

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT PALMERSTON PLACE CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 10TH TO 12TH JUNE 2010

Freshers' Meeting

A 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 10th June 2010.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. It was fitting, he said, that the readings should lead the Synod to focus on God's creation and the relationship of humankind to that creation. However, he called the Synod to think about the Church's place in the great purposes of God and not just about 'the ground on which we stand'. There was little about which to be complacent and so it was appropriate to be haunted by the words 'so it is with those who store up treasures for themselves but are not rich towards God'. The Primus invited those present to measure faithfully and in faith the movement forward of the Scottish Episcopal Church by God's grace. In everything, it was important to ask the question whether the Church was 'rich towards God'. Touching on aspects of the Synod Agenda, he noted that the Anglican Covenant arose from continuing questions about what it meant to be human and about the nature of God but it also led the Church to ask how a common faith in Christ could continue to be expressed within the rich diversity of the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church and of the Anglican Communion. The Church was similarly called to be rich towards God in its responses to the fragility of the creation and in the work of mission. A church which made itself the focus of its own life was fated to decline but a church which was prepared to transcend difficulties and challenges was one open to being transformed by the Spirit of God. His experience of recent episcopal election processes within the Dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway and Argyll and The Isles had reminded him that the Church was energised when it began to explore what mission meant. No longer was the discourse about the Church nor was it for insiders alone. The Church became a Pentecost place where everybody could speak in their own language the wonders and the richness of God in their lives. The Primus said that his experience of the Scottish Episcopal Church led him to be hopeful. Whilst the easy security of the past had gone, in both the cities and the sparsely populated spaces of Scotland, the Church was thinking positively about the future. There were riches of liturgy, preaching, prayer and shared ministry and the diversity of the Scottish Episcopal Church was a sign of openness to people of all kinds as they sought the chance to experience the life of a people who were rich towards God.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken for the Sisters of the Society of St Margaret, Haiti which amounted to £1,829 (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:-

Lt Col Alan Burns (Salvation Army), the Rev Patrick Coltman (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Dr Maurice Elliott (Church of Ireland), Ms Pramila Kaur (Scottish Inter-Faith Council), the Rev Susan Kirkbride (United Reformed Church), the Rev Gilmour Lilly (Baptist Union of Scotland), the Rev Dr Donald McEwan (Church of Scotland), Mr Bruce McKenzie (Roman Catholic Church), the Rev Malcolm Muir (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), Leslie Stevenson (Religious Society of Friends), and the Rev Lily Twist (Methodist Church in Scotland).

The Primus also welcomed the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan who had been consecrated as the new Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in April 2010. The Primus announced that the Rt Rev Dr John Mantle, Bishop of Brechin, was absent owing to a hospital appointment but expected to join Synod the following day.

The Primus offered the congratulations of Synod to the Very Rev Jim Mein who had won the Primus' Golf Championship Cup the previous day and to Ecclesiastical Insurance who had won the Jinty Kerr Cup. The competitions had been generously sponsored by Ecclesiastical Insurance.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Rev Canon David Bayne and the Rev Susan Macdonald were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

Miss Hilary Gibson and Professor Alan Werritty 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 Dr Joe Morrow had been appointed as his Assessor.

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2009

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 11-13 June 2009.”

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 Standing Committee, the Convenership of the Administration Board, one vacancy for a lay representative on the Standing Committee and one vacancy for a General Synod representative on the Administration Board.

As set out in the General Synod papers, Mr David Palmer had been nominated for the Convenership of the Standing Committee and Mr Michael Lugton had been nominated for the Convenership of the Administration Board. Since the despatch of the Synod papers, Mrs Anne Jones had been nominated in relation to the vacancy of lay representative on the Standing Committee. She had been nominated by Mrs Anthea Clarke and seconded by Mrs Gill Young. 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 11.15am the following morning.

1.8 Roll Call

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 141 members attended.

1.9 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of Synod: Ms Michelle Brown, Dr Elaine Cameron, the Rev John Conway, Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller, the Most Rev Dr Katharine Jefferts Schori, Ms Mary McKinnell, the Rev Dr Duncan McLaren, Mr Andrew Mott and Mr Richard Murray

1.10 Standing Committee

1.10.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31st December 2009

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009.

Placing the accounts in their context, she reported on a number of significant pieces of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the previous year. In the light of the recession and consequent financial pressures affecting all parts of the Church, further consideration had been given to issues developed in the Strategic Review. This had resulted in the preparation of a document to enable dioceses and charges to assess congregational viability in terms of both mission and finance.

By the end of 2009, missives had been concluded for the sale of St Serf's Care Home to a third party as a going concern. Following application by the new provider for

approval from the Care Commission, the Home had been transferred on 23rd May 2010 to St Serf's Care Home Limited operated by Fergus and Jenny Thain. A reception had taken place the previous week at which gifts had been presented to mark the long association between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Home. The Church wished both residents and staff every blessing as they embarked down a new road together. It had been a long and sometimes torturous journey to reach the point of transfer. Professor Peattie paid tribute to the staff at the General Synod and to Mr Ian Stewart of the Standing Committee who had also acted as Convener of the Transfer Task Group. Prior to the handover, further loans totalling £48,000 had been made in 2009 and a modest further sum had been required in the current year. Those sums, together with all other loans and accrued interest has now been recouped following conclusion of the sale and would be reflected in the accounts for 2010. The balance of the sale proceeds would remain in the St Serf's Trust in accordance with the Trust purposes.

Professor Peattie explained that pension fund matters would be reported on in detail later in the meeting but Synod members should note that a lump sum of £2m had been paid to the Pension Fund in accordance with the recovery plan indicated to General Synod 2009.

Professor Peattie explained that as a result of a reduction in investment returns, the income available to the Synod, its boards and committees had been markedly reduced and the situation was unlikely to improve in the near future. Reduced investment income had required a revision to the budgets for 2010 which resulted in a projected deficit on the General Fund of £131,466. Boards and committees had been asked to control their expenditure vigorously for the remainder of the year. The accounts for 2009 showed that their efforts had been successful with the year end position on the General Fund being a deficit of only £12,500. The overall position for the General Synod in 2009 had been a surplus of £45,210. The Statement of Financial Activities for the year ended 31st December 2009 showed an improvement of £3.3m in the value of investments during the year. Taking into account receipt of a generous legacy and gains on the sale of property, the overall position marked an improvement of over £2m in the year.

The Standing Committee had also considered a number of matters relating to governance, including adopting a revised approach to the identification, management and mitigation of risk, the development of a new model constitution for joint incumbencies and appointments to the Preparatory Committees for the episcopal elections in the Dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway and Argyll and The Isles.

In concluding her report she wished to pay tribute to the work of Ian Stewart who had led the Administration Board for the previous six years and throughout that time had been a significant and constructive contributor to the work of the Standing Committee. She also thanked the staff of the General Synod Office and the General Synod, as a whole, for having given her the opportunity to serve as Convener of the Standing Committee. She was grateful for the support and encouragement of her colleagues on the Standing Committee which had made the role a positive experience.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reminded Synod that its role was to help shape the work of the Church. It was helpful that the budget was addressed in the early part of Synod before substantive business was discussed. Every decision which the Synod took represented an opportunity cost. Professor Peattie had stressed the need to prioritise. Canon Peden considered it necessary to make such choices in the light of an overall strategy and called on the Synod and the Standing Committee to produce a clear vision. Whilst the Mission and Ministry Board had been undertaking work in relation to a Whole Church Policy on Mission and Ministry it was for General Synod to give a steer for church-wide policy.

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 2009.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.10.2 Budgets

Professor Peattie referred to the budgets contained in the Synod Papers for the years 2010 to 2012 and the proposals for provincial quota for 2011. Certain minor errors in the figures contained in the Synod Papers had been corrected and details had been provided to Synod members.

Professor Peattie confirmed that Boards and Committees had significantly reduced the anticipated deficit in 2009 by making some difficult decisions to reduce expenditure. They had not been asked to restructure their budgets completely, the intention being that they could concentrate on a major review of their planned expenditure for 2010 and beyond in order to take account of continued reduced levels of investment income. (The Standing Committee had anticipated a reduction in income of approximately £165,000 per annum.) In the light of the level of reduced income, the previous practice adopted by Standing Committee of budgeting of an overspend of approximately £50,000 per year (which usually resulted in a break even position) had no longer been considered appropriate. The Standing Committee had been able to agree target funding for each Board and the Standing Committee itself to enable a break even position for 2010. Professor Peattie reminded Synod that the budget of the Standing Committee supported most of the staffing of the General Synod Office and was therefore affected by the increase in pension costs as well as the non-negotiable costs of running the office, property and governance matters. The Standing Committee had been greatly helped in determining those target figures by the offer of a two year moratorium by the Finance Committee on building grants since the total cuts required amounted to approximately £314,000 or 16% of the General Fund expenditure.

Professor Peattie reported that all Boards and Committees had been able to agree budgets within the target perimeters so that, at its meeting in November 2009, the Standing Committee had been able to approve the budget submitted to it for 2010 and the projected outturn for that year, as shown on page 40 of the Synod Papers was a projected surplus of £20,302. The moratorium on building grants would impact

favourably on 2011 thereby buying time for other Boards and Committees to review the way in which they worked and how they set priorities. The effect of restoring funding for building grants in 2012, as shown on page 40 of the Synod Papers, would create an unacceptable deficit and it was clear that major adjustments to spending elsewhere would have to be identified in the coming year as any significant improvement in the level of income generated was unlikely in that timescale. Urgent work needed to be carried out by each of the Boards and especially by the Standing Committee, the Administration and the Mission and Ministry Board.

Professor Peattie expressed the view that no aspect of work could be considered sacrosanct, however worthy it might be, and the implications for the longer term needed to be worked through rather than simply identifying short term 'fixes'. This allowed a fantastic opportunity to re-think priorities, using a zero-based budgeting approach. Within the Standing Committee's own budget, considerable savings had been made during the previous five years by a reduction in staffing (from 18.9 staff in 2004 to 15.2 in 2009) and there had been almost no spending on the General Synod Office property (Forbes House). A quinquennial review had been commissioned on the property which had identified approximately £30,000 of work, of which £3,500 had been deemed necessary in the short term. Those essential repairs had been carried out but a further £20,000 was considered essential before the end of 2011 and would need to be factored into the budgets for that year. Also, in restoring at least some of the funds for building grants, policies for the allocation of other grants, including the traditional use of the Grants for Ministry Fund would need to be reviewed. She also anticipated that the Mission and Ministry Board, through the work it was currently undertaking in the development of the Whole-Church Mission and Ministry Strategy, would be able to identify a clearer framework within which funding decisions at Provincial level could be made to support the Church's call to mission in Scotland and beyond, whilst living within its financial means.

Professor Peattie turned to the question of provincial quota for 2011. The budget for the General Fund projected a deficit of £781 for 2011 and this assumed an increase in quota of 3% for that year. She appreciated that the same financial pressures as affected General Synod budgeting applied also to diocese and charges. Historically, quota had formed one quarter of the total income available to the General Synod but, as a result of the reduction in investment income, that percentage had risen disproportionately. In 2009, quota had formed 28% of total income and 37% of expenditure comprised support and assistance to dioceses and congregations by way of grant. In 2008, the figures had been 24% and 34% respectively. The purpose of quota was to support the Mission and Ministry of the Church through 'pump priming' new initiatives, to fund the governance of the Church and its general administration and to re-distribute resources against identified need. For those reasons, and in the light of continued pressures on income, the Standing Committee proposed a 3% increase in quota for 2011. She urged Synod members engaging with the presentations and debate which would follow during the meeting to bear in mind the impact of decisions which the Synod was asked to make.

Questions were invited.

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow & Galloway) explained that she was a member of the Mission and Ministry Board and was very aware of the consultation and planning

being undertaken in relation to the development of the mission of the Church. She noted, however, that there were large gaps for the funding of training for mission. She sought reassurance that money would be available for training and congregational development.

In response, Professor Peattie explained that there were gaps in the budget. There was no new money available and there was an opportunity cost to every decision. However, the comment made would be helpful for the Standing Committee.

In closing the session, the Primus expressed thanks to Professor Peattie.

SESSION TWO – Professor Patricia Peattie in the Chair

2.1 Faith and Order Board – Anglican Covenant

The Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller (TISEC) introduced the text of the Anglican Covenant, a copy of which was contained in the Synod Papers. He reminded Synod of the background to the Covenant including developments in The Episcopal Church in the USA and the Anglican Church of Canada. One of the concerns which had given rise to the Windsor Report was the complex cluster of issues surrounding human sexuality. The other, which had tended to receive less attention, concerned episcopal jurisdiction (namely incursions into one province by bishops of another). The Windsor Report had suggested a covenant as a possible way forward for the Anglican Communion. The Primates' Meeting in 2005 had endorsed the idea of a covenant and a Covenant Drafting Group in 2007 published the Nassau draft. The Faith & Order Board had prepared a written response on that draft. Twelve other Provinces had also responded and those responses had led in turn to the production of the St Andrews draft. It had been interesting to note that a number of the points made by the Scottish Episcopal Church on the Nassau draft had been taken up in the St Andrews draft. Expressions like 'common mind', 'matters of essential concern', and 'common standards of faith' used in the Nassau draft needed further elaboration and whilst such expressions had continued to appear in the St Andrews draft there had been an attempt to outline how they might be applied. Similarly, the Nassau draft had accorded significant power to the Primates' Meeting and the commentary on the St Andrews draft had noted the dissatisfaction which had been expressed with that arrangement. The Faith & Order Board had commented that such power might better be invested in the Anglican Consultative Council which had indeed been given an enhanced role in the St Andrews draft. The Faith & Order Board had also expressed uneasiness with the term 'covenant' and had suggested 'concordat' as an alternative. That suggestion had been rejected but had nevertheless been carefully considered. Canon Fuller considered that it had been encouraging to note the way in which the St Andrews draft had responded to the suggestions made to the Drafting Group. There had, therefore, been a genuine sense of a dialogical process. Following responses submitted to the St Andrews draft, the Ridley Cambridge draft covenant had been discussed by the Anglican Consultative Council in May 2009. At that meeting, it had been decided to send the Ridley Cambridge draft to Provinces for consideration and comment and this had led to production of the final Covenant which was now in the public domain and contained in the Synod Papers.

Canon Fuller also referred to the commentaries which had been produced on the successive drafts of the Covenant including the Lambeth Commentary produced by the Lambeth Conference of 2008. In addition to the documentation, the Anglican Communion Office had

been encouraging a ‘listening process’ and that process had resulted in at least two events within Scotland of which Canon Fuller was aware. It had also led to the publication of a book *The Anglican Communion and Homosexuality* which constituted an important document in the context of discussions around the Anglican Covenant.

Each Anglican Province now needed to think carefully about the text of the final Covenant and how it should proceed in terms of ‘owning’ that text. Each Province would have its existing synodical, canonical and practical structures, which would govern the means by which it would seek to address the Covenant and its implications. The motion about to be proposed to Synod would demit careful consideration of the Covenant to the Faith & Order Board as the body within the structures of the Scottish Episcopal Church best suited to address such issues. In passing responsibility to consider these questions to the Faith & Order Board, Canon Fuller expressed the hope that members of the Synod would not feel that they were in any sense relinquishing responsibility for engaging with the Covenant and he entreated everyone to continue to think and pray about it.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that the proposed motion was in part procedural. In common with other Anglican Provinces, the Scottish Episcopal Church needed to consider the questions which would arise if it were decided to adopt the Covenant. For example, might the matter be approached simply by proposing a resolution in Synod or would a new Canon be required? Similarly would the provisions of the Covenant need to be integrated into the Canons of the Church? Such technical questions required the advice of the Faith & Order Board and the procedures which the Church adopted would in turn shape the nature and pace of discussions regarding the Covenant. The motion also talked of enabling due consideration of the Covenant. To date, comment had been made on the previous drafts but it was now necessary to talk about the substance of the Covenant and the issues which surrounded it. This required measured and respectful debate and he reminded Synod that inter-dependence and co-responsibility were the essence of Anglicanism. The question was not simply ‘are we in the Scottish Episcopal Church going to adopt it or not?’ since what the Scottish Episcopal Church said and did affected others. The actions of each Province affected the whole life of the Communion. Questions such as whether the Covenant was a reasonable and necessary instrument to strengthen the cohesion of a diverse Communion; whether it was helpful to attempt to define the essence of Anglicanism; or whether it was unhelpful and un-Anglican to attempt to define a single view and to substitute a central authority for Anglican co-responsibility were all important questions. His task in the current Synod was not to attempt to resolve those issues but he hoped that the Church would discuss such matters in the coming years. As a Church, it had been very difficult to discuss the issues giving rise to the Anglican Covenant and discussion of the Covenant itself might give the opportunity to go back and re-engage in such discussion. As Primus, one of his tasks was to engage on behalf of the Church with the Church beyond the Province and he assured Synod members that others looked to the Scottish Episcopal Church and wanted to know what it thought.

The Primus noted two instinctive responses to the Covenant. The first was an understandable reaction against the concept of a covenant and the sense that it was not necessary to sign a document to prove Anglican identity. The second, and more positive, reaction arose out of the sense that the Scottish Episcopal Church was part of the roots of Anglicanism as a result of the consecration of Samuel Seabury. At that time, and indeed sadly even at the current time, colonialism influenced the tone of the debate in the Communion but in the Church’s reflection on the Covenant, it was necessary to think about how the Scottish Episcopal

Church could be part of a new beginning for the Anglican Communion. The difficulties faced by the Anglican Communion were being faced, or would be faced, by every other church across the world. At some levels, the cohesion within Anglicanism was remarkable but, obviously, responses to issues of human sexuality created tension not only between Provinces but also within Provinces. The period of 'gracious restraint' called for by the Primates' Meeting and the three moratoria had been a temporary measure to try and deal with such tensions. The College of Bishops had taken the view that it should respond positively to the request for gracious restraint in the interests of protecting Communion life. However, two factors made that difficult. Firstly, a moratorium was intended to create a space for resolving issues but it also tended to remove the pressure to seek such resolution. Secondly, the moratoria were essentially an exercise in self-discipline and there was no central authority to enforce them. In the absence of such self-discipline, the cohesion of the Communion was gradually eroded by events and debate centred on the moratoria rather than the issues themselves.

In closing, the Primus expressed the hope that the Scottish Episcopal Church would play its part in the discussion of the Anglican Covenant within Scotland and beyond. He also wanted to say to those who felt the issues which had given rise to the Covenant most keenly that the ability of the Scottish Episcopal Church to make such a contribution to Communion life depended on its ability to deal with such issues internally. The Scottish Episcopal Church was a diverse church and valued its diversity and sometimes that had not been said clearly enough. In the Province, there were warm and respectful friendships between individuals which spanned that diversity and he was aware from his correspondence and dialogue with people that no one wished to pursue those discussions in extreme terms. The College of Bishops felt it was necessary to find ways of developing open and respectful dialogue within the Province and would be happy to listen to suggestions as to how that might be achieved. That would be for the good of the Province and also for the good of the Anglican Communion.

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

"That this Synod, recognising the publication of the Anglican Covenant and the need to address the Covenant in a manner which is careful and prayerful, request the Faith and Order Board to advise General Synod 2011 on what process or processes might be appropriate to be followed by this Synod to enable due consideration of the final version of the Covenant by the Scottish Episcopal Church".

The Rev Canon Dr Robert Harley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the motion. He hoped that the Covenant could be 'given a try'. He was of the view that if the Church adopted the Covenant it would exert greater influence as an 'insider' rather than being left as an 'outsider'. If subsequently, the Church found the Covenant was not to its liking, there was a process for withdrawal.

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that this was the fourth General Synod in a row when the Covenant had been discussed and he felt increasingly uneasy about it. He supported the motion but was concerned that establishing a process for adopting the Covenant carried an assumption that the Church would in fact adopt it. He cautioned against sleepwalking towards adoption. He had noted from Section 4.3 of the Covenant that a church which chose to withdraw from the Covenant might be denied participation in certain aspects

of the Anglican Communion. He queried whether that would lead to a split in the Communion resulting in two tiers. He also considered that the more rigid the ties within the Communion, the more susceptible they would be to breaking. A looser arrangement would be better suited to taking the strain. He was also concerned that the Covenant would impose a 'convoy mentality' so that one church would only move if all others did. He queried whether, had there been a covenant in place, the Scottish Episcopal Church would now have women priests. He was of the view that the debate needed to be broadened to include the whole structures of the Communion and that the Church should not be afraid to contemplate breaking with the Communion. The Communion itself had been created because of division.

Mr Michael Partridge (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the motion but hoped that the Faith & Order Board would take it in the spirit intended, namely that the question of whether or not the Covenant should be adopted was an open one. It might be the case that the question was not simply should the Covenant be adopted but, indeed, whether that was even the right question to ask. There was still opportunity for questions to be raised and he hoped the matter would be approached with open minds.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow & Galloway) expressed sympathy with much of what the previous two speakers had said. He feared that what was being offered was not in fact an open question. He would vote against the motion because he was not convinced that the Covenant would be good for the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Primus responded that the motion was not intended as a way of easing the Church into accepting the Covenant without proper debate. Looking across the Communion, it was clear that the process as a whole would take a considerable amount of time and most Provinces had not even declared their timescale for consideration. It was not a process in which the Church should feel rushed. In what he had said earlier in presenting the motion, the Primus had been aware of an instinctive reticence about the Covenant and he had been endeavouring to keep open scope for the expression of that reticence. He did not feel that there was underway any kind of gradualist movement towards adoption of the Covenant. On the wider issues, he considered there was a question as to whether the processes and structures on offer to the Church (through the Covenant and moratoria) facilitated real discussion on the issues and provided a way of cohering across the diversity of the Communion. If discussion centred on the processes themselves then that might be a sign that the processes were not the right processes or had outlived their usefulness. The motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority.

The Chair thanked the Primus and Canon Fuller.

2.2 Information and Communication Board

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) presented the report on behalf of his Board. He explained that during the previous year, a number of changes had been introduced and he sought Synod's feedback. In addition, he invited Synod members to express their views on priorities as to what should be covered in the range of publications and other channels of communication which were available. The number of ways in which the Church communicated was becoming increasingly diverse. Obvious examples were *inspires*, the provincial website, social media such as Twitter and blogging and *inspires online* which had been the biggest development of the year. The development of *inspires online* as a monthly newsletter, had been primarily in response to

comments made in Synod and throughout the Church regarding the balance between online and print based media. *Inspires online* appeared to have been warmly received and had grown rapidly to a subscription list of just under 1,000. If people did not have email, he encouraged Synod members to print out *inspires online* and provide it to them.

In response to questions by Provost Holdsworth about usage, a high proportion of Synod indicated that they read *inspires* and received *inspires online*. A significant number had used the website in the previous month. A small number had used Twitter and approximately two-thirds of Synod members had visited some of the Episcopalian blogs in the previous month.

Provost Holdsworth explained the area in which the Board operated was one of the most rapidly changing and, as a result, people feared being left behind. However, the Church could not let go of the printed medium for the foreseeable future. *Inspires* the magazine was now produced four times a year and was a thicker publication than previously. He paid tribute to the Rev Kimberly Bohan and Rosemary Hannah who were developing a workflow and editorial team but it remained ‘work in progress’.

Provost Holdsworth encouraged Synod members to express views on the changes which had been made by the Board during the previous year.

The Rev Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) found *inspires online* very useful because news could be speedily digested from it.

Mrs Christine McIntosh (Argyll and The Isles) thought it was a brilliant idea to have *inspires* as a quarterly but more substantial publication. It provided a ‘shop window’ for the Church and, as such, its quality was all important. She invited the editorial team to pay particular attention to the sub-editing of articles. The syntax in a recent article had defeated her.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) wished to pay tribute to ‘Yvonne’ who provided the Daily Office online.

The Rev Tim Bennison (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) confessed that ‘Yvonne’ was his unpaid assistant who was not a member of the Church but had been seeking work experience. It was available at www.meltedgold.com/secdailyprayer.

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) paid tribute to those who provided Prayer for the Day on the radio. It was a great talent to provide something humorous and thought provoking at the start of the day and the quality of SEC contributors was head and shoulders above most others.

Mr Brendan Grimley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that developments by the Board were right for the moment but, in relation to future funding, consideration should be given to the fact that the mechanisms of communication would change.

Provost Holdsworth thanked the Synod members for their comments. He agreed that communications did not come cheap but the Church was managing to afford to do much more than it had been able to in the past. The Board had one of the smallest budgets and the fact that much was achieved was largely down to the hard work of many volunteers and staff and he thanked all who had been involved. In the future, he expected that the website would change to become a meeting place for people rather than simply something which was read or

which provided material for downloading. Provost Holdsworth then distributed a form to Synod members comprising a list of issues covered by *inspires* towards the end of 2009. He invited Synod members to consider which were the three most, and the three least, important items on the list, and then to complete the forms by indicating the order of importance.

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) considered that *inspires online* was excellent. He wondered who was behind the insert regarding the fixing of the date of Easter which appeared on 1st April. Provost Holdsworth noted that since the publication was issued on the 1st of each month, there would always be an issue falling on 1st April.

In closing, Provost Holdsworth thanked the staff of the General Synod Office, the design professionals engaged on the work of the Board, Miss Lorna Finley for her work in handling media enquiries and also the Rev Kimberly Bohan, Rosemary Hannah and all members of the Board.

The Chair thanked Provost Holdsworth. In presenting the budgets earlier in the day, she said she had not mentioned the Information and Communication Board budget because it was small and even if significant cuts were to be made to it this would not have a significant effect on the overall financial position.

SESSION THREE – The Rt Rev the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in the Chair

3.1 Standing Committee

3.1.1 Gender Audit Report

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that following the decision of General Synod 2009 to carry out a gender audit, the Standing Committee had commissioned Dr Elaine Cameron to do so. It had taken time to complete the exercise and it was to Dr Cameron's credit that she had managed to produce it for General Synod 2010. The report had come to the Standing Committee a few weeks previously and, whilst the Committee had not had the opportunity to consider it in detail, it had thought it appropriate that the report should come to the current meeting of Synod. She welcomed Dr Cameron.

Dr Cameron explained that the need for gender equality was recognised at a global level, as stated in the Gender Audit Report contained in the Synod Papers. In answering the question 'why an audit?' she gave three reasons. Firstly, the Scottish Episcopal Church was committed to issues of justice and gender equality was a justice issue as evidenced by the Millennium Development Goals and Resolution 13.31 of the Anglican Consultative Council. The Church could only be true to its gospel calling if in its own life it was trying to show concern for justice, equality and inclusivity. Secondly, the issue was one of theology. God called the Church to be a community of women and men working in partnership and sharing together. It was about seeking relationships which uplifted the disadvantaged gender, without dominance or subordination. The participation of women in decision-making was not just a matter of social justice but of theological integrity. Thirdly, it was a question of the economics of mission. Mission was fulfilled when all were enabled to use their

gifts and talents fully. The experience of women, brought equally to the table as that of men, might be able to point new ways of being Church in mission.

Dr Cameron then summarised the findings of the report. She expressed gratitude to the College of Bishops for requesting details of gender breakdown in the annual congregational returns. Overall, there were more women than men in congregations and fewer women than men in leadership. In terms of the communicant numbers, the proportions were similar across all dioceses with the female:male ratio being approximately 60:40. Congregations were not as female-dominated as might be thought but Dr Cameron suggested that in relation to the principal vestry posts, the Church conformed to a societal stereotyping with a predominance of male treasurers and female secretaries. She queried whether the best person for the job was always the one conforming to the gender stereotype. In relation to stipendiary clergy, the female:male ratio was 30:70. However, the picture was changing and would have looked radically different 20 years previously.

At diocesan level, gauging gender in decision-making bodies was not straightforward. Dioceses did things differently and in order to obtain broadly comparable measurements the statistics for cathedral chapters, diocesan synods and committee convenerships had been examined. In relation to cathedral chapters, she queried whether it was not time to have more women in senior positions. Interestingly, diocesan synods had more female than male members but in relation to the convenerships of diocesan committees only four out of 27 were female. Diocesan Standing Committees were usually convened by bishops. Finance and ministry committees reflected traditional perceptions: finance was perceived as to do with power and, therefore, for men, whereas ministry was about caring and seen as primarily for women. In relation to property committees, Dr Cameron queried whether church buildings would be as they were if they had been built by women.

At provincial level, while there were more male clerical members of General Synod, most dioceses had more lay women than men on General Synod. The membership of provincial boards showed women accounting for 32% (which reduced to 28% if the Provincial Youth Network were removed). In relation to convenerships, five out of 22 were female. Dr Cameron queried whether there was a cultural assumption that men 'did' committees and asked whether women were apprehensive of becoming involved.

In relation to TISEC, gender was quite well balanced in the student population and the members of the Provincial Selection Panel were equally balanced. However, there was only one female Diocesan Director or Ordinands and the academic staff and Board of Studies were predominantly male.

Turning to the recommendations contained in the Report, she suggested that they divided into two areas. The first three recommendations were the responsibility of everyone and should not be abdicated to a small group. The intention in the first three recommendations was not to seek a quota system or a fifty/fifty balance for its own sake but rather to seek a genuine equity of opportunity. The recommendation regarding inclusive language in the liturgy had not been the purpose of the audit but since it was integral to the ongoing conversation, it had been necessary to mention it. The Report recommended that a working group should examine gender and other

areas of possible discrimination with a view to developing equality policies, revising the annual congregational returns to include gender and to arrange a further audit in November 2010. In summary, the Report called people in the Church to a richer and deeper sense of themselves and to be more fully human. She asked Synod to support the motion concerning the Report.

Mrs Norma Higgott (Moray, Ross and Caithness) then proposed, and the Rev Dean Fosteckew seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod receive the report of the Gender Audit carried out in relation to the Scottish Episcopal Church and invite the Standing Committee to consider the recommendations made in the report.”

Mrs Nancy Adams (Edinburgh) welcomed the audit and the quantitative figures showing the involvement of women in the Church but wished to draw attention to the qualitative aspects. She was the one female member of the Finance Committee and liked to believe that what she brought to the work of the Committee was not so much financial competence but rather a different approach to things. Science had confirmed that men and women used the two sides of the brain differently and if the Church wished a truly holistic approach to the matters facing it then it was necessary to value the different qualitative lenses which women and men brought. She also invited male colleagues to indicate how their approaches to mission and ministry had been changed by the perspectives brought by women.

The Rev Maurice Houston (Edinburgh) welcomed the Report. He referred to the comment in the Report that the use of language defined one’s understanding of the world. He thought it would be helpful if the Liturgy Committee could look particularly at the language used in the Eucharistic Prayers. The use of different lenses in the language used in the worship of God was important.

The Rev Ruth Innes (Edinburgh) expressed her thanks to Dr Cameron and the Rev Marion Chatterley for the report. She said that the Report made horrifying reading not least in relation to the gender balance on her diocesan cathedral chapter. The Report had not made any mention of the benefit of transferable skills from secular employment which could be of use in the Church. She asked what the timescale would be for the Standing Committee to act on the recommendations and for confirmation that Standing Committee acknowledged that it had a responsibility for them.

The Rev James Milne (Glasgow & Galloway), speaking as a member of the provincial Liturgy Committee, indicated that it would be helpful if, when Standing Committee came to consider the recommendations, it could give a steer as to whether the reference to language in liturgy was to ‘people language’ or to ‘God language’. There was a general consensus that all ‘people language’ should be inclusive and that was reflected in all new liturgies being written, but there was less consensus in relation to ‘God language’ particularly where it came in the form of biblical quotations. There was some reluctance, at least on the part of some members of the Liturgy Committee, to alter the text of scriptural language.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) also wanted to ask what was in the minds of those who had prepared recommendation 4 contained in the Report. He was happy for the last vestiges of non-inclusive 'people language' to be removed from liturgy but to change doctrine and theology by altering liturgy was another matter. He would be uncomfortable about changing 'God language' where it derived from Scripture.

Mrs Sari Salvesen (Edinburgh) explained that, whilst she had no recent experience of church boards or committees, in her secular experience she was aware that women could be inhibited from speaking because of the model of operation of the body on which they served.

The Rev Shona Boardman (Edinburgh) agreed that the use of language created systems which could oppress or liberate. If the Church believed that God was beyond gender then why was language about God still predominantly masculine. Was there a danger of constructing a male deity thereby slipping into idolatry? Was there a danger of limiting the image of God as a result of the use of language? She agreed with St Augustine that if one believed one had understood who God was then what one had understood was not God. In order to be true to Scripture, it was necessary to be true to the entire breadth of Scripture in which God was also referred to in feminine terms. If the Church had adopted the framework of scripture/tradition/reason then she urged the Liturgy Committee to use a thoughtful, prayerful, theological and scriptural approach because if there was an insistence on an exclusive use of male-dominated language then there was a perpetuation of injustice towards half of the population but also to God.

The Rev Kimberly Bohan (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) was fascinated by the issues to which the Report was giving rise. She considered that understandings within the Church could often be confused and limited. There was a risk of slipping into essentialism as the only understanding of feminism. Whilst she wished to support continuing conversations on such matters, she had a concern as to whether the audit was the only way in which this could happen. She was not convinced that repeating the audit in three years' time was the right way to proceed.

The Rev Shona Lillie (Glasgow and Galloway) agreed with the previous two speakers but disagreed with the conclusion that the fact that lay membership of diocesan synods was more female helped to balance the fact that clergy were mainly male. She was concerned that the largely female lay membership of Synod reinforced the male bias in clergy. She had returned to Scotland in 2003 and experienced an extreme cultural shock in that she found women as oppressed as they had been when she had left in 1985. She had been shocked by the level of representation in churches and indeed the churches' way of 'being'. In fact, the Church had a role in helping people to understand their own position. Wearing a dog collar as a woman in Central Station on the day of a Celtic/Rangers match resulted in a hostile reception. People did not expect women to be in roles of authority. The question was what was God saying to the women in the Scottish Episcopal Church today. She believed that the matter should be returned to again in three years' time.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed recommendation 6 in the Report and noted that it referred to 'other areas of

discrimination'. She hoped this might include those with disabilities including those with autism and disabled children. Looking ahead to the Rural Commission report to be considered later in Synod, she had noted that all three members of the Commission were male and thought there was no great understanding of care in rural areas.

Mr Graeme Hely (Glasgow and Galloway) had read recently of a women priest who had been invited for preferment but had been unable to take on the position because of her husband's career and the fact that they had two children. He considered the reverse situation would not happen. It was important that the Church should make adequate provision to enable women to take on more senior roles.

Ms Catriona Beel (Argyll & the Isles) noted that the motion requested the Standing Committee to consider the Report's recommendations. In fact, some of the recommendations related to the dioceses and she thought both a top-down and bottom-up approach were needed. Consequently, she sought an amendment to the motion to include the words 'and Diocesan Synods' after the words 'Standing Committee'.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that he would be willing to second the amendment. However, he also wished to address how the report was handled by Standing Committee. He hoped that Standing Committee would be proactive both in debating the recommendations and passing them to others in the Church to consider. With reference to the comment made by the Rev James Milne that Standing Committee should give a steer on the use of language in liturgy, if Standing Committee were to do so, it would be a rather different kind of function for Standing Committee than that normally undertaken. He would welcome such a theological debate. The Bible contained many differing images of God. He would encourage the Liturgy Committee, like the biblical writers, to use their imagination in order to speak about God to the widest number of people in the widest possible ways. He also wished to suggest that any further audit in 2012 should be a broader 'inclusion' audit.

Responding to the comments made, Dr Cameron thanked Synod members for their interest. She had been surprised, but pleased, about the number of comments regarding language. She was aware that the use of language was not something she had been asked to do in the Gender Audit but somehow it had crept in. She was interested in the interpretation given to the conclusion in section 7.2 of the Report as an inversion of her interpretation. She agreed that all areas of discrimination were inter-related and she would also welcome a wider conversation about gender matters.

Professor Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) indicated that Standing Committee had not considered the detail of the Report at all and, consequently, all the views which had been expressed by Synod members would be very useful for Standing Committee. The purpose of the motion was to enable Standing Committee to consider different ways of taking the recommendations forward. She expected that General Synod 2011 would receive some sort of progress report. About three years previously, Standing Committee had sent out a document to dioceses inviting them to consider how to ensure the availability of the best skills for boards and committees and to take account of the kinds of issues raised in the Gender Audit Report. On that basis, Synod might be willing to accept the motion in its present form.

Ms Catriona Beel (Argyll & the Isles) then formally proposed, and the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded an amendment to the motion so that it would read:-

“That this Synod receive the report of the Gender Audit carried out in relation to the Scottish Episcopal Church and invite the Standing Committee and Diocesan Synods to consider the recommendations made in the report.”

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) wished to encourage Synod not to accept the amendment. He considered that the main thrust of the Report had become slightly sidetracked by the question of liturgy. He was also concerned that it was now proposed to disseminate the report to others before the Standing Committee had had a chance to consider its recommendations.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 73 in favour, 39 against and 5 abstentions.

The amended motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority.

3.1.2 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Ms Lexy Plumtree (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) referred to the Committee’s report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. She reported that work arising from the review of historic and closed cases had been continuing and that the Provincial Officers and she had met the College of Bishops and Standing Committee jointly. As a result, work was now underway in the development of protocols for certain areas including the development of a database and improvements to record keeping. Some of these matters would require discussions with the Information Commissioner in relation to matters of data protection. This work was being undertaken by the Provincial Officers who would report to the Committee. Work would also be done on the development of pastoral guidance for the support of victims of abuse. This would be for as wide application as possible, not specifically in relation to persons abused within a church context.

Ms Plumtree explained that the implementation of the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007 was due to take place later in 2010. Recently, significant numbers of regulations had been published and these would introduce the vetting and barring scheme. The new system would avoid the need for multiple disclosure checks being obtained by a single individual.

Ms Plumtree reported that the Provincial Officer for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults, Mr Leo Lanahan, would be leaving at the end of August. A recruitment process had recently been undertaken and she was pleased to report that an appointment had now been made, subject to a satisfactory criminal record disclosure being received, and the new person would take up appointment in time to allow a hand-over with Mr Lanahan. She expressed thanks to Mr Lanahan for his service to the Church and also to Dr Daphne Audsley, Miss Betty Robertson and the other members of her Committee.

Mr Michael Partridge (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to applaud the proposal regarding pastoral care for survivors of abuse. Care was often necessary throughout someone's life since the degree of suffering might only show up many years after the abuse had happened. He urged people to be aware of this. The proportion of abuse was much greater than was commonly supposed and it was likely that there would be survivors of abuse present in congregations.

The Chair expressed thanks to Ms Plumtree.

3.1.3 Material from Standing Committee

3.1.3.1 Notices under the Canons - Canon 57

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) introduced the second reading of proposed alterations to Canon 57, sections 1 and 3. Responses from the dioceses were contained in the Synod Papers. She noted that the principle of enabling notices under the Canon to be given by email had been supported by all dioceses. The purpose of the proposed change would enable a small saving financially and also a saving in staff time. Individuals who did not wish to receive notices by email could so indicate but dioceses would be asked for details of email addresses when they notified their list of General Synod members to the General Synod Office.

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

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

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was then put to the vote in Houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:-

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| House of Laity: | passed unanimously |
| House of Clergy: | passed by majority (1 against, 1 abstention) |
| House of Bishops: | passed unanimously |

3.1.3.2 Standing Committee Membership – Canon 52

Professor Peattie referred to the paper providing the rationale for the proposed changes to Canon 52 as contained in the Synod Papers. The amendment related to the membership of the Standing Committee but the opportunity was also being taken to tidy up the wording of the Canon by removing reference to the post of TISEC Principal which no longer existed.

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

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

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) referred to the proposed deletion of the reference to the TISEC Principal. The Diocesan Synod of

Aberdeen and Orkney had considered whether it was appropriate to make this change at the current time. The Church could be rightly proud that at the current time there were approximately two dozen individuals in training for lay and ordained accredited ministry. The diploma level course itself was similarly a matter for congratulation. Against that background, the Diocesan Synod had been concerned if that the Church's training officer did not serve *ex officio* in the meeting of the General Synod there was a risk of downgrading theological training at a time when it ought to be raised. He was aware that other provincial officers served the General Synod but were not members of it. The view of the Diocesan Synod was that the training officer for readers and ordinands was in a different category.

Professor Peattie did not agree that the change downgraded the role. The Synod frequently heard from TISEC and she considered it would be an unfortunate precedent for a member of staff also to be a Synod member. She did not see the change as preventing the post holder from contributing in any way to discussions in boards or committees or the General Synod.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:-

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| House of Laity: | passed by majority |
| House of Clergy: | passed by majority |
| House of Bishops: | passed by majority |

3.1.3.3 Digest of Resolutions

Professor Peattie explained that the proposed changes to the Digest of Resolutions were to reflect the current position in practice. It had been the practice for General Synod to appoint the Convener of the Standing Committee in exactly the same way as conveners of the boards. However, the Digest of Resolutions and the Canons were currently silent on how that should be done. Standing Committee wished to correct this by incorporating the current good practice into section 2.1.2 of the Digest of Resolutions.

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

“That section 2.1.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended by the addition after the existing paragraph (f) of the following:

“(g) the foregoing paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f) shall apply to the appointment of the Convener of the Standing Committee as if references to the Convener of a Board were references to the Convener of the Standing Committee”.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Professor Peattie explained the proposal to delete section 1.8 of the Digest of Resolutions. She then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

“That Section 1.8 of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted and that that sections 1.9 to 1.11 be renumbered as sections 1.8 to 1.10 respectively.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Professor Peattie then explained the proposed change to section 2.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions which was to delete reference to a number of obsolete accounts and funds. She then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart seconded, the following motion:

“That Section 2.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words “The Standing Committee shall have responsibility for the oversight of the Provincial and Other Expenditure Account, the General Synod Office Account, the Unallocated Legacies Account and the Development Fund.””

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Chair closed the session by expressing thanks to Professor Peattie.

SESSION FOUR – Mr David Palmer in the Chair

4.1 Mission and Ministry Board

4.1.1 Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) presented the report of his Board which took the form of an outline of what a ‘Whole Church’ Mission and Ministry policy might be. He explained that the paper contained in the Synod Papers was ‘work in progress’ since a serious attempt to deal with the whole range of policy concerns in province, dioceses and congregations was not an easy matter. Often, within the Church, policy and the finance to carry out policy were separated and so the key to moving forward was the significant commitment made by the Board to consultation. An important element had been the consultation day between members of the Board and the leadership of the dioceses.

The Primus explained that the objective was not a tidy statement of policy but rather sufficient clarity about direction to enable people to see how things related to one another. Sufficient clarity about priorities was needed to enable consistent and transparent decisions to be made about the use of scarce resources. It was also about producing a culture in which the Church could be energised for mission and growth rather than preoccupied with fragility and decline. He was pleased that since the exercise had started, questions had begun to arise in the life of the Church. For example, it was clear that there was a need to consider what kind of ministry the Church needed and how such ministry would be sustained in places where the financial resources to do so were not present. Another example was the complex of issues which ranged from the desire of dioceses to provide patterns of training for lay ministry which would have a degree of inter-diocesan consistency, to the potential for shared training which arose out of the EMU partnership.

The Board wished to solicit the responses of Synod to the report since this was another important element of consultation.

The Primus then proposed the following motion:-

“That this Synod receive the report of the Mission and Ministry Board entitled ‘Moving Towards a ‘Whole Church’ Mission and Ministry Policy’.”

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Brechin) seconded the motion. She reflected on a recent visit to Ardnamurchan where snow poles marked the route of single track roads. There was a need for the Church to be focused and to be guided by such snow poles to keep it on the right track. The snow poles were the Mission and Ministry policy being considered by Synod that day. She had been shocked earlier in Synod to learn that, in terms of priorities, planned giving appeared to have been placed at number 24 on the lists provided to the Information and Communication Board. Without planned giving was it realistic to plan for the use of provincial resources? There was need to build bridges between the Church and the culture of 21st Century Scotland, between men and young people, and between the islands of spirituality and the mainlands of Christianity. The policy would set the snow poles for a growing church, not one which managed decline.

The Primus then invited General Synod to consider in small groups their response to the paper in order to develop a proper alignment between provincial policy and what happened in dioceses. Synod members were invited to consider the question ‘what issue or issues in this report do you feel is important and why?’.

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Aberdeen and Orkney) said he found nothing to disagree with in the paper. However, in the previous 20 years, a number of ideas had been tried and had then been abandoned or left to fail. He cited Mission 21, Total Ministry, Local Collaborative Ministry as examples. In its self-critique, the Church needed some form of open appraisal to assess why initiatives had been started but then left to fall.

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) agreed that there was nothing to argue against in the paper. At first sight, it appeared to be what the Church was doing already but, in fact, how much more effective the Church would be if it acted as the paper suggested.

Mrs Sari Salvesen (Edinburgh) agreed with the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney that there was a sense of ‘déjà vu’. She suggested that the Church should re-visit work carried out by David Goodbourn at the time that non-stipendiary ministry had commenced.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) agreed with the paper wholeheartedly but his response was not to the paper but to the person of the Primus. He wished to encourage the Primus to lead and be bold in casting a vision. His confidence was in the Primus and the team working with him and he encouraged them to be bold.

The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), as a member of the Primus’ diocese, commended what Canon Round had just said. The Bishop had made a huge difference in the diocese. There was need to think widely and she believed that the work of the Information and Communication Board needed to be seen in the light of mission. In her diocese, websites were seen as a means of mission. Also, the diocese had developed nine marks of mission against which to judge

decisions being made. She knew of one rector who was using those marks in the work of the vestry. It provided confidence to be bold and she expressed gratitude for the visionary leadership being provided.

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Edinburgh) welcomed the report and encouraged members to remember the context, namely that the discussion was about God's mission. He encouraged the Church to wrap it in prayer and support the Board in prayer.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) was delighted to add his support to both the process and the report. However, he noted with dismay that apart from the points made earlier by Canon Lamont, the term 'stewardship' was absent. Stewardship needed to be a theme running through the policy like a stick of rock.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) referred to the comment regarding snow holes. If consultation days were being held, he made a plea for them not to take place in January or February since none of the representatives of his diocese had been able to attend the consultation meeting at Kinnoull earlier in the year owing to bad weather.

The Rev David Bunyan (Edinburgh) supported the report but urged that it should not operate so as to remove responsibility from each and every member of the Church. Ultimately, it was up to members to share their faith. Also, whilst he encouraged the role of women in the Church, there was a need for a strategy to encourage more men into the church. He also wished to encourage the Board to consider the use of the internet and social networking. Many teenagers were involved in spiritual activities through the internet.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) was encouraged by what previous speakers had said. He wished to encourage the Board to think of wider ways of working since the report might have been written before the internet had been invented. The policy needed to take account of the fact that the Church used a number of different communication media. He also wished to emphasise the place of worship in mission. In Synod, it had been commented that, if Sunday worship were of the same quality as the opening Synod Eucharist, there would be no difficulty filling churches across Scotland.

Dr Anne Pankhurst (Edinburgh) considered it was necessary to take into account the relationships of the Scottish Episcopal Church with the Church elsewhere in the world. In the vision for the work she considered it important to include the global aspect. This would provide not only distraction from the ills which often beset the Church but would also help church members move forward in their faith. The key words were 'partnership' and 'sharing'.

The Rev Anne Haselhurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that within her diocese they had found that lay training was a very important aspect. The Church now recognised that the laity had an important role and it would be helpful if training for such roles could be coordinated across the dioceses. This might include, for example, training for pastoral assistants, children and youth leaders and worship leaders. Such training could be done in a way so as to allow such skills to be transferable across the province.

Mrs Nancy Adams (Edinburgh) considered that part of the reason why previous initiatives had not been carried forward had been because of breakdown in relationships. Personalities could sometimes hinder the rolling out of such initiatives. She asked that ways be found of addressing conflict so that it could be used to the advantage of the Church. In addition, there was a need for good and transparent communication so that people could speak to one another with integrity. She suggested that Twitter might be displayed on the screen during the coffee and lunch break so that the Synod membership as a whole could see the comments which were being made.

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow and Galloway) considered that, if some of the projects which were considered to have fallen were assessed, it was likely that the strengths of those projects would in fact now be seen to be part of the Church's mode of being. For example, congregations were now using external facilitators as a result of Mission 21. LCM had contributed collaborative working. Such examples were the snow poles of the Church's way of life and it was important to affirm them. In relation to training, sharing the expertise which existed within the province was very important. Training needed, therefore, to be cross-diocesan and occasionally provincial. Clergy morale could be low and coming together on a province-wide basis gave scope for networking and encouragement.

The Rev Kimberly Bohan (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that it was essential to think strategically about the content of the report. Thinking should not be bound by the past. She queried whether it was realistic, possible or desirable that ministry be sustained in all places across Scotland. She wondered whether the resources currently used to sustain old patterns might be used more constructively to support new ones.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) applauded the report but also found it frustrating because it did not answer the question 'how?'. He hoped that the next stage would involve working out how matters should be implemented. He noted the reference in the report to children and young people but considered that it appeared like an addendum at the end of the report. He thought this aspect of work should be given greater prominence.

The Primus responded to the points made in discussion. Members had indicated that they had nothing to argue with in the report. That was both good and bad and suggested that any attempt to make policy tidy was probably doomed to failure. Such a view probably arose from a desire to move away from the position indicated by the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney that if a vision had been articulated at provincial level it would not work unless it were properly worked through with dioceses. It was, therefore, a question of trying to ensure consistency across dioceses so that scarce resources could be used to optimum effect. One of the things missing from the report was the 'spark factor'. The document was a policy statement and he accepted that it needed to be brought alive and accompanied by prayer. Also, the context in which the Scottish Episcopal Church carried out its mission and ministry was crucial. Ecclesiastical balances in Scotland were changing and it meant that the way of 'being church' in the Scottish Episcopal Church could be attractive to people in Scotland. The current time was a critical moment for this. The treasures of the learning and

experience of past initiatives were embedded in the life of the Church as it moved forward. Capacity to sustain an initiative was dependent on many things, not least on prayer but, in policy terms, it also depended on ownership. There also had to be absolute rigour in carrying out the policy. Often, it was in the sustaining that the treasures were found. Finally, he wished to express his thanks to everyone who was part of such a policy, including communications and worship. Included in the marks of mission was worship which renewed and inspired. It had to be transformative. Such matters were very much in the thinking of the Board.

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

4.1.2 Ministry Development Committee

Professor Judith George (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) explained that the report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009 had been prepared a number of months previously and she wished to supplement it. TISEC, namely the body of educators dispersed throughout Scotland, was now a high quality team. The team saw the potential of education not only to produce the clergy which the Church needed but also to deepen and develop lay faith within the Church. It was a tool for mission and transformation. Ministerial students had spoken to the Bishop of Brechin at the TISEC Summer School in 2009 about the fact that their training was often apparently perceived as being of second rate quality. They had sought his defence because their experience had been that training was in fact first rate. This perception had surprised and saddened Professor George but she was encouraged that the development of a Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy would help to move the Church on. The comments which had been made to students about the apparent quality of training had resulted from the turmoil and personal agendas which had been present at the time the present TISEC had been established.

Another comment which Professor George had heard was that TISEC had designed a Ferrari when all that the Church needed was a Mini. The Church needed and deserved first class learning – the quality and power of a Ferrari. TISEC was well on the way to responding to this need in terms of both clergy and lay training. There were exciting programmes and events across all dioceses delivered by diocesan teams who were also looking to roll out, on a province-wide basis, things which worked well in a consistent and coherent way and which had been referred to in the debate earlier. This was in addition to material taken off the shelf from resources provided by York St John University. However, the niftiness of the Mini was also present in enabling delivery down the single track roads in rural areas both as a result of the use of appropriate technologies but also in a readiness to re-shape ministry in scattered rural areas or other non-traditional contexts. The other exciting development was ecumenical partnership. A meeting of Scottish Episcopal Church, United Reformed and Methodist educators had taken place two weeks earlier from which it had been evident that the potential arising from collaboration was much greater than the sum of the three contributors. There were some common educational values and denominationally neutral initiatives which could be supported and which created opportunities for ministry development which no single denomination could do on its own. The coming few years would be most interesting times and TISEC was ready to

respond to the suggestion that it became the generic trainer and the custodian of quality.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Mrs Sue White (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), speaking as a lay reader, reported on the weekend conference of lay readers which had taken place in May 2010. It had been the idea of Mr Brian Woodburn who had attended similar conferences in the Church of England. A Steering Committee including lay readers from every diocese had been established to organise the conference entitled 'Turning the Page'. The keynote speaker had been the Primus and the conference had celebrated and affirmed the ministry of lay readers. Approximately 60 people had attended it. The Rev Christina Baxter had acted as theological reflector. It was hoped that another conference might be organised in approximately two years' time.

The Primus expressed thanks to Professor George for the huge amount of work which she had undertaken while having served as Convener of the Ministry Development Committee.

4.1.3 Overseas Committee

The Rev Canon Duncan McCosh (Convener, Overseas Committee) explained that the Committee had overspent its budget in the year 2009. The reason for this was that having set its budget the Committee declined the allocation of funds which it had normally received from the General Fund in the past because of the strain on church finances. This had resulted in a deficit of approximately £11,000. Canon McCosh expressed thanks to the staff of the General Synod Office, particularly for their assistance in the administration of grants on behalf of the Committee. In 2009, 62 grants had been made by the Committee.

A major piece of work carried out in the previous year had been the Companion Links day which had been organised by Mrs Gill Young. It had been a valuable day both for those already involved in overseas links and for those who were contemplating them and he expressed thanks to Mrs Young who was standing down from the Committee. One particular such link was that between the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney and the Diocese of Mthatha in South Africa and he invited Ms Mary McKinnell to give a short presentation about a visit made in 2009.

Ms Mary McKinnell spoke of the links with the South African Church which dated back to 1874 when the Scottish bishops had consecrated the first bishop to serve in the Eastern Cape. In summer 2009, Ms McKinnell had led the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney and eight other young people on a pilgrimage to the Diocese of Mthatha. They had received a wonderful welcome. She expressed gratitude to all those who had supported them financially in raising the necessary £12,000 for the trip. The Provincial Youth Network had contributed £2,000. It represented an investment by the Church in the future. This was important because of the need to limit spending. In Africa, despite the economic recession, they had experienced church growth first hand. The Diocese of Mthatha had doubled in size in the previous 10 years and would split to form a new diocese in July 2010. The group had experienced congregations

which had grown from being mission churches to become parishes in their own right, committed to both worship and outreach.

A number of the group had addressed a girls school conference with an audience of 2,000. They had also attended a diocesan family day with 5,000 present. They had attended a number of services and the combination of ‘bells and smells’ with ‘dancing in the aisles’ had often made three hour worship services seem shorter than the one hour which group members were accustomed to in Scotland. The Aberdeen group had reciprocated by leading worship using Taize chants and Iona music. She paid tribute to the work of the Mothers’ Union which had a significant role in the Church and in outreach programmes including the running of HIV/AIDS clinics. Much of the land was under-cultivated but she had been impressed to see self-help schemes in operation. They had stayed in the diocesan compound in Umthatha where they had been surrounded by razor wire and protected by security guards. They had found that there was still a lack of education about many issues. They had been limited to the programme which had been arranged for them by their hosts and there had been a sense of being protected from the worst. The group now wanted to return and work with the communities they had visited. The trip had been a wonderful and life-changing experience and she hoped that the Scottish Episcopal Church could learn from a place where ‘growth’ was the key word.

In conclusion, Canon McCosh commended the lunchtime meeting which would take place during Synod comprising a conversation between the Rev Canon Professor John Ritchie and the Rev Robert Koluba from Uganda. He also sought Synod’s confirmation as to whether it would wish the Overseas Committee to consider support for the Society of the Sisters of St Margaret in Haiti. Synod confirmed that it would.

Questions were invited but there were none.

SESSION FIVE – The Rt Rev The Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney in the Chair

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board (Continued)

5.1.1 Rural Commission Report

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) introduced the report of the Rural Commission. He explained that it had become clear to Synod that an increasing number of issues relating to matters such as genetics, farming, environmental matters etc were being received from dioceses and which could be seen differently in different parts of the country. Consequently, there was a need to bring together as many of such issues as possible to enable the Church to address them on a regular basis rather than simply responding to motions at General Synod. He referred to the remit of the Commission, as set out in the report contained in the Synod Papers. A report of the first day conference (referred to the Commission’s report) which had been organised by ACTS was available on the ACTS website and the provincial website carried the reports of the remaining two day conferences. Hard copies of the reports of those latter two day conferences would be sent to dioceses. The Commission had not operated with a large membership but rather three people (the Rev Professor David Atkinson, Mr Martin Robb and Bishop Strange himself) had met

together in order to move matters forward strategically. They had met twice and all other meetings had been by way of telephone conference. The purpose was to enable, ecumenically, people across Scotland to come together to talk about issues which might affect rural communities in the following 20 years. The Commission had not attempted at any stage to claim that rural ministry was different from urban ministry. Rather it had highlighted issues which affected lay or ordained people ministering in rural areas. The report did not, therefore, contain a theology of rural ministry nor did it make a plea for funding for rural areas but rather it identified issues of which the Church needed to be aware if it were to minister in rural Scotland. All three day conferences had been wonderful days with a breadth of ideas being contributed.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) said it was his privilege to commend to Synod the findings of the Rural Commission. He gave a powerpoint presentation to Synod. He demonstrated a map of Scotland showing the areas designated by the Scottish Government as 'remote rural', 'accessible rural' and 'urban'. If the Government considered that rural issues merited specific treatment then it was appropriate for the Church to do the same. A map of small shops and supermarkets prepared by the Food Standards Agency indicated that there were parts of Scotland where it was not economic for a supermarket to operate. Consequently, the Church might also require to look at such areas differently. One's perspective on issues depended on where one was looking from and who one was. The point was that there were sufficient differences between urban and rural for the Church to plan specifically for rural in the light of those differences.

Professor Atkinson explained that the main change of population in the 10 years 1997 to 2007 had been in 'accessible rural' and to a lesser extent 'remote rural' areas. If people were moving into a rural area, that was a good opportunity to involve them in the life of the Church. Figures for projected household growth for the period to 2031 indicated that there was expected to be growth in some areas where the Scottish Episcopal Church already had a significant presence. There were also relevant demographic factors showing the areas where such household growth included children or where the households were headed by those aged over 60. The Commission had encountered optimism in relation to church growth in rural areas and also in relation to what the rural church and rural community could offer to the wider church in terms of church growth and evangelism. Rural areas could offer much to the wider world including quality food at a fair price, clean water supply, renewable energy supplies etc. There remained major challenges in terms of rural industries. The future funding of farming was currently in question. Food security was an increasingly important topic on the national agenda. The fact that significant quantities of carbon were stored in Scottish soils and bogs was an important issue. The management of creation was an important challenge. The statistics also showed that in Scotland, compared with the rest of the European Union, there was a significant proportion of 'high nature value' farmland. Nevertheless, the RSPB had highlighted the fact of farmland bird declines.

The Commission had identified the importance of working in partnership with other churches especially in communities where there was only one church. That required thought to be given to the basis of the Scottish Episcopal Church's eucharistic hospitality to others. Similarly, partnership with bodies such as the Royal Scottish Agricultural Benevolent Institution could assist in addressing poverty in rural

communities. Statistics for volunteering were higher in rural areas than elsewhere and the Church was good at organising volunteering. Similarly, there could be partnerships with commercial organisations, such as the Post Office.

Professor Atkinson highlighted the importance of tourism. Attendance at rural places of worship visitor attractions had grown at 11% annually from 2000 to 2009. Linked to that was the development of pilgrimage. The rural church could retain a traditional emphasis through new approaches to liturgy but also needed to think about where it held its services. Information technology was very important in terms of communicating within rural areas. Broadband was not available across the whole of Scotland and it was important to continue pressure on Government to achieve coverage everywhere. Quoting from Richard Wakeford, Director General, Rural Futures, Scottish Government, Professor Atkinson said that a key conclusion had been that there was a real need for proper joined up strategies for whole regions so that both urban and rural people could benefit from what the other provided.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod accept the report of the Rural Commission and commend it to its boards and committees and to Diocesan Mission Committees for further study.”

The Rev Lisa Eunson (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Commission for its work. The Commission had provided a profile ecumenically and in civic circles but through its training and communication was also providing the riches of God referred to in the Primus in his opening charge. She had attended all three conferences and found them most useful for her ministry. The work of the Commission covered all aspects of mission and ministry. She had learned when she had arrived in her two charges how to serve the Church of the present but the Commission had taught her how to serve the Church of the future.

Dr Ian Findlay (Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke from his background in rural education. The report was not just aspirational. He outlined what he saw as the strengths of the report, namely: a tight-knit programme of conferences which built a credible context for the work; the recommendation of changes in Scottish Episcopal Church strategy and practice; the emphasis on partnership ecumenically and with other organisations; the spiritual leadership potential of the Church providing input to community values. The one omission was the rural school.

The Rev Robert Warren (Edinburgh) spoke of the influence of ‘incomers’ into rural communities. There was a sense that others could feel ‘pushed out’ as a result. He asked whether preparing a small rural congregation for ministry and growth operated at cross purposes with guaranteeing the integrity of the congregation.

Mrs Mary Moffett (Edinburgh) had noted the statistics relating to the number of households due to be headed by people over 60. She hoped that mission with, by and to older people would be given strong support from the Scottish Episcopal Church and its ecumenical partners and that any training offered might be done together. She declared her interest as part of Faith in Older People.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed the report and thought that some of the motions required to be bolder. There were three issues he considered needed to be addressed. Firstly, how could rural charges, working with community organisations, actively promote sustainable living in a drive to a low carbon economy? To that end, he commended the work of Eco-congregations Scotland. Secondly, how could rural charges help those who yearned to discover God in creation? Thirdly, would rural congregations still be there to meet the needs of rural populations in the future? The question, therefore, was how to plan strategically, on a province-wide basis. Also, dioceses needed to ask which of the opportunities for growth outlined in the report were relevant and how they could help energise local congregations.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) asked whether there were any significant cost implications which would arise from the motions being put to Synod.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that three of the motions to be passed appeared to rely heavily on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee. Also, he noted that the first motion commended the report for further study. He considered the report was not sufficiently full for there to be further study. The Common Agricultural Policy and the prospect of change was an immense factor for the future. There was a need for fuller information regarding that. The seaboard of Scotland was governed by the Common Fisheries Policy but there was no mention of that in the report.

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to commend the ecumenical approach taken in the report but considered there were cost implications and the Synod therefore needed to be careful. She was not entirely convinced about the argument that rural areas were able to provide food security since some dioceses would have minimal opportunity to contribute. On the question of education, her experience in the north of the Island of Lewis was that the number of schools had reduced but there were still the same number of churches. Choices would, therefore, have to be made and the report did not really help the Church make the radical choices which were necessary.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the issues of care for children (both pre- and after school), for the disabled, for long term sick and for the elderly needed to be taken into account. It would be interesting to see a map indicating where such care was provided.

The Rev Donald McEwan (Church of Scotland) wished to commend all Episcopalian churches which were open to the public particularly in rural Scotland. In many cases, it was only the Episcopal Church which could be found open. He asked any churches which felt obliged to remain locked to reconsider their decision since it could give the impression that God was closed. He hoped his own denomination could be as open as the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Rev Tim Daplyn (Moray, Ross and Caithness) referred to Emmanuel Kant's critique of reason, namely, 'what can I know?', 'what ought I to do?', and 'what may I hope?'. The report addressed the first of those. The second question was addressed in the resolutions before Synod. However, the question of what might be hoped for was

in the hearts and prayers of the Church and in the partnerships to be forged ecumenically and between lay and ordained. He commended the report.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness indicated in response that the remit for the Commission had been intended to lay a platform to enable the Church to discuss the issues. There had been a limited amount of time for the Commission to do its work and he recognised that there was a gap in relation to the question of fisheries policy. Ideally, there would have been more about many other subjects. However, the report was to enable the debate within the Church which now needed to happen and which would include matters such as fisheries, education, care etc. He hoped there was not a financial implication to the recommendations and would ask the Scottish Episcopal Church members on the Scottish Rural Churches Committee to keep that in mind.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 3 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod ask the Liturgy Committee to investigate the feasibility of pulling together into one place liturgies, especially those related to the word, focused on natural and rural seasons as a means of providing a resource for rural congregations.”

The Rev Canon Roy Ferguson Flatt (Argyll and The Isles) asked that when the Liturgy Committee undertook work as requested in the motion they take account of work being done by the Church of Sweden which was developing liturgies for use in very small congregations.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, mindful of the significant changes with a major impact on rural societies which are likely to occur in the foreseeable future, request its representatives on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to keep it informed of those developments likely to need action by the Scottish Episcopal Church.”

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) noted that one future challenge would arise as a result of the proposed cuts in public expenditure. He wished to emphasise the importance of schools to local communities and also that of the need for affordable housing. The proposed cuts needed to be challenged in order to maintain existing services rather than spending money on, for example, Trident. It might be necessary to argue for increased taxation.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 6 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, conscious of the need to continue working with other denominations, request the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to consider the value of running an annual conference dealing with emerging rural issues.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 5 against, 12 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, conscious of the developing interest in rural pilgrimage, request its members on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to encourage that Committee to make the development of rural pilgrimage one of its priorities for action.”

The Rev Dan Gafvert (Glasgow and Galloway) considered the report was a very good foundation to address issues of pilgrimage and tourism, on which he had been working for 20 years. The question was an important one not only for churches in rural areas but also for those in towns and cities. Pilgrims and pilgrimage were not only about walking a path which someone else had laid. A pilgrim was someone searching for holiness and churches were holy places and were, in themselves, missionaries. A tourist or visitor treated as a pilgrim would become a pilgrim. He then proposed that the motion be amended to read as follows:-

“That this Synod, conscious of the developing interest in rural pilgrimage, request its members on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to encourage that Committee to make the development of rural pilgrimage, as one part of a broader involvement with tourism, one of its priorities for action.”

Dr Jamie Hill (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded the amendment.

The Very Rev David Mumford (Breachin) one of his charges St Drostan’s, Tarfside, had been enthused by the idea of taking up pilgrimage and had now been doing so for several years. The pilgrimage had been ecumenical and had involved the local school. As a result, additional tourists had been attracted.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) was concerned that the motion would involve additional work for the Scottish Churches Rural Committee. He considered the process for what happened to the report was unruly. He was unclear whether the Scottish Churches Rural Committee would report to dioceses and asked for clarity.

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke against the proposed amendment. He considered that the proposed alteration changed the tone of the motion to suggest that rural pilgrimage was only part of the tourism industry. He did not agree that it was necessarily so.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness indicated that the issues of pilgrimage and tourism were separate ones. It was for the Synod to decide on the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment was then put to the vote but not passed.

The original motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 11 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor David Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod commend to rural charges the importance of identifying and documenting organisations active in their respective areas with whom they should be meeting on a regular basis.”

The Rev Robert Warren (Edinburgh) considered that the word ‘commend’ in the motion was tepid. In some rural situations, organisations such as boys’ or girls’ clubs were essential to ministry. He did not think all people were trained to be able to speak outwith their congregation and he, therefore, hoped this could be strengthened.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, 2 against, 10 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor David Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod request the Ministry Development Committee to consider the ways in which training for those intending to work in rural areas might be most effectively provided.”

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) wished to advocate that, for those who saw their long term ministry in rural areas, TISEC should specifically seek opportunities for placements in rural areas. Also, for those who were training incumbents in rural areas it would be helpful if such incumbents could meet together with one another on a provincial basis. The challenge of those moving to rural areas also needed to be addressed. In his own case, he had expected certain challenges when moving from the Netherlands to Scotland but, in fact, the greatest challenge had been the move into a rural area. Support for those moving into rural areas was, therefore, important.

Dr Peter Smart explained he was the incoming Convener for the Ministry Development Committee. He thanked Dean Mumford for his comments since they would help set an agenda for the Ministry Development Committee. The Committee would welcome the opportunity to continue to participate in the debate.

Professor Judith George (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) wished to point out that the assumptions made in the debate hitherto had been that training in rural areas was for incumbents. There was also training for lay people.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness responded that wording of the motion deliberately talked of the Ministry Development Committee so that both ordained and lay training could be taken into account.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed, 1 against, 7 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, recognising the importance of Broadband as a vital means of communication in rural areas, request the Mission and Ministry Board to urge upon Scottish Government the importance of having high speed Broadband links available to all areas of Scotland in the near future.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, recognising the role which electronic communication could have in the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church, request the Information and Communication Board to identify ways in which congregations might best be helped to use technologies such as Broadband in their mission works.”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway and Convener, Information and Communication Board) expressed his surprise that the first he had heard about this proposed motion was when it had been included in the draft agenda for Synod considered by the Standing Committee. He cautioned that passing the motion might involve financial implications but there had been no discussion of funding for this. If the budget were not modified there would be nothing which the Information and Communication Board could do. There had not yet been any discussion about how funding might be provided. He noted that even meetings cost money. He welcomed comments which had been made earlier regarding the need for communications, but considered that they were not just a rural issue but affected everyone.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness recognised that there would need to be an initial debate on whether or not resources could be found if there was a funding requirement.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed, 11 against, 37 abstentions.

5.1.2 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

The Rev Donald Reid (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) explained that the ethnic minority population in Scotland accounted for 2%-3% of the total population. Whilst that ‘other faith’ population was concentrated in the cities, there were people of other faiths throughout rural Scotland and they could be quite isolated and the Church needed to be aware of this. Many came from former Commonwealth countries and, more recently, people had come from post-conflict countries as refugees and asylum seekers. The latter were often economically inactive unlike the former group who were economically active. Also, there were students from all over the world. The largest other faith community in Scotland was the Muslim one (approximately 50,000-60,000 people). There were more Muslims than Episcopalians in Scotland. In addition there were Hindus, Sikhs, a strong Chinese community and a long standing Jewish community. Buddhists in Scotland tended to be converts but the largest Tibetan monastery in Europe was situated in Eskdalemuir.

There were also small numbers of Unitarians, Brahma Kumaris and Bahais. There was also a Pagan Federation.

Ms Michelle Brown spoke about the inter-faith 'architecture' in Scotland. Within civil society there were local inter-faith associations, of which there were 14. The development of such local associations had been encouraged by workers seconded to the Scottish Government from the Scottish Inter-Faith Council. The most active was the Edinburgh Association. The Scottish Inter-Faith Council had been established in the year 2000 to provide a means of engagement at national level. The Scottish Government Equality Unit promoted inclusion and funded many social cohesion projects. There was a Faith Liaison Advisory Group which Government used to consult on policy issues affecting faith groups. The newly established Equality and Human Rights Commission was active in tackling discrimination on the grounds of belief and in bringing together opposed communities. A further part of the 'architecture' was the faith communities themselves. The major Christian denominations engaged in inter-faith work and liaised through the Churches' Action for Inter-Faith Relations in Scotland a sub-group of ACTS. The Jewish and Muslim communities also had lobbying or representative organisations.

The Rev John Conway spoke about the work of the Scottish Episcopal Church which was arguably the most active denomination engaged in inter-faith issues. The Church had a dedicated committee which included representatives of the Methodist and United Reformed Churches. A Grosvenor Essay 'The Inter-Faith Encounter' had been produced a couple of years previously and articles had appeared in *inspires* on the subject. It was hoped that those articles would appear as a general resource in due course. The motion shortly to be proposed to the Synod was an encouragement by the Committee for the Church to take the next step in inter-faith engagement. A short DVD would be shown to Synod describing the work of the Festival of Spirituality and Peace. The Festival included an international peace programme for volunteers and had recently achieved a 'Investing in Volunteers' award. Young people were encouraged to participate in that.

The Rev Donald Reid then spoke about the 2010 Festival of Spirituality and Peace, the theme of which was 'Can we live by the Golden Rule?'. He then outlined some of the content and speakers at the Festival.

The Rev Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that the Scottish Episcopal Church had a good inter-faith track record. He suggested it would be helpful to have some written material providing the evidence for that. He agreed that inter-faith issues were as much a rural as an urban phenomenon. He then proposed the following motion:-

"That this Synod ask dioceses to map their engagement, and that of their congregations, with local Inter-Faith Associations, to encourage greater engagement where applicable and to send the findings of that mapping exercise to the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths by the end of December 2010."

The Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded the motion.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) commended the inter-faith work which was being carried out but also wanted to ask about the place of mission in the context of inter-faith relations. In some countries, it was illegal to convert to become a Christian but in Scotland there was a mission opportunity on our doorstep to be able to present Jesus as Saviour of the world.

Mrs Sari Salvensen (Edinburgh) explained that in East Lothian citizenship tests were taken every six weeks by approximately six people at a time. This was a matter to monitor in other areas.

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Breachin) explained that she was the Church's representative on what had previously been called the Scottish Churches Community Trust. It was now known as the Faith in Community Scotland Action Fund. It was the grant making arm of Faith in Community Scotland. It provided a means for tackling poverty at a practical level throughout Scotland. The main criterion for funding was acting in conjunction with partners from other faiths. Projects receiving support included matters such as rural transport in Caithness, youth clubs in Motherwell and work with older people in Dundee.

The Rev Donald Reid responded to comments made by noting that the Festival of Spirituality and Peace was itself a mission opportunity since approximately 20,000 people came to events. At least 40% of those people had no religious affiliation. As for mission between faiths, that was a hot topic. The Edinburgh 2010 Mission Conference had offended some people from other faiths. Some other faiths were not proselytising. It depended on one's view of mission but problems could arise where particular groups were targeted for mission. In Norway, certain immigrant groups had been targeted in order to receive certain social benefits and he questioned whether that was in fact mission. The Church of Norway, and the Muslim Council of Norway had agreed that people could convert in either direction.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, eight abstentions.

5.2 Pension Fund Matters

5.2.1 Pension Fund Report

Mr Simon Mackintosh (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) referred to the written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. He reminded Synod that the previous year the outline of the proposed recovery plan in relation to the Pension Fund had been approved. That had been worked on carefully with the Standing Committee and had involved a number of elements. It included an assumption of investment return at 5.5% annually, a duration of 15 years, a lump sum contribution from the Church of £2m and an annual employer's contribution of 34.9% of standard stipend or pensionable salary. The Pensions Regulator had approved the plan as submitted and the necessary actions had now been taken to implement that plan.

The trustees recognised the need for the Church to reduce its exposure to the volatility of investment markets. Consequently, the trustees had revised their investment strategy and had decided to change management to Schroder Investment

Management. The aim was a strategy which reduced volatility in investment performance and the risk of major changes to contribution rates whilst still meeting the assumptions in the recovery plan about the rate of capital growth. One consequence of the change to investment strategy was that it would remove direct investment in companies by the Trustees and replace it with investment through pooled funds over wider asset classes. As a result, it would not be possible to continue to implement the same ethical investment policy as before. The Trustees had considered this carefully and concluded that the risk of significant investment in companies which had previously been excluded was small. Since the change of investment policy was very important, the Trustees had decided to proceed accordingly.

Mr Mackintosh was pleased to report that, since General Synod 2009, there had been a welcome recovery in investment values and the capital sum injection from the Church had also helped. The next triennial valuation was due at the end of 2011 and, at that time, it would be appropriate to review the ongoing contribution rates.

He expressed thanks to the Trustees, including Professor Patricia Peattie and Mr John Davies who were stepping down as trustees. The Rev Canon David Bayne had also indicated his intention to retire at the year end. It would, therefore, become necessary to appoint two new member-nominated trustees who could be either contributing or pensioner members of the Scheme. He invited Synod members to consider this and, if interested, to discuss the matter with Dr Daphne Audsley. He also thanked Dr Audsley for her work as administrator to the Scheme.

5.2.2 Standing Committee Report

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) reported that when the pensions recovery plan had been presented to Synod in 2009, Standing Committee had been very conscious of the challenge posed by the large increase in the level of contribution. Standing Committee had, therefore, agreed that it would consider the benefits structure of the fund, as was set out in the report contained within the Synod Papers. The two key factors which Standing Committee had considered were the impact of risk being shifted to a greater or lesser degree from the Church to the members and also the question of affordability of the benefits provided under the current Scheme. Any changes to the Scheme, its funding arrangements or the management of any 'knock-on' effects needed detailed and careful consideration and extensive consultation with both employer representatives across the whole Church and with members. The Standing Committee, therefore, recommended that it commenced more detailed work at the present time on the three points identified in the report contained in the Synod Papers in preparation for the next triennial valuation.

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

“That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee regarding the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund.”

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) considered that a move to more pooled investments was prudent but wondered why that required a watering down of the ethical investment policy.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked what the selection criteria had been for deciding to move to Schroder Investment Management.

Mr Mackintosh responded that joint work had been carried out between the Investment Committee and Pension Fund Trustees. A wide range of managers had been invited to submit a proposal and there had then been detailed interviews with shortlisted firms. The review process had been carefully handled. In relation to ethical investment, future investment would be divided between a growth fund and fixed interest investment. The growth fund allowed for shifting between different asset classes and there was not a fund available with a specific ethical overlay which met those requirements. However, there was an appropriate system of positive engagement on the part of the managers with the companies in which they invested. Mr Mackintosh assured Synod that the matter had been carefully considered.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, six abstentions.

The Chair closed the session by thanking everyone who had contributed.

SESSION SIX – The Rt Rev The Bishop of Edinburgh in the Chair

6.1 Administration Board

6.1.1 Introduction

Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) reported that General Synod 2009 had invited the Administration Board to consider the report *Banking on Bloodshed*. The Board had collected as much information as possible but he explained that the decision of which banks were used by the General Synod was a decision for the Standing Committee. At present, accounts were held with the Bank of Scotland, Scottish Widows Bank and Standard Life Bank. A member of the Board, the Rev Ian Pallett, had recently represented the Board at a conference ‘Banking on Justice’ and his report would be considered at the forthcoming meeting of the Board in September at which time the Board could consider whether it wished to make recommendations to the Standing Committee.

Mr Stewart said that the previous couple of years had been challenging for most businesses and the financial climate had posed particular problems for the Administration Board and its committees but it was fortunate to have been served by so many able and experienced people during that difficult time. He wished to highlight the contributions made by the Committee Conveners whose untiring work and commitment deserved to be recognised.

Mr Stewart reported that Mr Graeme Thom and the Investment Committee had faced up to huge challenges and this had involved reviewing the asset structures and investment strategies of the General Synod as well as reviewing the investment

managers themselves. It was pleasing to know that the benefits of having highly experienced practitioners involved on the Committee were already flowing through in terms of investment performance indicators. In relation to the Personnel Committee, whilst clergy were not employees in the normal sense of the word, the same complex employment issues which arose in the secular world had to be dealt with. Mr Graeme Hely had ably led the Committee as it faced the task of developing numerous personnel policies in response to ever-increasing statutory requirements. In his former capacity as Dean of the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway, Bishop Gregor Duncan had brought his years of managing property affairs to the convenership of the Buildings Advisory Committee. His practical and common sense approach had been of immense value in supporting charges throughout the province. Mr Graeme Stirling, the Convener of the Retirement Welfare Committee, was the only one of the Board's five committee conveners who would remain in post after the current Synod. His caring manner was very valuable in looking after the housing and wellbeing of retired clergy and their spouses and widows. One advantage of being a relatively small church was that everyone knew each other and this enabled Mr Stirling and his Committee, ably supported by Dr Daphne Audsley, to meet any needs in an individually tailored and friendly manner.

Mr Stewart said that the Finance Committee had very much benefited from the business background and professional approach brought by the Rev Canon David Bayne. The Finance Committee had had to bear the brunt of expenditure reductions made to the provincial budget by accepting a two year moratorium on property grants. The Committee had agreed to this, albeit reluctantly, since it felt it was essential to protect ministry support grants. The budget for such ministry support grants had been put under close scrutiny by both the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee and there was a strong view in high places in the Church that stipend augmentation was not a good idea in principle and that the process produced unfair and inequitable results. A review into this was underway and he considered there was some risk that in the current climate, the baby might be thrown out with the bath water. He urged all Synod members to continue to consider this carefully in the following year or two to ensure that any policy changes which came forward were in the overall interests of the Church. He cautioned against reducing or eliminating provincial support for parish posts in order to expand the infrastructure at diocesan or provincial level.

Mr Stewart closed by warmly thanking all five Committee Conveners, the members of the Board and the Committees and all of the General Synod office staff for their support during his term as Convener.

6.1.2 Investment Committee

Mr Jeremy Burchill (Convener, Investment Committee) explained that, in the light of the recent decline in value of BP shares, the 'good news' was that the provincial church investments had no exposure to BP. As to the Pension Fund, that would be managed using the two investment vehicles which had been mentioned earlier. The diversified growth fund would hold a range of non-correlated asset types (ie assets which hopefully would not all react in the same way to any given set of economic circumstances). It would include commodities, private equity, emerging market debt as well as equities. That would result, in the opinion of the manager, in a volatility of approximately two-thirds that of a pure equity fund. The strategy had very much

focused on reducing volatility. At the present time, 5% of the overall fund was invested in property through two collective investment schemes.

The Investment Committee had decided to retain the current fund managers for the Unit Trust Pool. That decision had been influenced in part by the fact that the asset allocation strategy had only recently been altered and it was thought at the time of the fund manager review that that policy had not had sufficient time to be evaluated. In the 12 months to 31st May 2010, the portfolio value had increased by 6.4% against the benchmark for the same period of 4.45%. Consequently, to date, it seemed that the restructured portfolio was performing as had been hoped but it was still too early to make any proper evaluation. The portfolio comprised approximately 31% in a long term global growth fund (a collective investment vehicle), 10% in UK equities, 20% in global equities and 35% in fixed interest. This brought greater diversity to the portfolio and significantly expanded exposure to global equities. This was designed to improve investment performance and to mitigate volatility. The portfolio itself was managed on a total return basis and the distribution to unit holders therefore comprised income from the portfolio, potentially supplemented with a payment out of capital. Distribution from capital had to be exercised with considerable prudence to avoid eroding the capital base of the portfolio. The Committee nevertheless remained aware of the need to maintain the real value of the distribution since any reduction affected the Church's ability to discharge its mission and ministry. It was necessary to be realistic and he would not wish to hold out unrealistic hopes of an immediate increase in the distribution. Mr Burchill concluded by thanking Dr Daphne Audsley the secretary to the Committee.

Comments were invited but there were none. The Chair thanked Mr Burchill.

6.1.3 Finance Committee

The Rev Canon David Bayne (Convener, Finance Committee) referred to the Committee report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009 and also to the future budgets for the Committee.

In relation to matters concerning stipend, he reminded Synod that a number of years previously, the Synod had agreed to tie standard stipend in the Scottish Episcopal Church to the Church of England benchmark stipend. It was understood that for 2011 the Church of England had agreed an increase in its stipend of 1.5%.

The function of the Finance Committee was to allocate very limited financial resources to support ministry and buildings as fairly as it could in the light of applications made to it. Often, the Committee dealt with the Church when it was hurting, exhausted or defeated (however temporarily) and emotions could run high. The Committee always tried to listen but one's perspective depended on where you were standing. He wished to dispel two myths. The first was that there was a disjunct between mission and finance. The Committee comprised one member from each diocese part of whose remit was to represent the mission and ministry of the dioceses to the Committee. The Convener of the Home Mission Committee was also an *ex officio* member and there had also been created the 'Gang of Three' appointed by the Mission and Ministry Board who had first sight of the papers regarding Grants for

Ministry and who had an annual pre-meeting with the Convener of the Finance Committee. The work of the Committee was, therefore, directly linked to mission and ministry. Secondly, there appeared to be a notion that the Grants for Ministry system was full of injustices and designed to reward failure. Canon Bayne explained that there were four elements to Grants for Ministry (the term 'augmentation' had been officially dropped some 15 years previously). The Fund supported curacies (as determined by the College of Bishops), new types of ministries (over the years many kinds of sector and experimental ministries had been supported), the provision of transitional relief (where congregations ran into temporary financial difficulties) and the provision of long term support where dioceses indicated that this was necessary. In relation to the last category, the Committee worked with dioceses to establish that such requests for funding were reasonable. Approximately 5% of charges were supported in this way and whilst it was difficult to obtain comparable figures from other denominations, Canon Bayne thought that the equivalent level of support in the Church of England and Church of Scotland was approximately four or five times the level in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Of that 5% only two or three grants were given 'through gritted teeth'. In summary, whilst the system was not perfect, he was of the view that it was certainly not so broken that it needed fixing.

Canon Bayne expressed his thanks to the Committee members and to Mr Malcolm Bett as secretary to the Committee.

Comments were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Canon Bayne for his services as Convener of the Finance Committee.

6.1.4 Buildings Advisory Committee

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Convener, Buildings Advisory Committee) referred to the report of the Committee contained in the Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. As retiring Convener of the Committee, he had nothing to add to the report except to indicate how much he had enjoyed working with the Committee and its members. Questions were invited on the report but there were none.

Bishop Duncan turned to the revision of Canon 35. He referred to the draft list of minor works contained in the Synod Papers. That list had been provided to Synod members for information. As to the second reading of the changes concerning Canon 35, the comments made by dioceses following the first reading the previous year had been reproduced in the Synod Papers. Canon 35 itself was the law which determined how the Church controlled alterations to the interiors and exteriors of buildings in ecclesiastical use. The Canon in its current form had been in use for nearly a decade and had operated fairly effectively. It was designed, by ensuring a credible process of consultation and decision-making, to preserve exemption from listed building consent and also to encourage creative approaches to the use of all buildings, based on proper consent and consultation so as to avoid arbitrary and potentially damaging changes. Experience during the previous decade had suggested that the Canon needed some minor tweaking in order to improve aspects of its operation and to render it more 'user friendly'. The proposals before Synod were the result of a careful process of

consultation with Diocesan Building Committees, Historic Scotland and the Committee on Canons conducted by the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee.

Bishop Duncan wished to draw attention to two particular changes. The new Canon gave power to the provincial Committee to issue a list of minor works which did not require canonical consent. The Committee had prepared a draft list and would be happy to receive comments. It was hoped this would be a helpful measure for vestries and property conveners across the Province. Secondly, the resolutions had now drawn a clear distinction between listed and unlisted buildings.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Rev James Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) then proceed to comment on the changes, an explanation for which had been given in the Synod Papers. In particular, he wished to comment on the points made by Diocesan Synods. Following a comment made at General Synod 2009 and also by the Diocese of Brechin, the reference to the Voluntary Scheme to Apply Listed Building Control to the Exterior of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use had been included in the body of Resolution 3. This clarified the point at which vestries required to comply with the Voluntary Scheme. Following a comment by the Diocese of Edinburgh, wording had been included in the proposed Resolution 8 to make clear that an application for an extension of consent had to be made before the original period of the consent expired. Also, mindful of the fact that Diocesan Buildings Committees could be convened by persons other than the Diocesan Dean, reference had now been made in Resolution 6 to the conveners of the Committees rather than specifically to Deans. He appreciated that some might feel it was unnecessary to seek the consent of the Bishop when a church was used for a concert or some other non-religious event but he stressed that this was not an issue which the Committee had been asked to address when the proposed changes were being drafted. If the College of Bishops considered there was a need for change he was sure the Committee on Canons would be happy to look at the matter.

Questions were invited on any of the motions to be proposed to Synod.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) asked whether the Committee had an advisory role in relation to construction of new church buildings.

Bishop Duncan responded that if a congregation were planning a new building, it ought to be in detailed conversation with its diocese. If the diocesan Committee wished to approach the provincial Committee it was welcome to do so.

The Bishop of Glasgow then proposed, and Rev James Milne seconded, the following motion:-

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

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

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway then proposed, and Mr Milne seconded, the following motion:-

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

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

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway then proposed, and Mr Milne seconded, the following motion:-

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

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

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway proposed, and Mr Milne seconded, the following motion:-

“That the text for Resolutions 1 to 10 under Canon 35 be adopted in substitution for all existing Resolutions under that Canon.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway proposed, and Mr Milne seconded, the following motion:-

“That the text for Appendix 30 to the Code of Canons be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway proposed, and Mr Milne seconded, the following motion:-

“That sections 2.3.3(d) and 2.3.7 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words “Buildings Advisory Committee” wherever they occur and by the substitution thereof of the words “Buildings Committee”.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

6.1.5 Personnel Committee

Mr Graeme Hely (Convener, Personnel Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. A major preoccupation of the Board in previous years had been the development of a grievance procedure and that had now been completed. The Committee had also been working on a handbook for clergy vacancies. A number of drafts had been considered and it was hoped that the final version would be available shortly. One diocese had approached the Committee for guidance regarding part-time clergy appointments. The Committee had worked on guidance and this would also be made available to dioceses. The question of a capability procedure for clergy had been the subject of consideration within the Church of England and the Committee was currently discussing that topic.

Mr Hely expressed thanks to the Rev Canon Robin Paisley who had completed his term of office on the Committee. It had been pleased to welcome the Very Rev David Mumford and Mrs Jan Whiteside as new members. He also expressed thanks to the other continuing members of the Committee and to John Stuart as its Secretary. Mr Nick Bowry had been appointed by the Administration Board as the new Convener of the Committee with effect from General Synod.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) noted the introduction of the new Equality Act. He asked whether the Committee would provide guidance on the implications of the Act.

Mr Hely responded that whilst clergy were not generally employees under employment legislation there were a numbers of cases where such legislation also affected office holders. The provisions of the Act would be carefully considered by the Committee and it would be happy to provide guidance.

The Chair thanked Mr Hely as the retiring Convener of the Committee.

SESSION SEVEN – The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden in the Chair

7.1 College of Bishops

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that the College of Bishops had agreed it would be helpful to outline to Synod a typical agenda for one of its meetings. An overnight meeting began at 10.30am on the first day and ended with lunch on the next. It was punctuated by daily prayer and the Eucharist and split into perhaps seven sessions varying in length from one to two hours. Spread over those sessions were a business agenda of approximately 20 items as well as a host of other topics. At the meeting of the College in April 2010, items such as the following had been covered: Nomination of a member for ARCIC III, a paper on End of Life Issues, TISEC student funding, the TISEC library, vacancies, appointments, developments across the dioceses, minutes of all the provincial Boards, discussion of items for a joint meeting with the Standing Committee, arrangements concerning the meeting of General Synod, arrangements for the consecration of himself as the new Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, Canon 13, items concerning the Edinburgh 2010 Conference, papers concerning the Church Army, Church of England CME for Bishops, the CTBI Sanctuary Pledge, the Panton Stirling Trust, a report on the Porvoo Church Leaders Consultation, a letter from the WCC regarding attacks on Christians in Iraq and the proposed Celtic Bishops Meeting in Pitlochry in 2011. In addition, other current topics and areas of interest and concern which had been discussed included the following: episcopal elections, issues of human sexuality, the Anglican Communion moratoria, developments in The Episcopal Church (USA), a paper on same sex relationships from the Church of Finland, ‘Traditionalist’ issues, a forthcoming meeting with the Roman Catholic Bishops in Scotland as well as the visit to the UK of His Holiness the Pope. There had also been a discussion regarding the Service of the Word, media training matters and a session with the Provincial Director of Ordinands.

Bishop Duncan considered he was privileged to have joined a group of people who struggled hard faithfully to deal with the matters that the Church put before them. There was laughter

as well as straight talking, real debate and a willingness to listen to one another, all most skillfully convened.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus and Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that the current session was intended to ‘lift the veil’ on what bishops did. Listening to the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, there had been a significant number of items on the agenda and it was important also to ensure within meetings of the College that there was appropriate time to talk about what mattered, whether it was on the agenda or not.

The bishops tried to create two kinds of spaces. One was positive and the other more protective. In relation to the latter, he believed in the importance of boundary setting, by which he meant the creating of a ‘safe space’ within which it was possible to deal with difficult issues. Part of that might involve creating space for people who did not necessarily share the majority view to express what they wished to say. The best creativity happened within boundaries. There were also other kinds of spaces which it was the task of the bishop to create. Such spaces were created by encouragement, recognition, clear communication and a sense of direction. The purpose of creating such spaces was to bring the best out of clergy and laity. As a result, if the bishop appeared at some times to be somewhat controlling, at others he/she was to be as encouraging and enlivening as possible.

The Primus then spoke of his participation, during the previous two years, in the training programme for bishops in The Episcopal Church (USA). It was known as the ‘Living our Vows’ programme. He had just returned from a week-long session in the USA that had included excellent media training, consideration of theories of leadership and management applicable to bodies such as the Church where one aspired to energise the organisation at the margins rather than control from the centre. The session had included approximately 20 American bishops, five Canadians, one Irish and himself. That gave him an insight into what was happening within the Episcopal Church (USA). Between the residential sessions, there was a reading list, 360° appraisal and a coaching relationship. He commended the programme.

Questions were invited but there were none.

7.2 Faith and Order Board

7.2.1 Introduction

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) presented the report of the Faith and Order Board. He emphasized, as a point of process, that all matters for Synod came in the name of the Board itself. For example, the Committee on Canons did not originate proposals. That Committee was responsible for how things were expressed but the Board was responsible for the policy itself.

Bishop Smith explained that he was acting as the temporary Chair of the Board, instead of the Primus because the latter was the Convener of the Mission and Ministry Board. He referred to the written report of the Board in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. Responses to the Ridley Cambridge text of the Anglican Covenant had been submitted. Since the year end, it had been agreed that the conversations between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England, which had previously operated on a bipartite basis, would

be expanded to include the Scottish Episcopal Church and become tripartite talks. This had been agreed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland the previous month and the first meeting would take place in the Autumn.

Comments were invited but there were none.

7.2.2 Doctrine Committee

In the absence of the Convener of the Doctrine Committee, Bishop Smith presented the Committee's report. Since the completion of the report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009, there had been two developments. Having completed a Grosvenor Essay on the subject of death and resurrection, the Committee was now working on a further essay on the subject of incarnation. Also, the paper produced by the Committee on End of Life issues had been appended to a longer paper prepared by the College of Bishops which had been submitted to the Scottish Parliament Committee currently considering such issues. Reference had been made in that document to relevant discussions and statements on the subject made within the Anglican Communion.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Tim Daplyn (Moray, Ross and Caithness) noted the reference in the Annual Report to the relationship between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Open Episcopal Church. He sought clarification of that.

Bishop Smith explained that there were groups which described themselves as Anglican but were not in fact in formal communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church or the other churches of the Anglican Communion. The Open Episcopal Church was one such group. It had a bishop in Livingston and a small number of clergy in Scotland. It also had a presence in England. At times, it was necessary to explain, particularly to those outside the Scottish Episcopal Church, that that body was in fact distinct from the Scottish Episcopal Church. The recent past had seen other groupings with names which could confuse, such as the International Anglican Communion, and at the current time a number of other groups existed with names that might be seen as suggesting a close connection with the Scottish Episcopal Church. Where people were not aware of the history of such other bodies, there could be a risk of confusion that they were linked with the Scottish Episcopal Church. A particular issue was that of apostolic succession. Many of such groupings operated with a concept of apostolic succession which put great weight upon the tactile aspect of succession and less emphasis on the continuing community. There was, therefore, an interesting contrast between the concept of apostolic succession as it applied in such other churches, on the one hand, and, the other, on the discussion of it as relating to the entry of Denmark to the Porvoo Communion.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Bishop of Edinburgh and, in his absence, to Professor David Jasper, the Convener of the Committee and its members.

7.2.3 Committee on Canons

7.2.3.1 Canon for First Reading – Canon Sixty Two

The Very Rev Jeremy Auld (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that a need to change the canonical legislation of the Church tended to arise out of policy change or other developments within the Church. The Faith and Order Board considered how any such change should be effected and the Committee on Canons drafted proposed alterations. These were then presented to the Faith and Order Board which decided whether to bring such alterations before Synod.

Changes already effected to Canon 36 made possible non-stipendiary rectors and non-stipendiary clergy holding other offices within the Church. That had resulted in an anomaly in the retirement provisions in the Canons. Canon 62 addressed in the position in relation to clergy but the Faith and Order Board would be considering lay provision also in due course. The changes to Canon 36 had created an anomaly, namely that under the current Canons a stipendiary office holder was obliged to retire at the age 70 whereas a holder of such an office who happened to be non-stipendiary could continue for as long as he or she wished. The alterations to Canon 62 now being brought before Synod sought to put a non-stipendiary office holder on the same footing as the stipendiary equivalent, namely that they should retire at age 70. In 2009, it had been proposed that all non-stipendiaries, whatever position they held, should retire at 70. However, the motion had fallen and the proposal to the current Synod was to deal only with office holders. Non-stipendiary assistants would continue to be a matter of agreement between cleric, bishop and, where appropriate, incumbent.

In considering Canon 62, the Committee on Canons had noted that the preamble was incorrect. The Canon stated, that for pension purposes, the retirement age was 65. Pension rights were dealt with elsewhere and related to years of service. The Canon had nothing to do with pension rights and did not, and could not, affect such rights. In 2009, the proposal to remove any reference to pension rights had proved controversial and, consequently, amended wording was now being proposed. In line with good employment practice, notices of impending retirement were no longer to be given by the office holder since, in secular employment, such notices were given by the employer. The proposal, therefore, removed the onus from the one retiring to serve notice and put that onus instead on the Bishop. Finally, Section 3 of the Canon allowed for extensions, for various reasons, in office beyond age 70 at the discretion of the Diocesan Bishop (or indeed for an appointment of an individual over 70 to an office). However, such an appointment or extension would be for one year at a time and the Canon fixed a limit of three years unless the Episcopal Synod agreed otherwise. If a first reading was given to the new Canon by General Synod then any amendments or comments could be considered at Diocesan Synods.

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

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

Comment was invited but there was none.

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

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| House of Laity: | passed unanimously. |
| House of Clergy: | passed <i>nem con</i> , 1 abstention. |
| House of Bishops: | passed unanimously. |

7.2.3.2 Canons for Second Reading – Canon Eight

Provost Auld presented the second reading of Canon Eight. He explained that Section 1 of the Canon explained that no discussions could take place concerning the separation, sub-division or union of dioceses while any see was vacant. He was not aware of any such discussions but explained that the alteration would make such discussions possible. This was sensible given that there were significant periods of time when there was not a full complement of seven bishops.

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

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

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to represent views expressed at his Diocesan Synod. The Synod had been concerned about the change. If there were to be discussions regarding the separation, sub-division or union of dioceses then the Church should have the confidence only to initiate discussions when the affected diocese had a bishop in post. The bishop of such a diocese would be well placed both to present the merits and the demerits of any such separation, sub-division or union. As an example, he suggested that it would be quite wrong for the Church to consider a division of the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles when it had no bishop (as was the case at the current time). The Diocesan Synod of Aberdeen and Orkney, therefore, wished to urge the General Synod to vote against the proposed change to the Canon.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray Ross and Caithness) said that he had spoken at length to the members of the Electoral Synod of the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles. A division of the Diocese could not be contemplated during a Canon 4 process.

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that the proposed change had originated within the Standing Committee. The reason for proposing the change was because it was so often the case that there was not a full complement within the College of Bishops and this could stifle development within the Church as a whole. She recognised that Canon 4 provided protection for a diocese without a bishop but the rest of Canon 8 also provided protection. It was possible that a diocese wishing to make such a change might suddenly find itself without a bishop. The Canon did not simply relate to major diocesan change but might also affect congregational boundaries. She strongly supported the motion.

In response to a question from the Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) on a point of order, the Chair confirmed that the order in which Houses voted on a Canon was not fixed.

The Rev Canon Roy Ferguson Flatt (Argyll and The Isles) explained that he had spent 27 years discussing how matters might be re-shaped in the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles. It seemed that each and every time the subject was approached, the bishop retired and so no change was ever made. Some people would like to have the opportunity to consider the possibility of change. He supported the motion.

Mr Colin Sibley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that instead of deleting the final sentence of Section 1 of Canon 8, it might be reworded so that initiation of proposals could not be made during the vacancy of any see to which the proposals applied. He was not proposing a formal amendment but merely making an observation.

Provost Auld responded to comments made to the effect that when a see became vacant, Canon 4 automatically took effect and, consequently, protection was provided to the diocese in question.

The motion was then put to the vote in Houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:-

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| House of Clergy: | passed by majority, 1 against, 1 abstention. |
| House of Laity: | passed by majority, 2 against, 3 abstentions. |
| House of Bishops: | passed by majority, 5 in favour, 1 against. |

Provost Auld expressed thanks to those who had worked on and with the Committee on Canons. The Chair thanked Provost Auld.

7.2.4 Liturgy Committee

The Rev Darren McFarland (Convener, Liturgy Committee) referred to the report of the Committee contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. He referred to the somewhat surprising prominence given to liturgy during the debate earlier in the meeting in the context of the gender audit. He confirmed that the College of Bishops had authorised a number of alternative inclusive language amendments to the 1982 texts. These would be published in the coming weeks on the Provincial website and would be distributed in a clergy mailing.

On the instruction of the Faith and Order Board, the Liturgy Committee had been working on a Service of the Word. This was a non-eucharistic liturgy for use on a variety of occasions. A first draft had been provided to the Faith and Order Board and a second draft would be prepared for the Board in the light of comments received from the Board and also the College of Bishops. It was also hoped that feedback would be available from Glenalmond 2010 since permission to use the new service had been given for use there. It was hoped that there would be a new text brought to General Synod in 2011.

The Committee was also in the early stages of preparing for work on a new Eucharistic Rite. It was the intention of the Committee to engage with a wide variety of interest groups within the Province. The Committee was also undertaking a program of self-education by engaging with people who had lengthy experience in eucharistic revision or who had an academic interest in liturgical revision and history as well as with some people outwith the Province. An update would be provided to General Synod 2011.

The Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen & Orkney) expressed his thanks to the Liturgy Committee for shaping the Church's liturgy and also for demonstrating its beauty in the opening Eucharist for Synod. That Eucharist had been a creative interpretation of one of the Church's authorised liturgies. He prayed for the engagement of the whole Church in the creative interpretation of liturgy. He asked the Liturgy Committee to act as moderator of creative liturgies at the level of local worshipping communities.

The Rev Canon Allan Maclean (Edinburgh) referred to a question which had been raised at the Edinburgh Diocesan pre-Synod Meeting namely, who appointed the members of the Committee and what were the criteria for appointment? There appeared to be various people including those with expertise, knowledge and doctorates who considered they had been overlooked. He urged the Committee, at the very least, to consult with such people.

The Rev Darren McFarland responded that the authority in relation to moderation of creative liturgy lay with diocesan bishops and also with diocesan liturgical groups to explore with the bishop how much creativity was possible. On the question of membership of the Liturgy Committee, the position was the same as that applicable to other pendant committees, namely that the parent board made appointments. If individuals were keen to be considered for appointment, he suggested that they approach their diocesan representatives on the board. On the question of criteria, this was more difficult to define. Criteria would include a passion for a wide breadth of liturgical experience. The Committee was not bound to have diocesan representation but, at the present time, through design, there was in fact a fairly wide representation of the dioceses on the Committee. There was also a tendency to avoid those who might have a 'single issue interest' because that was not beneficial to the continuing work of the Committee. However, it was the intention of the Committee to engage with a number of people from single interest groups during the following year. He encouraged such people to contact members of the Committee to enable that engagement.

In closing the session the Chair thanked all those who had contributed.

SESSION EIGHT – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

8.1 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

Mrs Norma Higgott (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) introduced the work of the Inter-Church Relations Committee. The Committee had invited Dr Anne Pankhurst and the Rev Dr Duncan McLaren to talk about the recent Edinburgh 2010 Conference.

Dr Anne Pankhurst (Edinburgh) explained that the Edinburgh 2010 Conference entitled 'Witnessing to Christ Today' had commemorated the 1910 Missionary Conference. That 1910 Conference was generally seen as the start of the missionary initiative which had resulted in substantial growth of the Church in the global south and also the birth of the modern ecumenical movement leading to bodies such as the World Council of Churches, ACTS and the Scottish Episcopal Church's Inter-Church Relations Committee. Like 1910, the Edinburgh 2010 Conference promised to be a pivotal moment for the global Christian community.

There had been a group of eight official Anglican delegates to the 2010 Conference. In fact, there had been many other Anglicans at the Conference but the official delegation comprised only eight. Those delegates had spent time in the dioceses of the Scottish Episcopal Church for a weekend prior to the main Conference. They had encountered warm hospitality and various new experiences. Dr Pankhurst thanked all of their hosts and also the bishops for their support. The delegates had all been young future Anglican leaders and had come from places such as South Africa, Kenya, Brazil, Canada, Zambia and Hong Kong. They had shared a concern to make the theology and their church relevant to their own contexts in all their diversities. They had spoken of the respect for tradition which they had seen as part of the Scottish identity but at the same time they had seen vigorous signs of new life. The stories of forced eviction which were part of Scotland's history had helped them to understand what was now happening in many other countries and they noted that Scotland was engaged in a struggle for its own identity which also resonated with their own nations' experiences.

The Rev Dr Duncan McLaren explained that he had attended the Edinburgh 2010 Conference as a delegate on behalf of ACTS. The Conference had been the culmination of a five year study process which had looked at nine themes relating to the mission of the Church worldwide. The themes were: foundations for mission; Christian mission among other faiths; mission and post modernity; mission and power; forms of missionary engagement; theological education and formation; Christian communities in contemporary contexts; mission and unity; missions, spirituality and authentic discipleship. A study group for each theme had produced a report and these had been published prior to the Conference. The purpose of the Conference, therefore, was to reflect further on those nine themes. The result of the final plenary session was a nine point Common Call to the churches. This aimed to capture the passions of a wide range of theologies.

Dr McLaren compared the 1910 and 2010 Conferences. The 1910 Conference had been larger and longer. Despite its shortcomings, the 1910 Conference had spawned the modern ecumenical movement. He suspected that the legacy of Edinburgh 2010 would not be the Common Call, worthwhile though it was. Rather, the legacy was the fact that, for the first time in the history of the Church, the Conference had been a gathering of people who were broadly representative of the whole of God's Church on Earth. The delegates had been drawn from five continents, sixty nations, with every major church denomination having been represented. It had been awe-inspiring and humbling experience.

Dr McLaren outlined three particular observations. Firstly, in the opening plenary session it had been suggested that in 1910 the delegates had been very concerned because the world was only one-third Christian. In 2010, the Church was more likely to rejoice that the world was one-third Christian. The diversity of faiths in the world was more likely to be seen as a

cause for celebration rather than a cause for conquest. Not all delegates had seen this positively and it revealed a familiar fault line between an evangelistic zeal for conversion and an ecumenical concern for social justice. Secondly, in 1910 it had been the white men who wore the dark suits. In 2010, it seemed to be the Africans and Asians who wore the dark suits. That symbolized the persistence of a colonial mindset. The Global South continued to look up to the West to some extent while the so-called Developed World continued to harbour stereotypes of Christians in the Majority World. There had been talk of reverse mission but what did that really mean? Were the British churches ready to receive mission from the world Church? Thirdly, it had been pointed out that the 1910 Conference should not have been called a 'World Mission Conference' because not all of the world had been there. By the same token, Edinburgh 2010 could be called a World Conference but he queried whether it could properly be called a Missionary Conference. In his view, it had been more of an Ecumenical Conference. In conclusion, he suspected that the legacy of Edinburgh 2010 would be something to do with the coming of age of the world Church.

Mrs Higgott reported that a further exciting progression on the ecumenical journey of the Scottish Episcopal Church had happened in January 2010 when the Statement of Partnership with the Methodist and United Reformed Churches had been signed. The question now facing the three denominations was how this would be taken forward and how resources and experience could be shared. Laminated copies of the Statement of Partnership would be sent out to each Charge in the Province and she hoped this would be displayed alongside the laminated Porvoo welcome posters. One way of sharing was through learning together and the three churches were already beginning to find ways of working together on matters of training. Sharing of buildings and ministry in ways similar to what had happened in Dumfries and Livingston could also be encouraged.

Mrs Higgott then reminded Synod about the Porvoo Communion. The Anglican Churches of Britain and Ireland and the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Scandinavia and the Baltic States had agreed to share a common life in mission and service. Until 2010, the Church of Denmark had had observer status but had now decided to sign the Porvoo Declaration and this would be formalised in October. She outlined why the churches had come together and summarised the commitments given in the Porvoo Declaration. Many dioceses had established twinning relationships within the Communion. The Primates met bi-annually and theological conferences and consultations had been held on common issues. The Porvoo Communion had no central office. A Church Leaders Consultation meeting had taken place in March 2010 which she had attended along with the Primus and the Secretary General. Elspeth Davey as the Contact Group member had also been in attendance. The recommendations of the meeting included a proposal to hold a consultation on responding to conflict. Also, the theme for the next Porvoo Theological Conference would be 'sacraments in the mission of the church' and there would be a further consultation on diaconal ministry. It had also been agreed to hold a consultation on diaspora and migration in 2012.

Mrs Higgott closed by inviting Synod members to keep the work of the Committee in their prayers and to contact the Committee if interested in being involved.

8.2 Address by the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church (USA)

The Chair welcomed the Most Rev Dr Katharine Jefferts Schori, the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church (USA) and the Rt Rev Herbert Donovan, Deputy to the Presiding Bishop for Anglican Communion Relations.

Bishop Schori brought greetings from the many parts of The Episcopal Church. She explained that the Church had struggled with its name because 'ECUSA' was not accurate. At the current time 'The Episcopal Church' seemed the most apt even though there were other Episcopal Churches in the Anglican Communion. The Episcopal Church included churches in 16 nations. She also brought greetings from Episcopalians in the many indigenous nations served by her church in North America and abroad, particularly in Latin America, and she pointed to the tribal heritage shared with the Celts and Picts and other indigenous peoples of the British Isles. The Episcopal Church was multi-lingual and multi-cultural as well as multi-national and in Europe expatriate congregations were rapidly becoming indigenous.

Bishop Schori wished to talk about mission. Quoting Emil Brunner ('the church exists by mission as fire exists by burning') she said that if the Church were not engaged in mission it might as well close the doors and go home to die. Mission meant healing and restoring all creation toward the commonweal of God, where people were fed, full and feasting, living with justice and dignity and where all people and creation lived together in peace. The Baptismal Covenant, prayed by her church for 30 years, had increasingly roused its members into mission. That Baptismal Covenant was not shared by most of the rest of the Communion but it had shaped the theology of the American Church and had much to do with dignity and respect for the image in God in one's neighbour. God's mission was about speaking, doing and being good news, building a just society and co-creating shalom – a community of peace and justice. The Baptismal Covenant had taught the church that baptism was commissioning for service and that all the baptized were ministers and servants of God's mission.

The Episcopal Church and The Scottish Episcopal Church shared significant common roots and history. Two years previously, her church had celebrated 400 years of continuous Episcopal worship in North America. The first Anglican service had been held by Sir Francis Drake's chaplain north of San Francisco in 1579. That worshipping community had not survived but the fact that not all initial efforts continued did not mean that they were failures. Mission involved sowing seeds only some of which survived and flourished.

Throughout the colonial era, the Bishop of London had had charge of the Church of England in the colonies. He had largely ignored the church in America and no confirmations had been held even though adults were admitted to communion. As a result, lay leadership had become essential and vital and women had taken significant leadership roles. That history and polity had continued to shape The Episcopal Church. The beginnings of the church after the Revolution, reflected a long history of tension between high and low church, bishop-centred and congregational forms of governance. In 1783, the clergy of Connecticut had elected Samuel Seabury as Bishop. The Church of England had declined to consecrate him but the non-jurors in Scotland had laid hands on him with the agreement that the American Book of Common Prayer would reflect the theology of the Scottish 'wee bookies'. That act had also effectively begun the Anglican Communion.

Bishop Schori outlined the subsequent historical development of The Episcopal Church including its mission work in places that were, or became, effective USA colonies. Worldwide mission continued through Episcopal Relief and Development which touched two million people each year in domestic disaster relief and overseas development and disaster work. The church was involved in mission partnership with other parts of the Anglican Communion at all levels and was in full communion with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of

America and the Old Catholics in Europe. It had also voted for a full Communion relationship with the Northern and Southern Moravian Provinces and hoped that those Provinces would respond affirmatively later in the year. The church was also in growing partnership with the United Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in the US and those relationships were of immense missiological significance particularly in rural areas.

Internationally, the church's mission work was most often shaped by the Millennium Development Goals and domestically it had begun an initiative on poverty with an initial focus on indigenous communities. The church was experiencing numerical growth in most of its overseas dioceses but only in a small number of domestic dioceses. In the North American context, the church could no longer rely on evangelism by reproduction and an increasingly post-Christian society meant that church attendance was no longer culturally expected. The church had not done a terribly good job of mission work in emerging ethnic and cultural communities and was still learning to invite people into Christian relationships. A study several years previously had indicated that Episcopalians invited people to church once every 38 years whilst Lutherans did so once every 19 years!

The church was discovering that its ethos of radical hospitality, a focus on transformation, a tradition which invited questions and offered both structure and flexibility and empowered leadership in all persons, was proving attractive to young adults, Latino women and young mothers. It was likely that those characteristics would be effective in serving in the growing immigrant and ethnic communities in the US as well as others who were spiritually hungry.

The General Convention in 2009 had agreed a strategy for mission work with Latino communities but had been unable to fund it at a significant level. The church had realised it needed to address several different segments of the Latino/Hispanic population, not only recent immigrants and the church was relearning the principle of the English reformation that worship must be in a language and form 'understood of the people'.

The church was also moving beyond its buildings and learning new ways of accompaniment and solidarity to address a post-Christian context. This included the good news of befriending through food pantries, youth and after school programmes, house building and community development. Looking to the future, there were significant ways in which The Episcopal Church and The Scottish Episcopal Church might partner with and learn from each other in areas such as ministry in a post-Christian context, ministry to new populations, ministry in de-populating rural areas, the development of new forms of leadership and in a shifting understanding of leaders as agents of change towards transformation. The theological education programme in the Scottish Episcopal Church had something important to each the American Church about how best to serve geographically large but sparsely populated dioceses. There was a singular opportunity in the full communion relationships with the Lutheran churches as well as other opportunities with Methodist and Presbyterians.

The Episcopal Church looked for opportunities for dialogue and openings for transformative action around ethics and bio-technology and energy. It sought greater understanding around human sexuality and anthropology and worked to preserve the language and culture of indigenous peoples. Issues of resource use and the stewardship of creation were deeply connected to the vocation shared by the two churches, co-creating a world of justice, peace and right relationship.

The Episcopal Church celebrated the official companion relationships with four Scottish dioceses: Aberdeen and Orkney with Connecticut; Argyll and The Isles with Delaware; Brechin with Iowa; and Glasgow and Galloway with Kentucky. They would welcome such opportunities with other dioceses. They were immensely grateful for the support of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the Sisters of St Margaret in Haiti.

Bishop Schori expressed gratitude for The Episcopal Church's friends north of the English border. The Episcopal Church was eager to learn from the experience of the Scottish Episcopal Church and was energised about the possibilities for increased partnership in God's mission. She invoked God's blessing on the journeys of the two churches and on the world through the mission to which the churches were called.

The Primus thanked Bishop Schori for her address and presented her with a gift on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He also thanked the Very Rev Kevin Pearson and other members of the Diocese of Edinburgh who had hosted Bishop Schori and Bishop Donovan while in Scotland.

SESSION NINE – The Rt Rev the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness in the Chair

9.1 Queen's Birthday Honours

The Chair indicated that he was delighted to announce that in the Queen's Birthday Honours published that day, Mr Gordon Baxter, a long standing member of the Scottish Episcopal Church had been awarded a CBE. The Synod expressed its congratulations.

9.2 Mission and Ministry Board

9.2.1 Church in Society Committee

In introducing the session, the Chair explained that as part of the report from the Church in Society Committee, a DVD presentation would be made to Synod. The Committee had asked that, at the end of that presentation, an opportunity for quiet reflection be taken.

The Very Rev Ian Barcroft (Convener, Church in Society Committee) presented the report of the Committee. He referred to the written report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. The main task of the Committee, as a pendant Committee of the Mission and Ministry Board, was to resource the Scottish Episcopal Church community for its ministry and mission to wider society and the local community and to be a major constituent in a Whole Church mission and ministry process. The Committee was happy to raise issues of concern to the wider church to enable members to think about issues of peace and justice and engage in theological reflection both within the Scottish Episcopal Church and in ecumenical partnership. Since the beginning of the year, the Committee had become more representative of the dioceses and it was currently organising a day conference in October 2010 which would allow representatives from every diocese to explore the developments of volunteering across the church-community interface. The Church might once again offer resource both practically

and spiritually as government-driven deficit reduction took hold. Dean Barcroft encouraged Synod members to watch out for the event in Bridge of Allan.

With the support of the Primus, the Committee had sought a response from Scottish church leaders to the current issue of Trident renewal and, with the help of ACTS, it had been possible to produce a joint statement by church leaders. The Committee had also initiated an invitation across the denominations to begin to look seriously at the situation in Afghanistan. The ACTS Faith Studies Network would be considering this issue with regard to the appropriateness of the traditional 'just war' approach. Dean Barcroft believed that Christians ought to be asking how to seek a 'just peace' in that complex theatre.

It was the desire of the Committee to inform the mission and ministry of the Church and to engage other denominational partners in those issues which required ecumenical discernment. That was a demanding task but prevented the Church from acting in a populist pseudo-party political manner which the Committee considered was ineffective and not the primary task of the Church. He reflected on the fact that before the advent of the Scottish Parliament, it had been necessary for motions to be passed at Synod to alert Westminster to particular Scottish issues. That had since changed and had a consequent effect on Synod. The Synod could now concentrate on motions which reflected the Church's own life but which nevertheless connected with life in Scotland. The Church was moving to new ways to enable church members, especially younger members, to interact with the issues which caused concern. Formal institutional governance models, based on adversarial approaches, which pushed an argument forward based on conviction alone, would not work or add real value. It was necessary to find shared ways of reflecting on the principles which marked out how the Church and the Christian life concerned itself with wider community and societal issues.

Dean Barcroft was clear that the Committee could not be a lobbying instrument and behave in a way which did not add value to debate. The task of the Committee, however, was to point members, especially younger members and local churches with specific interests, to agencies which were happy to engage with the Christian community. There were many across the Province who were real activists, thoughtfully representing issues to society and back to the Church. The Church needed to be involved in that kind of dialogue and to enable thinking on a variety of issues. He encouraged members to contact the Committee about any local, national, or international issues which required thoughtful and positive change or where there was seeming injustice. He was pleased to report that the Scottish Episcopal Church, through ACTS, had been a valuable contributor to the recent report regarding the churches' concern about abusive trafficking, especially of women. He commended that report.

Dean Barcroft introduced Mr Andrew Mott and Mr Richard Murray. The material to be presented by them was an example of how the Church could work across the dioceses and he expressed the hope that in the coming year diocesan synods would contribute to thinking on the issue of climate change. The Committee wanted to engage in a form of consultation in order to bring together a Statement of Principles articulating the fact that the Scottish Episcopal Church was active and intentional about issues concerning the environment. Messrs Mott and Murray had been

committed for a number years to discovering ways in which members could adopt an intentional way of living, through their actions and worship, pursuing a way of life consonant with Christian beliefs. The presentation which they would give would reflect the desire to reduce the environmental impact of the activities of the Church and its members and inspire members to take matters seriously. The question being asked was whether a Statement of Principles could be embedded within the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church that reflected both a mutual desire, and the considerable challenge, to live sustainably. He encouraged Synod members, at the end of the presentation to be given, to consider the Collect from the opening Synod Eucharist.

Mr Andrew Mott explained that the first of the two motions to be presented would establish a ‘base camp’ by acknowledging that there was a real problem caused by the destructive manner in which humanity interacted with God’s creation and that, therefore, there was a need to respond both theologically and practically and that that response needed to be kept under review for its adequacy and appropriateness. To talk of an environmental crisis also signalled a religious crisis. The issue was a theological one because humanity and all creation came from God and belonged to God. The spiritual implications of the issues were such that they demanded an inner transformation. Transformed lives were transforming lives – the heart of ministry and mission.

The second motion proposed the drawing up of a Statement of Principles which would assist dioceses and congregations in taking action to encourage a sustainable way of living. Such a statement, endorsed by the College of Bishops, would provide a reference point and encouragement to those in the Church who were rightly anxious to progress that agenda. It would be especially useful for there to be a clear and considered view expressed by the Scottish Episcopal Church as a whole. Also, the drawing up of such a Statement would be a collaborative effort, the process being as important as the outcome. If the motion were approved, the Committee would prepare a first draft of the Principles and engage dioceses in the honing and refining of them into something of which the whole Church could take ownership. The Committee expected that process of discussion would spur on action, possibly in new and unexpected directions.

Mr Mott explained that it would have been possible to have been more specific than producing a Statement of Principles and, instead, to propose the identification and setting of targets. However, the Church lacked expertise to do so since target setting was best left to scientists, governments and NGOs. Also it was difficult to take account of the very different circumstances of each congregation. Alternatively, the Committee could have chosen to be less specific but had concluded that it would be helpful to set out, in some detail, the principles to which the whole Church subscribed. A Statement of Principles would leave congregations free to adopt the approaches which they found most helpful. Some might find the Eco-congregation toolkit useful, others might wish to take a different approach but a Statement of Principles would make it clear that to do nothing was simply not biblical.

Mr Richard Mott explained that audio visual meditation to follow would focus on the Greek word ‘oikos’ which meant ‘house’ or ‘home’. Derived from it were the words ‘economics’, ‘ecology’ and ‘ecumenism’. Whilst those words had diverse meanings, the important point was how they inter-acted in the ‘oikumene’ or ‘community’.

The audio visual presentation was shown to Synod following which the Chair led the Synod in the Collect from the opening Eucharist.

The Rev Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) recognised that in previous Synod debates he had encouraged Synod members to be active in inter-faith dialogue if there was to be ‘peace on earth’. However, the subject currently before the Synod was even more basic in that if there was to be an earth on which there could be peace, it was necessary to be active in relation to issues of climate change. He proposed the following motion:-

“That this Synod affirm that effective theological and practical responses are required for the sustainability of the environment due to the distortion created by human over-consumption, and that such responses should be a matter for continuing and urgent review within the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church.”

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) considered that the presentation had been a remarkable meditation but he hoped that as the Church moved from meditation to action, it would be guided by the resources already available. He commended in particular the resources of Eco-congregation Scotland as one of many which were available. He seconded the motion.

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) said that he did not oppose the motions but considered that ‘over consumption’ was too imprecise a word to describe the major factors leading to global warming and environmental unsustainability. For many people in the world, there was in fact ‘under-consumption’ as was reflected in the MiDGie Goals which had previously been endorsed by the Synod. To give an effective theological and practical response to the world, the Church had to be thoroughly professional about its facts and analysis. Part of the Church’s witness was to counteract those who denied that there was a problem regarding climate change. Global warming would impact most heavily on the poorest but not in Scotland. The Church needed to witness to international human solidarity. Current thinking was that an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 would stand a good chance of keeping global warming to less than 2°C. The Scottish Government targets of a 42% cut by 2020 and 80% by 2050 ought to be supported. Dean Mumford was of the view that targets were needed. It was not enough simply to have a general vision. If the Scottish Episcopal Church were to make an effective contribution it needed to be clear about what was required to achieve such targets and what it expected its members to do. That meant the Church needed to undertake lobbying. Current energy consumption in the UK was approximately 125 kilo watt hours per person per day. 40 of those hours represented transport and this could be halved by a transfer from petrol and diesel to electric power. A further 40 hours went on heating which could be reduced to 30 by better quality insulation in buildings. The Eco-congregation resources were profoundly helpful in that regard. A major reduction of fossil fuel consumption was crucial. The Church could not combine this with opposition to nuclear power, windfarms, extension of the national grid or an unwillingness to invest in tidal power. However, that was where the General Synod appeared to be three years previously. Action was needed on a national and international level. Whilst every little helped (for example, the use of low energy light bulbs), a change in shopping habits was not going to lead to fundamental global

change. People could be persuaded to take actions which were uncomfortable if they were persuaded that such measures were necessary and fair. That required collective democratic action. There needed to be both popular support mobilised around a vision, but also a specific and detailed programme for action. Principles by themselves were inadequate. If the Church considered the environment to be a crucial issue then it must act and lobby to ensure that effective action followed. Christian Aid had showed the way with the Jubilee 2000 campaign. It had also done much to press the Scottish Government to produce clear commitments and targets on climate change. The Scottish Government targets were now ahead of most other countries. The Church should support those targets and join the debate in addressing how the targets could be implemented. That was the task which he believed that the Church in Society Committee, and the Scottish Episcopal Church, should be set by the Synod.

The Rev Dr Andrew Barton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that an energy audit had recently been carried out on one of his properties. He expected that every church would have to have energy audits in futures. He agreed with the speaker earlier in Synod who had warned that the Synod's agreeing to motions would have financial implications. The audit in question had not granted the property top ranking because energy saving light bulbs had not been installed throughout. However, the professional conducting the survey had said that it was a myth that the installation of such light bulbs saved energy. The older style of bulbs were indeed less efficient but they provided background heating. Consequently, energy efficient light bulbs could lead to a need to turn up the level of heating in a property. Also the cost of recycling low energy light bulbs was greater than for traditional ones.

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 8 abstentions.

The Rev Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that the motions were about 'getting a foot in the door'. In time to come, more work could be done on the detail. He then proposed the following motion:-

"That this Synod ask the Church in Society Committee to prepare a Statement of Principles in 2010/11 confirming the necessity for all dioceses and congregations, as an expression of their faith in action, to encourage and protect a sustainable environment and to consider steps to reduce energy consumption; and that, once prepared, the Statement of Principles be offered to the College of Bishops for its endorsement."

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded the motion. The adoption of a Statement of Principles would be the first step in a process. He expressed the hope that once consultation had taken place with dioceses there would be an opportunity to think seriously about the possibility of setting targets. The action by the Scottish Government to set targets had been an enormous step forward. But those targets would not be achieved unless matters were taken up by individuals and communities. The Church had a significant role in raising the agenda within its own membership and more widely within society.

Mrs Anthea Clark (Glasgow and Galloway) said that lobbyists were needed but that could be left to the people with the requisite expertise. She wanted matters to be kept simple so that they could be taken back to dioceses and congregations. Recently, in

her diocese, a course entitled 'Tough Choices' had been run. Many, but not enough people, had attended. The Church needed to encourage its members to take these matters on board. People needed to be encouraged to think of themselves as stewards of God's creation. She wished to encourage all members to be active.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said he was in favour of environmental work but considered that there was a risk of an anti-urban bias and a sense of Luddite-ism. He considered that some of the images contained in the presentation had suggested that what happened in cities was wrong and what happened in the countryside was right. He asked that people should be aware of the language and images which were used in the debate.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) agreed with what Provost Holdsworth had said. He had spent his life working in production. In the UK, more production was needed and he considered that the presentation had not struck the right note.

Mrs Ruth McGrath (Edinburgh) reminded the Synod of comments made earlier during the meeting that one's perspective depended on where one was sitting. Her view of the presentation was quite different from that of the previous two speakers. She did not take the images to suggest that production was wrong. There were in fact as many queries about the role of farming in global warming as there were in relation to production. It was necessary to listen and respond and she expressed her thanks to those who had made the presentation.

The Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers (Glasgow and Galloway) did not detect an anti-urban bias in the presentation but rather a seamless organic relationship between town and country. The health of the planet depended on having an intelligent and caring approach to both. He encouraged members to examine the weedkillers contained in their shed to see whether they contained neonicotinoid insecticides because these were having a catastrophic effect on bee populations. That in turn affected pollination and crop yields and, if all bees died, world food production would fall by one-third.

The Rev Kimberly Bohan (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) sought clarification about what the proposal contained in the motion would add to the existing work of Eco-congregations.

The Rev Tim Daplyn (Moray, Ross and Caithness) had no difficulty with the substance of the motion but noted that it contained an element of compulsion. He therefore wished to propose that the words 'confirming the necessity for' be replaced by the word 'recommending'.

Mr Hugh Morrison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment.

Mr Andrew Mott, responding to the amendment, noted that the change would dilute the effect of the motion. If Synod passed it, that would be an indication of its level of commitment to the issue.

The amendment was then put to the vote with the following result: 34 in favour, 65 against, 8 abstentions.

The Chair declared that the motion had fallen.

The original motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, with 8 abstentions.

SESSION TEN – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

10.1 Mission and Ministry Board – Provincial Youth Network

The Synod granted permission to speak to each of the following: Doug Aitken, Angela Daye, Caroline Daye, Rhiannon Dellow, Megan Runciman and Andrew Wedge.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Convener, Provincial Youth Network) referred to the written report of the work of the Youth Network contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009. Youth work had seen growth in a number of dioceses. The function of the Network was to ‘network’ and to provide links for young people who might otherwise be somewhat isolated. He commented on the successful retreat for the 18-25 Network held on Mull and also a planning weekend in Pitlochry. Glenalmond 2009 had been successful and he paid tribute to the leadership team which had handled a major fire incident in an adjoining building and also an outbreak of what may have been swine flu. The highlight of the year had been the marriage of two current leaders of the Provincial Youth Network who had themselves been delegates in previous years.

Ms Angela Daye introduced herself as the Administrator of the Network and of the Glenalmond camps. During the year a new health and safety policy had been adopted which included a new focus on first aid care and child protection policy, especially in relation to social networking after the annual youth week. Leaders acted as leaders throughout the year, not just for the Glenalmond weeks and there was an annual training meeting. Attaining the right gender balance for Glenalmond was important. Visitors to Glenalmond were welcome and this could helpfully build links with the wider Church but there was also a protocol which needed to be observed and visitors needed a prior invitation. Ms Daye spoke about the 18-25 Network into which delegates moved once they had reached 18. She urged Synod members to encourage any within the 18-25 age range to contact her, particularly if they were moving away from home, since useful contacts could be established. She expressed thanks to the General Synod Office staff for their support.

Miss Megan Runciman explained that she had been attending Glenalmond for three years. It was the highlight of her summer and the experience had broadened her faith.

Mr Andrew Wedge explained that he was now a part of the 18-25 Network. His experience of Glenalmond had been to enable him to make his faith his own. Previously, his mother had taken him to church but now he took his mother. He spoke highly of the 18-25 Network which enabled people to remain in contact after moving on.

Mr Doug Aitken explained the importance of the leadership staff in arranging Glenalmond. He spoke of the training programme for leaders. The fact that this was organised provincially was of great value and he had personally benefited from this for the conducting of youth

work in the Diocese of Brechin. People were trained not just for Glenalmond but for youth work generally.

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Edinburgh) explained that 2010 would be his fourth year at Glenalmond and he counted it a privilege. He invited Synod member not only to encourage young people to come to Glenalmond and other provincial and diocesan events but also to consider coming forward as leaders. At times, there could be a dearth of ordained clergy at Glenalmond and individuals might like to consider taking the morning Eucharist.

Mrs Caroline Daye explained that the theme of Glenalmond 2010 was liturgy. During the course of the week, the 1929, 1970 and 1982 Eucharistic liturgies would be considered and there would be discussion in the bible study groups. Delegates would also consider issues of stewardship, ordination and lay ministry. One exercise would be to design advertisement of 'what the church can do for you and what you can do for the church'. She spoke of the effect which liturgy had had on her personally.

Bishop Strange expressed his thanks to those who had spoken and also all of the other leaders. Above all, he wished to express his thanks to the young people of the Church. It had been a privilege to serve as Convener of the Youth Network. He had to demit office in the current year and was not looking forward to it. He thanked the young people for what they had offered.

The Chair thanked the members of the Provincial Youth Network and for the encouragement which they gave to the rest of the church. He also expressed his thanks to Bishop Strange for having carried the responsibility of convening the Youth Network for many years.

10.2 Standing Committee – Budget and Quota

Professor Patricia Peattie (Standing Committee) indicated that certain members of Synod had asked her about the allocation of quota across the dioceses. Pointing members to information contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2009, she explained that information regarding congregational giving and 'other' income was provided on an annual basis. The 'other' category included investment income and grants from various organisations. Not all of the total income was included in the calculation for 'quota assessable income'. Certain items were excluded such as legacies (although income arising on the capital of such legacies in subsequent years would be included). Similarly, for example, building grants from the province or bodies such as Historic Scotland was excluded. The figures were shared by the Treasurer with Diocesan Treasurers so that there was an open and transparent process and any queries were resolved before the formula was then applied. A three year rolling average was calculated and that smoothed out major peaks and troughs. The total provincial quota was then allocated amongst dioceses in proportion to the three year average quota assessable income. The figures shown in the Synod Papers, which identified the percentage change for each diocese for the proposed quota allocation for 2011 compared with that for 2010, resulted in part from the increase required in the total amount of quota but also from the relative changes to the income levels as between each diocese. She noted that the figures contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31st December 2009 indicated the average per capita contribution from communicant members. If each diocese managed to achieve the current 'average' per communicant member then that would make a significant difference both to the

finances of such a diocese but also to the overall financial position and the respective contributions of other dioceses to provincial quota.

Professor Peattie then turned to consider the budgets contained in the Synod Papers. She explained that the budgets for 2011 were still subject to confirmation in terms of their detail, but a figure of £602,929 for quota in 2011 would, taking into account the moratorium on buildings grants, provide a projected year end deficit of £781. That quota figure represented an increase of 3% but needed to be considered in the light of a drop of 16% in investment income. A quota figure of this level for 2011 would not, with the best will in the world, enable, for example, a major investment in the work of the Information and Communication Board (as some comments in previous debates in Synod had suggested) but when budgets were considered for 2012 onwards using a zero based budget approach and in the light of Mission and Ministry Board strategy, there would be the possibility for a discussion about a re-allocation of resources to take place. Professor Peattie emphasised that whilst the Synod Papers explained how the figure for provincial quota would be allocated as between dioceses, since each diocese had its own means of apportioning its quota requirements internally, the overall 3% increase might bear little relationship to the actual change in quota experienced by local vestries.

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

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2011, agree to a quota figure of £602,929 for that year.”

Mrs Catherine Meikle (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed gratitude to Professor Peattie for having answered a question which she had put privately. She had no doubt of the need for a 3% increase in quota overall but she noted that the 3% increase was applied differentially between dioceses. She wondered whether it would be fair to interpret the differential as reflecting the relative means of each diocese. She wondered whether the current formula operated as an incentive to dioceses to set their sights higher. She queried why the increase should not be applied equally across all dioceses. She also wondered whether dioceses were free to use the principles applicable to the provincial allocation of quota to their own charges so that a different percentage allocation could be applied as between individual congregations.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed concern about the bigger picture. He had noted from the Gender Audit that there were twice as many women as men in the membership of the Church and that significant numbers of women were employed in the public sector. There were going to be changes to the public sector in the foreseeable future and many congregations were already struggling. He had doubts as to whether it was appropriate to increase quota as was being proposed. Referring to comments made earlier in the meeting by the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden about the setting of priorities, he considered that even if it were not possible to do anything in the current year, it might be necessary to address this in future years. He thought that it was possible that the moratorium on building grants would need to be continued for a further year.

Professor Peattie responded to the comments which had been made. She explained that the model for allocation of provincial quota had been considered carefully three or four years previously and a number of alterations had been made at that time. The question of how a fair arrangement was arrived at was not an exact science. Part of the difference in the

allocations made to different dioceses might be because some dioceses had been more 'successful' over the three year period for which figures were collected. However, each diocese needed to take seriously whether it was making a fair contribution to the whole. It was not impossible that Standing Committee could look again at the model but it was not an easy matter to change or to identify a better model. As to the question of how dioceses shared their quota out among charges, dioceses were free to decide for themselves how they wished to do that.

Professor Peattie explained that major reductions had been made in office costs over the previous five years. Borrowing from remarks made by the Primus the previous year, she said that it was important not to 'waste a good recession'. For both individuals and the Church as a whole, now was the time to rethink priorities and it was possible that some things which had been held very dear might need to take a lesser priority for the future. The offering of the moratorium on building grants for two years by the Rev Canon David Bayne on behalf of the Finance Committee had been very much appreciated but the fact that buildings grants would not be available for two years could mean that problems were being stoked up for the future. This would be a factor if any extension to the moratorium were to be considered. She expected that the budgets that would be presented to Synod for 2012 would look very different once priorities had been re-assessed. She encouraged all dioceses to consider whether they were making a fair contribution to the work of the whole and considered that there was a lesson to be drawn from one of the hymns sung earlier during Synod which talked of St Barnabas laying his riches and resources before the Apostles' feet.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

The Primus expressed thanks to Professor Peattie, referring to remarks made the previous evening by Mr Robin Angus during his after-dinner address, to the effect that, within the Scottish Episcopal Church, authority, one and indivisible, resided in Professor Peattie. She had 'taken authority' and had enabled the Standing Committee to exercise its role in a proper and searching manner, enabling the accountability of boards and committees in the process. She had helped other parts of the life of the Church also, such as the College of Bishops, with the advent of joint meetings which would remain as a regular feature of the 'behind the scenes' life of the Church. He expressed the warm thanks of the Synod to her.

10.3 Elections

10.3.1 Standing Committee Convenership

There being no competing nominations, Mr David Palmer (Edinburgh) was elected as Convener of the Standing Committee by general acclaim.

10.3.2 Administration Board Convenership

There being no competing nominations, Mr Michael Lugton was elected as Convener of the Administration Board by general acclaim.

10.3.3 Standing Committee Membership

There being no competing nominations, Mrs Anne Jones (Glasgow and Galloway) was elected as General Synod Representative to the Standing Committee by general acclaim.

10.3.4 Administration Board Membership

There being no competing nominations, the Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) was elected as General Synod Representative to the Administration Board by general acclaim.

10.4 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed the thanks of Synod to those who had arranged the Eucharist and led worship throughout the meeting; to retiring conveners; to those who had chaired sessions of Synod and those who had de-briefed those chairpersons; to the Rev Dr Joe Morrow as Assessor; to Mr Kennedy Fraser for operating the IT and for the audio-visual facilities; to the Rev Rob Warren and the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth for the audio updates and other facilities provided during Synod; to members of Cursillo who had served teas and coffees; to volunteers Forrester Davidson and David Stuart who had assisted; to David and Eileen McColl of Palmerston Place Church; to the ecumenical representatives present at Synod; and to the General Synod Office staff. He also thanked the Synod for its welcome to the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church (USA).

Professor Peattie thanked the Primus for his leadership and chairing of Synod.

10.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 12 noon on Saturday 12th June 2010.