

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT PALMERSTON PLACE CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 12th TO 14th JUNE 2008

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 12th June 2008.

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

The Primus referred to the text upon which a former Primus, the late Rt Rev Alastair Haggart, had preached at the consecration of the late Rt Rev Kenneth Woollcombe as Bishop of Oxford, namely the advice to King George III from his mother "George, be a king" – modified to "Kenneth, be a Bishop". The Primus noted that in the forthcoming Agenda for the General Synod there were a number of matters in which Bishops had an immediate and pertinent interest. The question of the authority of a Bishop and the question of what sort of Bishop was needed in the Church was still a matter to be reflected upon both within the Scottish Episcopal Church and ecumenically. Referring to different models of episcopacy throughout the Anglican Communion, he noted the variety but his ideal remained the fact that a Bishop was to be a focus for unity. Organisationally, he hoped to see the College of Bishops structurally rooted in the life of the General Synod. The Church had to allow its Bishops to exercise leadership and to enable them to do so. Part of that enabling was to create a climate in which there was trust and in which collaboration was part of the practice of leadership. Referring to the forthcoming Lambeth Conference, the Primus indicated that the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church would go with a determination to make the life of the Conference as positive and as fruitful as possible. Many of the current tensions being experienced in the life of the Anglican Communion had been part of the past experience of the Scottish Episcopal Church and Scotland had common cause with other Provinces whose origins lay in a free and considered choice to be Anglican and who now needed to find a voice. In gathering as a Synod, where the Church expressed its nature as a community of faith, it needed constantly to keep in mind the reality of the vocation to follow Christ.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken for the Lambeth Conference Fund and amounted to £1,051 (including tax reclaimed).

SESSION ONE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

1.1 Welcome

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

Dr Salah Beltagui (Scottish Inter-Faith Council), the Rev Ian Boa (the United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church), Mrs Margaret Clark (Roman Catholic Church), Major Alan Dixon (Salvation Army), Marjorie Farquharson (Religious Society of Friends), the Rev Gordon Jamieson (Church of Scotland), Dr William Reid and Rev Lily Twist (the Methodist Church in Scotland), Brother Stephen Smyth (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), Dr Kenneth Stewart (Baptist Union of Scotland) and the Rev Alan Moses (Church of England).

The Primus offered the congratulations of Synod to the Rev Robin Forrest who had won the Primus' Championship Cup the previous day and which had been generously sponsored by Ecclesiastical Insurance. He also offered the congratulations of Synod to Mrs Margaret Duggan who had recently been awarded a Lambeth Degree in recognition of 45 years of outstanding and knowledgeable service to the Anglican Church through the columns of the *Church Times*.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Alexander Gordon and the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

Dr Anne Pankhurst and Mr John Whittall were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

1.3 Election of Tellers

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

1.4 Assessor

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

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2007

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

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 7-9 June 2007.”

The Motion was put to the vote and was 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 Mission and Ministry Board, three vacancies for General Synod representatives on the Mission and Ministry Board and two such vacancies on the Administration Board, and vacancies on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal for three practising lawyers, two clerics from the Order of Priest or Deacon, and three communicant lay members of the Church.

In relation to the Convenership of the Mission and Ministry Board, the Rt Rev David Chillingworth, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane had been nominated. Nominations of the Rev Alison Simpson and Mrs Gill Young for General Synod representative posts on the Mission and Ministry Board had been received. The Synod agreed to extend the time for receipt of nominations for the one remaining vacancy for a General Synod representative on the Mission and Ministry Board and for the two vacancies for General Synod representative posts on the Administration Board until 11 a.m. the following morning.

Nominations in relation to the Clergy Discipline Tribunal were set out in the General Synod papers.

1.8 Roll Call

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 145 members attended.

1.9 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of Synod: the Rev Peter Colwell, Miss Angela Daye, Mrs Elspeth Davey, Mr Tim Edwards, Miss Sheila Galbraith and Mr Simon Mackintosh.

1.10 Standing Committee

1.10.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31st December 2007

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the annual report and accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007.

The Standing Committee had benefited from the new members appointed the previous year. The annual review of Synod by the Organisation Review Committee had resulted in a number of changes: a meeting of chairpersons had been held before Synod as well as the usual Freshers' meeting, the Eucharist had taken place in Palmerston Place Church as an experiment and the Morning and Evening Offices were formally incorporated into the Business Sessions of the Synod. In addition, an increased number of lunchtime meetings were being held during the current Synod. Professor Peattie thanked Dr Martin Hogg who had taken on the Convenership of the Organisation Review Committee the previous year and also the other members of the Committee which had devised a new comment form included in the Synod papers. Unfortunately, Dr Hogg had indicated that he would not be able to continue as Convener.

The accounts were printed in the format required by the new Charities Regulations. New accounting requirements applicable to the 2007 accounts required the accrual of the income derived from the Unit Trust Pool and as a consequence the 2006 figures had been re-stated alongside the 2007 figures. The accounts reflected the total income and expenditure for the entire year. Some of the funds had restricted purposes and it was therefore the General Fund which most accurately reflected the financial health of the General Synod. Certain legacies had been received during the year and were referred to in the Annual Report and Accounts and had been credited to the General Fund. A capital sum of £50,000 had also been received for the sale of a small area of land in the Meadowbank area of Edinburgh.

The effect of restating the 2006 accounts was that the surplus reported the previous year for 2006 of £8,981 was now shown as a surplus of £48,365. For 2007, there had been a budgeted deficit of £22,347 on the General Fund but the actual out-turn had been a positive surplus of £106,195, an improvement of approximately £128,000. Some of the surplus had been due to non-recurring events such as staff vacancies, which would be filled, and in particular to the fact that there had not been any new curates starting in 2007. There had also been an unexpectedly high return of monies which had been allocated as grants but which had not been taken up until later than had been expected or which had not been taken up at all as projects were postponed or cancelled. Whilst there would also be some slippage (and it was that slippage which allowed the Standing Committee to budget with confidence for a deficit of approximately £50,000), it was not the Standing Committee's intention to return significant surpluses. Rather, the Standing Committee sought to identify carefully the funding required and then spend it wisely on the Church's charitable activities. The underlying reasons for the surplus in 2007 would be explored and consideration would be given to whether it was appropriate to increase the level of deficit which was budgeted for, whether there would be other ways of closing the gap between bids and the uptake of funds and whether there might be ways of making use of funds not taken up during the year.

Professor Peattie thanked members of the Synod Office staff and members of the Standing Committee.

Questions were invited but there were none.

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

“That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2007.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.10.2 Budgets

Professor Peattie referred to the budgets contained in the Synod papers for 2008 to 2010. The overall position showed a surplus for 2008 and subsequent years, albeit significantly reducing, but the figures for the General Fund were less rosy. The Standing Committee, in setting budgets, sought to achieve a break-even position at the year end and also to put any significant receipts during the financial year into capital

to produce income in the long term in order to keep quota down. The out-turn for 2008 was currently predicted to be almost break-even albeit that some returns of grants would be likely to result in a surplus. Some increased needs were nevertheless anticipated. Whilst income from the Unit Trust Pool continued to increase, the proportion of overall expenditure which the Unit Trust Pool income represented was expected to reduce. In 2009, the budget reflected a redistribution between the Administration Board and the Mission and Ministry Board owing to a change in funding responsibilities. In 2010, the Administration Board expected a significant uplift based on the assumption that curate numbers would return to a more usual level. There was also a change in relation to the budget of the Information and Communication Board because the production of *inspires* had been transferred from Scottish Episcopal Church (Newscan) to the General Synod.

In the light of the budgets, the Standing Committee proposed a 3% increase in provincial quota (which was less than the rate of inflation). This would be divided amongst dioceses as set out in the Synod papers.

Professor Peattie explained that the Standing Committee would not normally recommend to Synod a budget which contained a deficit of £93,000 (as was projected for the year 2010). However, the Standing Committee had been content to present such a budget given that Synod would be debating the report of the review of *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions*. It was possible that there would be recommendations coming from that review which might require a serious re-thinking of the budgets.

The Primus reminded Synod that the motion to adopt the figure for Provincial quota for 2009 would be considered by Synod on Saturday morning and that was the point at which any questions should be raised.

SESSION TWO – Mr Ian Stewart in the Chair

2.1 College of Bishops

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones (Primus) introduced the session and invited the Bishops of Edinburgh and of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane to report in greater detail.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) reminded the Synod that the Lambeth Conference was one of the Instruments of Communion in the Anglican Communion. None of the instruments had legislative power and the question currently before the Communion was whether, by way of a Covenant, some degree of regulatory authority could be given to one of the Instruments of Communion. The Lambeth Conference, at which each diocese was represented, met once every ten years whereas the Primates' meeting, which met every two years, included representation from each Province. It was easy to criticise the Lambeth Conference and whilst it was in need of criticism, such criticism needed to be informed by truth and shaped by love. He considered that the specific virtues of the Anglican Communion needed to be articulated and "talked up" at the present time. The theme of the forthcoming conference was *Equipping Bishops to fulfil their Leadership Role in God's Mission*. The theme of the Spouses' Conference was *God's People for God's Mission*. Scotland had a strong tradition of making a significant contribution to the life of the Conference. It was a

disappointment to him that approximately 280 Bishops would boycott the Lambeth Conference and instead attend a Conference due to take place in Jordan and this would adversely affect the dynamic of Lambeth. There was also a considerable amount of misleading information in the public domain about Lambeth (for example, a Ugandan Website had suggested that over 1,000 Bishops would boycott Lambeth). Everyone would need to disentangle truth from fiction in assessing information about the Conference. The meeting would have to be informed by major issues concerning the mission of the Church such as poverty, climate change, inter-faith issues and HIV/Aids. It was not just issues of sexuality which would be discussed. The Conference would also engage in the “Windsor Process”. In 2005 the process had broken into two further processes: the process of listening to the experience of homosexual persons (called for by the Lambeth Conference 1998) and the process of mutual listening requested by the Anglican Consultative Council in 2005 which had also called for a facilitator to enable a process of reflection in the light of scripture, tradition and reason. The Primates had called for material to be prepared for the Lambeth Conference and this was now publicly available. The other process was that of the Covenant which would be discussed later in Synod. Some wanted a Covenant to regularise liberal attitudes to sexuality whereas others wanted one to regulate irregular interventions in Provinces. He considered that the Covenant process had shifted the liberal/conservative debate from an original focus on sexuality into an area where passions might not run so high. Some would feel the issue was about biblical authority but he personally believed that the real issue was the Church’s understanding of God and it was important for the debate to move up a level to avoid the danger of falling apart. He considered that, were that to happen, the current pain being experienced within the Communion would shift from one of decay to one of bringing forth new birth.

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to contemplate the world after the Lambeth Conference. This was difficult and he cautioned against investing exaggerated hopes in the event. The Conference was not structured so as to resolve the current difficult issues, nor did it have the constitutional power to do so. Also, it was very difficult to contemplate a future when the present was characterised by conflict.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference had set a tone for the handling of the debate on sexuality. Many would feel that that tone had been aggressive and conservative. He hoped that 2008 would engender a more positive and moderate atmosphere for the Church to deal with its current difficulties in the future. He viewed the post-Lambeth world with some considerable concern. In the period of “waiting for Lambeth”, a level of restraint had been engendered (for example the Episcopal Church in the USA had largely recognised the request from the Primates that it should not consecrate Bishops in a same sex relationship). Sadly, the incursions of other Provinces into America and Canada had largely not stopped. After Lambeth, the focus would no longer be on Lambeth itself but would be on the individual Provinces and the decisions which such Provinces made for themselves as well as how the Provinces then responded to such decisions. The post-Lambeth world, he hoped, would not be a place of winners and losers nor for grand gestures but for cool heads and warm hearts, and measured and wise leadership.

The Covenant process had significance beyond what people thought about Covenant itself. The Covenant process could, after Lambeth, be one of the major ways in which the different parts of the Church could keep talking to one another. The Covenant, therefore, provided an Agenda which broadened matters out in order to give a common language for continuing discussion.

Finally, there was the question as to whether or not Scotland and those other Anglican Churches in the British Isles of Celtic root had a distinctive and positive contribution to make at Lambeth. He liked to think that that was the case.

Dr Anne Pankhurst (Edinburgh) addressed Synod on the planned visits of overseas Bishops and spouses to Scotland in advance of Lambeth. The offering of hospitality created space where people could listen to one another. Approximately seventy Bishops and spouses would be coming to Scotland from all over the world. Each diocese had devised its own hosting plans, the focal point of which would be the Sunday before the Lambeth Conference started. She hoped that in giving such hospitality, it would be possible to convey the distinctiveness of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Information regarding the visits was available from the website of the Anglican Communion and the Lambeth Conference and also from the USPG.

She expressed thanks to everyone who was involved in the planning of the visits including the College of Bishops and General Synod Office staff.

The chair invited questions on the presentations from the College of Bishops but there were none.

2.2 Faith & Order Board

2.2.1 Anglican Communion Covenant

The Rev Canon James Milne (Brechin) presented the “St Andrews” version of the Draft Covenant which had been received from the Anglican Communion. He reminded Synod that the Windsor Report of 2004 had suggested that the adoption of an Anglican Covenant would “make explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between the Churches of the Communion”. A meeting of the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and of the Anglican Consultative Council had considered the concept of an Anglican Covenant in March 2006 and this had led to the appointment of the Anglican Communion’s Covenant Design Group which had met in January 2007 to produce a draft text which had then been commended by Primates for consideration by Provinces. At General Synod 2007, the Scottish Episcopal Church had considered the first Draft Covenant and the Faith & Order Board had been instructed to prepare a formal response. That response had been considered by the Communion’s Covenant Design Group, along with other responses, and the new “St Andrews draft” had been prepared. Discussion of that draft within the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and of the Anglican Consultative Council had resulted in Provinces being asked to consider and respond to that draft text and to answer some technical questions regarding the process by which any proposed Covenant might be adopted by Provinces.

Canon Milne explained that Provinces were being asked whether they could give an “in principle” commitment, not to the details of the text, but to the Covenant process. There were good reasons why he believed the Scottish Episcopal Church should remain part of the process. The Scottish Episcopal Church had valuable things to say regarding the Covenant and comments made previously had been taken seriously. Previous comments on the first draft had pointed out that no mention had been made of the role of “reason” within Anglicanism and concern had also been expressed that the Primates’ meeting was being given power to adjudicate in areas of disagreement

as opposed to a more representative body such as the Anglican Consultative Council. Both of these concerns had been addressed in the new draft. Similarly, discussion of the term “concordat” in the latest draft was almost certainly the result of a suggestion made by the Faith & Order Board that this would be preferable to the term “Covenant”. Canon Milne believed that it would be unfortunate if the Church were to withdraw from the Covenant process since, when the text of a Covenant was finally offered for adoption, there would be the opportunity to decide whether or not it was the right thing for the Anglican Communion and for the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Provinces had also been asked, at the current time, to give an indication of the synodical process by which any Covenant might be adopted and whether there were elements in the draft text which would make the process of adoption non-viable as far as existing Canons or the law of the land was concerned. Such questions were fairly technical and it was proposed that the Faith & Order Board should undertake a careful scrutiny of the Canons before giving a considered answer. He invited Synod to address questions of principle and thereafter Synod would be given the opportunity to make specific comments on the text of the “St Andrews” draft.

Canon Milne then proposed the following motion:-

“That this Synod affirm an ‘in principle’ commitment to the Covenant process at this time (without committing itself to the details of any text).”

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded the motion. He had come to the conclusion that a Covenant was necessary. Over the years the Anglican Communion had changed and “bonds of affection” were no longer sufficient to hold the Communion together. He considered that the Covenant process was a means of broadening discussion. It was, he believed, not a legalistic “quick fix” for the purpose of determining who was or was not part of the Communion. Rather it was a mechanism to enable the Communion to discuss what it held in common. By way of example, he referred to recent comments made by the Bishop of Cork who had suggested that, were new powers to be given to the Archbishop of Canterbury, this would imply the need to consider how the Archbishop of Canterbury was chosen. The Covenant process could therefore lead to a much more fundamental consideration of what the Anglican Communion stood for, how it worked, how it might be led and what it believed. It would be unfortunate for the Scottish Episcopal Church to place itself outside that discussion. Did the Scottish Episcopal Church not regard itself in some way as the “midwife” to the Anglican Communion?

He supported the motion.

The Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed difficulty in separating the process from the product. He queried whether, if the Church committed itself to the process, it was also committing itself to the outcome. He considered that committing to the process was a high risk strategy.

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow and Galloway) did not share the optimism of the Bishop of St Andrews about the Covenant, though she was optimistic about the process. She queried whether a distinction could be drawn between the process and the Covenant.

She favoured continuing with the process but disliked the concept of a Covenant, which she considered was very un-Anglican,

The Rev Canon Professor John Riches (Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) accepted that the Synod probably had to pass the motion but he wished to enter certain reservations regarding the process. He asked whether the Anglican Church saw itself as a communion (which involved a continual process of working together) or as something which needed re-inventing such that members now chose whether or not they were members of the Communion. There was a sense of becoming more like a gathered sect and he was concerned that in subscribing to the Covenant process the Church would undermine its own ecclesial status. The recent report from the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Theological Dialogue *The Church of the Triune God* talked of the respective Communions participating in the life of the Trinity. If the Anglican Communion were to re-invent itself, it needed to be very careful about what it was doing.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) disagreed that Synod had to give its support to the motion. The question was whether or not the Synod agreed with the Covenant process. His heart and his head were in disagreement. His heart thought that the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church should not go to the Lambeth Conference but with his head he accepted that they should go with the blessing of the Church and with some sense of where the Scottish Episcopal Church stood in the current debate. He did not agree with a Covenant which excluded others and would vote against the motion.

The Rev Ian Hopkins (Edinburgh) did not agree with Mrs Gill Young that the Covenant was un-Anglican. The Synod had been constituted with a Eucharist in which members had celebrated their participation in the new Covenant. The Scottish Episcopal Church had liberal tendencies and it was good that all should value love, truth, justice and freedom and this was not incompatible with a Covenant. Many members lived in Covenant in marriage and those values were shared quite compatibly with being in a Covenant relationship. He supported the concept of Covenant and would vote in favour of the motion.

The Rev Marion Chatterley (Edinburgh) asked for clarification on what would happen if the Synod voted against the motion. She wondered whether the Church would be excluded from further conversation or whether it would just be a question of “putting down a marker”.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) said that he spoke with some trepidation and hesitation. The current debate in the Communion required clarity and he asked what one should do if “one liked fish but not chips”. The wording of the motion implied an acceptance of the principle of Covenant. He did not wish to vote against anything but the motion left him with no choice but to do so. The document on page 75 of the General Synod papers suggested that a negative response would signify the Church’s rejection of the very idea of an Anglican Covenant and might mean that the Church would exclude itself from future discussions regarding a Covenant. He considered that everyone had a commitment to remain together as Anglicans and that could still allow scope for disagreement regarding the nature of God or the authority of the bible. He was interested in a Covenant of the sacraments and queried why the Covenant of

Baptism was not sufficient. Because he wished a choice of things other than just “chips” with his fish, he proposed that the motion be amended to read as follows:-

“That this Synod affirm an “in principle” commitment to continue to participate actively in discussions regarding the future shape of the Anglican Communion at this time (without necessarily committing itself to the concept of a Covenant).”

Mrs Nancy Adams (Edinburgh) seconded the amendment.

The Rev Canon David Bayne (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked Canon Paton for his amendment. He wanted to keep talking but was anxious about the kind of Covenant being presented. He supported the comments of the Bishop of St Andrews that bigger and better things could come from future discussions than just the Covenant itself.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) was broadly happy with Canon Paton’s amendment but wished to point out an omission. The Scottish Episcopal Church had responded to the previous Draft Covenant whereas not all other Provinces had. It was clear from the letter from the Anglican Communion dated 12th March 2008, a copy of which had been reproduced in the General Synod papers, that Provinces were being asked to initiate a process of detailed discussion with a view to responding by the end of March 2009. In voting for the original motion, Synod would be committing itself simply to that. Consequently, he had unease about Canon Paton’s amendment.

The Rev David Mumford (Brechin) expressed reservations about Canon Paton’s amendment. The Communion was in a process of working out what sort of international framework it best needed at the current time. Some of the proposals which had previously been made by the Scottish Episcopal Church had been taken on board by the Anglican Communion. At the current time, the Church was not being asked to respond to a process about the future shape of the Anglican Communion but rather was being asked to give an “in principle” commitment to the Covenant process. To drop the word “Covenant” from the motion would be for the Church to blind itself to many of the ways in which it was being called to act. He wanted a motion which affirmed that the process was one in which the Scottish Episcopal Church wanted to continue to be engaged.

The Rev Canon James Milne responded to the amendment saying that the Scottish Episcopal Church would not be prevented from commenting on the text of the draft Covenant but he feared it might reduce the weight of comments made by the Province. As far as the proposed amendment was concerned, he did not propose to accept it so that Synod itself could make the decision on the form of the motion.

The chair explained that the amendment would be put to Synod and that, if the amendment were passed, then the motion itself, in its amended form, would be put to the vote.

The amendment proposed by Canon Paton and seconded by Mrs Adams was then put to the vote and was carried (65 in favour, 56 against).

The amended motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority (2 against, 5 abstentions).

The Rev Canon James Milne then proposed, and the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod ask the Faith and Order Board to respond to the ‘three questions’ in the letter from the Joint Standing Committee, incorporating this Synod’s response to Question 1.”

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

The Rev Canon James Milne then presented for discussion the text of the “St Andrews” draft of the Covenant. He explained that this had been offered to the Communion for reflection and comment and would be considered at the Lambeth Conference and, he hoped widely discussed within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

He then proposed, and the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod:

a) note the St Andrew’s draft Covenant, and ask dioceses to discuss it and submit comments to the Faith and Order Board by 31 December 2008;

b) ask the Faith and Order Board to prepare a response to the Anglican Communion on the draft Covenant, taking due cognisance of the views of this Synod and of dioceses.”

The Rev John Penman (Edinburgh) said that on his initial reading of the new draft Covenant he wished to commend the Anglican Communion for taking account of comments which had been communicated by the Scottish Episcopal Church and especially for taking on board the comments regarding the role of the Primates as a kind of Curia. The current draft, however, seemed to move from the establishment of a Curia to that of a Papacy. He was not convinced that the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury was a judicial one. The Archbishop might not be the best person to make the kind of decisions required of him under the new draft Covenant. He would prefer the Covenant Design Group to consider where judgements might be made in a more collective fashion.

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

2.2.2 Canons for Second Reading - Congregational Status

The Rev Jeremy Auld (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained he was presenting the canonical material at the current Synod because the Convener of the Committee, the Rev Canon Professor John Richardson, was unavailable. He paid tribute to Professor Richardson, who was retiring as Committee Convener and also expressed thanks to other members of the Committee and its Secretary, Elspeth Davey.

Mr Auld reminded Synod that a discussion paper had been presented to Synod in 2005 explaining that the current hierarchy of congregations was regarded as outdated. At the current time, there were incumbencies, independent congregations, dependent congregations and private chapels. The proposed canonical amendments would not affect the last two categories but Synod had agreed in 2005 that the distinction between the first two categories should cease. He explained that the proposed changes were not retrospective and, consequently, someone who was a priest-in-charge of a congregation which was currently an independent congregation would not change status immediately. The effect of one of the resolutions to be proposed to Synod would be to retain the text of Canon 37 as an appendix to Canon 36 so that this would remain in force for those currently priests-in-charge and for current independent congregations. The changes would, however, come into effect as and when a vacancy arose and henceforth priests-in-charge would become rectors and independent congregations would become incumbencies. He was aware that certain concerns had been raised regarding the use of the words “rector” and “incumbent” but there appeared to be some confusion in people’s minds arising from Church of England usage of such terms. There was nothing in the Code of Canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church that required a rector, or indeed a Bishop, to be stipendiary and it was possible for congregations to have non-stipendiary clerics in charge. He noted that the proposals did not address the situation of Local Collaborative Ministry congregations.

Mr Auld explained that the second matter addressed by the proposed amendments was to give recognition to those congregations which had joined together and the new Canons would give the possibility of creating joint incumbencies or linked charges. In the latter case, the congregations would retain their separate vestries and constitutions. The joint incumbency had initially been the preferred option of the Committee on Canons but, partly because of concerns that such a mechanism might prove difficult because of the application of local trust arrangements, the linked charge structure was now also being proposed. There had been favourable support for linked charges in discussions within dioceses and the Diocese of Edinburgh had suggested certain specific changes which were set out in the General Synod papers and with which the Committee on Canons agreed. This created a choice for congregations to opt either for joint incumbency or linked charge status.

Mr Auld explained the process for a congregation to become a joint incumbency. There would be a single vestry for a joint incumbency but each congregation would have a management committee. At any stage, the process of becoming a joint incumbency could be halted by the congregations themselves. He then explained the process for becoming a linked charge which, as for joint incumbencies, would be initiated by the congregations in question.

Mr Auld referred to the comments which had been received from Diocesan Synods and which were set out in the General Synod papers. It had not been clear whether some of the proposals from dioceses had been voted on within Diocesan Synods or were simply suggestions of individuals. He asked that, in future, it would be helpful if Diocesan Synods could vote on any specific comments.

Mr Auld then addressed the specific text for Canon 36 which the Committee on Canons wished to present to Synod for second reading. He explained that Section 3

of the Canon now allowed a three month period for the adoption of a new constitution by a joint incumbency, as had been proposed by the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness. The suggestion from the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney that there should be a review every five years regarding representation on the joint vestry had also been taken into account. Section 7 of the Canon reflected the proposals from the Dioceses of both Aberdeen and Edinburgh allowing for choice as between joint incumbency and linked charge status. The proposals from the Diocese of Edinburgh brought into play a similar process for the establishment of a linked charge as that applicable for the creation of a joint incumbency. This provided that the agreement of clerics of the charges in question would be needed for the linkage to proceed (and the agreement of the Bishop was also required). The proposed text for Section 8 had also been altered to reflect the points made by the Dioceses of Aberdeen and Edinburgh that constitutions of the linked charges should be amended to make them subject to the Memorandum of Agreement which related to those linked charges.

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

“That this Synod agree that the version of Canon 36 to be debated for second reading shall be that incorporating such of the amendments suggested by Diocesan Synods as are recommended by the Canons Committee.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority (1 against, 1 abstention).

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

“That the amended text for Canon 36 be read for the second time.”

The Rev Robert Warren (Edinburgh) noted that the proposed Section 7 of Canon 36 deemed the clergy in charge of the original incumbency or incumbencies to have demitted office, and that this was followed by their reinstatement. The original version of the Canon had made it extremely difficult for a linked charge to be created if one of the charges had an incumbent and the other did not. He asked for confirmation that what was intended in the Canon as presented was a pro-forma demission of office rather than the actual ending of a ministry.

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) thanked the Committee on Canons for listening to comments which had been made in the past. He considered, nevertheless, that there was still a reluctance to rejoice in the concept of a linked charge. It had been explained that the linked charge option had been created as a result of local trust or constitutional difficulties. In fact, it was not just a question of local constitutional issues but rather because the linked charge status allowed retention of autonomy. He considered that joint incumbencies would, in fact, involve more administration given the existence of both a joint vestry and local management committees. He wished to commend the concept of the linked charge.

The Rev Canon Hugh Lee (Argyll and the Isles) commented that the word “rector” meant “ruler” which was in fact in conflict with the role of priest. If the Canons were to be updated then terminology similarly ought to be updated. The word “ruler” was not appropriate especially in small congregations and he suggested it should be changed to “parish priest” or something similar.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that Section 3 of the Canon referred to a three month period for the production of a new constitution in relation to a joint incumbency whereas Section 8 provided for a period of one month for the presentation of a Memorandum of Agreement in relation to a linked charge. She thought there should be consistency between the two.

Mr Auld responded that the three month period related to the complex situation of the constitutions of two incumbencies being abrogated and replaced with one whereas the putting together of a Memorandum of Agreement ought to be more straightforward. Timetables were, in any event, capable of extension with the consent of the Bishop. Commenting on the point raised by Canon Lee, Mr Auld suggested that even small congregations could at times be unruly. In relation to the point raised by Mr Warren, it was a question of how much the clergy could trust their congregation. If there was any doubt about this, the rector could enter into an agreement with the charges in question that he or she would be instituted or collated as rector of the new joint incumbency.

The Rev David Brooke (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that the first sentence of Section 1 of Canon 36 stated that no congregation could be constituted an incumbency until a Church or suitable building had been provided. He himself had a sense of “camping” and wondered why a building for worship was needed when the clergy were not housed properly.

The Rev Sally Gorton (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested in Section 3 of Canon 36 the words “shall require to produce” ought to read “shall be required to produce”.

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

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

“That Canon 37 be repealed in its entirety (second reading), subject to Synod passing the motions set out below for the adoption of the proposed new resolutions 2 and 3 under Canon 36.”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) asked for clarification regarding the status of an appendix to the Canons. Mr Auld responded that the effect of Resolutions 2 and 3 which would shortly be proposed for adoption under the new Canon 36 would give effect to the appendix such that the current provisions of Canon 37 would effectively remain in place in the future for the congregations and clergy to which they currently applied.

The motion was then put to the vote in-houses with the following result:-

House of Laity: passed unanimously.

House of Clergy: passed by majority (1 against, 4 abstentions).

House of Bishops: passed *nem con*.

The chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

Mr Auld explained the proposed changes in relation to Canon 13.1 which were to include a reference to joint incumbencies and also provide for the preparation of a plan dealing with proposals for the mission and ministry of congregations and the review of such a plan every five years. It would be for each diocese to decide what would be involved in such a review.

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

“That the amended text for Canon 13, Section 1 be read for the second time.”

The motion was put to the vote in-houses with the following result:-

House of Laity: passed unanimously.

House of Clergy: passed *nem con* (6 abstentions).

House of Bishops: passed *nem con*.

The chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

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

“That the amended text for Canons 6, 11, 12, 13.3, 13.5, 13.7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 35, 38, 39, 40, 43, 50, 53, 57, 60, 61, 62, and 63 be read for the second time.”

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) suggested that in Canon 63.1 the words “meeting of the communicants of that congregation” should read “meeting of the communicants of each congregation”. Mr Auld agreed that this was a typographical error.

The motion was then put to the vote in houses with the following result:-

House of Laity: passed unanimously.

House of Clergy: passed *nem con* (3 abstentions).

House of Bishops: passed *nem con*.

The chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

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

“That the text for Resolution 1 under Canon 36 be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (2 abstentions).

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

“That the text for Resolution 2 under Canon 36 be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (3 abstentions).

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

“That the text for Resolution 3 under Canon 36 be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (3 abstentions).

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

“That the text for the Appendix to Canon 36 be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed by a majority (1 against, 1 abstention).

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

“That the amended text for Appendix No.13 to the Code of Canons be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (3 abstentions).

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

“That the amended text for Appendix No.14 to the Code of Canons be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* (1 abstention).

SESSION THREE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

3.1 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Ms Lexy Plumtree (Convener, Committee for the protection of children and vulnerable adults) presented the report of her Committee. The Church had been working for the previous couple of years in relation to policy for the protection of vulnerable adults, alongside the bringing into force of the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007. The Scottish Government had been developing its provisions for implementation and, as far as she was aware, the first phase of implementation would probably take place around the middle of 2009. There was a considerable amount of secondary legislation to be produced. The programme for implementation was available from the Scottish Government website. Given the current state of implementation, the Committee was still waiting for considerable further detail as to what the full implications would be for the Church. In consequence, the kind of issues which had been raised at General Synod the previous year by Mrs Sainsbury were still under consideration.

Ms Plumtree referred to the proposal for the carrying out of a review of historic and closed cases and reported that interviews were set for later in the month for the appointment of an independent reviewer. The Appointments Panel would be chaired by Professor Peattie and would include the Rev Malcolm Goldsmith, the Secretary General and the Provincial Officer for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults. A full report would be provided to the Synod the following year.

She expressed the thanks of the Committee to Mr Lanahan as the Provincial Officer for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults and to Dr Audsley as the Assistant Officer.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Ms Plumtree then explained the background to the proposal for the adoption of a revised Code of Practice (as required by Disclosure Scotland) for Registered Persons, their Nominees and Other Recipients of Disclosure Information. The previous version of the Code had been adopted in 2002 by the General Synod but it had subsequently been changed.

The Rev Dr John Armes (Edinburgh) then proposed, and the Rev Canon Clifford Piper (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the Code of Practice for Registered Persons, their Nominees and Other Recipients of Disclosure Information (2007 edition) be adopted, in place of the Code of Practice for Registered Persons and Other Recipients of Disclosure Information adopted by the General Synod in 2002 and that paragraph no.3 of the Schedule to Canon 65 be altered accordingly.”

There being no comment, the motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Chair thanked Ms Plumtree and the members of her Committee.

3.2 Standing Committee - Charity Regulation

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) reminded Synod that the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 had come into force in April 2006 and a number of seminars had been organised through the General Synod Office for vestry members and treasurers and a range of written materials had also been prepared. The Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) was conducting a programme of rolling review for the purposes of assessing whether charities on the Index met the charity test. If charitable status were to be lost by the Church, the advantages of gift aid would also be lost. The General Synod, each diocese and each congregation was a separate charity in its own right and it would be necessary for all such component parts of the Church to pass the charity test. The General Synod itself had been reviewed and had passed the test. Governance arrangements had been reviewed as part of the process and it had been necessary to clarify who were to be regarded as the Charity Trustees of the General Synod. Those known as “the Trustees of the General Synod” held property and investments but the “Charity Trustees” were those who had control of the administration and management of the charity. The proposal being brought to Synod was to clarify the provisions in the Digest of Resolutions regarding the role of the Trustees of the General Synod and make clear who were the Charity Trustees. It was proposed to modify Section 2.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions to reflect the wording of the Charities Act. Also, the Act prevented charities from remunerating a majority of its Trustees and OSCR had been advised that Trustee Indemnity Insurance might be regarded as remuneration. In fact, a change to the legislation was required. It was proposed that a new provision be included in the Digest of Resolutions, as Section 2.10 regarding indemnity insurance.

Professor Peattie explained that in the past “designated religious body” status had exempted certain religious bodies from some aspects of regulation, especially in relation to the format of accounts. Under the new legislation, however, all charities were required to comply with the accounts regulations. The Standing Committee had carefully considered whether or not to seek designated religious charity status under the new legislation and, whilst an application had been submitted, the Standing Committee in fact considered that there were significant advantages in not having such status since it allowed the regulator to regulate and allowed the

Church to act in a more pastoral capacity. OSCR had declined to award designated religious charity status because of the absence of provision in relation to the discipline of lay people and of directional control as between different parts of the overall Church structure. Whilst the Church could reapply for designated religious charity status, it would be necessary to introduce the kind of powers which were set out on pages 145 and 146 of the General Synod papers. This would need a canonical change and there was a risk that, as a result, the Church would require to consolidate its accounts at all levels. The Standing Committee, in the light of this, had concluded that it did not wish to take the question of designated religious charity status any further.

Comment was invited but there was none.

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

“That the Digest of Resolutions be amended as follows:-

(a) In the existing paragraph 1.2

Synod (i) the title to the paragraph be altered to read “Trustees of the General of the Scottish Episcopal Church”.

(ii) the following words be inserted after the end of the first sentence:-

“The Trustees act solely as nominees or custodians of property of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church and consequently do not have general control and management of the administration of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church.”

(iii) the existing fifth sentence be deleted and there be substituted therefor the following:-

“The Trustees shall have power to sell or feu heritable property, and also shall have all the powers possessed now or from time to time by Trustees under statute, and also all the powers which the Court of Session is entitled to confer upon Trustees under the Trusts (Scotland) Act 1921, the Trusts (Scotland) Act 1961 or the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005, as amended”.

(b) By the insertion after the existing paragraph 1.3 of the following:-

“1.4 Charity Trustees

The members of the Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church have the general control and management of the administration of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church and are consequently the Charity Trustees of the General Synod for the purpose of the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005.”

and by the renumbering of the existing paragraphs 1.4 to 1.10 inclusive as paragraphs 1.5 to 1.11 respectively.

(c) By the deletion of the preamble of paragraph 2.2.2 (appearing immediately before paragraph 2.2.2(a)) and the substitution therefor of the following:-

“Acting under the authority of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and subject to the terms of the Digest of Resolutions, the Standing Committee has the general control and management of the administration of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church and as such any authority in the administration of the affairs of the General Synod operated by other boards and committees of the General Synod shall be by authority delegated by the Standing Committee and it shall be empowered to exercise generally all financial powers vested in the General Synod and in particular, without prejudice to the foregoing generality, it is empowered:-”

(d) By the insertion following the existing paragraph 2.9 of the following:-

“2.10 Indemnity Insurance

Insurance against any liability and associated matter which by virtue of any rule of law may attach to any member of the General Synod, the Standing Committee or the Boards or Committees of the General Synod in respect of negligence, default or breach of duty of care, but excluding gross negligence, fraud or wilful default, of which he/she may be guilty in his/her capacity as a member of the General Synod, the Standing Committee or Boards or Committees of the General Synod may be purchased from the funds of the General Synod.””

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

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

4.1 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Canon Clifford Piper (Convener, Information and Communication Board) referred to the formal reports of his Board and SEC Newscan in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007. The Board’s communication strategy identified three key communication tools: *inspires*, the Provincial website and the College of Bishops. The Board regularly reviewed its communication strategy and had focussed on the key messages it conveyed to the Church which were that it was: a confident Scottish Church; an independent Province of the Worldwide Anglican Communion; a distinctive voice in Scotland; inclusive; encouraging of good inter-church and inter-faith relationships; exploring new ways of mission and ministry; had hundreds of Churches serving local communities; had a rich spirituality to share. The College of Bishops had enjoyed a number of successes in communicating such messages including the extensive Good Friday interview in the *The Scotsman* with the Primus and coverage of the Bishop of Aberdeen’s position on embryology. Canon Piper referred to the fact that the Scottish Episcopal Church had been the first Church to participate in the Scottish Wedding Show. He himself had featured in a *Daily Mail* article about Clergy in Cyber Space but had been brought down to

earth by being featured as a museum piece by a local photographer the following week. All of this was good publicity for the Church.

Turning to *inspires*, he indicated that it was highly regarded in the Scottish Episcopal Church and in other Churches and was frequently referred to as an excellent “shop window”. The profit of SEC (Newscan) Ltd had risen from £6,444 in 2006 to £8,785 in 2007. *Inspires* was not only an effective communication tool but also made a small profit to help finance other work of the Church. However, it could only continue if people continued to subscribe. The increase in profit was in fact due to advertising since subscription levels had fallen. The main burden of producing the publication lay with Lorna Finley as the Communications Officer, assisted by a small editorial team. Declining subscriptions were demoralising and Canon Piper encouraged Synod members to make use of the subscription form in the June 2008 edition, a copy of which had been provided to Synod members.

Canon Piper reminded Synod members that the new provincial website had been launched the previous year and he had encouraged people to make use of it. He thanked them for doing so. The site experienced more than 30,000 hits per month (of which 4,000 were new each month mainly from the UK and the USA). The most visited pages of the site were the Church Directory, the Liturgies and the Blogs. There was a regular transfer of data from the General Synod Office database to the website in order to keep the Church Directory section up to date. A new resource section had been created and gave information regarding charity regulation and would in future make available information of the kind currently in the Vestry Handbook. The General Synod papers had also been available online for the first time in this current year. In the Synod meeting, internet wireless access was available and Lorna Finley was able to post regular updates regarding the Synod to the Provincial website. Audio casts were also being regularly uploaded on to the site for the first time in the current year, arranged by the Rev Robert Warren. Careful design of the site had allowed the integration of the website for the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway and discussions were currently underway in relation to further developments between the site and those for the Diocese of Edinburgh and TISEC. All of this needed resourcing and his colleagues on the Standing Committee had been as generous as they could. However, the Board needed to prepare a costed plan. He invited Synod members to let the Board know what they wanted to appear on the site. Finally, the Board had arranged two fringe meetings during Synod on blogging and the use of websites as tools for mission.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Canon Piper then addressed the proposed changes to the Digest of Resolutions to reflect the fact the production of *inspires* had been moved from Scottish Episcopal Church (Newscan) Ltd to the General Synod. He then proposed, and the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the Digest of Resolutions be altered as follows:

(a) by the deletion from paragraph 2.6.2 of the words “It shall be responsible to Scottish Episcopal Church (Newscan) Limited for the financial management of, and contractual arrangements relating to, “The Scottish Episcopalian”.

(b) by the deletion of paragraph 5.2 of the words “and by the Directors of Scottish Episcopal Church Newscan Ltd on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church Newscan Ltd”

and by the insertion of the word “and” immediately before the words “by the Directors of the Scottish Episcopal Church Nominees.””

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

4.2 Liturgy Committee

The Rev Darren McFarland (Convener, Liturgy Committee) reported on two items of work being carried out by the Liturgy Committee, both of which involved two phases. In both cases, the first phase had been completed already. Earlier in the year, stocks of the Liturgy for the *Administration of Holy Communion by a Deacon or Lay Person (from the Reserved Sacrament)* were running low. This gave the opportunity of either ordering a reprint or making some alterations and this coincided with expressions of concern from various quarters in the Province about Communion from the Reserved Sacrament as a regular experience of worshipping communities. It was reported that some congregations were unaware of the Province’s liturgical provision for such a service and some congregations had chosen not to use it. Evidence was presented of a wide variety of liturgical use and, perhaps, abuse. The Committee had therefore presented to the Faith & Order Board an expanded version of explanatory notes and an article on the theological and ecclesiological understanding of Communion from the Reserved Sacrament. Both of these would be included in the short-term, in-house version of the liturgy. The Committee had also been asked to prepare a revision of the liturgical text as well as a framework for the use of the liturgy as part of the main Sunday service. It would also include further seasonal material. The Board had also asked the Committee to explore the provision of a Ministry of the Word as an alternative to the use of the 1997 Reserved Sacrament liturgy at public worship on Sundays.

Mr McFarland reported that the 1982 Liturgy had celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary with a lunch bringing together the Liturgy Committee and some of those who had worked on the production of the Liturgy. The Scottish Episcopal Church was the only Anglican Church in Britain and Ireland which had not revised its “Blue Book”. This led to a request from the Faith & Order Board that a survey be carried out regarding the use of the 1982 Liturgy. A questionnaire had been circulated and there had been a sizable response which the Committee would need to consider. It would be used to provide an overview to the Faith & Order Board in the autumn and a decision could then be taken as to whether or not a revision was needed and, if so, the extent of such revision.

Mr McFarland said that “liturgical formation” remained the passion of liturgical committees the world over. The Liturgy Committee had been progressing steadily on this and, in the previous academic year, members of the Committee had acted as consultants to TISEC students preparing worship for residential weekends. It was hoped that this would be developed in the coming years. Also, two years’ worth of articles had been commissioned from members of the Committee for publication in *inspires*. The first year would concentrate on Eucharistic texts and it was hoped that these would be of use to the Province following the previous series on feasts and festivals under the authorship of the Rev Canon James Milne. It was hoped that these would be published as a booklet in the future. The Committee was discovering that liturgical formation could often best be achieved through interaction with liturgical text.

Mrs Mary Moffett (Edinburgh) indicated that she would be delighted to have the opportunity to comment on a liturgy for taking communion from the reserved sacrament to people at

home, particularly in relation to the practical instructions for the person administering the sacrament. She was willing to act as a “guinea pig”.

Further comment was invited but there was none.

SESSION FIVE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

5.1 Administration Board

Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) reported that the Board and its pendant committees had worked very hard in providing the support to the core activities of the Church which was vital to ensure that such core activities could be delivered. He had attended meetings of most of the committees during the year and had confidence that work was being handled well. The Board had dealt with an array of matters during the year including participation in a consultation by the Scottish Government on water charges for small charities. Although conflicting messages were emerging following the consultation it appeared from comments in the press that the issues raised by the Scottish Episcopal Church and other charities had been listened to. He understood that the current exemption for those charities with a net income of less than £50,000 per annum would be continued until 2014 and perhaps indefinitely thereafter.

Comment was invited but there was none.

5.2 Investment Committee

In the absence of Mr Graeme Thom, the Convener of the Investment Committee, Mr Stewart presented the report on behalf of the Committee by reading a text provided by Mr Thom. During the year a new Ethical Investment Policy had been approved and applied to both the Pension Fund and the Unit Trust Pool portfolios. The policy involved positive criteria in promoting good corporate governance, good employment and environment policies through active engagement on the part of the fund managers with corporate management. It also contained negative criteria in that direct investment would not be made in companies whose main business lay in armaments, gambling, tobacco or pornography.

The stock market had been unsettled in the previous year with the financial sector doing particularly badly. The Pension Fund had had a small holding in Northern Rock which had been sold before the stock price collapsed completely.

The aim of the Unit Trust Pool was to achieve a good rate of income and the Fund Managers, Baillie Gifford, had achieved that target. In order to maintain the income, the portfolio contained substantial holdings in the financial sector which gave a good rate of return but this had resulted in an underperformance in capital terms. The Committee had some concerns about the overall performance of both funds. This had been discussed with the Fund Managers who were aware of the situation but believed that their stock selection remained appropriate and that results would even out over the longer term. A review of the Fund Managers was carried out every five years and preparation was in hand to carry out the next review in 2009. At the most recent meeting of the Committee, Mr Bob Burgon and Mr Adrian Tupper had both retired having completed 8 years’ service and their valuable contribution over the years had been very much appreciated. Mr Andrew November also

completed his term of office and had kindly agreed to continue for a second term. The Committee had selected, from a very strong list of candidates, two new members with current experience of the investment management industry to replace Messrs. Burgon and Tupper and had co-opted a third new member whose experience would complement the existing strength of the Committee. The Committee would be asking the Administration Board to endorse those appointments at its next meeting.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.3 Finance Committee

The Rev Canon David Bayne (Convener, Finance Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007 and to the prospective budgets for the funds administered by the Committee set out in the Synod papers. Accounts and budgets were encrypted mission statements. Part of the reason for the significant surplus for 2007 which had been reported on by Professor Peattie the previous day related to the Finance Committee. Part of the budget was “top-sliced” for provision of curate grants and in 2007 there had been no new curates. There were also vacancies in some supported charges and one experimental ministry on the south side of Edinburgh had come to an end. It would be helpful for the Committee to have flexibility in moving resources from one fund to another during the course of the year and it was likely that the Committee would wish to take this up with the Administration Board and the Standing Committee. As far as the budget was concerned, the reason for the reduction in funds allocated to the Finance Committee was because of shifting of responsibility for funding ministry adviser posts from the Committee to the Ministry Development Committee. This explained the reduction in the 2009 budget for the Committee. The Committee had opposed any reduction on the basis that it had not been provided with additional resources at the time that responsibility for funding such posts had been placed upon it.

Canon Bayne reported that stipend levels were kept under review by the Finance Committee and the current policy was to shadow the Church of England’s benchmark stipend which, for 2009, was expected to be £22,250, an uplift of 3%. This would require to be approved by the Administration Board in September.

The Committee had revisited the question of child allowance and had decided to make no change. The usefulness of the allowance was in fact withering as stipend levels increased and spouse income augmented household finances. Nevertheless, the allowance was still important for those who needed it. Removing it would send the wrong kind of signal and it had been decided to leave it in place at least until 2011.

He explained that in relation to the Dunderdale Fund for the Endowment of Charges it had been decided many years previously to divide the income available from the Fund by splitting it more or less equally among the seven dioceses. Some of the charges which had been supported no longer existed whereas others were in fact now quite prosperous and no longer needed the support. One supported Edinburgh congregation had recently returned three years’ worth of distributions. The Committee intended to recommend to the Administration Board that the fund be divided by seven and that each diocese then decide how it wished to allocate the funds to individual congregations. This might come as a shock the following year to some congregations.

Canon Bayne indicated that he considered the name “Finance Committee” was no longer appropriate since there was now a dedicated Investment Committee and a number of other financial matters were now handled by the Standing Committee. Accordingly, he invited suggestions for a new name for the Committee.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.4 Retirement Welfare Committee

Mr Graeme Stirling (Convener, Retirement Welfare Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007. He drew attention to the possible need to realise investments in order to fund retirement housing. Current projections showed a deficit arising in 2012 but it was very difficult to forecast future needs with accuracy. When a further questionnaire was issued regarding housing needs, he encouraged clergy to respond.

Mr Stirling then turned to the proposals contained in the Synod papers to alter the composition of the Committee. It was proposed to remove the requirement from the Digest of Resolutions that at least two of the Committee’s members be clergy and that least one member be a clergy spouse or widowed clergy spouse. If a clergy spouse in fact wished to serve, one of the current members of the Committee was willing to stand down but otherwise would continue in office.

The Primus thanked the Committee for their vigilance in ensuring the future provision of clergy housing.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) then proposed, and the Rev Canon David Bayne (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

“That paragraph 2.3.3(c) of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words “at least two of whom must be clergy of the Church and at least one of whom must be the spouse or widowed spouse of one of the clergy of the Church.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed by a majority (1 vote against).

5.5 Buildings Advisory Committee

The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Convener, Buildings Advisory Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007. The Committee was due to meet in July to consider proposed changes to Canon 35. He expressed gratitude to the Rev Canon James Milne, a member of the Committee on Canons, for the work which he had already done on that subject. It was hoped that a revised and improved Canon could be presented to General Synod, perhaps in 2010.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.6 Personnel Committee

5.6.1 Grievance Procedure

Mr Graeme Hely (Convener, Personnel Committee) referred to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended to 31st December 2007 and the supplementary material contained in the General Synod papers. In the previous ten years, there had been a flood of legislation and statements from government departments, trade unions, employers' associations and the European Union on matters such as employment rights, equal opportunities, sexual harassment, age discrimination and similar topics. The position maintained by the Committee was that clergy were not employees and that priesthood was a vocation not a job. The relationship between Bishop, Priest and Deacon was not that of industrial or commercial line management. The changes in legislation had coincided with an express desire on the part of the Scottish Episcopal Church to re-examine questions of clergy terms and conditions of service which had been evidenced for, example, by the work of the Clergy Personnel Commission in the late 1990s. A major preoccupation of the Committee in the previous year had been the drawing up of a Grievance Procedure for matters which fell outwith the scope of the existing Canons 53 and 54. The documents presented to the Synod had been considered by the Administration Board, the College of Bishops and the Faith & Order Board. Mr Hely explained that Synod was not being invited to adopt the Grievance Procedure but only to give a first reading to Canon 53 for the purpose of creating a framework within which a Grievance Procedure could be adopted in the future. He wished to stress that the Personnel Committee welcomed any comments on the draft presented to Synod so that a finalised version could be brought forward for adoption the following year.

Miss Sheila Galbraith, a member of the Personnel Committee, spoke to the draft Grievance Procedure. She explained that because clergy were not employees the normal industrial model of Grievance Procedure did not work and, consequently, the Committee had tried to create provisions which would sit comfortably in a Church context. The procedure was not intended to replace normal relationships but was rather a fallback position where the usual, charitable, Christian discussion could no longer take place. Her preference was that in situations where a grievance arose, the facility of mediation would be made use of but mediation itself could fail. The Grievance Process therefore, sought to enable parties to continue to work together without festering resentment. It was not a panacea and often grievance processes ended with neither party feeling satisfied. The procedure had its limitations. In some organisations, there was scope for employees to be moved to other departments but the Church was not that sort of organisation. For example, the Diocesan Bishop could not order a vestry to take a specific action and, consequently, the Grievance Procedure might not resolve an issue. She encouraged comment on the Grievance Procedure.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) welcomed the possibility of a Grievance Procedure and the endorsement of a benchmark of conciliation and mediation. He wondered what kind of provision would be available for this. He also asked whether trade unions were being consulted on the process.

Miss Galbraith responded that there were a number of mediation services available. There was a Church Mediation Group and it might be that parties to a grievance in fact would have someone available in their own diocese to help. As far as trade

unions were concerned, an individual in a Grievance Procedure was entitled to bring his or her trade union representative to a meeting. The Committee had not, however, consulted with any trade union but Miss Galbraith had considered material available through ACAS. There was no recognised clergy union and, consequently, there would be a question as to which union should be consulted. Her experience of Grievance Procedures was that it was often helpful to have a trade union representative present.

Mr Larry Scrimgeour (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) accepted that clergy had no contract of employment but queried whether it might be possible in a single instrument to accord all of the protections to clergy which the Law accorded to employees rather than having to deal with everything on a case by case basis. Miss Galbraith explained that it would be more straightforward for things to be dealt with in a single instrument but said that the overwhelming reaction from clergy to being categorised as employees had been negative. The relationship was one of call rather than one of employment. The difficulty of a mechanism which sought to adopt legislation automatically would be that there might in fact be some provisions which were not applicable within the Church, such as mass redundancies.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked members of the Personnel Committee for their diligence. However, he did not recall any consultation with clergy being carried out in relation to the assumption that clergy did not wish to be treated as employees.

The Secretary General responded that a number of questionnaires to stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy and laity had been issued during the course of the work carried out by the Clergy Personnel Commission. The adoption by Synod of the recommendations of the Clergy Personnel Commission (the vast majority of which had been adopted by Synod) proceeded on the assumption that clergy were not to be treated as employees. The position was complicated by the fact that there was not a single “employer” for clergy. In the Church structure, vestries and Bishops had a role. That was why issues had hitherto been dealt with on an issue by issue basis.

The Rev Jeremy Auld (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) addressed the proposed amended text for Canon 53 to provide a framework for the adoption of a Grievance Procedure. He then proposed, and the Rev Canon James Milne (Brechin) seconded, the following motion:-

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

There being no comments, the matter was put to the vote in houses and passed unanimously in each house.

5.6.2 Age Discrimination

The Rev Canon Robin Paisley (Glasgow and Galloway) spoke as a member of the Personnel Committee on the proposals to alter the Canons regarding matters of age discrimination. He explained that the proposals involved adjusting the Canons to be consonant with the law of the land in relation to age discrimination. There would no longer be an age limit in relation to the undertaking of certain duties and the situation regarding retirement age was being clarified. Retirement age was not being changed.

However, proposals would alter the Canons so that when a stipendiary cleric reached the age of 70 in future, the Church would require to invite a cleric reaching 70 to indicate whether he or she wished to continue. Under the current Canon, it was a little unclear as to whether such individuals could continue for only one year or for successive periods of one year at a time and it was now being made clear that this would be an annual review. Matters concerning pensions were for the Pension Fund and changes had already been made by the Pension Fund Trustees in that service could be accrued after the age of 65 (up to a maximum of 42 years' service). Comment was invited.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) was happy to support the proposals but asked whether there were any other kinds of discrimination which could take place legitimately within the Church which would not be allowed in any other workplace.

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) was concerned about the proposed changes to Canons 1 and 11 and queried why the age restrictions on ordination to the episcopate, presbyterate and diaconate had been introduced in the first place. He wondered whether other Churches were taking similar measures.

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether there was any ultimate cut off date by which an individual had to retire. He also felt some concern with the provision which would require the cleric to apply to the Bishop since there was no word as to what the criteria might be for deciding upon any extension. There was, for example, a financial implication. He wondered what criteria were to be applied by a Bishop in agreeing or refusing a request for continued stipendiary ministry.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Edinburgh) referred to the discussion earlier during Synod regarding Canon 36 when the Synod had been reminded that an incumbent could be either stipendiary or non-stipendiary. The provisions being considered in the current debate appeared to be limited to the retirement of stipendiary clergy. He queried whether the changes made in relation to Canon 36 had any implications in relation to the retirement of non-stipendiary incumbents.

Canon Paisley responded to the points which had been made. The question regarding discrimination raised by Provost Holdsworth would be taken to the Committee for consideration. The point raised by Canon Lindsay was an example of the kind of issue illustrated by the debate which had taken place earlier as to whether or not there should be automatic application of legislation applicable to employees to the Church context. Legal advice had been taken by the Personnel Committee and this was to the effect that age limits regarding ordination should be abolished. It was an issue which the Committee was happy to continue to consider during the following year. On the question of retirement, once a cleric, stipendiary or non-stipendiary, reached 70 they could apply for an extension of office for one year and that process could continue for so long as continuation was mutually agreeable. There was no requirement on the part of the Church to agree to any request for an extension of office. Canon Paisley suggested that both the Personnel Committee and the College of Bishops ought to consider what the appropriate criteria would be for either agreeing or refusing an extension of office.

The Rev Jeremy Auld (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that Canon 36 did not change the position in relation to either stipendiary or non-stipendiary incumbents. It had always been possible to have a non-stipendiary incumbent under the Canons. The Canons did not deal with the question of retirement of non-stipendiary ministers and the Committee on Canons would be grateful for the Synod's authority to draft canonical legislation to deal with that issue. The Synod confirmed its authority to the Committee on Canons to address the issue.

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

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

The motion was put to the vote in houses with the following result:-

House of Laity: passed *nem con.*

House of Bishops: passed *nem con.*

House of Clergy: passed by a majority (1 against).

The Chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

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

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

The motion was put to the vote in houses with the following result:-

House of Clergy: passed *nem com.*

House of Laity: passed by a majority (1 against).

House of Bishops: passed *nem com.*

The Chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

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

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

The motion was put to the vote in houses with the following result:-

House of Bishops: passed *nem com.*

House of Clergy: passed *nem com.*

House of Laity: passed *nem com.*

The Chair declared the motion passed by the requisite majority.

SESSION SIX – The Very Rev Gregor Duncan in the Chair

6.1 Mission and Ministry Board- Introduction

The Rev Canon Professor John Riches (Convener, Mission and Ministry) commented on the expanded breadth of the work of the Board and its Committees since the Board had been created from its predecessor Boards a number of years previously. On balance, he considered it had been a good idea to merge the Boards albeit that the discussion time at Board meetings was limited. It was possible for a single item of business to occupy significant amounts of time on the part of the Board. In such circumstances, the Board had to rely heavily on the quality of work done by its pendant Committees and he wished to pay warm tribute to the Conveners and members of those Committees and to Mrs Nancy Adams, in particular, who was demitting as Convener of the Church in Society Committee at the current time. The Church was immensely fortunate to have the energy and dedication of such individuals. One of the privileges of serving had been the friendship which had built up amongst the Conveners and this had enabled the emergence of joint initiatives which would have been much more difficult under the former structure of two separate Boards. He also expressed his warm thanks to the staff of the General Synod Office for the support which they had provided.

In terms of the Board's operations, it had been involved in a degree of fire-fighting but that had been necessary. More positively, the Board did not develop policy *de novo* but rather inherited and developed policy. Where there were "black holes", it attempted to fill them in and the Board had set up the Ministerial Strategy Advisory Group which Mrs Adams would chair and there would also be opportunity for reflection on the five marks of mission since these would feature as the theme for the Provincial Conference 2009. The Board had inherited *Journey of the Baptised*, and *New Century, New Directions* and the Home Mission and Ministry Development Committees had worked on implementing and developing the policy which those contained. The review which had been carried out earlier in the year of those two initiatives would act as a springboard for further work. The Church had extraordinary reserves of talent within the clergy and laity and educational policies were being developed at all levels to unlock and focus those skills. He believed that the future of the Church lay in developing more collaborative forms of ministry between both clergy and laity. There was a significant cultural change going on at the current time which was not easy to cope with and Professor Riches commented briefly on the work of the Provincial Overseas Committee, the Church in Society Committee and the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths.

Professor Riches referred to the report contained in the Synod papers regarding the progress which had been made following the passing of motions by General Synod 2006 regarding the Residential Homes. Matters at Braeburn were far advanced in connection with the transfer of the operation of the Home. With St Serf's, the matter was more complicated partly because of the terms of the original Trust and partly because of operational difficulties experienced in the running of the homes. He expressed thanks to Mr Ian Stewart and the Transfer Task Group and Mr David Palmer and the Governance Group. It was encouraging that St Serf's had recently received a very favourable Care Commission report which reflected the quality of care provided in the Homes.

Professor Riches commended to the Synod the note regarding the Community Fund which had been provided to Synod members. In 2007, approximately £4,000 had been distributed

by way of grant and the Fund had benefited from the Eucharist Offering at General Synod 2007 and the subsequent gift day which had been promoted in the Province. He asked Synod members to encourage their own congregations to undertake gift days for the Community Fund.

6.2 Review of *Journey of the Baptised/New Century, New Directions*

Professor Riches reminded the Synod that the Church had been running with *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions* since 2003. The former had required a review in 2008. The Board had been fortunate to identify within the Scottish Episcopal Church Tim Edwards and Isobel MacNaughtan as consultants to undertake a review of both initiatives. The report made a number of recommendations which the Board would need to consider in the coming year. Synod was not being asked to vote on the recommendations during the current debate but was being asked to receive the report and to endorse the proposal of the Board to establish a Task Group, as was set out in the Synod papers.

Mr Tim Edwards addressed Synod regarding the review. It had been a challenging task both in terms of the scope of the original reports and the work which had stemmed from them. The purpose of the review had been to fulfil the Board's accountability to the Church through the Synod, by assessing what had been done well and what could be done better, by providing a foundation for the next stage of development and to act as a catalyst for that development. Approximately thirty interviews had been carried out across all dioceses. These had been followed up with further enquiries by the consultants who had also examined significant numbers of documents, reports and statistics. The scope of the review and criteria for assessment had been agreed at an early stage with the Board's Management Group appointed to oversee the process. During the course of the review a number of visits had been made to different parts of the Province and there had been substantial discussion with the Management Group. A special section in the report had been devoted to Local Collaborative Ministry and a further section to organisational matters as well as consideration of the two foundational documents. Mr Edwards regarded the report as a positive one. It had been evident that a significant amount of work had been done since 2003. There was a vast range of highly skilled educators who had created excellent materials. There was an increasingly skilled and confident laity emerging within the Scottish Episcopal Church. The report also commented on tensions and areas where improvements could be made. There was now a stunning opportunity and this needed a strategic and well organised advance in order to take matters forward.

Comment was invited on the report.

The Rev Canon James Milne (Breachin) noted that the report acknowledged that there were two strands of ministry: that of the baptised and that of the ordained. The report also acknowledged that, handled carelessly, those two strands could cause pain. He welcomed that acknowledgement. The comment which had been made at a previous Provincial Conference that the stipendiary clergy were a "burden on the Church" still rankled. There needed to be practical reflection on this topic, in particular, in relation to the future role of stipendiary clergy. Whilst it was likely that there would be fewer stipendiaries, he had heard comments to the effect that a single stipendiary might oversee eight congregations. That sounded like a nightmare and he doubted whether clergy would in fact wish to take up such roles.

The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed the motion which was to be proposed to Synod in order to allow time to absorb the report. She also welcomed the suggestion that more training be absorbed under the TISEC umbrella but there needed to be a common purpose at the centre. It was true that lay learning and LCM and initial ministerial education could develop a life of their own and they needed different kinds of resourcing but there needed to be a combined sense of overall purpose. She suggested that the competency framework was a statement of ministry skills and qualities. It was good that this framework was used in recruitment and selection, LCM, initial ministerial education and continuing ministerial development. The report recorded the habitual sniping at IME provision and the curriculum (but with no hard evidence to support this). The course in fact received enthusiastic support, indeed accolade, from those who validated it namely, Ministry Division of the Church of England and York St John's University. Students themselves were also positive in their feedback. Evidence-based suggestions for improvement were taken on board and given careful monitoring within TISEC. As a provincial body, TISEC was subject to more external regulation than any other. The Church appeared to project its anxieties about mission and decline onto TISEC. This was demoralising for both students and staff. A more important point about which to be anxious was the age profile of candidates for ministry. Where were the young people who were fired up with the desire to serve the Church? This was an urgent priority.

Dr Anne Pankhurst (Edinburgh), speaking as a lay member, wished to support the development of lay learning from which there had been enormous benefit in the Diocese of Edinburgh. People attended Church to prepare themselves for action and training was needed in this. The Church ought not to be shy of developing such training to an advanced level. The inclusion of lay people in IME training had been very enriching. This could lead to members feeling a call to the ordained ministry.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) also wished to express unhappiness at what appeared like sniping at TISEC. He believed TISEC did a marvellous job. However, it was necessary to make clear that three to four years of a university degree in theology could not be squashed into a part-time course. There was far less quantity of work being done though he trusted that the quality was high. There were some who felt that they themselves had undergone full-time training whereas others were being ordained with less training. He sought, first and foremost, holiness of life in those coming forward for ministry and this provided a foundation upon which to build. He, together with others, had identified the possibility of re-starting some kind of residential training for young people who could obtain university degrees. He asked for a balance within the Church between those doing full-time training and those undertaking the part-time course.

The Rev Ursula Shone (Brechin) commented on the link between lay learning and the debate which had taken place earlier regarding age discrimination. She considered the Church needed to think more about how the resources of those who were retired could be used.

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the consultants for their report. The report tracked the progress which had been made and the booklet which had been provided to Synod members *Local Collaborative Ministry: The Story so Far* showed how varied LCM could be. He noted that the report recommended the cessation of the Provincial LCM Officer post. The post holder was due to demit office at the end of year and his concern was that no resource would be made available for charges which currently relied upon the work of the officer. He asked that, before the post was discontinued, provision be

made for a transitional post at least, pending what he hoped would be the resumption of a permanent post in future. LCM had been successful because of its specific focus. Far from being a demerit (as the report suggested), this was a matter for which LCM should be praised. He was, therefore, concerned that what was best within LCM would be lost by its incorporation within the concept of congregational development. He asked that those who would have to respond to and implement the report should remember that the international acclaim which LCM had brought to the Church was at risk of dilution to the point of ineffectiveness if some of the report's recommendations were put into practice.

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow and Galloway) endorsed what the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney had said and wanted to reinforce what Canon Peden had said regarding competency skills. Mission 21 had encouraged the discernment and development of competency within congregations. Often during a clergy vacancy, the emphasis had been on filling the vacancy without sufficient time to address the tasks and needs of the congregations. The booklet *Local Collaborative Ministry: the Story so Far* indicated the many different stories and contexts of congregations and it took time to discern what the competencies and congregational needs were. This had been spear-headed by the Provincial LCM Officer, Facilitators and Mission Advisers and she agreed with the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney that this kind of initiative should not be lost.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) referred to the comments made earlier in the day by the Rev Canon David Bayne regarding the importance of names. The Scottish Episcopal Church was blessed with exceptional talent but he wondered whether the talent of both clergy and laity was mutually enriching. There was often a tendency when the Church was confronted with an issue to look to people outside the Province for assistance when in fact use could be made of internal ability. He suggested that some form of structural development might assist and that there might be need for a body parallel to, for example, the Royal College of Surgeons, for those engaged in Christian ministry, whether clerical or lay. There was a place for a collegiate role to encourage mutual responsibility for the development of professional ministry within the clergy and laity. He was a little concerned with some of the organisational comments in the report and whilst he did not wish to disagree with them he did not discern within the report a need for the Church to become a mutually learning body. The creation of a College of Ministry might allow a constellation of issues to come together.

The Rev Dean Fostekew (Edinburgh) welcomed the report and hoped that the impetus would be kept up. He hoped that the consultants would continue to work with the Church so that there could be a continuing external review built in to future progress.

Professor Riches responded by observing that the comments which had been made reflected a considerable range. The point made by Canon Milne was one which the Board would need to continue to weigh very carefully. The fact of declining numbers of stipendiary clergy emphasised the need to address the kind of ways in which ministry should develop in future. Developing satisfactory pathways for clergy to follow would depend on freeing up lay people to work with clergy. He welcomed the positive comments which had been made regarding the high quality of training delivered by TISEC. Whilst it would be good to allow younger ordinands to undertake university study, it was not a case of "either/or". It was also a question of finances and recruitment. As far as LCM was concerned, he had already been engaged in discussions with some of the Bishops and was aware of the need to provide some form of interim arrangements in relation to the LCM resource. The work of the LCM Officer

had been of a very high quality and it was important not to lose this. How such matters would be dealt with was for the Board to address in the future. He agreed that some kind of body, such as a College of Ministry, might be the framework to bring things together. It was important to provide structures which gave such matters full recognition.

Professor Riches then addressed the motions set out in the Synod Agenda and explained the Board's proposal that a Task Group be set up to prepare an action plan. The Board had already approached individuals to serve on the Task Group but sought Synod's endorsement.

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

"That this Synod receive the report of the review of Journey of the Baptised and New Century, New Directions.

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

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

"That this Synod endorse the proposal of the Mission and Ministry Board that it should commission a Task Group to prepare an action plan to enable the report of the review of Journey of the Baptised and New Century, New Directions and its recommendations to be carefully considered so that decisions can be taken in due course on the adoption of such of the recommendations contained in the report as are considered appropriate."

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

6.3 Home Mission Committee

The Rev Lewis Smith (Convener, Home Mission Committee) presented the report of his Committee. He explained that in his capacity as Convener, he also chaired the group which gave preliminary consideration to applications to the provincial Grants for Ministry Fund on behalf of the Mission and Ministry Board. Money was set aside each year for four and a half stipendiary curates but was not used. Canon Peden had expressed concern at the lack of young ordinands. He wished to express concern at the lack of stipendiary ordinands. In relation to transitional arrangements regarding Local Collaborative Ministry, he had undertaken to take this on in the first instance.

Mr Smith commended the "Back to Church Sunday" initiative which had been started in the Church of England and in the current year was being expanded to other places including Scotland, where it was being handled ecumenically. Church members undertook to invite former members back to Church. In the Diocese of Lichfield, an additional 6,000 people had come to Church of whom 700 - 900 had stayed on as regular worshippers and some 3,000 had stayed in touch. The day would take place on 28th September 2008 and materials were available from Action of Churches Together in Scotland. He also wished to commend the booklet *Local Collaborative Ministry: The Story so Far*, a complimentary copy of which had been provided to all Synod members. Additional copies were available for purchase. Finally, he paid tribute to the Rev Dr Anne Tomlinson who had served the Church for the

previous five years as Provincial LCM Officer since her post would come to an end at the end of the year.

Questions were invited but there were none.

6.4 Motion from the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney – Proposed Rural Commission

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that the Scottish Government had identified that 21% of the population lived in rural areas, representing 98% of the land mass of Scotland. Rural communities were thus important to Scotland as a whole and even more important to the Scottish Episcopal Church since approximately one third of congregations were situated in such areas. Many of the current key issues for rural communities were also important in urban areas but, in rural communities, the issues affected more of the population. Rural communities had been hit hard by the impact of rising energy costs and food poverty was also an issue. In 1993, the General Synod had established a Rural Commission which had presented its final report in 1996. The world had moved on since then. At that time, the proportion of net farm income derived from purely farming activities was in excess of 50%; a significant proportion of rural villages had post offices; BSE had not become a key issue; foot and mouth disease had been a distant memory; Blue Tongue had not appeared. The need for the UK to produce much of its own food requirements was unquestioned. The Rural Commission had raised the rural profile in the Scottish Episcopal Church and had assisted ecumenical thinking as well as giving impetus to Local Collaborative Ministry. Since then Synod had continued to be active in relation to rural issues and, in 2004, had set up a rural focus group which had facilitated inter-action with other Churches and in 2006 had endorsed setting up of the ACTS Rural Group.

The motion from the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney was intended to continue and to develop the support of Synod for the rural sector. The world of 2008 might see rural post offices disappearing and for many the single farm payment from the Common Agricultural Policy now represented over two thirds of income. The CAP was scheduled for major review with implementation planned for 2013. A probable consequence would be a reduction of CAP funding by 50% and a consequent fall in farming incomes of one third. Perhaps of most concern, the need for the UK to have a food production sector at all had recently been seriously questioned by the Government. When such arguments had previously been advanced in the 1930s, the result had been rural dereliction. Whilst economic factors were important, the Church would also emphasise the need to challenge arguments which valued everything in economic terms. The rural sector mattered to the nation's spirituality in the most basic sense. It was also important not to be overly pessimistic.

As far as a new Rural Commission was concerned, Professor Atkinson explained that activity was needed at both local and national levels. Even if the proposal for a Commission were accepted, there would still be much that was needed at diocesan level. The proposal thus only related to action appropriate for the Province to take. The objectives suggested were: identifying future challenges; assessing the scope for the Scottish Episcopal Church, alone and in partnership, to act on such issues; reviewing the future form of ministry to rural areas. What was being suggested was not a large formal body which would be expensive to run and which would take years to produce a lengthy document. He suggested that once the group had been set up, it would deal with urgent issues (such as post office closures) and long term issues. It would seem appropriate for it to report at short intervals on urgent issues and at the

end of its work on matters such as adaptation to CAP reform. What was suggested would impact on mission, liturgy, doctrine and the place of Church in society. Since there were committees dealing with all of such areas, he felt it important for the Group to be established to work within the Church's existing structures. Whilst the size and composition of the Group and its working methods were left for the Board to determine, he commended the model of the recent Church of Scotland enquiry into fair food which had reported in 2007. That comprised a committee of nine with a mix of representatives within the Church and those with specialist knowledge of specific subject areas. He hoped that the Commission would complete its work in time to report to General Synod in 2010.

Professor Atkinson then proposed, and the Rev Canon John Walker (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod notes with concern a series of recent proposals which seem likely to damage the Rural Sector in Scotland. This includes changes as varied as those which will lead to the loss of many rural post offices and other facilities and the European Union's intention to conduct a major review of the Common Agricultural Policy which seems likely to reduce average farming incomes by as much as one third. Synod is concerned that recent government reviews of rural communities in Scotland have been dominated by an excessive economic bias. It believes that this is inappropriate given the breadth of the environmental and cultural contributions which rural communities make to Scotland. Synod believes that changes of this type will impact on the SEC, and other churches, and on their ability to meet the needs of rural people. It considers that there is urgent need to reassess the relationship between the church and those who live and work in rural areas. Consequently it believes that there is a need to revisit the issues which were considered by the SEC's Rural Commission over a decade ago. Synod instructs the Mission and Ministry Board to establish a new Rural Commission with the following remit:

- 1) to identify the major changes likely to impact on rural communities in the coming decade;*
- 2) to assess where there is scope for the SEC, both alone and working with other member churches of The Scottish Churches Rural Group to act so as to mitigate the adverse impact of change;*
- 3) to suggest what might be the most appropriate forms of ministry to meet the needs of rural communities in the future.”*

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed the focus on the rural community but was concerned by the proposed budget of £7,000 referred to in the paper included in the Synod papers. She noted that the Rev Canon David Bayne had suggested that the Dunderdale Fund was being reviewed and she suggested that were a computer to be installed in every Church this would enable communities to enter the virtual world and the College of Ministry proposed by the Bishop of Edinburgh earlier in the day could be a virtual one.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) spoke in support of the motion. He reported that his experience of the Glenalmond youth weeks was that people were finding it more difficult to attend. He was aware of one congregation which had lost its meeting space (in a community venue) and he himself found it harder to find rural shops in which to buy his lunch. While he supported the proposal, he suggested that it should not have a time limit. There was a need to proceed to deal with the issues rather than await the

outcome of discussions and he suggested that dioceses might need to create a rural office within the Province.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked Professor Atkinson for bringing the issue to the Synod. He had not supported the motion in the Diocesan Synod nor did he in General Synod. Whilst a compelling argument was made, rural communities were already represented within the Synod. It was necessary to do the work at once and he did not believe that a Commission was the way to respond to the issues. In February 2005, the Churches together in Scotland had set out how they were going to respond to rural issues by establishing their own group but it was now already too late. The Church already had the capacity to undertake work and it was necessary to proceed to do it locally. He endorsed what the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness had said.

The Rev Lewis Smith (Convener, Home Mission Committee) reported that when the concept of a new Rural Commission had been brought to the Committee earlier in the year, the Committee had supported it enthusiastically but by the following meeting, the enthusiasm had waned. The reason for this was because of the concept of a commission encompassing a lengthy process of evidence taking and the production of a weighty report. Professor Atkinson had made it clear that this was not what was envisaged and, therefore, the Home Mission Committee could and would support the proposal. If what was proposed was action-focussed so that decisions could be arrived at quickly then this should be supported. He commended the motion.

The Rev Anne Haslehurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) had been glad to find the motion in the Synod Agenda and believed it was important whether Synod members lived in rural or urban areas. It was necessary to consider not just economic factors but spiritual values also. She valued the proposal as an occasion to consider the economic values in society. How people spent their money impacted not only on the rural community in Scotland but on such communities throughout the world. Subsidies available within Europe disadvantaged those in the developing world. The proposal was an opportunity for everyone to think about the many and complex issues which the motion raised. She supported the motion.

The Rev Fay Lamont (Breachin) said that the issues which had been raised by Professor Atkinson resonated with those who worked in urban priority areas. The Church was “on the edge” but was also at the heart of communities. She welcomed the proposal to establish a Commission since whatever it brought forward would have an impact on the urban scene also. To set up a Commission would carry influence with the Scottish Parliament.

Professor Atkinson then responded to comments made in the debate. He explained that the figure of £7,000 which was referred to in the Synod papers was an administrative cost based on what the Church of Scotland Fair Food Group had cost. Were computer access to be facilitated in Churches, he would welcome this. In relation to the points raised by the Bishop of Moray Ross and Caithness, he accepted that some structure was needed and the motion itself referred to appropriate forms of ministry, so there was already scope for this. He disagreed with Provost Kilgour because the proposal offered a way ahead for the Scottish Episcopal Church. The ACTS Group had achieved a significant amount of work but it could not simply be left to ACTS to do the work and thinking of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He welcomed the comments made by the Rev Lewis Smith and he considered that the

Commission could be fast moving in relation to urgent matters such as Post Office closures. He also hoped that it would operate “lightly on the ground”.

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

6.5 Ministry Development Committee

Professor Judith George (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) reported on behalf of her Committee and indicated that she was increasingly convinced of the need to rename or subtitle the Committee the “Lifelong Learning Committee”. In relation to Lay Learning activities, Diocesan Ministry Coordinators were now a strong team who shared resources and ideas. The first Lay Learning conference had taken place in the spring and whilst feedback had been enthusiastic, attendance had been low. David Liddle had been in post for approximately six months. He had been welcomed by the Provincial Lay Learning Group and provided resource and support. He was also involved in training Facilitators for the Provincial Conference, in collaboration with Rev Dr Anne Tomlinson. Much had been happening but there was still much to do. The post had been half-time since Dr Kenneth Fleming had left and there had been a frustrating limit to what initially Mrs Elspeth Strachan, and subsequently Mr Liddle, had been able to do. Much had nevertheless been achieved and the Report of the review of *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions* was welcomed in being able to match requirements with resources. Mr Liddle would be working over the summer in setting up additional resources available from the website. The “training the trainers” programme would hopefully create a forum for mutual support and professional education and development across the Province. In relation to clergy training, Professor George explained that York St John’s University linked into a lively regional training partnership. Validation by York St John’s therefore gave access to an exciting range of programmes for lay and clergy. York St John’s was interested in working with the Scottish Episcopal Church in providing support for isolated learners. The Distance Information Support and Communication Group established by the Ministry Development Committee was due to meet the following week with a member of the Information and Communication Board to create a DIY kit for training and supporting those who were less confident in the use of IT in remote and scattered areas. The links with York St John’s would also allow the Church to benefit from wider practice and to strengthen the competences framework.

The review of *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions* gave the opportunity to assess the work that was currently undertaken and the reasons why. Why was degree level study important? It gave professional credibility and was important for the quality of life and leadership for the Scottish Episcopal Church and the wider community. Why academic learning and competences? TISEC training was about the development of the whole person not just academic learning. The competence framework was being used in areas such as recruitment and selection and congregational development and, therefore, provided a Provincial template for learning and development across a number of aspects. Why this particular validation? The programme was validated, in higher education terms, by York St John’s and was also validated by the Church of England Ministry Division. This was essential for credibility within the wider Anglican community. In seeking validation, all Scottish options and a number of other UK ones had been explored. Either institutions were not interested or they were unable to support as small an operation as TISEC or they were academically focused and had no interest in formation (and, consequently, were of no interest to TISEC). In summary, there was a high quality team across the Province writing and delivering materials, advising and supporting students and they had been sincerely praised by

those from York St John's at the recent validation meeting. The validation report gave warm praise for the innovative nature of the course and the true dedication and commitment of the staff. She thanked all TISEC staff working across the Province and especially Rev Dr Canon Michael Fuller for the commitment which he gave to the programme and for masterminding a successful bid for new validation.

Comment was invited.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) welcomed what had been said and suggested that it would be helpful to be provided with some figures. He had been doing some work on statistics and indicated that within the following 15 years, 100 stipendiary clergy would reach 65. There was no one to replace such people. In the previous two and a half years, he had made five to six stipendiary appointments within his diocese and not a single candidate had come from Scotland. Recruiting from outside Scotland would change the nature of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

SESSION SEVEN – Professor Patricia Peattie in the Chair

7.1 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)

7.1.1 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

The Rev Donald Reid (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) reported on the work of his Committee. Inter-faith relations had moved “centre stage” and the Scottish Episcopal Church was progressive in its engagement with this area. Referring to the Committee's written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007, Mr Reid confirmed that the Scottish Episcopal Church would be hosting a conference in December 2008 on behalf of the Porvoo Communion on inter-faith matters. Each member church was being invited to bring with them someone from the Muslim community in their respective countries so that the conference could look, in particular, at Christian-Muslim relations. It would be an opportunity to catch up on reactions to the Danish cartoon issue and also on developments in Norway where the churches had signed an understanding with the Muslim community on the issue of conversion between faiths. It would also be an opportunity to consider how the churches had responded to the *A Common Word* document. The conference would be supported by the Scottish Government and it would be used as a catalyst for creating, within Scotland, a Christian-Muslim network. He extended an invitation to Scottish Episcopal Church congregations which had a mosque in their area to be involved in the consultation and in the possible creation of a Christian-Muslim network in Scotland. Mr Reid also referred to the Festival of Spirituality and Peace which would take place in August in Edinburgh. The programme could be viewed at www.festivalofspirituality.org.uk. The theme for 2008 was “Be that change” and would address issues of global, social and personal well-being, through a programme of over 100 events. The core would be public conversation events. Speakers would include Mahatma Ghandi's grandson, Bishop Gene Robinson, Charles Handy, Gerald Hughes, Kate Hallam, Martin Bell, Oliver James and Rabbi Lionel Blue.

Mr Reid then introduced the Rev Peter Colwell of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland.

Mr Colwell explained to Synod that in the autumn of 2007, 138 Muslim scholars had issued *A Common Word Between Us and You* which had been addressed to Christian leaders throughout the world. It called on Christians and Muslims to come together around the themes of love of God and love of neighbour. Many responses had already been issued to the document and CTBI had been invited to prepare resources (rather than a response) for local churches. It had accordingly produced *Above Us and Between Us*. He explained the background to the issue of *A Common Word*.

Questions were invited but there were none.

7.1.2 Overseas Committee

The Rev Canon Duncan McCosh (Convener, Overseas Committee) explained that the Committee wished to address two particular issues in the current Synod, namely those of education and the Millennium Development Goals.

Mr John Rea explained that he was the education portfolio holder on the Overseas Committee. The purpose of the work of the Committee was to provide education in the widest sense for the strategic development of the Anglican Church or schools and education projects which it ran in the global south. The Committee could help provide school fees or bursaries for primary or secondary school children but more frequently it supported bursaries for key diocesan clergy or laity to pursue theological, postgraduate, or vocational training. The Committee had £45,000 per annum to distribute but demand always exceeded the available resources. Careful research was undertaken in relation to any grant application. Mr Rea then illustrated some of the projects which had been supported by the Committee including the sponsoring of two priests in the Diocese of Zanzibar for further training with the prospect of possible election to the bishopric, the training of a clergyman from the Diocese of Cape Coast in Ghana in Canon Law and the support of a residential vocational training centre in the highlands of Papua New Guinea. Mr Rea closed by indicating the geographical spread of support which had been provided by the educational portfolio of the Overseas Committee.

Miss Angela Daye spoke about the “MiDGies”. MiDGies were looking for others to join them in agitating for movement on fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals which had been agreed by 190 countries in 2000 with a view to halving world poverty by 2015. In fact, the Overseas Committee had been supporting overseas projects for many years and initiatives such as the establishment of the Jubilee Campaign for debt cancellation, and the support for Make Poverty History and other projects had been important stages on the journey to fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals. The eight goals were: to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; to achieve universal primary education for all; to promote gender equality and empower women; to reduce child mortality; to improve maternal health; to combat HIV/Aids, malaria and other diseases; to ensure environmental sustainability and to achieve global partnership for development. Taking, as an example, the achieving of universal primary education, she suggested that much could be done to address this. For example, one church had a project with a linked church in Ghana to provide primary education for street children. The Overseas Committee sponsored seven secondary school children in Uganda and one SEC congregation had an education fund which enabled it to sponsor a primary and a secondary school in Uganda. It was a question

of continuing to focus resources and work with the Church's partners overseas, many of whom were already involved in education, health and social care. She appealed to church members to join the MiDGies and become part of the "swarm".

Canon McCosh then explained that leaflets had been produced and would be sent to all congregations. There was also a MiDGie membership card and he invited members to sign up and encourage others to do so. The MiDGies would operate as a swarm (network) and he encouraged people to email the General Synod Office to confirm that they wished to join.

In closing the Mission and Ministry Board Session, Professor Riches expressed his thanks to everyone who had presented the work of the Board and its committees during the meeting.

Professor Peattie, from the Chair, paid tribute to Professor Riches as he demitted office as Convener of the Board and thanked him for his work on the Board, the Board's Steering Group and the Standing Committee.

7.2 Faith and Order Board

7.2.1 Doctrine Committee

The Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller (Convener, Doctrine Committee) presented his final report as Convener of the Doctrine Committee. During the year, the Committee had welcomed to its membership the Rev Dr Paul Foster and Sister Clare Lockhart, and the Rev Professor David Jasper had agreed to succeed Dr Fuller as Convener of the Committee.

The Committee was launching its fifth and final Grosvenor Essay *On Salvation*. The topic was tackled from a variety of angles and included an annotated bibliography. Canon Fuller expressed his thanks to all members of the Doctrine Committee, to Mrs Mary Wilkinson and Miss Lorna Finley for arranging the publication and to Mrs Elspeth Davey as Secretary of the Committee.

Professor Peattie, from the Chair, thanked Dr Fuller for his contribution to the work of the Committee and the series of Grosvenor Essays which had been produced over the period of the preceding years.

7.2.2 Committee on Canons – Canons for First Reading: Church Membership

The Rev Jeremy Auld (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that discussion of the current membership proposals had started at General Synod 2006. It had been agreed that the types of membership operating within the Church would be changed in order to enable the Church to be as inclusive as possible and in order to identify those who were responsible for the running of charges, not least because the Office of the Scottish Regulator needed to know who carried that responsibility. The Faith and Order Board had therefore asked the Committee on Canons to draft new Canons to reflect these new categories of membership in two rolls: a Congregational Roll and an Electoral Roll. The latter would consist of those who were baptised communicant members who were over the age of 16, and who wished actively to serve their congregation. Those on the Electoral Roll would be known as "constituent members" and would be entitled to vote at the Annual General Meeting and serve on Vestry.

Those on the Congregational Roll, but not on the Electoral Roll, would be entitled to attend the Annual General Meeting and speak at it with permission of the Chair but would not be entitled to vote or hold office. The proposals provided that the maintenance of the new rolls would be the responsibility of the vestry in consultation with the cleric. It would nevertheless still be necessary to continue to maintain the old Communicants' Roll in order, for example, to establish who was eligible to go forward for ordination but it would be the Electoral Roll which would be the relevant roll for governance purposes within the Church. Anyone who wished to go on the Congregational Roll would be able to do so and would be regarded as a member of the congregation. At the outset, as a transitional measure, there would be an assumption that everyone whose name appeared on the existing Communicants' Roll would appear on the Electoral Roll unless they wished otherwise. In the future, however, any new person wishing to be entered on the Electoral Roll would need to sign an appropriate declaration. Mr Auld then explained the detail of the proposed canonical change to Canon 41. Whilst responsibility for the maintenance of the rolls would be that of the vestry, the rector would be entitled to be provided with copies of them. The Canon also provided for reference to the bishop in relation to any question arising as to the omission or removal of any person's name from the roll and there was provision for appeal to the Episcopal Synod. Mr Auld also referred to proposed resolutions under Canon 41 which included provision that no member could be on the Electoral Roll of more than one congregation (and this implied that it would be possible to be on the Congregational Roll of more than one congregation). There were good reasons why an individual should not be able to be on the Electoral Roll of more than one congregation (for example, there might be conflicts of interest in relation to the appointment of lay representatives on behalf of the congregations).

Mr Auld then proposed, and the Rev Canon James Milne seconded, the following Motion:-

"That the amended text for Canon 41 be read for the first time."

Professor Peattie, from the Chair, explained that were the Motion to fall, the Motion which appeared as Motion 29 in the Agenda and Programme for General Synod (which related to consequential changes to the Canons) would not be put to Synod.

The Rev Sally Gorton (Glasgow and Galloway) said that the reason for changing a Canon should be to improve the Church's ministry or mission. One of the strengths of the Scottish Episcopal Church was its inclusiveness and the proposed new Canon would add an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy and would have pastoral implications by creating an unnecessary barrier. Under the existing Canon 25, baptism conferred full membership of the church, including admission to communion. There were few congregations which were so numerous that maintaining the existing Communicants' Roll posed difficulties. If clergy were not keeping the role up to date, they should be reminded of their obligations. If the Communicants' Roll were kept properly, the present arrangement under congregational constitutions worked well. In view of the fact that vestry members were now charity trustees, she considered that the age of 18 ought to be the appropriate minimum age limit rather than 16. She considered that if the change to the Canon were adopted, fewer people would be willing to take an active part in church governance.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) considered that in terms of good governance the rector ought to have responsibility and that it was not appropriate for responsibility to be given to the vestry as the proposed new Canon envisaged. The Canon certainly needed to be revised. There was a role for those who were actively involved in lay ministry to participate with the cleric in verifying the rolls but overall responsibility ought to remain with the rector. He also agreed that the question of age limits needed to be considered.

The Rev Dr John Armes (Edinburgh) indicated that he had spoken against the proposals two years previously and was of the view that they had not been improved since. The proposals sought to force the Church into a mould rather than allowing the mould to be formed around the way the Church actually operated. The Canon was exclusive, rather than inclusive, by placing burdens on people becoming involved. He considered the proposals pastorally uncomfortable. He was aware of people who were deeply involved in the life of congregations but who were not communicant members. If it was the case that baptism marked initiation into membership then why was it necessary to have a Communicant Roll? However, he queried whether even baptism was the place to draw the boundaries of membership. People might not have reached the point of baptism but was it correct to say that they should not be involved in the running of a congregation? Also, he queried why in terms of the proposed resolutions under the Canon, individuals could not be on the Electoral Roll of more than one congregation. He would vote against the proposal unless he heard satisfactory answers.

The Rev Robert Warren (Edinburgh) said that different people were at different points in their journey in the Church's congregations. The Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator could understand standardised kinds of organisation. He suspected that the Church was now on the receiving end of legislation upon which it had not been previously consulted. It was important to be vigilant about future legislation to ensure that the Church could have an input at an early stage.

The Rev David Mumford (Breachin) did not share the reservations expressed by previous speakers. He considered that there ought to be a transparent list of members which could be shared openly. His concern, however, was in relation to the prohibition on an individual being on two Electoral Rolls. One of his charges, Tarfside, had services in part of the year only and some people were on the Communicants' Roll of both Tarfside and Brechin. This had not given rise to any problems and he would not like to have to ask people to choose between them.

The Rev Canon James Milne (Breachin) explained that there were legal problems with the current Canon. Being a member carried rights and responsibilities under the law which could not be ignored. The current system allowed the rector to place a person on a list without the person having the right to say "yes" or "no". He urged members to support the proposal.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) had not intended to speak in the debate. At the age of 16, it was possible to have sex and be married and he would be uncomfortable with reverting to the age of 18 as the threshold for membership.

The Rev Darren McFarland (Glasgow and Galloway) welcomed the additional level which the proposed Electoral Roll would bring. Priests had been in the difficult position of having to make decisions as to whether or not an individual's name should go on a Communicants' Roll. The situation of an individual turning up on Sundays for a few weeks in advance of a significant congregational vote was not unknown. He supported the clarity brought by the new proposals.

The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) also supported the proposals. When new people came to a congregation it was often difficult for them to identify the point at which they became members. The new Canon would provide a helpful mechanism of affirming people in membership.

The Rev Canon Hugh Lee (Argyll and The Isles) considered it would be preferable for the rector to have control of the rolls in consultation with the vestry. He had experienced difficulty with an individual who had come to church only one Sunday per annum when the rector was not present and otherwise attended another church. He was sure that there must be a process for dealing with both that kind of situation and the kind of circumstances mentioned by Mr Mumford earlier in the debate. There needed to be a means of challenging the inclusion of someone's name on a roll.

The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that he had read 65 Communicants' Rolls four times in the previous 12 years as part of his visitations as Dean. He considered that the current system worked well. He considered that under the proposals, the Communicants' Roll would be very similar to the Electoral Roll. He considered it was a bad principle to frame Canons on the perversity of individuals. He intended to vote against the proposals.

Mr John Whittall (Aberdeen and Orkney) said he had spent 25 years in a Church of England parish and the Electoral Roll system had caused no problems at all. He queried, however, whether if the proposals were adopted it was really necessary to maintain three rolls. If the only need for continuing a Communicants' Roll was to certify that someone could be authorised to enter holy orders, he considered there must be another way of addressing the issue. If the change were adopted, it would soon become the norm.

The Rev Sally Gorton (Glasgow and Galloway) was permitted to speak again for the purpose of asking a question. She asked whether the responsibilities and liabilities to which Canon Milne had referred could be spelt out since that would be helpful for the purposes of the debate.

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) wished to endorse the comment which had been made about the inclusiveness of the Church and about the fact that the current system appeared to be working satisfactorily. He considered that the suggestion that the Church had to adopt the proposals was a little spurious because clarification regarding the status of congregations was still awaited.

The Rev David Brooke (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) pointed out potential difficulties where a vestry member had a complete copy of the Communicants' Roll on his own computer. If the vestry had responsibility for drawing up the rolls then who had responsibility, in terms of data protection, for the privacy of the information?

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) indicated that he had previously been opposed to canonical change but had subsequently changed his mind. He did not consider that the Gospel was unconditionally inclusive – it was unconditionally inviting. He had no problem defining membership by reference to baptism and wanted a church that openly invited people into the life of God. He envisaged the Canon being a pastoral tool in that task.

Mr Auld responded to the comments which had been made and recognised that there was strong feeling on the issue. In terms of data protection, the rector was currently responsible for the Communicants' Roll. One of the issues relating to the proposals was that the vestry were the charity trustees of the congregation and responsible for its governance. Consequently, it was appropriate that the vestry should have responsibility for the rolls. He emphasised that General Synod was currently considering only a First Reading of the Canon and there was still a full year in which to debate the proposals in Diocesan Synods. He endorsed what Canon Milne had said about liability. There was both the OSCR liability but also a common law liability and it would be possible for every communicant member of a church to be sued at the instance of someone who was aggrieved. At the current time, it was possible to be on an electoral role without knowing it. If the proposals were adopted, those on the Electoral Roll would know that they had signed up to be members. A Congregational Roll would be inclusive and allow people the option of being on it instead of the Electoral Roll. In relation to the question of an individual's name being on more than one Electoral Roll, he explained that there could be a conflict if, for example, an individual were on the vestry of two different charges or, theoretically, if the same individual were appointed as lay representative of two charges. On the question of age limits, it was possible to be a charity trustee at the age of 16 so it was not appropriate for the attainment of 18 to be a condition of membership.

The Motion was then put to the vote in houses with the following result:-

House of Clergy: passed by majority (35 in favour, 23 against).

House of Laity: passed by majority (45 in favour, 14 against, 4 abstentions).

House of Bishops: not passed (3 in favour, 4 against).

The Chair declared that the Motion had fallen.

Since the Motion had fallen, the Motion appearing as Motion 29 in the Agenda and Programme for Synod was not put to the vote.

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

8.1 Faith & Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

Mrs Norma Higgott (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) emphasised the importance of relationships in how the Churches worked together. She was delighted to welcome Brother Stephen Smyth, the General Secretary of Action of Churches Together in Scotland, who was representing ACTS at the Synod.

Brother Stephen Smyth commended the Scottish Episcopal Church for its role in the ecumenical journey. The list contained in the Synod papers indicated the number of Scottish Episcopal Church members who were involved ecumenically. One of the emphases in the ecumenical movement at the current time was on the gifts which different traditions brought rather than focussing on difference. Having started as General Secretary a year previously, he was now much more aware of the extent of contribution brought by the Scottish Episcopal Church. He expressed his thanks to Elspeth Davey as the Ecumenical Officer for the Province. He explained that ACTS was becoming a company limited by guarantee and that, as a result, the profile of the Scottish Episcopal Church within ACTS would be raised. Ecumenical engagement needed to be structural and theological as well as local and practical.

Brother Smyth went on to talk about Edinburgh 2010, the Conference to mark the centenary of the 1910 World Mission Conference which had been a significant ecumenical event. There was both an International Committee making preparations for 2010 as well as a local Scottish Committee (on which the Scottish Episcopal Church was represented by Mrs Helen Hood). It was hoped that by January 2009 materials would be available for dissemination. It would be a “delegate conference” but there would also be a fringe of accompanying events and volunteers would be sought to assist with this. The Churches in Scotland had been approached to prepare the materials for the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity for 2010 and Mr Andrew Barr, representing the Scottish Episcopal Church, was a member of the Committee preparing such materials. The theme for the 2010 Conference would be “Witnessing to Christ Today” and the theme for the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity material would be “Luke 24.48: You are witnesses to this”.

Mrs Higgott referred to the fact that the Rev Canon Mel Langille had been invited to participate by Churches Together in Britain and Ireland in the development of a creational liturgy. His report of this was printed in *inspires*. A close relationship with CTBI had developed since the Rev Bob Fyffe had become its General Secretary. Both the Very Rev Alex Gordon and she had been privileged to be involved in CTBI arrangements to celebrate the Centenary of the Anglo-German Churches Exchange Visit of 1908/1909. The greatest impact on relationships recently had been through European links. Involvement with Porvoo had resulted in a number of consultations taking place within Scotland and elsewhere which had led to a sharing of ideas and a better understanding among the respective Churches. As a result of meetings in Edinburgh, a network of contacts among youth leaders in the Porvoo Communion had been established. There had been similar developments in relation to lay learning and this would be further developed by the Inter-Faith Conference which had been referred to earlier in Synod.

Mrs Higgott explained that the current main signatories to the Meissen Commission were the Church of England and the German Churches (the Evangelische Kirche Deutschland). The Celtic Anglican Churches had been invited to be observers at discussions and she had been privileged to have acted as observer on behalf of the Celtic Churches. It had been good to be able to give a minority Anglican Church view. The German Churches had been encouraged to learn that the Scottish Episcopal Church had already passed a Canon allowing the ordination of women bishops. She hoped that General Synod would authorise the Inter-Church Relations Committee to investigate the implications of becoming a full member of the Meissen Commission.

Mrs Higgott then proposed, and the Rev Kimberly Bohan seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod approve the proposal of the Faith & Order Board that the Inter-Church Relations Committee investigate the implications of the Scottish Episcopal Church becoming a full member of the Meissen Commission (including matters of process, doctrine and costs) with a view to proposing a motion to General Synod 2009 about such prospective membership.”

Questions were invited but there were none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mrs Elspeth Davey, as the Provincial Church Relations Officer, spoke to the work of the National Sponsoring Body for Local Ecumenical Partnerships. The role of the body was to encourage neighbourliness between congregations. It was necessary to know one's neighbours in order to understand them. There had been some suspicion of the work of the National Sponsoring Body because it had been perceived as adding a layer of additional bureaucracy. The motion which was about to be proposed to Synod, which substituted a new Resolution for the existing Resolutions 1 and 2 under Canon 15, would remove a tier of bureaucracy. The National Sponsoring Body was to enable and facilitate support of those who wanted to enter into Local Ecumenical Partnerships and, once they had done so, to accompany them in that partnership. Information regarding the Body could be accessed through the ACTS website. Mrs Davey was happy to speak to individual congregations. The National Sponsoring Body did not operate a “one size fits all” policy but could help individual congregations be more specific about the commitments which they wished to make in Ecumenical Partnerships. There were good examples within the Province, such as the Church's relationship with the Methodist Church in Dumfries.

Mrs Higgott then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion:-

“That Resolution 1 and 2 under Canon 15 be deleted and that there be substituted therefor the following as a new resolution 1:-

The Inter-Church Relations Committee shall, in terms of this Canon, act on behalf of General Synod to issue approval of Local Ecumenical Partnerships undertaken with members of the Scottish Churches' National Sponsoring Body for Ecumenical Partnerships (NSB). These partnerships will be reviewed ecumenically following NSB guidelines every five years from date of signing. When a request for approval of a Local Ecumenical Partnership comes from Scottish Episcopal and Methodist Congregations, any such partnership so approved shall be subject to the provisions of Canon 15 and of the Declaration of Intent between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church in Scotland agreed by General Synod in June 1996.”

The Rev John Penman (Edinburgh) wished to commend the motion. He had had four years' experience of working with Falkirk Churches Together. Moving closer together locally required significant work between the denominations and the motion would make things simpler.

The Rev David Mumford (Brechin) explained that he would wish approval of future Local Ecumenical Partnerships to come to General Synod unless clarity could be given about the meaning of the motions which appeared as numbers 32 and 33 in the Agenda and Programme for Synod. He noted that those motions for approval of Local Ecumenical Partnerships stated

that the Eucharist was always to be understood to be the Eucharist according to the discipline of the Church of the presiding minister but also recommended that the Diocesan Bishop be able to authorise an Episcopalian Priest serving the Local Ecumenical Partnership to preside at the Eucharist using the rites of the other Church, as approved by the Bishop. He had reservations as to whether the Synod ought to authorise Episcopal Priests to celebrate a valid Eucharist using some of the Church of Scotland rites. If approval of Local Ecumenical Partnerships was in future to be given to the Inter-Church Relations Committee and this meant that such conditions were to be accepted, he would be unable to support the motion (though he was in agreement with the previous speaker regarding a shorter process for approving Local Ecumenical Partnerships).

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Edinburgh) explained he had formerly acted as Convener of the Inter-Church Relations Committee and wished to reassure Mr Mumford. The wording of Motions 32 and 33 which appeared in the Agenda and Programme for Synod was standard wording which had been used for many years and he believed had been prepared by the late Bishop George Sessford.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) was in favour of Local Ecumenical Partnerships but agreed that there appeared to be a contradiction in the conditions being imposed by the wording of Motions 32 and 33. Clarity was needed about this. Whilst he would support the motion, he asked for the contradiction to be considered.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) said that it was a significant matter to use the rite of another denomination. Local Ecumenical Partnerships were provisional. There were different liturgies in use by different denominations but there was only one Eucharist.

The Bishop of Moray Ross and Caithness, from the Chair, explained that if Motion 31 were passed by Synod, Motions 32 and 33 as set out in the Agenda and Programme for Synod would not be put to the vote. Mrs Higgott confirmed that Inter-Church Relations Committee would consider the point which had been raised during the debate before issuing any approval for the Local Ecumenical Partnerships in Edinburgh and Irvine as mentioned in the said Motions 32 and 33.

The Rev Dr John Armes (Edinburgh) expressed concern that if Motion 31 were approved then Motion 32 (which concerned a Local Ecumenical Partnership in which his congregation was involved) would not be put to the vote because the celebrations to mark the new Partnership had been planned for 14th September 2008. He sought assurance that approval would be given before then. Mrs Higgott confirmed that such approval would be given before then.

The Motion (as set out above in these minutes) was then put to the vote and passed by majority (2 against).

Mrs Higgott expressed her thanks to all members of the Inter-Church Relations Committee and especially to Elspeth Davey as the Secretary to the Committee.

The Motion having been passed, Motions 32 and 33 as set out in the General Synod Agenda and Programme were not put to the vote.

8.2 Pension Fund

Mr Simon Mackintosh (Chair, Pension Fund) presented his first report as Chairman. The previous year, Mr Gavin Gemmell, had demitted office and had reported that the Pension Fund was on an even keel and that there were no plans to close the final salary scheme because the Trustees believed that a scheme in which the employer took the risk and the Trustees managed the investments was best for the membership of the scheme. Whilst final salary related schemes were expensive both to fund and to run, Mr Mackintosh expressed his agreement with the views which had been expressed by Mr Gemmell. However, there had been changes since the previous year. World stock markets had suffered as a result of the “sub-prime” crisis and there had been significant energy cost increases. The current investment environment was demanding and volatile but equity investment was a long term strategy and it was necessary to look beyond current difficulties. The Fund also held other assets, such as government bonds, which provided stability in times of turbulence on equity markets.

During the previous year, the Trustees had reviewed their ethical investment policy. Consultation had taken place with the Provincial Investment Committee and the Trustees had recognised their responsibilities to maximise investment returns whilst striving to meet reasonable ethical investment expectations. The Trustees aimed to invest in companies which would successfully develop their businesses financially in the interests of shareholders but which also demonstrated reasonable employment and best corporate governance practices coupled with a conscientiousness with regard to environmental performance and human rights and sensitivity to the communities in which such companies operated. In achieving the same, the Trustees were dependent upon the Investment Managers and their engagement with company management. There were also strict negative criteria such that no direct investment would be made in companies whose main business was in any of the following: armaments, gambling, tobacco or pornography. The next actuarial valuation of the Fund was due at the end of 2008 and, apart from investment returns and outlook, one of the major factors which would affect the valuation would be revised actuarial assumptions (such as longevity).

Finally, Mr Mackintosh explained that the scheme was required to have two member-nominated Trustees. Whilst an invitation for nominations had been extended, none had been received. He expressed his gratitude to Mr John Davies and the Rev Canon David Bayne for agreeing to continue in post but it would be necessary to take steps to identify successors as member-nominated Trustees and he encouraged members of the Church to participate. He closed by expressing thanks to the Pension Fund Trustees and Dr Daphne Audsley as the Pension Fund Administrator.

Questions were invited but there were none.

SESSION NINE – Mrs Gill Young in the Chair

9.1 Election Nominations

The Secretary General announced that following the decision of Synod earlier in the meeting to extend the times for the submission of nominations for the General Synod representative posts on the Mission and Ministry Board and Administration Board, nominations had been received of the Rev Kirstin Freeman and the Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan for the one

remaining vacancy on the Mission and Ministry Board. A nomination had also been received of Miss Hilary Gibson for the post of General Synod representative on the Administration Board.

An election by ballot was then conducted in relation to the nominations for the posts on the Mission and Ministry Board.

9.2 National Honours

The Chair announced that the Birthday Honours list of her Majesty the Queen published earlier in the day included an OBE for Professor Richard Fawcett for public and voluntary service and an MBE for the Rev Di Williams for services to higher education. The Synod expressed its congratulations in their absence.

9.3 Provincial Youth Network

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) spoke as the Convener of the Provincial Youth Network. The previous year he had reported that it was hoped to arrange a Youth Synod. In fact, it had not been possible during the previous year for this to be proceeded with but the matter remained on the agenda and would hopefully come to fruition in due course. Preparations were well advanced for the Glenalmond Youth Camp later in the summer. Two weeks were again being organised in the current year. There was now a large group of trained leaders many of whom had themselves come through the Glenalmond and Strathallan experience and a training weekend had been organised for them. It was now expected that anyone involved in a leadership role underwent training. He extended an invitation to Synod members to join the “amble” which took place on the Wednesday of both weeks. The Glenalmond Camp was of particular importance to those in more isolated communities and the cost of travelling for such individuals could be significant. Later in the year, there would be a pilgrimage for those aged 18 to 25 to Iona. During the previous year, a couple of additional provincial activities had been organised and he expressed thanks to those who had attended his Consecration in Inverness. He emphasised that the Youth Network was indeed a network rather than a committee. However, a network could only function effectively where there were people with whom to network. At one meeting earlier in the year, for a variety of reasons, there had been no Youth Officers present and this made it difficult to take matters forward. When he had taken on the Convenership, there had been both a Youth Officer and a Youth Chaplain in most dioceses but the development of projects would be hampered without the necessary people. Finally, he reported that a contingent of young people was travelling to the Lambeth Conference from Scotland where they would run the Labyrinth.

Comments were invited but there were none.

9.4 Church in Society Committee

Mrs Nancy Adams (Convener, Church in Society Committee) commended the Committee’s written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2007 and the Church in Society insert in *inspires*. She had been pleased to read the stories in the booklet *Local Collaborative Ministry: The Story so Far* and had noted that as congregations explored new forms of ministry this led to an increased involvement with local communities.

The Scottish Episcopal Church was hosting with ACTS and the Faith in Older People Project a conference in October 2008 “Wasteland or Harvest Field: An Ecumenical Exploration of the Needs of Older People and the Gifts they Bring to the Churches”. She also reported that matters had moved forward in relation to trade justice. The Dioceses of Edinburgh and Moray had now joined Brechin, Aberdeen and Glasgow by achieving Fair Trade Diocese status and the Diocese of Argyll had also appointed individuals to take the matter forward. The Mission and Ministry Board had recently joined the Fair Trade Foundation Stakeholders Group and the Rev Canon Professor John Riches, who was already involved in the Scottish Fair Trade Forum, would represent the Church on that group. The previous week, the Scottish Parliament Cross-Party Group on Palestine had hosted the launch of the initiative International Church Action for Peace in Palestine and Israel. The Primus had addressed the gathering and urged Scots to support those on both sides of the situation in the Middle East who were working for peace with justice. The meeting had also been attended by other Church leaders, Scottish Jews for Justice and the Scottish Islamic Foundation. On the question of environmental justice, the Committee was investigating the Scottish Stop Climate Chaos Campaign. In demitting office, she expressed gratitude to her fellow Committee members, Miss Lorna Finley and Mrs Elspeth Davey and wished her successor, the Rev Ian Barcroft, well in taking the work of the Committee forward.

The Rev David Mumford (Brechin) asked whether the Committee would feel able to develop some operational materials for churches to help safeguard the environment. Christian Aid addressed broad concerns in relation to the matter but there was often confusion as to what realistic practical steps could be taken. Mrs Adams suggested that it would be appropriate to wait until Professor Alan Werritty had addressed Synod before responding.

9.4.1 Climate Change

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) addressed Synod on issues of climate change. As a scientist, he was fearful for the future of the planet but every Sunday he was reminded of “a creation restored by love” and was mindful of the psalmist’s assertion that “the Earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof.” He outlined the principles of the greenhouse effect. Global temperatures had increased by 0.74 degrees between 1906 and 2005 and eleven of the years 1995 to 2006 ranked amongst the twelve warmest years since 1850. Some climate change scenarios projected that arctic summer sea ice could disappear by the 2080s. Unstoppable climate change would result if the North Atlantic Conveyor were to be turned off and there was already evidence of recent slow down. Professor Werritty asked why Christians ought to be concerned. God’s promise to Noah established a Covenant with humankind and all living creatures. God had entrusted creation to humankind as stewards. He encouraged members to read the Doctrine Committee’s Grosvenor Essay *On Salvation* which included a section on ecological salvation.

Professor Werritty then turned to the Eco-congregation Programme which encouraged Churches and their members to celebrate the gift of creation and care for it in an appropriate practical and spiritual way. The Eco-congregation toolkit contained twelve written modules, support through a website, newsletters, links to other organisations, a network of local Churches and also an award scheme. He outlined the content of the modules. More than thirty Scottish Episcopalian congregations were already involved and he encouraged participation.

Comments were invited but there were none.

Mrs Adams, as the Convener of the Church in Society Committee, indicated that the Committee had limited resources and had felt that, rather than developing policies as such for the Church to adopt, it was more important to increase the level of knowledge so that Church members could make informed decisions.

The Rev Alison Simpson (Moray, Ross and Caithness) explained that she had recently taken over the Convenership of the ACTS Church in Society Network. The Network largely received reports from other bodies and the Eco-congregation initiative was part of that Network. The promotion of strategies would therefore happen at an ecumenical level.

Mrs Young, from the Chair, expressed thanks to Mrs Adams as she demitted office as Convener of the Committee.

9.5 Standing Committee

9.5.1 Strategy Review/Response to Rule 10 Motion

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod papers which included a summary of responses from dioceses to the Strategic Review Paper which had been circulated in 2007.

A wide range of views had been expressed. There was no strong advocacy for a reduction in the number of dioceses but concern was expressed about the extent of the administrative burden on Bishops. There was no real perception of unfairness in the current quota system. This had been reported upon at General Synod 2007 and no further work had been done on that particular aspect. Some issues had been raised regarding possible central provision of certain specific services such as payroll, insurance and human resources support. There was a desire for an increase in e-conferencing and meetings outside Edinburgh. In order to assess the level of administrative burden upon Bishops, it was necessary to establish what level of administrative support was already available and a questionnaire had been sent to dioceses in the autumn of 2007 to which the responses showed a mixed picture. In order to obtain a fuller picture, a small group had been established for the purposes of visiting dioceses. That process was not yet complete. In addition, when the questionnaire had been sent out, Bishops had been encouraged to explore ways in which dioceses could work together, examples of which might be collaboration in relation to continuing ministerial development or payroll provision.

Some specific administrative burdens had been considered. The possibility of a central payroll system had been discussed with Diocesan Treasurers. There were now significant challenges in managing payroll but the notion of a centralised system had not received great support since some dioceses were already operating such a system of their own and were funding it. It had been suggested that other congregations which were managing their own payroll, at no direct financial cost, would be unwilling to pay for a centralised provision. If that were to change, collaboration in or across dioceses with an organisation that could provide a localised service might be a more appropriate route. Another area which had been investigated was the possibility of establishing a centralised insurance policy. A single central contract

would not be viable but it might be possible to provide a special policy arrangement with Ecclesiastical and it was hoped to provide more information to Vestry Treasurers about this in due course.

Professor Peattie reported that some Committees were already developing e-conferencing for their meetings and also held some of their meetings outwith Edinburgh. However, there were disadvantages and the balance had to be found between effectiveness and the burden of travel time. The Synod was already funding the costs of Forbes House and, if other venues were used, that represented an additional cost. There was also a question of how much travel time would be imposed on General Synod Office staff.

Greater clarity was needed regarding the role of provincial bodies including the General Synod Office, the College of Bishops, the General Synod and its Boards and Committees and their respective relationships with Diocesan bodies and charges. The College of Bishops and Standing Committee had set themselves the task of establishing a grid to identify who did what (or, more importantly, who should do what). This was proving a difficult task but such a framework would enable decisions to be taken as to what committees were needed, what their business should be and what functions should not be done by provincial bodies. She did not equate “provincial capacity” necessarily with General Synod staff. It was possible that some things could best be done by within a diocese or a charge where an individual could receive additional provincial funds, with the work being monitored by an appropriate provincial body. She expressed the hope that the Task Group established by the Mission and Ministry Board following the review of *Journey of the Baptised and New Century, New Directions* would take the opportunity to consider different ways of delivering provincial services. She noted that Synod had agreed to add another body, the Rural Commission, to the existing Committees and had there been greater clarity about the respective roles of provincial and diocesan bodies, it was possible that Synod might have decided that the work might have been given to one of the existing provincial committees. The purpose of the exercise was to give clarity so that everyone was clear about what the different parts of the Church contributed to the whole and to reduce frustration and replication and free up energy and skills. The College of Bishops and the Standing Committee would continue to work on these issues in the year ahead and she hoped to report something more concrete the following year. She welcomed any suggestions or ideas.

Mrs Nancy Adams (Edinburgh) expressed mixed emotions about the report. She was grateful for the opportunity to respond to the questions set out in the Strategic Review paper but she was disappointed that there had not been more lateral thinking. In response to the question about the three main priorities, on which the Church should focus, there was a laudable list but little perceived need to change the structures. What would be done to relieve the Bishops of their increasing administrative burden? Given that considerable time, energy and money was devoted to maintaining Church buildings, she wondered at what point the example of sharing of church buildings might become common practice. There was much good practice at the local level where some congregations took on a “sister Church” approach to support payment of quota and stipend but was there the same sense of cooperative responsibility across diocesan boundaries? However, the Strategic Review process was seen as a continuing one and there was much cause for optimism. The most important thing

was to continue to challenge the structures and to keep asking what were the priorities of the Church and how could financial resources be balanced with the desire to train and utilise untapped potential in human resources.

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) considered that the material contained in the Synod papers regarding the Strategic Review was disappointing. Without in any way criticising what Professor Peattie had said, he suggested that the Standing Committee was swimming in a kind of “soup” trying to draw common themes out of a welter of material when in fact there were no common themes to be drawn because the Church had not made up its mind as to the core dynamics. If the core dynamics could be agreed, matters would be much easier. He considered that the focus of energy for mission had to be within the dioceses but in other respects he was a centraliser. He was not sure what others believed. Members should also be aware that some Bishops had inherited situations which were unacceptable. Significant energy went in to raising such situations above the line of acceptability. There was need for a central attempt to frame an acceptable standard of how dioceses should be administered. There were a range of issues where the administrative agendas and other issues which the Church was tackling intersected (for example, “the green agenda” of fuel costs, rural broadband availability etc impacted on how a diocese could be administered). If such intersections could be identified, this would help shape the future dynamic.

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones (Primus, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) said that the Standing Committee in practice did little else but try to assess priorities. The resources of the Church would not be so limited if people had responded to the call for stewardship. He was fortunate in his own diocese in that he was advised by his Dean from time to time as to how certain administrative tasks could be delegated. Were the Church to start afresh, it would not be encumbered by its current clutter but it had not yet identified anyone to assist it in transforming what currently was into what it needed to become. He encouraged members to make the Province aware of individuals’ skills.

Professor Peattie thanked members for comments which had been made. She suggested that the “soup” needed to be sieved.

9.5.2 Budget and Quota

Professor Peattie presented the budgets for Synod’s approval. Whilst the motion for the Rural Commission had been approved, no real budget had been identified for that (other than an indicative cost in the paper included in the Synod papers). The Mission and Ministry Board would need to consider its existing commitments and plans and together with Standing Committee would seek to identify ways of funding this additional requirement. Inevitably, in the absence of additional income, something might have to give. This underlined the need to be more business-like and progress was being made in that direction. She had identified earlier in Synod the key changes incorporated in the budgets presented in the Synod papers.

Given the significant developments that might arise from the review of *Journey of the Baptised* and *New Century, New Directions*, it was difficult to project the budget for 2010. The present assumptions were clearly not affordable and it would be necessary to look at different ways of delivering on commitments. She asked Synod to

recognise that. In order to deliver the 2009 budget, it was necessary to increase quota by 3% overall which was below the retail price index rate. Given that much of the budget was dependent on costs which were determined externally, an increase of that level ought to enable a breakeven position by the end of the year, assuming some underspends. She expressed gratitude to all of the board conveners and especially the Rev Canon Professor John Riches and Mr Ian Stewart (whose boards had the largest budgets) for the work which they and their boards had undertaken to bring expenditure into line. Three years previously, the budgets for the General Fund were projecting annual deficits of £100,000 year on year. This would have been disastrous and the fact that it had not occurred had not been without pain. Staff support had been reduced, some activities had been curtailed and pressure on a large number of volunteers had been enormous. If there were a good response to Stewardship, it would mean that there were more resources available in dioceses and congregations to carry out desired activities.

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

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2009, agree to a quota figure of £568,318 for that year.”

Comment was invited.

The Rev Canon Professor John Riches (Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) noted that mention had been made of the Stewardship Campaign and its apparent lack of effectiveness. Figures which he had seen indicated that incomes of congregations and dioceses had increased in 2007 by about 8%. Recognition of the work which had been done as a result of the Stewardship Campaign and by the Rev Dean Fostekew was in order.

There being no further comment, the Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

9.6 Provincial Conference 2009

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen & Orkney) announced that a provincial conference would be held from 2nd to 4th October 2009 at the MacDonald Highland Resort in Aviemore. The venue was excellent and the price was good. The theme would be the five marks of mission. The keynote and principal speaker would be the Rt Rev Stephen Cotterell, Bishop of Reading, and he would be joined by Ms Annabel Goldie MSP and the Rev Eric Cramb. The underlying scripture for conference would be John 4: 3-44, the encounter of Jesus with the woman at the well. The title of the conference would be “Living Well” with the strapline “Proclaim, Discover, Respond”. There would be space for 300 delegates and the cost would be £295 for a single room, £265 for a shared room.

SESSION TEN – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

In resuming the Chair, the Primus thanked all those who had chaired sessions during Synod.

10.1 Elections

10.1.1 Mission and Ministry Board Convenership

There being no competing nominations, the Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane) was elected as Convener of the Mission and Ministry Board by general acclaim.

10.1.2 Mission and Ministry Board: General Synod Representatives

Nominations of the Rev Alison Simpson (Moray, Ross & Caithness) and Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow & Galloway) having been received within the requisite timescale, Ms Simpson and Mrs Young were elected as General Synod Representatives on the Mission and Ministry Board by general acclaim. An election by ballot having been conducted in relation to the subsequent nominations of the Rev Kirstin Freeman and the Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan (Synod having agreed to accept late nominations), the Secretary General declared that Canon Poobalan had been elected as a General Synod Representative on the Mission and Ministry Board.

10.1.3 Administration Board: General Synod Representative

There being no competing nominations, Miss Hilary Gibson (Brechin) was elected as General Synod Representative on the Administration Board by general acclaim.

10.1.4 Clergy Discipline Tribunal

The nominations for the membership of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal were as set out in the General Synod papers, there being a single nomination for each vacancy.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following:-

Three practising lawyers: Sheriff Iain Peebles, Lord McEwan, Sheriff Margaret Gimblett

Two clerics: The Rev Dr Anne Tomlinson and the Rev Canon Professor John Richardson

Three lay members: Mr Fraser Falconer, Mrs Sue Horne and Mr John Whittall.

10.2 Extension of Convenerships

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

“That the convenership of Mr Ian Stewart, as the Convener of the Administration Board, be extended until the conclusion of General Synod 2010.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Rev Canon Professor John Riches (Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) seconded, the following Motion:-

“That the convenership of Professor Judith George, as the Convener of the Ministry Development Committee, be extended until the conclusion of General Synod 2010.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

10.3 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed the thanks of Synod to the Provincial Liturgy Committee members and others who had led the worship throughout Synod, to the Rev Canon Professor John Richardson who was retiring as Convener of the Committee on Canons, to the Rev Paul Romano as Assessor, to the members of Cursillo who had served teas and coffees and to the other volunteers who had assisted behind the scenes, to the Kirk Session and Mr and Mrs David McColl of Palmerston Place Church and to the General Synod Office staff. Professor Peattie thanked the Primus for his chairing of Synod.

10.4 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 11.00am on Saturday 14 June 2008.