Shone (Brechin) noted that Canon 35.4 stated that no church consecrated for public worship could be used for any purpose which was not religious or ecclesiastical without the consent of the bishop. Her church was regularly used for concerts and they had never thought that the consent of the bishop might be needed.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) noted the reference in the proposed Resolution 6 to a list of minor works. He welcomed the idea of minor works in principle. He asked whether the Committee had considered creating three classes of works: those which required the full canonical procedures; those which did not require any consent whatsoever and those which might be approved, for example, by the Dean of the Diocese.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the acquisition of additional land might extend the ownership of a church. She was concerned that the process under the Canon would be too lengthy to meet the necessary timescales required for acceptance of a legal offer.

Dean Duncan, responding to the point made by the Bishop of Edinburgh, said that the Committee had not thought of creating three classes of work but would give consideration to that suggestion. The Rev James Milne, referring to the comments made in relation to Resolution 11, explained that the reason why the Voluntary Scheme was referred to was because it was voluntary and, therefore, not a requirement of the general law. The Committee on Canons would be willing to consider whether the provision might be better placed in the proposed Resolution 3. He also indicated that as a result of discussions with Historic Scotland, it had been very clear that Historic Scotland wanted to be consulted in relation to interiors as well as exteriors. In relation to the proposed Resolution 9, he accepted that it would be difficult for reinstatement to be enforced but by including the Resolution, it was hoped to emphasise the fact that the Canon should be taken seriously. On the question of gifts of land to the Church, whilst the Canon 35 process was lengthy, it was important that things were done properly.

Dean Duncan then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 35 be read for the first time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy *nem con*, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

Dean Duncan proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 50, Section 9 be read for the first time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy *nem con*, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

Dean Duncan proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the first time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy *nem con*, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

#### **4.6 Personnel Committee**

Mr Graeme Hely (Convener, Personnel Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. In addition to the matters being brought specifically before the Synod at the current meeting, the Committee was also considering the possibility of a capability procedure for clergy. It had been hoped that one of the Committee members, Miss Sheila Galbraith, would present the Grievance Procedure to Synod but, unfortunately, she was unwell and, at short notice, Mr Nick Bowry, another member of the Committee, had agreed to present the material.

Mr Bowry then explained the Grievance Procedure which sought to provide a process for matters of grievance on the part of clergy, who were regarded as “atypical workers”. Since the draft had been produced to General Synod 2008, the only change to the text appeared in Section 3 of the Grievance Procedure on the issue of representation. A new ACAS document

had been published in April 2009 and the wording of that had been reflected in the draft Grievance Procedure being presented to Synod.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Rev Jeremy Auld (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained the proposed alteration to Canon 53 which was being presented for a second reading in order to incorporate the Grievance Procedure as an appendix to the Canons. The reference to the issue of instructions in the proposed Canon 53.10 arose from the fact that clergy did not have a line manager and it was possible that different persons, such as the bishop or vestries, might issue instructions. The new Canon also stated that the raising of a grievance could not be made in relation to any accusation made under Canon 54 until after the matter of the accusation had been resolved.

Comment was invited.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) noted that the Canon referred to clergy generally but the Grievance Procedure restricted the scope of its application so that clergy licensed to institutions such as prisons or hospitals were not included. Whilst the Church could not handle an issue of grievance relating to an individual's employment in such an institution, it might nevertheless be the case that such an individual might have a grievance in relation to an issue concerning the Church (for example, membership of Diocesan Synod).

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to encourage the use of mediation since there were many people within the Scottish Episcopal Church who had been trained in mediation skills.

Mr Hely confirmed that clergy working in other institutions would normally have their own contract of employment and any grievance would be dealt with under that. If such individuals fell outside the Canon, he suggested that an aggrieved cleric might contact the Secretary General for advice. The comments made by Synod would be taken back to the Committee.

The Rev Jeremy Auld then proposed, and the Rev Canon Robin Paisley (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 53 be read for the second time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed *nem con* in each House.

Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the text of the Grievance Procedure set out in the General Synod Papers 2009 be adopted as the text for Appendix 29 to the Code of Canons.”*

The motion was put to the vote and carried *nem con*, with one abstention.

Mr Auld then explained that the motions numbered 14 to 16 in the General Synod Agenda related to questions of age discrimination. This was an area where the Church needed to comply with legislation. He explained the proposed alterations to Canons 1.2 and 11.5 which would remove the age limits on ordination to the Episcopate, Presbyterate and Diaconate.

Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

*“That Canon 1, Section 2 be repealed in its entirety. (Second reading)”*

The Motion was put to the vote in houses and was passed by the requisite majorities as follows:-

House of Bishops: passed unanimously  
House of Clergy: passed by majority (one against)  
House of Laity: passed by majority (one against)

Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

*“That Canon 11, Section 5 be repealed in its entirety and that the Canon be re-titled “Of the Qualifications and Title of candidates for Holy Orders”. (Second reading)”*

The Motion was put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:-

House of Clergy: passed by majority (one against)  
House of Laity: passed by majority (one against)  
House of Bishops: passed *nem con.*

Mr Auld then proceeded to explain the alteration to Canon 62 which was being proposed for a second reading. Under Section 2 of the current Canon, if any person holding stipendiary office wished to continue working after the age of 70, it was incumbent upon them to give notice that they wished to continue. The proposed change reversed the onus so that the bishop would be required to give notice. This would be more in keeping with current employment legislation. In relation to the proposed change to Section 1, which proposed that the Canon should state that the normal retirement age was 70, Mr Auld explained that, in fact, the proposed change did not alter the *status quo*. The proposed change in wording was in fact consistent with the terms of the Canon which currently provided that no-one in stipendiary office could continue beyond the age of 70. “Normal retirement age” was a phrase used in current employment legislation and it meant the age beyond which ordinarily an employee would not work. The reason for proposing a deletion of the reference to retirement age for pension purposes was that in its current form the Canon confused two issues. Matters relating to the Pension Fund were dealt with in the Pension Fund rules. The Canon was intended to relate simply to the question of whether an individual could carry on working. He was aware that the Diocese of Edinburgh wished to propose an amendment which was set out on page 123 of the Synod Papers and would wait before commenting further until that matter had been raised.

The Rev Robert Warren wished to propose an amendment. He was aware that at second reading stage, amendments could only be proposed at General Synod if they had been adopted by Diocesan Synods. Given that the amendment he was about to propose had been adopted by the Diocese of Edinburgh, he was surprised that it had not been reflected in the wording presented to the General Synod. He considered that General Synod should be more loathe to pass a Canon at first reading stage if the wording was not right. The word “normal” used in the Canon had a technical meaning but the difficulty was that the Canons were not a purely internal document and were used broadly throughout the Church. They were used, for example, by selection committees considering clergy appointments. Similarly, the Canons were used by vestries who might give a conventional understanding to the word “normal” in

the context of discussions with their cleric about retirement. In the Diocese of Edinburgh, out of 15 recent retirals, 14 had involved retirals between the ages of 63 and 67. Sixty-five was the “normal” age for retirement as understood in most congregations. The discussion which had taken place within the Diocese of Edinburgh essentially was about the pastoral implications of no longer being able to have a discussion with clergy about their retiring at age 65. Clergy were not all equal. At 70, some people would have before them a decade of retirement, others would be within a few years of their death. He opposed using the word “normal” in a context when in fact it did not mean “normal”. He proposed an amendment as follows:-

*“That the italicised words “The normal retirement age in this Church is seventy years. No” should be taken out and be replaced with the words “Notwithstanding that, in this Church, the retirement age of clergy for pension purposes is sixty-five years, no”.”*

Mrs Quetta Johnston (Edinburgh) seconded the amendment. There was an element of unease about the proposals. It had been explained that the purpose of the change was to reflect provisions in the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006. She expressed concern that that if the Committee on Canons were selective in which parts of legislation they chose to embody in the Canons, the effect of the original legislation might be distorted if the Canons did not also contain the safeguards contained in the original legislation. Also, there was the potential for much time and energy being taken up in amending Canons every time the Government chose to change legislation. Concern had been expressed at the Edinburgh Diocesan Synod as to why the Committee on Canons was proposing a change from a statement in the Canons about retirement age which was currently accurate to one which would not be. It remained the case that the retirement age for pension purposes was 65. It was not true that the normal retirement age in the Church was 70. The proposals therefore cast doubt over the age at which clergy could draw their pension. The proposed changes to the Canon, combined with the deficit in the Pension Fund, gave rise to considerable anxiety about future pensions. To an outsider, it appeared that the change might be paving the way for a change to the age at which pension could be drawn. Whilst she was sure that Synod would be assured that that was not the case, the very fact that it had been mentioned, meant that it was an issue. She urged support for the proposed amendment brought by the Diocese of Edinburgh.

The Rev Dr John Armes (Edinburgh) recognised that legislative requirements had to be reflected in the Canons. However, if the Canons aped legislative requirements slavishly, they could result in a nonsense and in unforeseen consequences on the culture of the Church. In this case, the nonsense was that the word “normal” did not bear its “normal” meaning and the risk of consequences on the culture of the Church was the alarm caused to congregations and clergy within the Church. The pensions deficit invited a proper debate on when pensions should be payable but he was opposed to predetermining the outcome by canonical “sleight of hand” or clumsiness. He supported the amendment from the Diocese of Edinburgh.

The Chair indicated that the use of language such as “sleight of hand” was unparliamentary and grossly unfair. He proceeded to explain that for the amendment to be adopted a two-thirds majority in each House was required

The amendment as proposed by Mr Warren and Mrs Johnston was then put to the vote. In the House of Bishops, the voting was three in favour, four against. The Chair declared that since the amendment had not been passed in the House of Bishops it fell.

Raising a point of order, the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) asked for clarification on where in the standing orders it was stated that an amendment required a two-thirds majority. The Chair referred to the explanatory note on voting procedures contained in the Synod Papers which stated that such amendments required a two-thirds majority and confirmed the advice of his assessor that this was set out in Canon 52.17. The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) sought clarification that the wording in question applied not just to the final vote adopting an amended Canon but also to amendments proposed during second reading stage. The Primus confirmed that a two-thirds majority in houses was required in the case of amendments proposed during debate at second reading stage.

The Rev Jeremy Auld then proposed, and the Rev Canon Robin Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 62 be read for the second time.”*

The motion was put to the vote in houses. The House of Clergy voted 24 in favour 31 against. The Chair declared that the motion fell in the House of Clergy and it was therefore not put to the House of Laity or House of Bishops.

#### **4.7 Ethical Banking**

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) wished to ask the Convener of the Administration Board in the light of the report by War on Want entitled “Banking on Bloodshed” which detailed the significant involvement of the present Scottish Episcopal Church bankers in financing armaments, what plans the Board had to consider both the report and the place of ethical criteria in the choice of bankers for the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Mr Stewart responded that he would take the matter to the Administration Board for consideration. In fact, the Standing Committee was responsible for the selection of bankers for the General Synod but the Board could engage in discussion and make a recommendation to the Standing Committee.

In closing the Administration Board session, Mr Stewart thanked the Conveners of the Board’s pendant committees.

#### **4.8 Pension Fund – Triennial Valuation**

Mr Simon Mackintosh (Chairman, Pension Fund Trustees) reminded Synod that when he had reported at General Synod 2008 he had made reference to what had then been a gathering crisis in world financial markets, to the demanding and volatile investment environment and to the then forthcoming valuation of the Pension Fund due as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. He then referred to the additional papers which had been circulated with the General Synod Agenda for the current meeting and which made reference to the funding deficit in relation to past service of £8.8 million. It was a matter of very great regret that the Pension Fund was in its current position but that was also the position of very many other final salary pension funds. Referring to the debate which had taken place earlier in the morning on Canon 62, he explained that he had had no knowledge of the proposals regarding normal retirement age and this had played no part at all in the deliberations of the Pension Fund Trustees.

The paper which had been circulated highlighted the material deterioration in the position of the Fund due principally to the fall in investment values. It also explained the actions which the Trustees required to take in conjunction with the employer. In short, a recovery plan had to be produced which had to be approved by the Pensions Regulator. In considering the position revealed by the valuation, the Trustees had met three times to agree the assumptions adopted and the terms of the recovery plan. Representatives of the Trustees had also met with the Standing Committee to discuss the valuation and its implications. Following that meeting, a draft recovery plan had been developed and this was now produced to Synod. The role of the Trustees was to protect the interest of the members of the scheme and to be satisfied that the recovery plan was achievable. The first stage of this was to be satisfied with what was described in the pensions world as the "Employer Covenant", namely the willingness and ability of the employer to deliver its part of the bargain. The Trustees were aware that the Church scheme had aspects of a multi-employer scheme although in fact there was only one employer under the Trust Deed.

The first motion to be proposed was recognition on the part of the General Synod, on behalf of the Church, that the recovery plan be funded. The Trustees were of the view that the plan put forward struck a reasonable balance between what was achievable and the wish and duty of the Trustees to see the Scheme restored to balance as quickly as possible. The Trustees therefore supported the proposal in the paper which involved the following main elements: an assumed investment return rate of 5.5%, a plan lasting 15 years, a lump sum contribution of approximately £2,000,000 and an annual employer's contribution of 34.9% of standard stipend or pensionable salary. Prudent assumptions had been made in relation to a number of factors such as the number of members choosing to commute pension for a lump sum and it was considered that the deficit of £8.8 million had been prudently assessed. Having had discussions with the Standing Committee, the Pension Fund Trustees were satisfied with the recovery plan put forward. If the proposed motions were adopted by Synod, the Pension Fund Trustees, together with the Standing Committee, would put forward the recovery plan to the Pensions Regulator. There was a possibility that the Pensions Regulator might require a shorter period for the recovery plan in which case the recovery plan would have to be adapted. The finalised recovery plan had to be agreed by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 which was why some flexibility was sought from Synod in the motions shortly to be proposed. In closing his report, he thanked his fellow trustees and Dr Daphne Audsley, Pension Fund Administrator.

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) explained the role of the Standing Committee in relation to pension matters. She reminded Synod that members of the Standing Committee constituted the Charity Trustees of the General Synod and acted as the employer representative for the Church. The Standing Committee had considered a number of scenarios with two key priorities: affordability and acceptability. Consideration had been given to the level of future asset return, the period of the recovery plan and the possibility of contribution of a lump sum. In the original papers, the actuaries had produced figures showing an asset return of 5% and it was also the case that the normal duration of the recovery plans in the past had been 10 years. If those figures had been used, and no capital sum were to be injected, the contribution rate would have had to rise to 50.7% of stipend or pensionable salary. This was considered neither affordable nor acceptable. The actuaries had advised that an assumption of a 5.5% investment return remained prudent and this had been agreed by the Standing Committee. Standing Committee had also been advised that, given the global nature of the financial crisis, the Pensions Regulator was more likely to agree to a plan of longer duration than 10 years. Accordingly, a 15 year recovery period had been agreed. The Standing Committee had agreed that a lump sum contribution should be made at

provincial level partly because the majority of the deficit related to people already receiving a pension and whose employers were not necessarily still making a contribution to the Fund. Therefore, it would have been inequitable for the full burden to be borne by current contributors. A lump sum of £2,000,000 was being proposed and this would need to be found from current investments. Consequently, there would be an adverse effect on investment income available to General Synod Funds. The combination of assumed future investment returns, the duration of the recovery plan and the lump sum injection resulted in a proposed increase in contribution rate to 34.9%. This contribution rate was significantly less than current rates in many other churches albeit higher than the Standing Committee would have wished. As a result of the significant pressure which this would have on provincial resources, the Standing Committee was of a view that on this occasion dioceses should be charged with responsibility for short term assistance for charges for whom the rise in contribution rate would be too great a challenge. In addition, the Standing Committee, together with the Pension Fund Trustees, would review the current benefit structure of the Fund. This did not necessarily mean any change would be made. The Standing Committee had considered spreading the injection of the lump sum over a period of two years but that would have resulted in a further increase in the contribution rate of 0.3-0.4%. The proposals as put forward would represent a major challenge for all parts of the Church.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That, in order to assist the Trustees of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund in their assessment of the General Synod’s covenant in funding the SEC Pension Fund, this Synod recognises the obligation of the General Synod on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church to ensure that the SEC Pension Fund is adequately funded.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con.*

Professor Peattie proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the Standing Committee be instructed to work with the Trustees of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund to prepare a Recovery Plan, acceptable to the Pensions Regulator, to address the deficit arising on the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008 and that the Standing Committee be authorised to contribute such capital sum to the Pension Fund as may be required in terms of such Recovery Plan.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con.*

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

*“That with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010, the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be increased to 34.9% of standard stipend and pensionable salary respectively save that in the event that the Pensions Regulator, following consideration of the Recovery Plan submitted by the Pension Fund Trustees and Standing Committee, determines that a different contribution rate is necessary, the Standing Committee be authorised to alter such rate following consultation with the Pension Fund Trustees.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr Mackintosh and Professor Peattie.

## **SESSION FIVE – The Very Rev Gregor Duncan in the Chair**

### **5.1 Mission and Ministry Board**

#### **5.1.1 Introduction**

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) introduced the report of the Board.

The Board had warmly welcomed the report received the previous year on the implementation of *New Century*, *New Directions* and *Journey of the Baptised*. The Board had established a Task Group to carry out an examination of the report and identify the main recommendations and he expressed thanks to the Very Rev Richard Kilgour who had chaired that Task Group. There were two key questions which the review brought to the Church. The first related to training for ministry in general and the role of TISEC in particular. TISEC fulfilled an important role in providing quality-assured training for authorised ministries and the question was whether that role should be extended so that TISEC should act as the single training agency for all ministry across the life of the Church. His view was that this would be a logical step. It made sense to take a holistic and integrated view of training for ministry at every level. The second issue raised by the report was the need to consider what the future of congregational development and ministry ought to be. A wonderful resource of experience and material in local collaborative ministry had been developed and the Board considered that the Church was being challenged to find ways in which those treasures should be allowed to mature and find their place in the mainstream life and ministry of the Church.

One of the key functions of the Board was to attempt to take an overview and develop a “whole Church” policy in mission and ministry. The Board hoped to bring at least a first attempt at such a policy to General Synod 2010 which would arise from a number of places. The debate about to be undertaken by Synod about the mission of the Church was one strand of the development of such a policy. Also, the Board saw the need for a new process of consultation between the Board and the dioceses. Whilst there were diocesan representatives who offered valuable service on the Board, that was not quite the same thing as consultation between the Board and diocesan leadership namely the bishop, key clergy and laity in each diocese. To undertake such a consultation would have a secondary benefit of creating greater cohesion among dioceses.

Bishop Chillingworth emphasised the importance of recognising that the current time was a particularly difficult period for the Church. The Board oversaw significant spending and the period of financial difficulty ahead would impose particular strains on that work. The Board’s aim would be to protect key areas of work but also to use

the challenge brought by such financial pressures to ask painful questions about priorities.

The Board had also recognised that there were some particular issues in need of exploration. Consultation had already taken place about “younger ordinands” which attempted to clarify questions about whether and how the Church might encourage vocation to the ordained ministry amongst younger people. Such consultations could be a helpful way of moving quickly on some of the policy issues faced by the Board.

In closing, Bishop Chillingworth referred to the situation regarding St Serf’s. He paid tribute to the Transfer Group and also to the House Committee chaired by St Michael Bonallack for the work which they had completed. The challenge had been to establish financial viability in the hope that, as with Braeburn, St Serf’s might be transferred to a church-rooted instrument of governance. Whilst it had been possible to bring St Serf’s to a situation of near financial viability on a day to day basis, it had never been possible to achieve the necessary financial stability to enable investment for the long term or to allow the Church to respond to the many requirements which any residential institution had to face. With reluctance, therefore, the Board had proceeded to give effect to the decision made by the General Synod in 2006 which allowed for the transfer of St Serf’s to a suitable third party operator and that process was currently underway. It would be the hope of the Board, although it could not be guaranteed, that a significant pastoral involvement from the Scottish Episcopal Church would continue to be part of the ethos and value of what St Serf’s offered to its residents and their families.

### **5.1.2 Debate: *What is the Mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church in 2009?***

Bishop Chillingworth explained that in order to commence the debate, the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth, the Rev Malcolm Round and Mrs Elspeth Strachan had been invited to speak for three minutes.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) considered there were two important strands of mission activity: the first in local congregations and the second in the way the Church related to wider Scottish society. Building local congregations would enable people who would never expect to discover God to find that they were already welcomed and loved. Engaging with wider society was a question of taking the churches to places where people did not expect it to go. Examples of this included appearing at the Wedding Show, the broadcast studio and engaging with the Press, the Parliament and higher education chaplaincy. The sharing of the good news that individuals were loved by God was done in many different ways. Dioceses had a primary task in focusing mission in local congregations. As far as engaging with wider society was concerned, perhaps the importance of organising some things provincially needed to be recognised. There would be no peace in the Church until members of the Church had learnt to disagree. It was necessary to recognise that God was at work in those with whom one disagreed and, until that was recognised, the Church’s mission would be compromised by in-fighting. Three things needed to characterise the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church: spirituality, the Bible and the love of God. Mission was teaching people to pray and creating worship that changed hearts and souls. The Bible was to read and to share. He was often surprised at the lack of knowledge of the Bible in the Scottish Episcopal Church. It was an

exciting part of the Church's calling to enable people to read the Scriptures anew with passion and with the old fashioned orthodoxy of common sense. Finally love, because mission was simply finding ever more creative ways to share what it meant to be utterly loved by God. Spirituality, the Bible and the love of God were all the heritage of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Rev Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) reminded Synod that "the church that loses its sense of mission is in peril of its life. The church exists for mission as a fire exists by burning." This summed up the passion and urgency of mission. There was no need to reinvent or rediscover mission because the Church had already been set the Great Commission of Matthew chapter 28 verse 19. The Church's role was to obey the Great Commission by finding out how it could make disciples in a way which was relevant to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scotland using the unique gifts, style and opportunities which the Scottish Episcopal Church had. He wished to make three slightly provocative suggestions. Firstly, it was necessary to narrow the definition of "mission". When the word was used broadly, it lost its meaning. The Church fooled itself that it was doing mission when in fact the statistics from the Annual Report showed that current strategies were not working. The Five Marks of Mission were helpful but he considered it was necessary to focus on "expressed mission" such as personal faith sharing, proclamation and witnessing. The Scottish Episcopal Church was good on mission interpreted as justice, peace and acts of compassion but mission in scripture also had a strong emphasis on proclamation. As an inclusive Church it was important to reach the least, the last and the lost with the message of Christ. He suggested using "mission" to mean words of proclamation and "mercy" to mean love in action. Secondly, it was important to be clear about the gospel which the Church was communicating, as Jesus had been. The Scottish Episcopal Church had learnt to be good at welcoming and inviting but there was a need to recover a confidence in the gospel of repentance, forgiveness and baptism. Mr Round challenged Synod members as to whether they were confident to explain the gospel to a stranger. Thirdly, members of Synod needed not just to engage in discussion but to model this pattern of mission. He suggested that Synod members might ask themselves how many un-churched people had joined their congregation in the previous three years. How many un-churched people had Synod members shared their faith with in the previous year? How many "not yet" Christians had members invited to their congregation in the previous year? Synod members could not expect others to take steps which they themselves were not prepared to take. Synod the following year could include sessions on personal faith sharing and personal invitation and the arranging of guest services in congregations. Pairs of Synod members, led by the bishops and Standing Committee, could go out into the streets of Edinburgh and share their faith. Next year, Synod members could return and tell their stories of how they had shared their faith. His vision of the Church was a missional one with missionary dioceses and mission-orientated charges full of confident mission-minded individuals.

Mrs Elspeth Strachan (Edinburgh) asked how the God of mission wished to use the Scottish Episcopal Church in 2009? The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church was to let the world know that God loved the world with passion. That was the mission of every Christian and every church, so what was particular to the Scottish Episcopal Church? At a conference in the Diocese of Edinburgh the previous year, there had been an attempt to identify what was distinctive about the Scottish Episcopal Church. The response was that the Church was small, eccentric, inclusive,

prayerful, intelligent, smug and hugely diverse in liturgy, theology and size of congregations. She believed that the Church's calling lay in its gifts and a significant theme which recurred at that conference had been that of diversity. She compared the Scottish Episcopal Church to the street dance group Diversity which had recently won "Britain's Got Talent". That group had been an intelligent, quirky group of friends and family very diverse in age, colour and ability but which moved together with great passion. They also had a fabulous choreographer. The love and trust which the members had in one another was clear and they loved not despite, but because, they were different. The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church was similar – setting a hurting and divided world alight not by cleverness but by a risky love which church members had for one another and for the world. Within the Scottish Episcopal Church, there were differences but perhaps the difference in approaches was in fact the Scottish Episcopal Church's particular window into God. It was the case that in Britain many people believe but no longer belonged. The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church could be to learn to dance together to the music of the Spirit, that great choreographer, with such a sense of hope, love and fun that people were drawn into that dance and could find God at its heart.

Synod then broke into buzz groups for a few minutes to discuss the presentations which had been made after which the debate was opened to the floor for contributions.

The Rev Robert Harley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that he served on the Missions Committee of Scripture Union which co-ordinated beach missions and holiday clubs for children. The aim was to teach children the faith. Children often returned each year and could be seen to be deepening their faith and they then moved into the role of helpers. The themes of reaching out and encouraging into service were relevant to the Church's mission.

The Rev Dean Fostekew (Edinburgh) spoke as one who had been involved in the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church for some 10 years. He loved the Church and its diversity but it needed to stop apologising for what it was not and be proud of what it was.

The Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that as he had arrived at Synod he had been conscious of the presence of a stranger beside him asking "Do you love this Church?" Looking around, he had been conscious of the diversity of the Church. At the confession during the Eucharist he had responded "Yes I do, but just" and asked for grace to love the Church more. The stranger had responded "The mission of the Church is to love who you are here and now".

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) considered that the answer to the question about mission was to be confident in the proclamation of the scripture which the Church knew to be true and meaningful. At times, the Church tended to behave like a chaplaincy to an Anglican Diaspora, rather than as a confident church in its own right. The smallness of the Church did not need to affect its confidence. The Church could be confident in applying what it knew of scripture to the current problems of financial systems and climate change. Referring to the 80% reduction target for carbon emissions by 2050, he suggested the Church could apply its biblical understanding to strategies for mitigating climate change. The mission of the Church should be about confidence and clarity in how the gospel was expressed.

Dr Jamie Hill (Glasgow and Galloway) reminded Synod that the debate was taking place on the feast of St Barnabas who had been a man of true mission and stewardship. Dr Hill was involved in stewardship in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway, for the second time. First time around, the Diocese had produced information to support stewardship campaigns and the emphasis had been on finance. Second time around, the Stewardship Committee had concluded that stewardship was about mission, not finance; service to God, not fundraising. The definition of mission in the review of *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions* was “alerting the world to God’s presence in it”. The Five Marks of Mission were all about stewardship. He believed that stewardship was a sacrament as fundamental as the Eucharist. The service of God required the Church to engage in the stewardship of creation, of God’s gifts of the poor, vulnerable and exploited. This was the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church in 2009 and in every year. From mission and true stewardship came faith, commitment and finance. The Church could do no better than follow the example of St Barnabas.

Professor Barbara Parfitt (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to question the question which was being posed in the debate. She thought it was the wrong question. The mission of any Church was that of Christ. That mission was written clearly within the Scriptures and was shared by all churches and all Christians. The mission was to reach out to those who did not know and love Christ. She considered the question ought to read “How can the Scottish Episcopal Church fulfil effectively the mission of Christ in 2009?” What were the gifts, skills and expertise which the Scottish Episcopal Church had which could make a difference in the context of the Christian Church so that the Scottish Episcopal Church could make an impact locally, nationally and worldwide.

The Rev Anne Haselhurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to echo the words confidence, diversity and inclusion. She believed that confidence was already growing within her diocese and referred to the “Casting the Net” strategy. The Diocesan Standing Committee had a policy that items of mission and ministry came at the top of its agenda. As Convener of a diocesan group charged with addressing work with children and young people, she was conscious that the Church would not see greater numbers of younger ordinands unless there were more children in church. There was great diversity within the young people. At the Corpus Christi Service held the previous evening at Old St Paul’s there had been a significant number of young people in what was an old fashioned ritualistic, but nevertheless very vibrant, service. The young people quite obviously had related to that form of worship. Young people were able to relate both to the charismatic evangelical forms of worship but also to older forms. Inclusion was very important since young people wanted to be listened to. The Church needed to go into schools and the uniformed organisations to meet the young people where they were.

The Rev Ian Barcroft (Convener, Church in Society Committee) spoke of his experience as a priest for 20 years. He had always asked questions and wanted to continue to do so. He agreed with much of what had been said during the debate but wished to emphasise the need for the Church to listen to the community around it. In his capacity as Convener of the Church in Society Committee, there was a wide range of issues which arose. Even in his first year as Convener, the following had required

attention: criminal justice, family matters, climate change, land reform, poverty and social justice, personal debt, end of life issues, nuclear weapons, asylum, the internet and the equalities agenda. In asking “Where is God?” in such issues, the starting point was to listen and to take personal responsibility. Another issue which had not been mentioned hitherto during the debate was that of valuing older people. The Church was overwhelmingly local and it was important not to stop listening. He hoped that each diocese would have a Church in Society Action Group (four dioceses already had such a group). The Church was called to speak in the public sphere but actions spoke louder than words. The work of the local churches in the caring for community was what people sought. He hoped that the Church could carry on what it was doing but in a co-ordinated way so that the listening could be brought to a conclusion.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Brechin) said that mission occurred when Christians shared their faith with other people. People in the workplace were thirsty for spirituality and church members had a mission to share their faith in all situations. The problem was that often there was a lack of confidence. How could the Church prepare its members to share their faith? The Scottish Episcopal Church prided itself on being inclusive. She urged Synod members to return to their congregations and count how many disabled people there were. There was a call to minister to the vulnerable and bring them into the churches.

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred to two points which had emerged from his buzz group. Firstly, when mission was discussed, it tended to be seen in terms of structured activities. Church members were not adequately prepared to respond personally. One Synod member had been approached on Princes Street the previous day and been asked “Will you bless me?”. Secondly, there were the many occasions when personal encounters were not “measurable” and the “results” might never be known to those involved in such encounters.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke about confidence in the power of the Gospel to change lives. He spoke movingly of his personal experience, and that of his family, in coming to faith from an unchurched background. It was the power of God through the Gospel which had changed his life.

Rev Lewis Smith (Convener, Home Mission Committee) referred to his work as an ombudsman, dealing with peoples’ complaints. People in Britain were grumpy and many saw their lives as empty. His experience was that Muslims were good at talking about their faith. In *Journey of the Baptised*, one of the key points made had been that “the Church exists by mission as fire by burning”. Also “the church of God did not have a mission but the God of mission had a church”. The question to be asked in the debate was where the Church fitted in to God’s mission. The Review carried out the previous year of *Journey of the Baptised* suggested that many church members were more confident than had been the case previously but he suspected there was still a reluctance to engage in personal mission because there was a fear of failure. The Church had to plan for growth since otherwise it died. There was a need to move beyond words into action. The Church had been given the Great Commission. Its confidence came from the promise of Jesus Christ to be “with you always to the end of the age”.

Mr Graeme Hely (Convener, Personnel Committee) emphasised the influence that Christian teachers and chaplains could have on children.

Professor Judith George (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) said she could offer her Committee as a tool for using learning in order to respond and disseminate whatever the answer to the question posed in the debate might be. At her first Synod as Convener she had been asked what provision was made for those in scattered communities throughout the Province. There had been two significant developments. A lay learning pilot project had been run in the Diocese of Moray using a module entitled "Using the Bible". Thirty-two students had participated and the feedback had been very positive. Learning was a tool to enable talking with others about one's faith. It was a model of learning to reach the parts that other models could not. Secondly, computer conferencing was now being used to create groups of students regardless of geography. This mode of learning was of good quality, inclusive and transferable.

Mrs Nancy Adams (Edinburgh) considered that the Scottish Episcopal Church had three important things to offer. It could offer a contemplative and spiritual aspect, enabling people to see through different lenses. In a world of conflict, the Church could also offer healing and reconciliation. Thirdly, she wished to see the Church being much more prophetic in challenging power structures, advocating non-violence and seeking social and environmental justice.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) spoke of his experience at the Lambeth Conference 2008 at which bishops had come to ask him "Why can't we run our church as you do?". His mission was to be like Christ on the Emmaus Road and to reveal God by the way he spoke and in the confidence of his faith (which could sometimes be lacking). The Scottish Episcopal Church could provide "space" in the busyness of life. Christ could be discovered when people slowed down.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) agreed with the comments which had been made regarding the Great Commission but emphasised Christ's call to each person to live it out themselves. He also made a plea for funding for university chaplains. Full time university chaplains had been lost but their influence could be significant.

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) disagreed that the issue was one of confidence. Diversity had won "Britain's Got Talent" because they had talent and had practised. Church members needed training and education to enable them to engage in mission. If that were the case, they might lose the "cringe factor" and acquire the "X factor".

Mr Nick Cox (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that no mention had been made during the debate of the cross of Jesus Christ. At a baptism service he had attended a number of years previously a "turn or burn" sermon had given him cause for reflection. The mission of the Church was to serve and make a difference but principally was to see people coming into God's Kingdom and moving from darkness into light. People needed to be able to answer the question "If you died tonight, where would you be going?".

The Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers (Glasgow and Galloway) observed that there had been little reference to the ecumenical dimension of mission. In Ireland, he had often heard it said that the Anglican Church was both catholic and reformed. If that were embraced, it gave confidence because the Scottish Episcopal Church could legitimately say to both major traditions that it belonged with them.

The Rt Rev Martin Shaw (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) referred to the experience of Jean Vanier, founder of the L'Arche Community who had been asked by a Downs Syndrome child "Do you love me?". Jean Vanier had been unable to answer the question but recognised the gaze of Christ in that of the boy. The Bishop was concerned at the over-use of the word "confidence". He was not sure whether he was confident in his faith or not. "Confidence" meant to "have faith with". In the Episcopalian tradition, even in his moments of atheism, he was carried by the body of Christ. There were two views of mission. The first was to believe that the Christian "had Christ" and was to take Christ out to others. The second view was that Christ was in the people one met and one's task was to respond to their question "Do you love me?".

In concluding the session, the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane thanked the three opening contributors and all other participants. The debate had contributed to the creation of a mood. The Synod had engaged in "conversations about the work of God". Moving from the debate towards policy involved a number of stages. He considered that three things had emerged from the debate. Firstly, there was an issue of depth. There was a sense that the Church was good at welcome and invitation – community and friendship was built. However, the Church was not quite sure how to deploy its treasures. These treasures included faith, the heritage of Scripture, theology and worship and working with people who believed but did not belong. Such people sought the answers to deep questions. Secondly, he spoke of a moment of personal revelation regarding questions of inclusiveness and diversity. His experience was that in situations of deep conflict, it was essential to speak the truth since otherwise confusion resulted. This was true in a situation of diversity which prized inclusion. Nothing less than the truth would do. Thirdly, there was the issue of confidence, namely a self-belief which arose out of a belief in God. The Scottish Episcopal Church was also re-establishing a picture of itself within the ecclesiastical life of Scotland. All denominations were now minority churches in a secular society. He had recently had the opportunity to meet with the 30 most recently consecrated bishops in the USA. At the gathering, it had become more difficult to distinguish the liberals and conservatives and one bishop had said "we all now talk about Jesus". The focus was not on what divided them. If the Church gathered itself around a vision of its mission, other difficulties would find their place and level.

## **SESSION SIX – Professor Patricia Peattie in the Chair**

### **6.1 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)**

#### **6.1.1 Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office**

The Rev Ian Barcroft (Convener, Church in Society) welcomed Ms Chloe Clemmons, the recently appointed Scottish Churches Parliamentary Officer.

Ms Clemmons addressed the Synod. The primary role of her Office was to build relationships between Scottish churches and the Parliament. This was carried out through a research team which undertook comprehensive parliamentary monitoring and the production of monthly briefing materials and the Office also created space for churches and politicians to talk to one another. As an example, she cited the fact that Eco-congregations had identified that the Climate Change Bill being promoted by the Scottish Government lacked a mechanism whereby the Government could inform and empower communities and individuals to work towards the targets proposed in the Bill. Eco-congregations had considerable practical experience in this field and through her Office, approaches had been made with a view to amending the Bill. Her Office also supported the ecumenical discussions in the Scottish Churches' Social Inclusion Network and the work of the Joint Faiths Advisory Board on Criminal Justice. Whilst most of the work of the Office involved engaging with churches at denominational level, the Office was also very happy to support individual congregations.

### **6.1.2 Provincial Youth Network**

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Convener, Provincial Youth Network) reported that there had been a scene shift at the Glenalmond Youth Weeks in 2008 in that ecumenical delegates from the Swedish Church had attended for the first time. Contacts had been maintained since. Attendance in 2008 had been the biggest ever. Whilst the event had grown each year, he had anxiety that the finances had not. He expressed gratitude for donations which had been made and encouraged churches to continue to support their young people. A pilgrimage to Iona for the 18-25 year group had taken place in 2008 and the Youth Network had also attended the Lambeth Conference and run the Labyrinth there, encouraging bishops to think about the place of young people. A CD had been produced and sent to most provinces since the event.

There was now a full complement of Youth Officers across the dioceses and 20 people had trained in the Network's Leadership course. There had been talk about "vocation" for many years. Many young leaders gave up significant time and it was important that people felt included in the programmes already on offer. For those in smaller congregations, there was no network able to support them in exploring vocation and the idea of a postulancy network which had been aired within the Mission and Ministry Board earlier in the year would be very helpful. However he urged people not to adopt the attitude "when are we going to get round to doing something about our young people" because the young people were frustrated at continuing to hear this.

Questions were invited but there were none.

### **6.1.3 Rural Commission**

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Convener, Rural Commission) spoke about the work of the Rural Commission. He emphasised that the work of the Commission was not intended to concentrate on rural issues at the expense of urban ones. He was aware that both were important. There was, however, an urgency in relation to certain rural issues. For example, within his own diocese, one community was no longer served by

public transport at all. Bishop Strange drew attention to the leaflet which had been produced for use at the Royal Highland Show later in the month. He explained that there would shortly be a facility on the Provincial website to encourage comment on rural matters. The Commission intended to organise a series of three day conferences to look at the following issues: the rural environment in general; rural issues within the Scottish Episcopal Church (for example, liturgy, doctrine, buildings); connections with local communities. He expected that these would result in the production of a short report.

Questions were invited but there were none.

#### **6.1.4 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths**

The Rev Donald Reid (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) referred to the report in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. 2008 had been a good year for the Committee culminating in a stimulating inter-faith consultation which had been hosted by the Scottish Episcopal Church in Edinburgh for the Porvoo Communion. He reminded Synod members that the Grosvenor Essay, *The Inter-faith Encounter*, had been produced a few years previously and *inspires* had subsequently featured responses to the booklet from a number of other faiths. In 2007, the Committee had staged an inter-faith dialogue with a Rabbi and an Imam at General Synod and had raised the issue of including representatives of other faiths in local clergy gatherings. In 2008, Synod had engaged with *A Common Word*.

The First Minister had noted the leading stand taken by the Scottish Episcopal Church in the inter-faith arena and the current political climate was benign. The Scottish Inter-faith Council was now 10 years old and was promoting Scottish Inter-faith Week which took place around St Andrew's Day. At a time of year when Scottish identity was celebrated, it was an occasion to recognise that Scottish identity comprised people from a range of faith communities. Mr Reid suggested that Synod members might wish to engage with a member of another faith during Inter-faith Week, perhaps by participating in one of the organised activities, details of which could be found from the Scottish Inter-faith Council website.

Mr Reid referred to the work of the Edinburgh Inter-faith Association and of the Festival of Spirituality and Peace, the theme of which in 2009 would be "The Call of Home". Participants would include the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

Finally, Mr Reid referred to the open meeting which the Committee was organising later in the year at the Inter-faith Centre on Holy Isle. The event would involve conversation with the Buddhist Community on the subject of what Christians referred to as the Kingdom of God and what Buddhists might refer to as the Buddha mind or mindfulness.

Questions were invited but there were none.

### **6.1.5 Overseas Committee**

The Rev Canon Duncan McCosh (Convener, Overseas Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008. He expressed thanks to Mrs Gill Young who was now retiring from the Committee having served for a number of years. She had organised a very successful conference earlier in the year on companion links. The current edition of *inspires* featured an article on the work of the Committee and the emphasis was on partnership with others.

Ms Catriona Beel spoke regarding the small grants portfolio of the Committee for which she was responsible. There were two categories of grant: small project grants normally subject to a maximum of £750, and travel grants for which members of the Scottish Episcopal Church could apply if they wished to work overseas on community-based projects. Recipients were asked to provide reports and it was heart warming to read of the benefits which such grants had brought. She encouraged members to inform others of the availability of such grants.

The Rev Robert Anderson spoke on the work of Scottish World Exchange, of which the Scottish Episcopal Church was a founder member. It had been created as one of the first actions of ACTS. Its first initiative was the creation of the ecumenical volunteer programme which sought to build ecumenical social capital. It had sent 1,200 volunteers abroad. There were two main programmes: a volunteering programme (which sent people abroad) and a learning programme (which delivered courses). The learning programme sought to build capacity in member churches both at home and overseas. The volunteering programme was costly and there had to be a clear justification for sending a person abroad. The volunteering programme included both capacity building and network building. There were currently three Scottish Episcopalian volunteers abroad and he outlined some of their work. He was convinced of the benefit of working ecumenically.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Canon Roy Flatt (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the Overseas Committee for the award of a grant to a small group in mid-Argyll. This group brought together local people from Argyll and gave them the opportunity to meet people from Africa. It had been a marvellous experience.

In closing the Mission and Ministry Board session, the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane thanked all those who had contributed. He expressed thanks to the Rev Dean Fostekew for the work which he had carried out on stewardship and also thanked the conveners and members of the Board and its committees.

## **6.2 Faith and Order Board**

### **6.2.1 Doctrine Committee**

The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Glasgow and Galloway) reported on the work of the Committee in the absence of its new Convener, the Rev Professor David Jasper. He drew attention to the new booklet which had been produced ecumenically entitled

*Talking of the Trinity.* It contained materials from the Roman Catholic, Church of Scotland and Orthodox traditions as well as that of the Scottish Episcopal Church and could be ordered from ACTS. Owing to the past success of Grosvenor Essays, the Committee had decided to produce a further series on aspects of the Nicene Creed. The first would deal with the death and resurrection of Jesus and it was hoped to publish this in the autumn.

Questions were invited but there were none.

## **6.2.2 Committee on Canons**

### **6.2.2.1 Canon 62**

The Rev Jeremy Auld (Convener, Committee on Canons) drew attention to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008 which reiterated that it was not the role of the Committee to make church policy. It responded to proposals put forward by the General Synod and its boards. Once a Canon had received its first reading and been submitted to Diocesan Synods for comment, the Committee took careful cognisance of the comments which were made and these were also considered by the Faith and Order Board.

He considered that it had been unfortunate that the second reading of Canon 62 had not proceeded because failure of that second reading meant that it was no longer possible to bring forward at the current time further alternations to that Canon as had been set out in the Agenda for the meeting. The Committee on Canons would give further consideration to this but he invited Synod members to indicate to the Committee any comments which they had on the proposals which would have been brought during the current session had the earlier second reading not fallen. He explained that as a result of the changes made the previous year in relation to Canon 36, it was now possible for non-stipendiary ministers to be rectors. There was, however, an anomaly in that a stipendiary rector was required by the Canon to cease holding stipendiary office at the age of 70 whereas a non-stipendiary minister could continue without limit. He hoped the Synod could agree that there ought to be parity. The alterations to Canon 62 which would have been proposed also addressed the situation where individuals wanted to continue indefinitely. He understood that certain aspects of the proposals might be controversial and any comments on the material should be passed to the Committee on Canons through its Secretary, Elspeth Davey, at the General Synod Office. He considered it likely that material would need to be proposed afresh in 2010.

### **6.2.2.2 Canon 8**

Mr Auld explained that, in its current form, Canon 8 stated that no discussion could take place about a division or amalgamation of dioceses when there was a vacancy in any See. In practice, it was often the case that there was at least one vacancy and, consequently, there were significant periods of time when no discussion about diocesan structure could be initiated. He emphasised that he was not aware of any plans to initiate such proposals, but the proposal to

amend the Canon would allow such discussion to take place notwithstanding a vacancy.

Mr Auld then proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the amended text for Canon 8, Section 1 be read for the first time.”*

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:-

House of Laity:	passed <i>nem con.</i>
House of Clergy:	passed by majority (3 against, 3 abstentions)
House of Bishops:	passed unanimously.

### **6.2.2.3 Digest of Resolutions**

Mr Auld explained that in the light of the changes which had been made the previous year to Canon 36, it was necessary to amend the Digest of Resolutions to alter the reference from Canon 36, section 2 to Canon 36, section 12.

He proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

*“That paragraph 7.7 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended by the deletion of the words “Canon 36, Section 2” and the substitution therefore of the words “Canon 36, Section 12”.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

## **6.3 Motion from the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney**

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke to the motion set out in the Synod agenda which emanated from the Diocese of Aberdeen & Orkney. He explained that the most recent episcopal election process in his Diocese had involved two elections. Under the terms of the current Canon, the electors had remained the same for the second process despite the fact that new clergy had since arrived in the Diocese. It was also the case that Church Army officers were not entitled to participate in the process and religious houses were also disenfranchised. The purpose of the motion was for Synod to request that these matters be remitted to the Faith and Order Board for consideration.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) indicated that if there was to be consideration of the election process, it should also include the fact that currently no distinction was drawn between very small congregations and very large ones in the electoral process. If religious houses were to be brought into the process, it was arguable that there was an inequality if very large congregations continued only to have the same number of electors.

Mr Peter Kemp (Secretary for the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles) wished to suggest that the Faith and Order Board consider extending the principle behind inclusion of stipendiary clergy and Church Army officers even to a first election. In the forthcoming election in the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles, there were very few stipendiary priests eligible to vote and one who had recently joined the Diocese since the time of the most recent Diocesan Synod would be disenfranchised. He expected that only four stipendiary clergy in the Diocese would be eligible to vote.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) welcomed the motion and noted in particular its reference to Church Army officers. The Canons did not currently provide a straightforward mechanism for licensing Church Army officers and he considered that the position of such officers should be regularised on a wider front, not just in relation to episcopal elections.

The Primus noted that the motion asked for the matter to be considered by the Faith and Order Board. He would be delighted for it to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Board. However, he wished to note that the suggestion that religious houses should be entitled to elect a member of Diocesan Synod “if the order so desires” was not good enough.

The Bishop of Aberdeen then proposed, and Ms Lesley Platford (Aberdeen & Orkney) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the Faith & Order Board be requested to consider:*

*i) amending Canon 4 so that, in the event of there being a second Episcopal election, those who were stipendiary clergy and lay Church Army officers licensed in the diocese the day before the issue of the mandate would be added to the list of qualified electors;*

*ii) in order to resolve anomalies in the house of laity, amending the appropriate section of Canon 50.3 to include as full members of a diocesan synod: deaconesses licensed to definite pastoral work; lay Church Army officers ministering under a license from the Bishop in a manner similar to clergy; and Lay Readers, if in charge of a congregation, be members whilst they hold such charge;*

*iii) amending Canon 63 so that each Religious House situated in the diocese be treated as a congregation and be entitled to elect one lay member of the order as a member of Synod (if the order so desires).”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (one abstention).

## **SESSION SEVEN – The Rt Rev the Bishop of Edinburgh in the Chair**

### **7.1 Faith and Order – Inter-Church Relations Committee**

Mrs Norma Higgott (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reported that various initiatives within the Porvoo Communion had enabled a confident sharing of faith including the Inter-faith Conference for the Porvoo churches which the Scottish Episcopal Church had hosted in Edinburgh in November 2008 and a conference on the diaconate in Sweden which had been attended by the Rev Dr John Armes and the Rev Freda Alexander from which a number of recommendations had been brought back. Mrs Higgott emphasised the fact that

though the Scottish Episcopal Church was small it had a great deal to offer and was valued by others.

The report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008 provided an update on the Episcopal, Methodist and United Reformed (EMU) talks. She invited the Primus to speak further on the subject.

The Primus spoke to the material contained in the Synod Papers including the Statement of Partnership between the Scottish Episcopal Church, the National Synod of Scotland of the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church in Scotland. It had been hoped that at the current Synod a joint initiative regarding theological training would be launched. This had been delayed but he commended it to the Church when it became available. The EMU conversations had moved at an even pace and whilst they would continue, all three partners were at a stage where it was felt appropriate to recommit to one another. There had been a declaration of intent signed with the Methodist Church in the 1990s which remained in force. Signs of hope had already emerged from that arrangement but the partnership was now one of three churches. Joining together would increase the confidence of all three churches as they sought to commend the gospel.

The Primus then proposed, and Mrs Elspeth Strachan (Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the Statement of Partnership between the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the United Reformed Church (National Synod of Scotland) and the Methodist Church in Scotland be approved.”*

Mrs Jenny Easson (the Methodist Church in Scotland) expressed gratitude for the approach adopted in the EMU arrangement to doing things together. The Statement being considered by the Synod would go to the Methodist Synod later in the year. The Methodist Church already had partnerships south of the border and the signing of the Statement in Scotland would be important beyond the Scottish Border. There was now a Scottish Episcopalian representative on the Joint Implementation Commission of the Anglican Methodist Covenant south of the border. Indeed there were both Scottish and Welsh representatives from the Methodist Churches north and south of the border, the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales. Statements were evidence of how the churches worked together and she commended it and expressed gratitude for the opportunity to walk together and develop personal friendships.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mrs Higgott explained that the Statement would also be presented to the Scottish Synod of the United Reformed Church later in the year. She thanked the Primus for his support of ecumenical relations.

Mrs Higgott explained that the review which had been undertaken of the structure of CTBI would require the Church to look at how ecumenical work continued at the Four Nations level. It was possible that some of the work formally organised by CTBI would in future have to be dealt with within the Four Nations. She then invited the Rev Lindsey Sanderson to speak.

The Rev Lindsey Sanderson (Action of Churches Together in Scotland) explained that she was a minister in the United Reformed Church. It was very exciting that the Synod had just approved the Statement of Partnership. She referred to the work of the National Sponsoring Body for local ecumenical partnerships. It had provided opportunities for the churches to meet and work together. By bringing together appropriate expertise, it had been possible to support local ecumenical partnerships, especially where difficulties had arisen as a result of differences in church governance structures. A major aspect of the work of the National Sponsoring Body was that of review of local ecumenical partnerships which included ensuring that the requirements of all relevant denominations were met. The General Assembly had now approved the fact that there should be a single process of ecumenical review. It was likely that a review would equally apply to a partnership statement between the Scottish Episcopal Church, the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church. A further aim of the National Sponsoring Body was to be a bridge builder between national and local levels. Its work would not be possible without the dedication of the denominational ecumenical officers and she expressed thanks to Elspeth Davey for her contribution to the work of ACTS in general and the National Sponsoring Body in particular.

Mrs Higgott referred to the Edinburgh 2010 Conference which was due to take place in June 2010. The Inter-Church Relations Committee hoped that the Scottish Episcopal Church would work with its ecumenical neighbours in order to celebrate the centenary of the 1910 conference. More information regarding Edinburgh 2010 was available from the website [www.edinburgh2010.org](http://www.edinburgh2010.org).

The Primus then proposed, and the Rev Canon John Lindsay seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod encourage all congregations of the Scottish Episcopal Church to support and participate in local ecumenical events to celebrate the centenary of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 and to work with their ecumenical neighbours in their shared mission during 2010 and beyond.”*

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church) explained that he was part of the local organizing committee for the Edinburgh 2010 Conference. It had undergone a major change and the size of the Conference had been slimmed down to approximately 250 delegates partly in the light of the global financial situation and also because of difficulties within the world-wide church in planning the Conference. It was hoped that this would allow time to be freed up for local initiatives to take place in different places across the world-wide church.

The Primus explained that it was expected that approximately 10 Anglican delegates would attend Edinburgh 2010. The Scottish Episcopal Church had been invited to host those delegates and this would be a means of enabling the Scottish Dioceses to participate in the wider celebrations.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mrs Higgott drew attention to the publication of *The Legal Systems of Scottish Churches*. The book covered the legal systems of the Church of Scotland, the Roman Catholic and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Indeed, the Episcopalian section, written by Sheriff Alexander Wilkinson, represented a sizeable part of the publication. She expressed thanks to him. The

Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) also commended the publication. It was the first substantial book which covered the Scottish Episcopal Church structures since L'Empriere.

In closing the session, Mrs Higgott expressed thanks to the Rev Gordon Fyfe, who was retiring from the Committee, to the Primus and to Elspeth Davey.

The Primus drew the Faith and Order Board session to a close and expressed his thanks to members of the Board and of its pendant committees. He reminded Synod that the Committee on Canons acted only on the instructions of the Faith and Order Board. The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) thanked the Primus formally for handling business of the Board as its Convener.

\* \* \* \* \*

At this point during the General Synod, an Episcopal Synod was convened for the election of a new Primus, the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones having retired as Primus with effect from the end of Friday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2009. The Episcopal Synod took place at 9.30am on Saturday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2009 and elected, as the new Primus, the Most Rev David Chillingworth, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **SESSION EIGHT – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair**

### **8.1 Statement by the new Primus**

The new Primus expressed his thanks to the members of the Episcopal Synod. There were a thousand reasons why it was challenging to be elected as Primus but the point was that this was a vocation, and a calling was an extraordinary and wonderful thing. He expressed his personal thanks to his predecessor as Primus, the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones, to whom tribute had been paid at the previous evening's Synod Dinner. In the context of the General Synod, the Primus thanked Dr Jones for the ministry which he had given to the Church and wished him and his wife Alison a long and happy retirement.

The Primus said he approached the task with deep humility and no small apprehension. The Scottish Episcopal Church had been extraordinarily generous in the trust which it had placed in him. That spoke of the spiritual strength of the Scottish Episcopal Church and its willingness to take risks. He sought to honour it in the passion of his own commitment to ministry and service. He asked for the prayers of the Church for himself and for all bishops as they worked out together what leadership meant in the Scottish Episcopal Church where collegiality and collaboration were much valued. The Church was richly blessed in the quality and commitment of laity and clergy and this was a precious moment of calling for the Scottish Episcopal Church. Firstly, the Church was being called to take its place in a new way among the family of churches in Scotland and in the wider community. Minority churches did not have to be marginal and small churches could bring special gifts to the whole. The strengths of the Scottish Episcopal Church in spirituality and service, in dignified liturgy and inclusive openness, were gifts for the current moment. The calling was to offer Jesus – new ways of exploring faith – in a time when people searched for answers but feared that they might not find them in traditional churches. Secondly, the Church faced a time of difficult decision-making as it responded to new financial circumstances. Adding new areas

of activity was relatively easy; deciding what mattered when resources did not stretch to cover everything was much more difficult since it tested decision-making and relationships. That was the period the Scottish Episcopal Church was about to enter and his prayer was that this would bring a creative refining and pruning out of which would come more growth.

At a personal level, he paid tribute to the contribution of his wife Alison and the support which she provided to him. Scotland had been good to them.

The Primus looked forward to playing his part in the adventure in faith which the whole of the Scottish Episcopal Church would undertake together.

## **8.2 Standing Committee**

### **8.2.1 Strategic Review**

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) referred to the report regarding the Strategic Review contained in the Synod Papers. Since General Synod 2008, the Standing Committee and the College of Bishops had considered matters related to structures, the role of dioceses and their bishops and how these could be adjusted to meet changing needs. As a result of that, Synod had been asked earlier in the current meeting to agree a first reading of an alteration to Canon 8. Standing Committee had further considered how, practically speaking, risks should be minimised and managed in relation to both financial and other areas. The report identified a number of areas which required appropriate expertise and which might ideally be provided on a province-wide basis. Current financial circumstances did not appear to allow the possibility of expansion within the General Synod Office but the Standing Committee would continue to carry out a careful review to establish what the actual risks might be and might come forward with further proposals. She referred to the special policy arrangement, noted in the report, which was being negotiated with Ecclesiastical. There appeared to be support for a greater degree of centralisation of services relating to issues of compliance. She explained that the reference in the written report to the strengthening of resources available at local level for issues of mission and ministry reflected a desire for more things to be done closer to the local level where mission and ministry actually took place. She expected that there would be further discussion regarding such issues in the light of the debate that had taken place earlier during Synod regarding the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Standing Committee and the College of Bishops were of the view that specific avenues of work had been identified which they would like to pursue (some of which might require to be modified in the light of financial constraints). There would also be other matters which would be set in train as a result of other discussions which had taken place at the current Synod. The Standing Committee was, therefore, now proposing to take off the agenda the “Strategic Review”. She had received a comment that, in fact, the exercise had not been a “Strategic Review” but she explained that the original consultation document had deliberately been framed with a wide range of open questions in order to elicit views within the Church.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee and College of Bishops regarding the Strategic Review.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

### **8.2.2 Budget and Quota**

Professor Peattie referred to the explanation of the financial position of the General Synod which she had given during Session One. Since then, Synod had voted on motions regarding the Pension Fund. In order to continue to meet essential needs, and to minimise as far as possible the amount of disinvestment that would be required to make the capital contribution to the Pension Fund, the Standing Committee recommended that Provincial Quota for 2010 should be increased by 3%. The context for such an increase was the loss of approximately 15% of the General Synod's income. The Budget Report contained in the Synod Papers outlined the impact on each diocese of the proposed 3% rise. She appreciated that this was a difficult time. The draft Budgets provided in the Synod Papers gave the opportunity for Synod members to note the size of the difficulty. The budget deficits set out in the papers were not acceptable and Standing Committee would be working to bring matters into line. By careful management, some surpluses had been accrued in the previous three years and Standing Committee expected to spend some of that. She commended all those who had worked prudently to enable the achieving of such surpluses. It was not entirely by chance that God had seen fit to give the General Synod a legacy in the current year which would be of assistance. However, it was likely that the figures for 2009 would show a deficit.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2010, agree to a quota figure of £585,368 for that year.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*.

### **8.3 Provincial Conference 2010**

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen & Orkney) referred to the fact that the Provincial Conference which had been planned for October 2009 had had to be cancelled. He reminded Synod that the recommendation of General Synod Review Group in 2006 had been that the Provincial Conference provided a major focus for the development for the whole life of the Church and that it should continue to be held regularly. The planning for the Conference had been superb. A large number of facilitators had been trained and their enthusiasm had been as palpable as their disappointment when the Conference had had to be cancelled owing to low take-up. For the future, the Planning Group had recommended that certain organisational processes should be streamlined, such as on-line booking. Why had the Conference not taken off this time? Perhaps, in a celebrity age, celebrity speakers were needed (though in fact the proposed speakers were among the best); perhaps the focus on the

Five Marks of Mission did not appeal (though the discussions at the current Synod had shown there was a need to talk about mission); perhaps publicity could have been more effective (the fact that some dioceses had responded more strongly than others suggested that this might be the case); cost was certainly a problem and the Planning Group were aware of other conferences which had had to be cancelled recently. In the immediate future, he urged dioceses and congregations to make use of the skills of the facilitators who had been trained. At the very least, the facilitators could offer two or three evenings of interaction on the story of the woman at the well. He had lists of the facilitators which he would pass to the other members of the College of Bishops. It was too early to say what shape any future conference might take. He expressed his thanks to the members of the Planning Group, the facilitators and General Synod Office staff.

The Primus expressed thanks on behalf of the Church to the Planning Group for its work.

#### **8.4 Ballot**

A ballot was conducted for the election of the Convener of the Information and Communication Board.

### **SESSION NINE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair**

#### **9.1 Liturgy Committee**

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) reported on behalf of the Committee in the absence of its Convener, the Rev Darren McFarland. The Committee was most grateful for the responses which had been received to the questionnaire which had been sent out to clergy and lay representatives in relation to the Scottish Liturgy 1982. The responses led to the production of a list of proposed textual amendments. The responses also evinced support for a new Eucharistic Rite. There had already been some discussion at the Faith and Order Board and it was intended that there would be a day consultation for the wider church before any work was commenced on the creation of a new Eucharistic Rite. The Board agreed in principle that the Committee could commence work on a new rite but it was recognised that, owing to financial constraints, the matter might require to be spread over a number of years. The Committee remained committed to the principle of consultation before commencing work. This was one reason why Synod members had themselves been provided with a copy of the questionnaire. The earlier circulation of the questionnaire to clergy and lay representatives had resulted in 119 responses which was a significant number compared to previous similar consultations. Ninety-five percent of the returns had been positive but a recurring theme was in relation to the language used and it was noted that a number of changes were already being adopted in various places in order to make language more inclusive. The Liturgy Committee proposed that the recommended changes would be presented to the College of Bishops so that diocesan bishops could authorise such changes as they felt appropriate for permissive use. Those changes would then be available from the Provincial website.

The Committee had also received a mandate from the Faith and Order Board to prepare a provincially acceptable structure for a Service of the Word and Administration of the Reserved Sacrament. The Committee would provide resources to help members of the Church produce an expanded Service of the Word using current structures. The College of Bishops would consider how the Reserved Sacrament was used currently in the Church and

provide guidelines for its use for congregations and worship leaders. The Liturgy Committee would commence work on the production of a stand-alone Service of the Word which could be used with *Communion from the Reserved Sacrament (Administered by a Deacon or Lay Person) 1997*. The draft text of that new Service of the Word would be presented to the Faith and Order Board at its next meeting.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness referred to discussion on earlier occasions regarding the preparation of a new Scottish Prayer Book. It had been suggested that this would involve confirming or revising existing texts, namely the Calendar, the Lectionary, Daily Prayer, the Psalter, the 1970 and 1982 Liturgies, Baptism, Affirmation, Funerals, Marriage and the Ordinal. It might also determine those parts of the Scottish Prayer Book 1929 which would be included, for example, Holy Communion and Morning and Evening Prayer, and create new texts and submit for canonical authorisation, new collects, a service of reconciliation and healing and services of the Word. Further, it had been suggested that pastoral and theological notes would be prepared. In the light of the current financial constraints, however, it had been agreed that the project should be put on hold. That was not to say that the work would not continue but it was not appropriate to make a clear decision to embark on a project which would have a substantial cost to the Church.

Comment was invited.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked the Liturgy Committee for its work. Since liturgy was so definitive of who the Church was, he wished to express some sadness that the proposal in relation to the changes to the 1982 Liturgy would be permissive and would therefore not have the same status as the main text. The Liturgy Committee had been encouraging the Church to think about liturgical formation for a number of years but this did not appear to be being carried through in the way that the Committee proposed to deal with the changes incorporating inclusive language. He asked that the matter be kept under review.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness explained that the discussion on how to make the changes had taken a long time. The reason for proposing that changes be dealt with permissively was because of the proposal for a creation of a wholly new Eucharistic Rite. There was, therefore, an assumption that in due course there would be a wholly new text available.

Mrs Mary Moffett (Edinburgh) indicated that she often found herself providing services for people with dementia. In such circumstances, the “Yellow Book” was not much help. She wondered where she could ask for advice. The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness responded that she should contact a member of the Liturgy Committee or there would be people within her diocese who could help. He recognised that within such circumstances there might be specific issues which she would want to include and he would take that back to the Committee.

## **9.2 Response to Question from Provost Holdsworth**

Responding to the question which had been asked by the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) earlier in the meeting, the Primus responded that the statement from the College of Bishops in March 2009 arose out of the experience of members of the College at the Lambeth Conference and the requests to the provinces for a period of “gracious

restraint” expressed through the three moratoria. The Statement expressed a collegiate response to the request for a moratorium on the authorisation of rights of same-sex blessing – prior to the moratoria, members of the College had responded in different ways to pastoral requests for same-sex blessings. The Statement made clear that, in respect of authorising or attending such blessings during the moratorium, the bishops believed that they should express a gracious restraint.

### **9.3 Elections**

#### **9.3.1 Information and Communication Board Convenership**

The Secretary General announced the result of the election for the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, the result of which was the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth 56 votes, the Rev Robert Warren 52 votes. Accordingly, Provost Holdsworth was elected as Convener.

#### **9.3.2 Administration Board Membership**

There being no competing nominations, the Rev Ian Pallett (Moray, Ross and Caithness) was elected as General Synod representative to the Administration Board by general acclaim.

#### **9.3.3 Preliminary Proceedings Committee**

The nominations for the membership of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee were set out in the Synod Papers, there being a single nomination for each vacancy.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following:-

Two Practising Lawyers:	Mr Derek Buchanan Rev Paul Romano
Lay member:	Mrs Mary Birch
Alternate Lay member:	Mr David Palmer
Secretary:	Mr Graham Robertson.

#### **9.3.4 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership**

There being no competing nominations, the Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) was elected by general acclaim to fill the one clerical vacancy on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

#### **9.3.5 General Synod Trusteeship**

There being no competing nomination, the Hon Lord McEwan was elected as a General Synod Trustee by general acclaim.

#### **9.3.6 Home Mission Committee Convenership**

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

*“That the convenership of the Rev Lewis Smith, as the Convener of the Home Mission Committee, be extended until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009.”*

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority (one against).

#### **9.4 Vote of Thanks**

The Primus expressed the thanks of Synod to those who had arranged the Eucharist and led Morning and Evening Prayer, to retiring conveners the Very Rev Clifford Piper and in due course, the Rev Lewis Smith, to those who had chaired sessions of Synod, to the Rev Paul Romano as Assessor, to Mr Kennedy Fraser for operating the IT and audio visual facilities, the Rev Rob Warren and Ms Ruth Green for arranging audio and website updates during the meeting, to members of Cursillo who had served teas and coffees and to the other volunteers who had assisted behind the scenes, to the Kirk Session and Mr and Mrs David McColl of Palmerston Place Church and to the General Synod Office staff. Professor Peattie thanked the present and former Primuses for their chairing of Synod.

#### **9.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod**

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 11.00am on Saturday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2009.