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GENERAL SYNOPD 2017 AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED ALL MEETINGS WILL TAKE PLACE IN ST PAUL’S & ST GEORGE’S CHURCH, YORK PLACE, EDINBURGH

A “Freshers’ Meeting” will be held at 09:00 on Thursday 8 June for new members of Synod.

Thursday 8 June 2017

10:00 Coffee

10:30 Opening Eucharist at St Paul’s & St George’s Church, including Primus’ Charge
Offering to support the work of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees
Constitution of General Synod

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

12:00 Primus: Welcome to delegates and guests

During this session Synod members will be invited to introduce themselves to each other in their table groups

Preliminary Business (Page 9)

Minutes of General Synod 2016 (Page 11)

Motion 1: That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 9-11 June 2016.

Elections: (Page 46)

Administration Board Membership
Institute Council Membership
Preliminary Proceedings Committee Membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

Motion 2: That the appointment of the Rev Marjory McPherson as an additional member of the Institute Council for a period of three years be ratified.

Motion 3: That the appointment of John Stirling as a member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee be ratified.

12:45 Lunch
SESSION TWO: MS JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

14:00 Standing Committee – Strategic Direction

Budgets and Quota Overview (Page 49)

SESSION THREE: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

14:30 Faith and Order Board

Process for discussing alteration to Canon on Marriage (Page 75)

Motivation 4: That voting in relation to the motion numbered 6 on the agenda be conducted by ballot.

Committee on Canons

Canons for Second Reading

14:40 Liturgical change

Canon 22 – Of Divine Worship and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church (Page 86)

Motion 5: That the amended text for Canon 22, Sections 2 and 3 be read for the second time.

14:45 Marriage

Canon 31 – Of the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony (Page 88)

Motion 6: That the amended text for Canon 31 be read for the second time.

15:50 Tea

SESSION THREE CONTINUED: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

16:20 Announcement of result of ballot on Motion 6

The following two motions will be proposed only if Canon 31 receives a second reading

Motion 7: That the amended text for Appendix 26 be adopted.
Motion 8: That the following be adopted as Resolution 1 under Canon 31:-

Where a cleric is to be nominated on behalf of the Church to the Registrar General for Scotland for the purpose of solemnising marriages between persons of the same sex, the person to make such nomination shall be the cleric’s diocesan bishop or, in the absence of a diocesan bishop, the dean of the diocese.

17:00    Evening Prayer
19:30    Synod Dinner at the Principal Hotel, 19-21 George Street, Edinburgh

Friday 9 June 2017

SESSION FOUR:  REV CANON ANNE DYER IN THE CHAIR

09:00    Morning Prayer
09:20    Standing Committee

Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

09:30    Faith and Order Board

Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

Rev Dr David P Easton, Chair of the Synod of the Methodist Church in Scotland and of the Shetland Methodist District

Inter-Church Relations Committee

Proposal to resume membership of the Conference of European Churches (Page 95)

Motion 9: That application be made on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church for membership of the Conference of European Churches.

Review of Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership (EMU) (Page 96)

Motion 10: That this Synod approve the Proposal for Synods of Spring 2017 regarding the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed (EMU) Partnership set out in the Synod Papers.
Committee on Canons

Canon for Second Reading

**Canon 63, Section 3** – Of the Office of Lay Representative (Page 98)

**Motion 11:** That the amended text for Canon 63, Section 3 be read for the second time.

10:20 Information and Communication Board

10:45 Coffee

SESSION FIVE: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

11:15 Mission Board

Stories and Statistics

Moving Forward in Mission (Page 99)

The Anglican Communion paper entitled Intentional Discipleship and disciple-making - An Anglican guide for Christian Life and Formation is enclosed as background information only (Page 101)

12:00 Church in Society Committee/Investment Committee

Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments (Page 105)

**Motion 12:** That this Synod, conscious of its responsibilities as a Christian Church

(a) Calls on all members, congregations and Dioceses to develop approaches consistent with a low carbon economy;

(b) Encourages the Church in Society and Investment Committees to work with and as part of the Church Investors Group as a means of informing and setting the Scottish Episcopal Church’s policy on investment in an era of climate change and helping small investors to implement such policies;

(c) Seeks to follow the example of other churches by restricting its direct investments in companies deriving over 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands;
(d) Asks for an annual meeting with the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Investment Managers, currently Baillie Gifford, at which the means of agreeing any limits to investments in companies with a poor environmental profile and encouraging the use of targets and processes suggested by the Church Investors Group might be discussed;
(e) Seeks to put in place a mechanism, which would allow the policy of the Church Investors Group on voting at company meetings, to be put into effect;
(f) Encourages the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund Trustees to follow similar approaches.

Church in Society Committee

Paper on other matters (Page 132)

**Motion 13:** That this Synod take note of the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod Papers.

12:45 Lunch

SESSION SIX: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

14:15 Institute Council
15:00 College of Bishops
15:20 Faith and Order Board

Liturgy Committee

Doctrine Committee

Launch of Grosvenor Essay No.13: *Clothe Yourselves with Compassion*

15:45 Tea

SESSION SEVEN: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

16:15 Pension Fund Trustees
16:45 Evening Prayer
Saturday 10 June 2017

SESSION EIGHT: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

09:30  Morning Prayer

09:50  Administration Board

Personnel Committee (Page 136)

Motion 14: That paragraph 6.8 the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

The Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, have power to adopt policies, procedures, rules, and guidance in relation to personnel matters in respect of clergy, not otherwise covered by the Code of Canons.

10:15  Coffee

FINAL SESSION: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

10:45  Mission Board

Provincial Youth Committee

Global Partnerships Committee

Report on Attendance at the 61st Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women

11:15  Standing Committee

Accounts

Motion 15: 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 2016.

Budget and Quota (Page 49)

Motion 16: That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2018, agree to a quota figure of £ 741,527 for that year.
Elections (Page 46)

Administration Board Membership - election required only if more than three nominations received

11:45 Confirmation of Acts of Synod and close of meeting
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Welcome to Delegates from other Churches and Faiths

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Thursday only), Major Steven Turner (Friday only):
Salvation Army
Rev Ian Boa: United Free Church of Scotland
Rev Mitchell Bunting: United Reformed Church
Rev Dr David Easton: Methodist Church in Scotland
Rev Dr Liam Fraser: Church of Scotland
Sue Lycett: Religious Society of Friends
Rev Dr Peter McEnhill: Action of Churches Together in Scotland
Very Rev Steven Mulholland: Roman Catholic Church
Trishna Singh: Interfaith Scotland

Guests from outwith Scotland
The Rev Canon Jane Charman, Director, Learning for Discipleship and Ministry, Diocese of Salisbury, Church of England

2. Prolocutors and Tellers

The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

Prolocutors:
- Clerical Prolocutor: Very Rev Frances Burberry
- Clerical Vice-Prolocutor: Rev Canon Paul Watson
- Lay Prolocutor: Dr Anthony Birch
- Lay Vice-Prolocutor: Ms Jenny Whelan

Tellers:
- Daphne Audsley
- Malcolm Bett
- Michael Hull
- Anne Tomlinson
- Donald Urquhart
- Miriam Weibye

3. Assessor

The Primus has appointed Dr Nicholas Grier, as Assessor

4. Minutes of General Synod 2016

5. Any Matters Arising from Minutes

6. Elections

Administration Board Membership
Institute Council Membership
Preliminary Proceedings Committee Membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership
7. **Housekeeping Matters**

8. **Roll Call**
   Please detach the attendance slip towards the end of this document and place it in the box.

FRESHERS’ MEETING

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

OPENING EUCHARIST

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul’s & St George’s Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 9 June 2016.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. With Synod commencing on St Columba’s Day, the Primus reflected on St Columba and the Gospel for the day which called the Church to go and make disciples.

Within congregations, there was the call to move from being a gathered church with a culture of membership to being a discipleship church with a culture of growth. In the Church provincially and nationally there was an increasing recognition of the need for a narrative which at times could be specific (for example, dealing with vocation and ministry in the next generation) and at times more general – what it meant to be a church with a national presence in Scotland. The Primus suggested that the context in which that narrative was shaped had never been more complex than at the present time. The relevant injunction from the Scripture readings of the day was St Paul’s call to the Thessalonians to “please God who tests our hearts”.

The Primus reflected on the proposal which would come to Synod regarding canonical change in respect of marriage. If a decision were made to change the Canon, what could be said to those who did not agree and could the Church continue to express the love and unity to which it was called by God?

During the year, deep pain in relationships had been experienced – in the Anglican Communion and in relationships with the Church of Scotland and Church of England. There was a need to explore where the Scottish Episcopal Church itself might have contributed to that distress and to shape a response accordingly, “pleasing God who tests our hearts”.

Referring to the approaching European Union Referendum the Primus noted its focus on questions of migration and immigration. If the Referendum took the UK out of the European Union, it might in turn have profound effects on the unfolding story of the new Scotland and the future of the UK itself. It was not the wish of many people in Scotland to use national borders to protect economic privilege. In previous centuries many had emigrated from Britain and Ireland. However, those who emigrated were not just those for whom there was no hope. His recent experience suggested that the best and brightest had also been let go so that they could develop other people’s societies, leaving an impoverishment of leadership at home.

In a time of extraordinary turbulence in both church and society what might it mean “to please God who tests our hearts”? It meant being faithful to the Gospel, responding to others as God had responded to us. The Church was called to exercise compassion, to pursue justice and to honour difference. The Primus prayed that in the forthcoming Synod, members would witness to that expression of faith in Jesus Christ who had suffered and died for the overcoming of sin and death.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Christian Aid with refugees. The offering amounted to £1,975.

SESSION 1 – THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members of Synod including the following delegates representing other churches: –

The Rev Alan Anderson (Methodist Church in Scotland), Lieutenant-Colonel Carol Bailey and Lieutenant-Colonel Jonathan Roberts (Salvation Army), Catherine Bell (Religious Society of Friends), Mr Paul Goldfinch (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Rev John Humphreys (United Reformed Church), the Rev Andrew McMillan (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Dr John McPake (Church of Scotland), the Rt Rev Stephen Robson (Roman Catholic Church), Mrs Evelyn Stewart (Baptist Union of Scotland) and the Rt Rev Patrick Rooke (Church of Ireland).

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Ian Barcroft and the Very Rev Susan Macdonald were elected as Clergy Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively by the House of Clergy.

Mrs Maureen McKellar and Dr Anthony Birch were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively by the House of Laity.

1.3 Tellers

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, Mrs Elspeth Davey, Mrs Carol Duncan, Rev Dr Michael Hull, the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson and Mr Donald Urquhart were appointed Tellers for the meeting.
1.4 **Assessor**

The Primus announced that Dr Nicholas Grier, solicitor, had been appointed as his Assessor.

1.5 **Minutes of General Synod 2015**

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) reported that a minor correction had been identified in the draft minutes of the meeting of General Synod 2015 and that the first full sentence appearing at the top of page 18 in the Synod Papers for the current meeting ought to have read: “However, if it did not, those who had voted for the least favoured option would have their votes reallocated in accordance with their second preferences.” Mr Gordon explained that the version of the minutes for signature would include that correction. He then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion: –

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of General Synod held on 11-13 June 2015.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.6 **Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.7 **Voting**

The Secretary General reminded Synod members as to who was entitled to vote on motions and in elections. In cases where an actual count of votes was required, Synod agreed that the Facilitator at each table would complete a voting slip to record the votes on their table. The voting slips would then be collected by the Tellers who had been appointed earlier in the meeting so that the total number of votes could be ascertained.

1.8 **Video Streaming of Proceedings**

The Secretary General indicated to Synod that, as had been previously advised, the proceedings of Synod would be video streamed via the provincial website.

1.9 **Elections**

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by General Synod in 2016 comprised a vacancy for one General Synod member on the Administration Board. No nomination had been received in respect of that vacancy by the deadline for submissions and it would therefore be for Standing Committee to determine whether to fill that vacancy for the year ahead.

The only other vacancy was on the Institute Council, in relation to which the Standing Committee had made a nomination.

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council), seconded, the following Motion: –

“That the appointment of the Rev Canon Paul Watson as an additional member of the Institute Council for a period of three years be approved.”

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

1.10 **Roll Call**

The roll call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 134 members attended.

1.11 **Permission to Speak**

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of the meeting: Dr Alison Strang, Mr David Bradwell (via video), Dr Donald Bruce, the Rev Cole Maynard, Mr Richard McIndoe, Ms Rachael Fraser and all ecumenical guests at Synod.

**SESSION 2: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR**

2.1 **Anglican Communion Matters**

2.1.1 **Report from Primus on Primates’ Meeting**

The Primus reported on the meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion which had taken place in Canterbury in January 2016.

The Synod Papers contained a copy of the Communiqué, including the "consequences" which that meeting had decided upon in relation to The Episcopal Church of the United States. The Primus suggested that, for Synod members, the primary question was likely to be whether the same consequences would apply if the Synod approved the proposals for canonical change in respect of marriage in 2016 and 2017.
The Primus had suggested that the unanswered question was: who was responsible for overseeing the limits of Anglican diversity and what happened when such limits were crossed? What had changed was that the Primates’ meeting had taken that role to itself and had concluded that the American church had put its autonomy ahead of catholicity.

The Primus indicated that he believed that the Primates’ meeting had acted beyond its powers and he regretted the adoption of a sanctions-based approach to the internal discipline of the Communion when proposals for an Anglican Covenant had already been rejected. He outlined four implications.

Firstly, the supreme authority for the Scottish Episcopal Church remained the General Synod and the proposals for canonical change to be debated at the current meeting were unaffected by what had happened. However, what had changed was that each Synod member now understood what the impact of any change would be on the Communion and the Scottish Episcopal Church’s place within it. It was important to be respectfully mindful of that.

Secondly, whilst it was tempting to be upset and angry, the standard of response had been set by the Presiding Bishop of America in a graciousness which was challenging.

Thirdly, the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church had been focused on the unity of the Church and had been attempting to model how such difficult issues could be dealt with. The need to maintain unity was paramount and there were measures coming before the Synod which were intended to maintain a place of respect and acceptance for the diversity present within the Church.

Fourthly, the Anglican Communion needed a process for measured and respectful conversation. In fact, it already had one in Continuing Indaba, the reference group of which the Primus was privileged to be the Chair of the International Anglican-Reformed Dialogue. Other effects, however, would be limited. Scottish Episcopal Church Bishops would be fully present and involved in the Lambeth Conference planned for 2020 and the Church would continue to be actively involved in diocesan companionships and Anglican networks.

The Primus proceeded to comment on these various developments. The provinces within the Anglican Communion were autonomous, the Communion having no central authority. Provinces, however, owed a duty of respect to other provinces and were in that sense autonomous and interdependent. That delicate balance became stressed when provinces in very different contexts addressed their changing contexts in very different ways. The global north was experiencing massive social change in relation to human sexuality (albeit it was not the case that the Church simply followed such developments). The global south, and in particular sub-Saharan Africa, remained deeply conservative and was under pressure from the Islamisation of Africa. The legacy of colonialism made measured and respectful dialogue very difficult. Different understandings of collegiality and leadership also confused expectations about how issues ought to be addressed.

The Primus suggested that the unanswered question was: who was responsible for overseeing the limits of Anglican diversity and what happened when such limits were crossed? What had changed was that the Primates’ meeting had taken that role to itself and had concluded that the American church had put its autonomy ahead of catholicity.

The Primus’ meeting had been a very difficult one and had been driven by a desire to stave off fracture. The justification for moving beyond the consultative role envisaged for the Primates’ meetings when they had been established by Archbishop Donald Coggan, lay in a resolution of the Lambeth Conference 1998 suggesting the Primates could offer “guidance on doctrinal, moral and pastoral matters”.

The Primus indicated that he believed that the Primates’ meeting had acted beyond its powers and he regretted the adoption of a sanctions-based approach to the internal discipline of the Communion when proposals for an Anglican Covenant had already been rejected. He outlined four implications.

Firstly, the supreme authority for the Scottish Episcopal Church remained the General Synod and the proposals for canonical change to be debated at the current meeting were unaffected by what had happened. However, what had changed was that each Synod member now understood what the impact of any change would be on the Communion and the Scottish Episcopal Church’s place within it. It was important to be respectfully mindful of that.

Secondly, whilst it was tempting to be upset and angry, the standard of response had been set by the Presiding Bishop of America in a graciousness which was challenging.

Thirdly, the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church had been focused on the unity of the Church and had been attempting to model how such difficult issues could be dealt with. The need to maintain unity was paramount and there were measures coming before the Synod which were intended to maintain a place of respect and acceptance for the diversity present within the Church.

Fourthly, the Anglican Communion needed a process for measured and respectful conversation. In fact, it already had one in Continuing Indaba, the reference group of which the Primus was privileged to be the Convener. Sadly, it had been damaged by unfair attack and misinformation but it stood for the reality that the Communion was dispersed and relational rather than centralised and authoritarian.

The Primus believed that in God’s providence, the Communion was more at the end of the beginning than at the beginning of the end.

2.1.2 Report on Anglican Consultative Council (ACC–16)

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) reported on the meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC-16) which had taken place in Lusaka in April 2016.
"God is good ... all the time" was the call and response affirmation he had encountered for the first time in Lusaka. One of many first encounters, it had stuck with him as had the exhortation to "shake his body in praise of the Lord", which he had been happy to do!

He had been honoured by the invitation to become the Scottish Episcopal Church’s representative but, as a gay man, the prospect of visiting a country which imposed legal sanctions on homosexuality, had given him some pause for thought. Similarly, engaging in the ACC meeting in the immediate aftermath of the Primates’ meeting and its decision in respect of The Episcopal Church of the United States against the backdrop of an issue which could not have been more personal, had given cause for thought. Despite lots of apprehensions in advance, he had been glad that he had gone. He had been inspired, bewildered and frustrated, albeit it was the inspiration which had remained with him the most. The bewilderment and some frustration had been bound up in the diet of business in which a huge amount of ground had been covered including: the work of the Anglican Communion Office, developments in ecumenical dialogues, discussion around human migration, violence (particularly gender-based), climate change, evangelism, discipleship and the role of young people in the Communion. The resolutions passed by the meeting had been made available to Synod members but it was the quality of the meeting which had inspired him.

34 out of the 38 provinces of the Communion had been represented at the meeting and there had been little desire to rake over past arguments or rub salt into old wounds. There had been a genuine desire to find commonalities. He had discovered the hugely important force for positive change which the Anglican Communion represented across the world. It was possible that that sense of the Communion’s real power and influence resonated more in Africa than in other parts of the world but when the worldwide Anglican Church spoke about gender justice, peace and reconciliation and climate change, it was listened to. Also, for all of his personal frustrations about the Communion tensions regarding human sexuality issues, it was the case that when the Archbishop of Canterbury restated the opposition of the Primates to criminal sanctions for homosexuality in a country which maintained such sanctions, that was of great significance. The perception of the Anglican Communion as an agent of progress and a courageous speaker of truth to power had come as an inspiring surprise.

On a more personal level, he had experienced a profound sense of spiritual renewal at the ACC. In a province which did not yet ordain women, two of the daily Cathedral Eucharists during the ACC had been celebrated by women and on the second Sunday of the meeting, when members had attended different churches across the Lusaka area, at least three of the congregations had heard sermons preached by senior ordained women of the Communion.

Mr Dinnie suggested that the legacy of ACC-16 was that the Anglican Communion was in a better and stronger place than before. Also, the ACC had posed a question for him which was not altogether clear but part of which was about how to find better ways of linking the Scottish Episcopal Church to the bigger international picture, of being able to communicate the sense of the vital worldwide movement and of maintaining that relationship, however challenging, and whatever consequences might ensue.

Thanks to his experience at the ACC, he stood convinced that "God is good – all the time".

The Synod then engaged in group discussions.

2.1.3 Motion Regarding Primates’ Meeting

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that authority within the Anglican Communion was maintained through bonds of friendship, establishing mutual respect and honouring the autonomy of individual provinces. That was not easy and could not be taken for granted. The dignity of the Communion was established by both the freedom granted to provinces and, at times, by the careful restraint which marked the fragile harmony of the Communion. Four key entities gave direction to the path the Communion needed to travel: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference of Bishops, the Anglican Consultative Council and the meeting of the Anglican Primates. Sometimes incompleteness marked the way each of those entities worked; sometimes controversy; sometimes remarkable achievements arose. That was not surprising since rarely was any family united on every issue, especially if it had some 80 million members.

The press reports prior to the Anglican Primates’ meeting in January 2016 had heralded a split in the Anglican Communion as the likely outcome. Whilst tensions remained, and things were not as united as one might wish, nonetheless it had been a remarkable gathering. The Motion he was about to propose was for Synod to mark its place in the Anglican Communion by “taking note” of the meeting of the Primates as an honouring of the fact that they had met, under God, in trust, and had worked hard on behalf of the provinces and of the Communion to preserve in peace the unity that bound the Communion together, in spite of differences and divergences.

Bishop Gillies then proposed the following Motion:

“That this Synod take note of the meeting of the Anglican Primates in January 2016 and of the terms of the Communiqué (including the Addenda to that Communiqué).”

The Rev Canon Dave Richards (Edinburgh) seconded the Motion. He recalled comments made by the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness at the recent meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in which the Bishop had likened the recent joint report between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England to the situation when one’s best friend took an interest in one’s sister. If one was hurt
when one’s sister flirted with one’s best friend, one could not ignore the reaction of the rest of the family when one did something which upset them. One could choose one’s friends, but not one’s family. The Motion was a reminder of the catholicity of the Church.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) proposed an amendment to strengthen the Motion so that the Synod could itself commit to walking together, as the Primates’ had done. He, therefore, proposed, and Ms Nicola Mills (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, an amendment to the Motion so that it would read: –

“That this Synod take note of the meeting of the Anglican Primates in January 2016 and of the terms of the Communiqué (including the Addenda to that Communiqué) and support its commitment to walk together.”

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

Discussion of the amended Motion ensued.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed his understanding (and asked to be corrected if he were wrong) that a “take note” Motion did not imply agreement with all of the texts which were referred to in the Motion. That had been a problem about that at the Anglican Consultative Council meeting. Based on his understanding, he was happy to support the Motion. With regard to the Primates’ meeting and what the Primus had said, Provost Holdsworth wished to stand in solidarity with him. It was difficult to have someone look into your eyes and tell you that if certain matters took place, you would be removed from a role you performed within the Church. If that happened, the Primus would enter a club to which a number of Synod members already belonged. Provost Holdsworth referred to the press conference which had taken place at the end of the Primates’ meeting at which the Archbishop of Canterbury had been asked whether, if another church followed a similar route to that taken by The Episcopal Church, similar consequences would follow. The Archbishop had responded that he could not know and that the actions of one Primates’ meeting did not bind another. He had indicated that he had one vote along with the others. Provost Holdsworth suggested that it now appeared that something had changed between the time of that press conference and the Primus’ recent meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Was it possible to know what had changed? He wondered whether the Primates had been consulted again or whether there had been consultation with the ACC or its Standing Committee. Would it be possible to obtain an answer to that question?

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed her surprise that the Archbishop of Canterbury could know whether similar sanctions would apply to the Scottish Episcopal Church. The process within the Scottish Episcopal Church was not yet complete. No one could know whether amendments would be proposed during the debate the following day or at Diocesan Synods or at General Synod 2017. She found it surprising the Archbishop of Canterbury could pre-apply sanctions. Whilst she would have been happy to support the original Motion, she considered that the amendment implied endorsement of what the Primates had agreed and, therefore, would vote against it.

The Primus responded to points made by Dr Routledge. He emphasised that in what he had said he had implied a very careful provisionality. It was reasonable, if the Synod were to debate changes to the marriage Canon, to endeavour to find out what the consequences might be but to raise such a question was not to pre-empt the decision nor to make any assumptions about what that decision might be. In response to Provost Holdsworth, the Primus said he had come away from the Primates’ meeting not quite sure what the consequences might be for provinces acting similarly to The Episcopal Church. There was, for example, also lack of clarity as to what would happen at the end of the three-year period referred to in those “consequences”. A letter had subsequently been sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Primates in the context of the Anglican Consultative Council meeting which indicated that all of the actions which had been agreed by the Primates had been completed. The Primus had assumed from that that the application of “consequences” had therefore begun and ended with The Episcopal Church and that it might require a further Primates’ meeting to extend those consequences to others. It was, however, very hard to know how to interpret matters which is why the Primus had sought a meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Anglican convenerships of formal dialogues between the Anglican Communion and other traditions lay within the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Membership of such dialogues was for the Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council. It was, however, clear that where matters lay within the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop would act accordingly. The Primus had no knowledge whether a change had taken place and if it had, he had no knowledge of why it might have taken place.

The Rev Cedric Blakey (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that in his address the Primus had made reference to the need for maintaining unity as being paramount. He recalled the debates within the Anglican Communion regarding the ordination of women. Was the reference to maintaining unity as paramount equally a reference to the need to do so in relation to debates regarding the leadership of women, the marriage of divorcees, doctrines of redemption or Eucharistic theology? He wondered what the boundaries of such an approach might be.

The Rev Markus Dünkofer (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the Motion and thanked those who had brought the amendment because for him it meant that the Church would go forward to walk together with brothers and sisters in The Episcopal Church. However, he expressed disappointment that the agenda only contained a Motion regarding the Primates’ meeting, particularly in the light of Alistair Dinnie’s excellent presentation on the meeting of the ACC. He considered there was something of an “episcopalisation” in the Anglican Communion. To have a Motion only regarding the Primates’ meeting seemed to follow that trend. He suggested it would be good to be able to react to the meeting of the ACC.
The Rev Canon Paul Watson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that one of the reasons he had become an Episcopalian was to do with the Anglican Communion. His first contact with Anglicanism had been in Bangladesh where he had caught the end of two centuries of Anglican church planting around the world. Returning, some years later, to explore possibilities of overseas working, he had been told “don’t expect to come here and solve our problems, but come and live with us in the problems”. He had ended up in Sri Lanka and lived with the Church of Ceylon in the problems of that country. There was a richness of texture and depth to relations with fellow Anglicans which was precious and unique. The fellowship of living within one another’s problems gave rise to bonds of affection which deserved more than simply a “take note” Motion. In entering into a time of change for the Anglican Communion, the Scottish Episcopal Church owed it to its forebears and brothers and sisters across the world to make as much of an effort as possible to sit together with each other in one another’s contexts. “Supporting its commitment to walk together” expressed that desire to maintain bonds of affection and to struggle towards understanding, even if, ultimately, different destinations were arrived at. Another reason for being an Episcopalian was that he valued Anglicanism’s theological diversity. The Scottish Episcopal Church would be much impoverished in the long term by taking a road which led it out of the Anglican Communion. It was important to grapple with the realities of life and mission in 21st-century Scotland but that did not need to be done alone. It could be communicated to sister churches so that they could be helped on their own journeys. It was difficult to be vulnerable and ask for understanding and patience from sister churches as the Scottish Episcopal Church wrestled with the wording of the marriage Canon. Ultimately, policy might not be sufficiently orthodox for many in the Anglican Communion but it was too early to start to slowly disengage. Only to “take note” of the Primates’ Communiqué was definitely a cooling and slight distancing. No vulnerability was being displayed and already the Synod would be seen to be moving to defensive and preemptive mode. He called on Synod to give a warmer response to the Communiqué’s commitment to walk together even if it disagreed with the Primates’ actions towards The Episcopal Church.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to commend the amended Motion. There was much pain within the Scottish Episcopal Church as well as within the Anglican Communion and as the Synod came to debate the marriage Canon the following day, it was important to commit to walk together – as a Scottish Episcopal Church as well as an Anglican Communion. He encouraged others to support the Motion - it did not mean that the Synod agreed with everything in the Communiqué but nevertheless members would walk together in love.

The Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney, responding to points made, confirmed that to “take note” did not imply assent to the contents of the Primates’ Communiqué. Also, it was possible to walk together with someone with whom one disagreed. Mr Dinnie’s presentation on the ACC had shown how when 34 out of 38 provinces met together it was possible to walk together. The Bishop expressed sympathy for the point made by Mr Dünzköfer that there was no reference in the Motion to the ACC. The text of the Motion had come from the Standing Committee to the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney because the former had been unable to accept the Motion passed by the Diocese. However, he suggested that within the hearts and minds of Synod members there might be an inclusion of the ACC for those who supported the Motion.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, two against, three abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Primus and Mr Dinnie for their respective presentations.

2.2 Faith and Order Board

2.2.1 Process for Discussing Alteration to Canon on Marriage

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) reminded members that General Synod 2015 had instructed the Faith and Order Board to present a revised version of Canon 31 to the current Synod for a first reading. The instruction had been that the revised Canon was to delete section 1, with its doctrinal definition of marriage to be a lifelong union between one man and one woman, and to add a conscience clause. The substance of the matter would be debated the following day and in order to allow as much time as possible for synodical debate, he intended to explain the proposals at this stage, supplementing his paper in the Synod Papers.

In relation to the text of the Canon itself, it was proposed to delete the current sections 1 and 2 and replace them with a new section 1 which offered no doctrinal definition of marriage but, by way of introducing the “conscience clause”, referred to the fact that there were differing understandings of the nature of marriage in the Church. The Canon made no attempt to define the term “differing understandings”. The new wording also indicated that no cleric could solemnise a marriage between persons of the same sex unless the cleric had been nominated on behalf of the Church to the Registrar General for Scotland. Bishop Duncan explained that the purpose of this approach was to offer General Synod a way of implementing the decision made in 2015 with the best possible chance of maintaining the unity of the Church, given that differing understandings of marriage existed and would continue to exist. He wished to commend this rationale, on behalf of the Board and indeed of the whole College of Bishops, as strongly as he could. He explained that after General Synod 2015 the College of Bishops and Faith and Order Board had been clear about what Synod required to be done but were also acutely aware of the unhappiness in the evangelical constituency of the Church produced by the outcomes of that Synod. Out of various conversations and correspondence, he, as Acting Convener of the Board, had received requests from a group of clergy covering areas such as different theologies of marriage within the Church, gender specific marriage liturgy, criteria for sponsoring candidates for ordination training and the manner of opting in to the new marriage law of Scotland. The Board had agreed in January 2016 to form a sub-group comprising the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness (as Convener), the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney, the Rev Dr Harriet Harris, the Very Rev
Dr Francis Bridger, the Rev Dave McCarthy and the Rev Alastair MacDonald to discuss those requests and to make recommendations to the Board’s overnight meeting in March 2016. In all of this, both the Board and the College of Bishops had been clear that implementing the decision of Synod 2015 by producing a revised text of Canon 31 was their necessary task but wished to explore how this might best be done in such a way as to keep everyone walking together.

One of the recommendations made by the Board’s sub-group had resulted in the Board’s proposal to alter Canon 22. (Of Divine Worship and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church) which would make liturgical changes subject to the normal two-stage canonical process – at the present time only a single resolution with a simple majority of Synod voting as one house was required. The reason for this was that if the present definition of marriage was removed from the Canon then the Church’s doctrine of marriage would in future only be found in the marriage liturgies. At the present time, the marriage liturgies recognised a diversity of understandings of marriage and, given the importance of the fact that liturgies expressed doctrine, it was considered that introducing a quasi-canonical procedure for such change would allow the proper consideration throughout the whole Church which liturgical changes ought to require.

A further recommendation concerned Appendix 26 to the Canons. It had previously been discovered that the present appendix was out of line with the civil law and the Board had thought to address this by having the revised Canon indicate simply that the prohibited degrees were the same as those in the civil law of Scotland for the time being in force. However, the sub-group had recommended that there should continue to be an appendix to the Canon setting out the Church’s own list of prohibited degrees. The Board had agreed that the Church ought to take its own decisions in such matters. The sub-group had also recommended that the College of Bishops adopt revised criteria for the recruitment and selection of candidates for ordination and lay readership recognising that candidates might hold different views on the doctrine of marriage and that no candidate should be discriminated against on the grounds that they believed that marriage constituted a union between a man and a woman only. These matters were under active consideration by the College.

Bishop Duncan explained that the College of Bishops and the Faith and Order Board were also aware that there were certain “surrounding issues” in need of consideration. These included matters such as the role of vestries, provision of a parallel track analogous to remarriage after divorce, appointment processes, for example provision in application forms regarding whether a person would wish to be nominated to conduct same-sex marriages. The College was actively considering pastoral guidance for those clergy wishing to be nominated to solemnise marriages between people of the same gender.

Finally, Bishop Duncan proposed, and Mrs Helen Hood seconded, the following Motion: –

“That voting in relation to the motion numbered 14 on the agenda be conducted by ballot.”

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that in section 2 of the proposed revised Appendix 26, there appeared to be no reference to “former civil partner of grandparent”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) commented that in the light of the concessions which had been made, he would look forward to seeing whether those who had sought concessions would support the proposals when they came before Synod the following day. On the question of the pastoral guidelines which Bishop Duncan had referred to, since such guidance would relate to marriages of same-sex couples in churches Provost Holdsworth asked that the guidelines not be published without some prior conversation or consultation with some of those who might be affected by such guidelines.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) responded to the point made which had been made in relation to Appendix 26 and explained that the proposed text reflected the wording of the civil legislation.

Bishop Duncan responded to Provost Holdsworth and indicated that any guidelines issued by the College of Bishops would not be intended to make marriage of same-sex couples more difficult. The College of Bishops was at quite an early stage in relation to such guidance and had already discussed the possibility of consultation. That would likely involve the Faith and Order Board but would also involve interested parties who might be able to offer helpful comment. As yet, however, no decision had been taken as to how that might happen.

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

2.2.2 Committee on Canons – Canons for Second Reading

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) explained the process for considering Canons at second reading stage and referred members to the responses from dioceses on the Canons, as set out in the Synod Papers. In relation to each, he would state the policy of the Board and the Rev Paul Romano, Convener of the Committee on Canons, would deal with the specific texts.

2.2.2.1 Canon 52, Section 5

Bishop Duncan explained that Canon 52, section 5 concerned the qualifications for elected membership of lay members and alternate lay members of the General Synod. The policy of the Board was to reduce the qualification age from 18 to 16 in line with the age of majority in Scotland, to encourage younger people in the life of the Church and to remove the requirement for Confirmation since Confirmation was
no longer required for communicant membership. Bishop Duncan also explained the proposed consequential amendment to Appendix 23 to the Code of Canons.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) spoke to the text of Canon 52.5 and Appendix 23.

Bishop Duncan then proposed, and the Rev Cedric Blakey (Glasgow and Galloway), seconded the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 5 be read for the second time.”

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) understood the reason for removing the requirement for Confirmation. However, there remained in the Canons a requirement for ordinands to be confirmed and he wondered why that provision was not also being removed at the same time.

Bishop Duncan responded that the possibility of removing the requirement for Confirmation in relation to ordinands had not been considered.

The Rev Canon Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that the reason why removing the requirement for Confirmation on the part of ordinands was likely to be because of the link between the Scottish Episcopal Church’s recruitment and selection procedures and those of the Church of England.

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

- House of Clergy: passed by majority, one against
- House of Laity: passed by majority, one against
- House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

Bishop Duncan then proposed, and Mr Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Appendix 23 to the Code of Canons be adopted.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, one against.

2.2.2.2 Canon 57, Section 6

Bishop Duncan explained that Canon 57, section 6 defined the meaning of certain terms used in the Code of Canons. The policy of the Board was to redefine the terms “adult” and “full age” in the Code of Canons to mean a person who had attained the age of 16 in line with the age of majority in Scotland and to encourage younger people in the life of the Church. Mr Romano spoke to the specific text of the proposed change.

Bishop Duncan then proposed, and Mr Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Canon 57, Section 6 be read for the second time.”

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

- House of Bishops: passed unanimously
- House of Clergy: passed nem con, one abstention
- House of Laity: passed unanimously.

2.2.2.3 Canon 60, Section 5

Bishop Duncan explained that Canon 60 related to vestries. The policy of the Board in presenting the new section was to reduce the qualification age for vestry membership from 18 to 16 in line with the age of majority in Scotland and to encourage younger people to take an active part in the governance of the Church. Mr Romano spoke to the specific text of the proposed new section.

Mr Matthew Pembre (Edinburgh) noted that whilst the Synod had just altered the definition of “adult” in Canon 57, section 6, the term “adult” did not appear to be used in the proposed change to Canon 60.

Mr Romano reiterated that wherever the term “adult” was used in the Canons it would mean any person aged 16 and above.

Bishop Duncan proposed, and Mr Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

“That the text for section 5 of Canon 60 be read for the second time.”

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

- House of Laity: passed unanimously
- House of Clergy: passed nem con, one abstention
- House of Bishops: passed unanimously.
2.2.2.4 Canon 63, section 4

Bishop Duncan explained that Canon 63 related to the office of lay representative. The policy of the Board in presenting the alteration to the Canon was to reduce the qualification age for the office of lay representative from 18 to 16 in line with the age of majority in Scotland and to encourage younger people to take an active part in the governance and leadership of the Church. He then proposed, and Mr Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Canon 63, Section 4 be read for the second time.”

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) sought clarification in relation to section 5 of the Canon and in particular whether a lay representative of linked charges would be entitled to one or two votes. It was confirmed that if the charges were linked there would be only one vote.

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

- House of Laity: passed unanimously
- House of Bishops: passed unanimously
- House of Clergy: passed nem con, one abstention.

2.3 Doctrine Committee

In the absence of the Convener of the Doctrine Committee, the Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) who was a member of the Committee, reported on the new Grosvenor Essay. He explained that it was devoted to “prayer and spirituality”. It started with the idea that prayer was “a complete waste of time” as the Dominican Herbert McCabe had said. That was because prayer was a matter of love rather than utility. The more that people prayed, not for the sake of doing something useful, but simply for the love of God, the more they became a home for Christ. For the early church, “spirituality” had meant the new spirit-filled life made possible by participating in the body of Christ. That seemed a long way away from the more private sense of spirituality which might pertain today. On the other hand, spirituality had become institutionalised outside the Church – in health care, education, prisons, etc – and in business was looked to as that which focused on values, connectedness and the meaning of life. For those who liked to read the Grosvenor Essay in groups, there was plenty to discuss about what helped people to pray. The focus of the Essay was that prayer was more God’s activity than that of people and that prayer changed people as they made room for Christ’s spirit. The Essay looked at the Scottish and Anglican heritage of prayers, the social outworking of prayer and the liturgical and Eucharistic shape of prayer. The Committee would be most satisfied if it aided prayer amongst its readers.

2.4 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Rev Dr John McPake, representing the Church of Scotland, brought thanks on behalf of the ecumenical delegates for Synod’s welcome and hospitality. He expressed deep appreciation for that hospitality and welcome, symbolising the fact that the Churches were called together towards a common vision and to share in the realisation of that vision in contemporary Scotland.

Dr McPake explained that he had represented the Church of Scotland on three occasions at the Synod and, as well as representing his church at the General Synod of the Church of England, had begun to appreciate more fully the practices and processes of Anglican churches. In his view, the Anglican Communion undoubtedly had the finest acronyms in the lexicon of the Church catholic. His undoubted favourite of the moment was IASCUFO, the Inter-Anglican Standing Committee on Unity, Faith and Order. He had been particularly interested in the IASCUFO report to the Anglican Consultative Council which had been received “as a resource to assist member churches of the Anglican Communion in recognising and receiving ordained ministry in their relationships with ecumenical partners”. The report had been commended for study and action in the provinces of the Anglican Communion as they sought to order their ecumenical relationships. He had already acted on that resolution of the Anglican Consultative Council and had begun to reflect on what “receiving one another’s ordained ministry” might mean as the churches journeyed towards a common vision in contemporary Scotland. The report was an invitation to journey together however long such a journey might be. There was no guarantee of reaching a defined destination that would satisfy all. However, he suggested that the wise words of the report, whilst not beyond benefiting from the leaven of a gentle critique from beyond the Anglican Communion, were ones which the Synod and the churches represented at the current meeting might profitably “read, mark, learn and inwardly digest”.

The business of Synod had all the undoubted hallmarks of the business of all synods, assemblies, convocations and the like. That included wrestling with the profound theological challenges which stalked all churches in their endeavours to realise a common vision as churches aligned, in their distinctive ways, their participation in the life of the one holy, catholic and apostolic church, in shared mission in Christ which, in the providence of God, Synod reflected upon that day, the feast day of Columba. He assured Synod of his prayers that it might bear witness to “evangelical truth and apostolic order” and asked that Synod pray also for the other churches represented.

The Chair thanked Dr McPake for his greetings.

SESSION 3: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee.
He paid particular tribute, and made a presentation, to the Rev John Humphreys, representing the United Reformed Church, who was retiring and for whom the Synod was his last public engagement.

Canon McLuckie spoke of the challenge faced when visiting his parents-in-law in Geneva, of where to go to church, given the significant number of options available. The globalised world presented challenges and opportunities in the ecumenical life of churches. Mostly, the many anomalies were managed well but occasionally the desire for co-operation between churches created an anxiety that historic spheres of operation had become too porous for comfort. The answer to such existential questions seemed to him to be more co-operation, coupled with vigilance, respect and a confident disregard for one's own more narrow interests.

The publication of the report of the Joint Working Group between the Church of England and Church of Scotland (Growth in Communion, Partnership in Mission) had raised some of those existential anxieties among members of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The view of the Committee was that there was no actual threat from what he considered to be an excellent and commendable piece of co-operation over matters of shared concern for those two national churches. The reason for his opinion was straightforward: the Church of England had no canonical locus in Scotland and so could not operate within Scotland. It was also the Committee's view that the complex reasons for people's choice of church when they crossed the border were not significantly affected one way or the other by the simple expression of hospitality contained in the report. Similarly, the arrangements for clergy to share in leading worship when they crossed the border were no different from those already in place. Closer ecumenical co-operation was envisaged only in those places where the two churches shared territory namely in England and on mainland Europe.

When the Scottish Episcopal Church had altered its status in the Joint Study Group to that of an observer, it had been for a good reason, namely that any relationship forged with the Church of Scotland would have to be of a different order from that which the Church of England might seek, because the Scottish Episcopal Church shared a common calling in Scotland to work for the kingdom of God. Canon McLuckie considered that the best response to this new initiative between partner churches was to put fresh energy into the Scottish Episcopal Church's own relationship with the Church of Scotland. He was delighted to report that that was exactly what the Committee was doing with a new conversation due to start in the autumn. He was happy to commend the report as an example of ecumenical commitment in a complex world. There was nothing to fear and much to welcome.

Canon McLuckie then proposed the following Motion: –

"That this Synod take note of Faith and Order Board's response to the report entitled "Growth in Communion, Partnership in Mission"."

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the Motion. In representing the Scottish Episcopal Church at the General Assembly the previous month, he had come across many people there whom he knew and had worked with. If the Scottish Episcopal Church could now put more energy into joint mission with the Church of Scotland, that would benefit the whole of Scotland.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus and Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeid and Dunblane) believed there was more to be said regarding the Growth in Communion Report than the points he had raised shortly after Christmas 2015 when the Columba Declaration had been published. Since then the Archbishop of Canterbury had graciously apologised and that apology was accepted. However, there was more to be said than Canon McLuckie had indicated because the report was more than an ecumenical agreement in the classic sense. There was a process of exploration which needed to be undertaken. The Primus reported that some Scottish Episcopal Church Bishops had met with some Church of England Bishops the previous week. That had been a very interesting and helpful exploration of the issues. There had also been contact with senior people in the Church of Scotland which had proved very helpful. If the report was more than just an ecumenical agreement (and he meant that positively), then it was an agreement which spoke of more than just matters of mutual recognition of ministries, understandings of the Eucharist, etc. Its potential was in the aspiration to be a multi-layered whole church engagement in the British Isles. That meant, he believed, that the Scottish Episcopal Church needed to commit wholeheartedly to the role being offered in the proposed new Contact Group. To do that would help to straighten out the issues concerning the presence of the Church of England. There were also possibilities for a strong relationship between the Church of Scotland and the Scottish Episcopal Church. There had been concern that the difficulties around the Columba Declaration might have been another SCIFU (Scottish Churches Initiative for Union) but he did not believe that to be the case for a moment. The current time was a difficult moment in the history of the Anglican Communion and an open relationship with the Church of England could be a very positive development within the life of the Communion. He believed there was a need for careful reflection within the Scottish Episcopal Church, not just by those with a specific ecumenical brief but also within the College of Bishops, the provincial Standing Committee and in other places about the potential now available.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to say something difficult. He appreciated the spirit of what the Primus had said but the difficulty was that sometimes on the ground matters were not the same as they were in ecumenical committees. It had been reported to him within the Presbytery of Glasgow that locally people within the Church of Scotland had indicated that they now considered Anglicans moving to Scotland "fair game". That was a very different tone from what had just been said. His perception was that some things had changed as a result of the report. Also, responding to the comment by the Primus that there was a need for the Scottish Episcopal Church to reflect upon its own role in the situation, he was aware that some people felt that the fulfilling of an ecumenical goal was of paramount importance and was, however, others who were just as committed to working together as Christians in Scotland who believed that strong fences made good neighbours. He asked the Synod to reflect on whether there were enough people of both views within the Synod's Inter-Church Relations Committee – were the hawks as representative as the doves?
Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the Synod had just voted to share the commitment of the Primates to walk together. She had in fact voted in favour of that Motion. Her concern with the Columba Declaration was that she believed the Church of England was saying to the Scottish Episcopal Church that it did not really wish to walk together in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church anymore. She had appreciated the remarks by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the General Synod of the Church of England and at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland apologising for the manner in which details of the report had been released just before Christmas 2015. However, she believed he had misjudged the mood in Scotland, particularly in the Scottish Episcopal Church, by failing to understand that there were issues of substance and not just of style. She hoped that it would be possible to move towards an ecumenical agreement and make stronger ties with the Church of Scotland. She expressed regret that the Church of England had not seen fit to send a delegate to the current Synod.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) had been present at the General Assembly the previous month. He had gone with much suspicion but he had been moved by the atmosphere having heard stories not just of ecumenical committees but of people sharing ministry on the ground. There had also been stories about sharing mission around Scotland with Scottish Episcopalians. Such activity was already underway. Unity which could happen between the Churches was already happening. His own congregation contained many people who self-identified as Presbyterians and his local Church of Scotland also contained many who regarded themselves as English Anglicans. Denominational identity was no longer as important as it had been. The report could open the door to new possibilities in Scotland.

Canon McLuckie responded to points which had been made and thanked the Primus for setting the wider context. He wished to reassure Provost Holdsworth that the Inter-Church Relations Committee comprised people who were actually engaged on the ground, often in ecumenical partnerships. In terms of future conversations with the Church of Scotland, the Committee was keen that this would be a “bottom-up” process. There was no desire for a “SCIFU Mark 2”. The new initiative was not being set up as talks about union but rather about how the Churches could re-engage better in mission. It was intended to be strongly rooted in local experience as well as undertaking the necessary theological reflection to take matters forward. Canon McLuckie said he did not share Dr Routledge’s fears regarding the Church of England’s motives. The agreement was a genuine expression of co-operation and there had been no intention to cut the Scottish Episcopal Church out. The strong desire of both the General Synod of the Church of England and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was that the Scottish Episcopal Church should continue to participate.

The Chair responded to Dr Routledge’s comment regarding the absence of the Church of England from the current meeting. He explained that the Church of England, Church of Ireland and Church in Wales were invited to send a representative to the Scottish Episcopal Church General Synod once every third year. The invitation for the current Synod had been to the Church of Ireland which is why the Church of England was not present.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, one against, four abstentions.

Canon McLuckie then addressed the fact that in 2017 the 500th anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation in continental Europe would take place. The Inter-Church Relations Committee had considered that the best way of marking that anniversary would be to commend the excellent study material produced by the Lutheran World Federation. He then proposed, and the Bishop Duncan, seconded the following Motion: –

“That, in recognition of the 500th anniversary of the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation in 2017, this Synod warmly commend the study material created by the Lutheran World Federation, “Liberated by God’s Grace”, for use in congregational and ecumenical settings.”

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed nem con, one abstention.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) referred to the fact that he had raised at Synod the previous year the question of the inclusion of the Philippine Independent Church in the schedule to Canon 15. There was a discrepancy between the introduction to the Code of Canons and the text of the schedule. He asked that the Committee address the matter. Canon McLuckie confirmed that the Committee would consider the matter.

### 3.2 Church in Society Committee: Refugees

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) introduced the session. He referred to the establishment of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees on which he represented the Scottish Episcopal Church. The group included representation from the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities and the Muslim Council for Scotland as well as Christian churches. He read out a statement which had been prepared by Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees for release on International Refugee Day 2016 expressing solidarity with those seeking sanctuary and encouraging and commending faith communities working with refugees to provide hospitality and build mutual understanding.

A video from Mr David Bradwell, who acted as Secretary to Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees was shown. He spoke of how Germany’s policy on refugees had been altered following an encounter between their Chancellor, Angela Merkel, with a child who was a refugee. Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees had been established following the massive publicity given to the refugee crisis. It built on the experience of many churches actively working with refugees and asylum seekers. His own work was to support churches proactively so that people could pull in the same direction. Whilst goods could be donated, gifts of money were preferable and Christian Aid already had well-established processes for accepting these. In Scotland refugees from Syria had been arriving over the previous nine months. There were many asylum seekers who had been in Scotland for many years but asylum seekers and
refugees had different needs and a different status. Churches could have a role in helping with integration. If Synod members wished to know more, he suggested that they contact him. Fundamentally, the work was to foster human dignity and promote the values of the kingdom of God. He thanked the Scottish Episcopal Church for its support.

Dr Alison Strang (Queen Margaret University) addressed Synod. In recent days, she had been reading transcripts from interviews conducted by her research team with refugees in Scotland. She cited, as an example, the story of two sisters from the Congo and their experience of being refugees in Scotland. They had received support from the Red Cross Family Tracing Service, the Scottish Refugee Council and Freedom from Torture. They were open about their struggles and yet overwhelmingly their spirit was one of hope and thankfulness. It was the case that inequality and poverty lay at the heart of much migration and there was a need to engage with migrants as a matter of justice as well as charity.

Dr Strang highlighted areas which refugees had themselves identified: the need for safety (there was a need to lobby governments to pursue both protective and preventative responses); a need to learn English; to learn about how society worked; to meet local people and make friends; to be in touch with their own families; to find a job. The national strategy was New Scots: Integrating Refugees in Scotland’s Communities. Councils across the country were working together to learn about integration and address in particular housing and welfare benefits and the need for language classes. Commenting on what churches could do, Dr Strang suggested that there was clear evidence that churches had led the way. There were good examples of churches which ran drop-in centres or food banks and provided English language practice and access to computers. Her analysis was that the most crucial need to support refugees was to provide opportunities for people to mix in their local communities. Refugees were desperate to become independent and to have a chance to give as well as receive. Churches were well placed to make opportunities for refugees and local people to meet together, to involve refugees in providing services to each other and the wider community and to influence employers and the wider business community to open up opportunities for refugees to gain work experience. She closed by highlighting resources available from the Scottish Refugee Council website.

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) referred to passages of Scripture which spoke of people coming into a new country from outside and referred to how they should be treated and what they might do in return. Mr Dinnie explained that he was a local government officer with Edinburgh Council and had been involved in the resettlement of 15 Syrian families as part of a Scotland-wide initiative. This was part of the settling of 20,000 refugees in the UK in the lifetime of the present Parliament. It involved all local authorities. The question of what the churches could do was difficult to answer because circumstances varied from place to place. In Edinburgh, for example, there was a particular pressure around accommodation but that was not so elsewhere. Edinburgh was blessed with a large number of Arabic speakers, whereas other areas were not. Before any church embarked upon a plan, it was essential to find out what the local needs were. He urged that the wheel should not be reinvented and that churches should work with others. Churches could have a role in longer-term settlement and integration. He suggested that public sector was quite good at the crisis response but found the longer term more of a challenge. The experience of resettlement involved turning a house into a home. The public sector could not do that easily but churches could assist.

Synod members then engaged in group discussions around tables.

The Rev Jane Ross (Glasgow and Galloway) then proposed, and Mr Dinnie seconded, the following Motion:–

“That this Synod welcome the establishment of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees as an interfaith body, which includes within its membership Christian churches from across Scotland together with Interfaith Scotland, the Muslim Council for Scotland and the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities, and call on all charges of the Scottish Episcopal Church to seek ways of supporting work with refugees.”

The Rev Tom Wilson (Glasgow and Galloway) spoke as a points-based immigrant into Scotland. In Paisley, in response to news that Syrian refugees would be resettled there, an ad hoc ecumenical/interfaith/inter-political Committee had been established with a view to supporting 50 families. Unfortunately, once the refugees had arrived, the local Council had cut off the possibility of contact on the part of churches. The Council had been concerned that churches would proselytise. He wondered what the Church in Society Committee could do about this.

The Rev Cedric Blakey (Glasgow and Galloway) spoke as Convenor of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths. He wished to commend the work of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees as a practical way of interfaith collaboration. The body had its own website which was very helpful and he was sure would address the issue which had just been mentioned.

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

SESSION 4: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Standing Committee: Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Mr Hugh Donald (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) reported on behalf of the Committee. He referred to the Committee’s written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015. The Committee, along with the Provincial Officers, was tasked with promoting and encouraging safe and protected environments for all children and vulnerable adults within the Church. In the previous year, the focus of the Committee had been in ensuring compliance with the PVG scheme and the delivery of training for those with responsibilities for children and vulnerable adults. The Committee, with the Provincial Officers, continued to explore the best ways of delivering such training in order to maximise engagement across all churches. The Committee was only too aware of the devastating impact which cases of historic abuse, committed by well-known figures such as Jimmy Savile, had had in recent years. The high profile which those had received in the media had
generated a number of enquiries and the Committee continued to monitor the robustness of the Church’s own systems and processes. The challenge going forward was to ensure that the policies and processes were in fact a reality and were being put into practice. At times, the Committee had had some cause for concern around the level of compliance with policies when it saw sometimes a low level of safeguarding returns or perceived lack of commitment to training. Members of the Church should be able to expect that children and vulnerable adults were safe. Sadly, in modern society safety could not be guaranteed. The approach of the Committee was to look beyond the legal wording of complex regulations and to embrace the idea of a safe church. In closing, he expressed appreciation to the members of the Committee and the provincial staff Mr Donald Urquhart, Dr Daphne Audsley assisted by Miss Betty Robertson (who had now retired) and Mr Peter Cozens. He was delighted that, as he stood down as Convener, he would be succeeded by Mr Chris Townsend, one of the Committee members.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Mr Donald for his service as Convener and in other ways to the Church.

4.2 Faith and Order Board: Committee on Canons – Canons for First Reading

4.2.1 Canon 22

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) introduced the proposed change to Canon 22. As he has indicated to Synod the previous day, the purpose was to make liturgical change subject to the same process as a change to Canons. He then proposed, and Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion: –

“That the amended text for Canon 22, Sections 2 and 3 be read for the first time.”

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) indicated that the Liturgy Committee had no strong view on the proposed change. He confirmed that no change to the marriage liturgy would be required as a result of the change to the marriage Canon which Synod would consider shortly. The production of new liturgy already underwent a significant process of scrutiny but the Committee could see benefit in the proposed change to the process. It might help both General and Diocesan Synods to view the task as one of significance and it would impart to any new liturgy an enhanced authority.

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) indicated that the Liturgy Committee had no strong view on the proposed change. He confirmed that no change to the marriage liturgy would be required as a result of the change to the marriage Canon which Synod would consider shortly. The production of new liturgy already underwent a significant process of scrutiny but the Committee could see benefit in the proposed change to the process. It might help both General and Diocesan Synods to view the task as one of significance and it would impart to any new liturgy an enhanced authority.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) wondered how many clergy, hand on heart, could say they always used the authorised liturgies. He therefore questioned what advantage the proposed amendment to the Canon would be to the Church.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) speaking as a former Convener of the Liturgy Committee indicated that when he had first become Convener he had thought that the process for liturgical change involved a two-year procedure. He suggested that the issue related to the Latin tag lex orandi, lex credendi. That did not mean that doctrine was only found in the text of liturgies but was best understood to mean “we pray what we believe and we believe what we pray”. It did not mean that the authorised liturgies could be expected to reflect the worshipping life of the Church. The authorised liturgies did not define the Church’s worshipping life. Creativity, adaptation and a sense of mission were to be encouraged in worship. He supported the Motion because he believed that worship was a place where worshippers were shaped by God. In the liturgy of marriage, the development of the understanding of marriage over time could be seen in that the liturgy no longer emphasised the reproduction of the human race as the primary purpose of marriage. Instead, the liturgy now reflected the loving relationship between the couple as the primary purpose.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said that Synod had heard that the proposed change to Canon 22 had been requested by a number of people who were part of Synod. He wanted to know whether, if Synod agreed to the proposed amendment, would it make it easier for such people to vote in favour of the Motion to come later in the debate regarding the proposed change to Canon 31. He noted that Synod had not discussed such a change the previous year and, in that sense, the change had come somewhat “out of the blue”. The Boards and Committees of the Synod served the Synod and he considered that the proposed alteration to Canon 22 upset that balance somewhat. However, if the proposed change would assist the Synod in staying together then he could see that it might have merit.

Bishop Duncan responded that the Board believed that the proposed change to Canon 22 would help those who might have difficulty with the proposed change to Canon 31. He believed that passing the Motion would make it easier for people to stay together in the Church.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) wished to propose an amendment to the proposed final sentence of Canon 22, section 2 so that instead of reading “Any proposed addition, deletion or other alteration shall be initiated only on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board and shall proceed by way of the process set out in Canon 52, section 17 and by no other process” it would read “Any proposed addition, deletion or other alteration shall be initiated only on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board and shall proceed by way of the process set out in Canon 52, section 17 or as required by a change to the Canons of the Church.” He had been assured that the proposed change to Canon 22 would not result in additional delay in implementing any change to Canon 31, as Synod would discuss shortly. However, he was concerned that future changes to the Canons might require future liturgical change. Canonical change would require two years of debate at General Synods but if liturgical change, arising from any such canonical change, were to require discussion at two General Synods then the entire process might take four years. His amendment related only to changes to liturgy which were necessary as a result of changes to the Canons.
The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) seconded the amendment.

Bishop Duncan responded that the Faith and Order Board had been advised by the Liturgy Committee that the 2007 Marriage Liturgy could be used without further amendment for a marriage of a couple of the same sex.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and the Isles) considered the amendment misguided and not very Episcopal because it was trying to address a future event which might, or might not, happen. It also risked fast tracking something which would normally be dealt with in a proper deliberative process.

The Rev Canon Dave Richards (Edinburgh) said he understood the proposed amendment would short-circuit the process. That would, however, prejudge the issue.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) indicated that he did not know what Canon 52, section 17 said but that if that was where the process was set out, there was no need for the words “and by no other process” in the proposed Canon 22, section 2.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that Canon 52, section 17 set out the process for canonical change. He wished to commend the original text of the Motion.

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

The original Motion, namely: –

“That the amended text for Canon 22, Sections 2 and 3 be read for the first time.”

was put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows: –

House of Laily: passed by majority
House of Clergy: passed by majority
House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

4.2.2 Canon 31

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) introduced the proposed change to Canon 31. He did not propose to make any additional comment to what he had said to Synod the previous day. He then proposed, and Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion: –

“That the amended text for Canon 31 be read for the first time.”

The Rev Paul Romano outlined the proposed change to the Canon, including the incorporation of a conscience clause as Synod had asked for the previous year. Mr Romano explained that in relation to Appendix 26 set out on pages 88 and 89 of the Synod Papers, the category of “former civil partner of grandparent” had accidentally been omitted from the list of relationships by affinity set out in section 2 of that Appendix. Synod agreed that the matter be treated as a typographical error and that any vote on the Canon would proceed on the assumption that the words “former civil partner of grandparent” was inserted after the words “former spouse of grandparent”.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) expressed thanks that there had been engagement with certain members of Synod following last year’s Synod meeting. The way the process had developed the previous year had been upsetting to a number. He was unhappy that Synod had never been asked as a matter of principle whether marriage was to be understood as being between a man and a woman only or as gender neutral. The Synod had been asked only to vote on more procedural matters such as the changing of Canons. He regretted that Synod had never been asked a straight question. He was grateful to those who had drafted a Canon which he believed created a safe space. However, it remained the case that a vote on the Canon was the only way Synod members could vote on the principle. On that basis he would have to vote against the proposed change to the Canon because he disagreed in principle with the change. He believed that Scripture taught that marriage was between a man and a woman.

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) expressed surprise at how little time had been allocated to the debate. The Doctrine Committee paper of the previous year had been released him to be able to support gay marriage. At the meeting of the Edinburgh Diocesan pre-Synod meeting the previous week reference had been made to a paper by Prof Oliver O’Donovan. That paper had disputed much of the methodology of, and the conclusions drawn by, the Doctrine Committee paper. The dry approach of Prof O'Donovan's paper distracted from the fact that the debate was a matter of fundamental importance to the humanity and spirituality of real people. Gay people were created in God's image as much as heterosexual people and God had seen that his creation was good. Mr Thompson said he could not believe that God intended to cast a shadow over so many of his created children as certain members of the Church through homophobia or intransigent interpretation of Scripture appeared determined to do. God's call was to love all people. Being gay was not just about sex. Whilst he could be married in church, his gay friend who had been in a faithful relationship for many years, could not. For years, the Anglican Communion had fudged the issue. The evangelicals sat on their hands and argued that Scripture was clear. Sadly, the Primates’ meeting had continued the fudge by putting the American Episcopal Church on the naughty step for three years. What would happen after that? The final paragraph of Prof O'Donovan's paper had asked the question as to how to conceive of new pastoral initiatives in faithfulness to the catholic Christian identity which the Church professed. The paper
had suggested that if an Anglican Church was convinced of the need to provide new support for same-sex couples, might it find a way of imagining that innovation in a way that would not result in a shipwreck of its identity. If it could not so imagine, it did not matter what others thought of it because it would have given up the attempt to be true to its self. Mr Thompson suggested that if a theologian of Prof O’Donovan’s stature believed that there was a way of embracing the homosexual community within the Church’s catholicity, then surely that ought to be pursued as a matter of urgency. Surely, there was a pathway of reconciliation and he did not believe that God wanted the Anglican Communion to disintegrate. If the Church were to arrive at an academic solution, it needed to use academic techniques. He understood that there was much theological material on the subject in the Church but it was not co-ordinated. Simply to see one paper arguing in one direction and another in the opposite left him feeling confused. The Anglican community was better than that.

Dr Christopher Johnston (Edinburgh) was distressed about the proposed changes. They would amount to a destruction of marriage and he urged Synod to draw back and find another path. The proposed new Canon did not say what marriage actually was. In the absence of any statement regarding the understanding of marriage, marriage would mean what anyone chose it to mean. He did not wish to hurt or offend anyone and he condemned no one. He was aware, from a lifetime in medical practice, what homosexual people suffered. However, he did not think it was the right thing to destroy marriage and its meaning. Biologically, marriage was about creating families and was needed for a healthy society. Society was increasingly losing its way in the current generation and to remove the definition of marriage would encourage society towards its destruction. He had been encouraged during the Cascade process by one person who had indicated that they sought civil partnership but not marriage. It would be possible to acknowledge such an approach in the Canon. He was concerned that the change would put the Scottish Episcopal Church outside the Church Universal. He suggested that the matter be taken back to the drawing board.

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) said that if changes had not been made to the Canon in 1981, measures would not have had to be taken to permit marriage between persons of the same sex because the civil law of Scotland would express the legal definition of marriage and the Church’s liturgies would contain the theology. Neither the law nor the Church’s liturgies expected any form of sexual activity to be involved in a same-sex marriage. That, therefore, was not the question at issue. The question of sexual acts between people was not a matter for canon law but for the teaching of the Bishops. The proposal allowed both sides to hold their position with integrity. There would be nothing in the Canons nor in the liturgies of the Church which would define marriage as being between persons of the same sex. It would, however, be naive to suppose that a change in practice did not imply a change in doctrine. Any new doctrine would only be applied by those clergy who wished to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage. For that reason, he urged the Scottish Episcopal Church to be careful in how it presented the issue to the Anglican Communion and the outside world. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not about to do what The Episcopal Church of America had done in that a new definition of marriage was not being incorporated within the Canons. What was being done was to allow a self-nominating group of clergy to perform marriages the sacramental validity of which was not universally acknowledged.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) had read the account of the debate the previous year and had noted that theology had not featured strongly. Theology was important because the Canon had theological implications. Theology had, however, featured in the Cascade Conversations. He had been glad to see the paper even though it opposed equal marriage. Dr Holmes supported equal marriage. The paper, however, was useful in that it pointed out that liturgy was not the only source of doctrine. The paper referred to the dynamic role of Scripture, tradition and reason. A dynamic view of tradition would allow for the possibility of change in doctrine but Prof O’Donovan appeared to consider that tradition was something from the past to which the Church had to conform. The paper did not address why equal marriage threatened catholic unity. Dr Holmes pointed out that an expansion of doctrine had happened before in that the Church had allowed remarriage of people who were divorced. There was no reason to vote against the Canon and he supported the Motion.

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) said that in Scripture every reference to marriage either directly or by implication restricted it to a relationship between a man and a woman. That was the case when Jesus himself spoke of marriage. If the mind of Christ was to be that of the Church, one must conclude that marriage should remain as the existing Canon defined it. He would, therefore, be voting against the Motion and urged members of Synod to do likewise.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) noted that the Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board had referred the previous day to the issue of pastoral guidance for clergy. He asked that such measures include guidance for those clergy who did not wish to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage so that a same-sex couple approaching such a cleric would be able to receive appropriate assistance if seeking to marry.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Faith and Order Board for seeking to fulfill its remit. There was much in the Canon which he welcomed but he remained concerned at the deletion of section 1. The view in that section that marriage was between a man and a woman was upheld by Scripture and he therefore could not agree to a change in that view was articulated in the book of Genesis and upheld in the teaching of Jesus. If marriage was written into the Creator’s design, the Church was not at liberty to change that. Where a province acted unilaterally, that was the case when Jesus himself spoke of marriage. If marriage was written into the book of Genesis and upheld in the teaching of Jesus. It would only be applied by those clergy who wished to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage. That, therefore, was not the question at issue. The question of sexual acts between people was not a matter for canon law but for the teaching of the Bishops. The proposal allowed both sides to hold their position with integrity. There would be nothing in the Canons nor in the liturgies of the Church which would define marriage as being between persons of the same sex. It would, however, be naive to suppose that a change in practice did not imply a change in doctrine. Any new doctrine would only be applied by those clergy who wished to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage. For that reason, he urged the Scottish Episcopal Church to be careful in how it presented the issue to the Anglican Communion and the outside world. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not about to do what The Episcopal Church of America had done in that a new definition of marriage was not being incorporated within the Canons. What was being done was to allow a self-nominating group of clergy to perform marriages the sacramental validity of which was not universally acknowledged.

Dr Christopher Johnston (Edinburgh) was distressed about the proposed changes. They would amount to a destruction of marriage and he urged Synod to draw back and find another path. The proposed new Canon did not say what marriage actually was. In the absence of any statement regarding the understanding of marriage, marriage would mean what anyone chose it to mean. He did not wish to hurt or offend anyone and he condemned no one. He was aware, from a lifetime in medical practice, what homosexual people suffered. However, he did not think it was the right thing to destroy marriage and its meaning. Biologically, marriage was about creating families and was needed for a healthy society. Society was increasingly losing its way in the current generation and to remove the definition of marriage would encourage society towards its destruction. He had been encouraged during the Cascade process by one person who had indicated that they sought civil partnership but not marriage. It would be possible to acknowledge such an approach in the Canon. He was concerned that the change would put the Scottish Episcopal Church outside the Church Universal. He suggested that the matter be taken back to the drawing board.

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) said that if changes had not been made to the Canon in 1981, measures would not have had to be taken to permit marriage between persons of the same sex because the civil law of Scotland would express the legal definition of marriage and the Church’s liturgies would contain the theology. Neither the law nor the Church’s liturgies expected any form of sexual activity to be involved in a same-sex marriage. That, therefore, was not the question at issue. The question of sexual acts between people was not a matter for canon law but for the teaching of the Bishops. The proposal allowed both sides to hold their position with integrity. There would be nothing in the Canons nor in the liturgies of the Church which would define marriage as being between persons of the same sex. It would, however, be naive to suppose that a change in practice did not imply a change in doctrine. Any new doctrine would only be applied by those clergy who wished to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage. For that reason, he urged the Scottish Episcopal Church to be careful in how it presented the issue to the Anglican Communion and the outside world. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not about to do what The Episcopal Church of America had done in that a new definition of marriage was not being incorporated within the Canons. What was being done was to allow a self-nominating group of clergy to perform marriages the sacramental validity of which was not universally acknowledged.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) had read the account of the debate the previous year and had noted that theology had not featured strongly. Theology was important because the Canon had theological implications. Theology had, however, featured in the Cascade Conversations. He had been glad to see the paper even though it opposed equal marriage. Dr Holmes supported equal marriage. The paper, however, was useful in that it pointed out that liturgy was not the only source of doctrine. The paper referred to the dynamic role of Scripture, tradition and reason. A dynamic view of tradition would allow for the possibility of change in doctrine but Prof O’Donovan appeared to consider that tradition was something from the past to which the Church had to conform. The paper did not address why equal marriage threatened catholic unity. Dr Holmes pointed out that an expansion of doctrine had happened before in that the Church had allowed remarriage of people who were divorced. There was no reason to vote against the Canon and he supported the Motion.

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) said that in Scripture every reference to marriage either directly or by implication restricted it to a relationship between a man and a woman. That was the case when Jesus himself spoke of marriage. If the mind of Christ was to be that of the Church, one must conclude that marriage should remain as the existing Canon defined it. He would, therefore, be voting against the Motion and urged members of Synod to do likewise.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) noted that the Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board had referred the previous day to the issue of pastoral guidance for clergy. He asked that such measures include guidance for those clergy who did not wish to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage so that a same-sex couple approaching such a cleric would be able to receive appropriate assistance if seeking to marry.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Faith and Order Board for seeking to fulfill its remit. There was much in the Canon which he welcomed but he remained concerned at the deletion of section 1. The view in that section that marriage was between a man and a woman was upheld by Scripture and he therefore could not agree to a change in that view was articulated in the book of Genesis and upheld in the teaching of Jesus. If marriage was written into the Creator’s design, the Church was not at liberty to change that. Where a province acted unilaterally, that was the case when Jesus himself spoke of marriage. If the mind of Christ was to be that of the Church, one must conclude that marriage should remain as the existing Canon defined it. He would, therefore, be voting against the Motion and urged members of Synod to do likewise.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) noted that the Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board had referred the previous day to the issue of pastoral guidance for clergy. He asked that such measures include guidance for those clergy who did not wish to be nominated to solemnise same-sex marriage so that a same-sex couple approaching such a cleric would be able to receive appropriate assistance if seeking to marry.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Faith and Order Board for seeking to fulfill its remit. There was much in the Canon which he welcomed but he remained concerned at the deletion of section 1. The view in that section that marriage was between a man and a woman was upheld by Scripture and he therefore could not agree to a change in that view was articulated in the book of Genesis and upheld in the teaching of Jesus. If marriage was written into the Creator’s design, the Church was not at liberty to change that. Where a province acted unilaterally, that was the case when Jesus himself spoke of marriage. If the mind of Christ was to be that of the Church, one must conclude that marriage should remain as the existing Canon defined it. He would, therefore, be voting against the Motion and urged members of Synod to do likewise.
The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said she did not follow the liturgy of marriage which Adam and Eve followed. The way that marriage was done today was very different from how it had been 5,000 years previously. In relation to the idea that marriage was ordained in Scripture, she suggested that the understanding of marriage then was very different from current understandings. It had only been in the preceding 300-400 years that marriage had been addressed by the civil law, let alone in Church Canons. There were some who could no longer hold to the definition of marriage as expressed in the current section 1 of the Canon. They had come to the conclusion through their reading, prayer and spirituality that that doctrine was no longer valid. The new section 1 allowed everyone to hold their respective doctrines of marriage. The view of the sacraments had changed through the ages and the Church’s view of looking at marriage. If members of the Church were truly to walk together in love and grace, neither understanding of marriage should be privileged over the other. Prof Werritty referred to St Paul’s letter to the Ephesians in which the call was to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Whatever the outcome, he prayed that unity would be maintained.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred to the fact that when God had looked at his creation he had found that it was good. In looking at creation, it was necessary to look at it as it actually was, not as one might like it to be nor as one’s prejudices might want it to be. One had to accept that scientific understanding of the world had moved on. The writers of Scripture had written with the understanding of their time. Normal heterosexual sexual activity was clearly part of the created order. Bonobos were a race of chimpanzees in which bisexual activity was the norm. In human populations, it was now very apparent that sexual preference was formed very early in life, before conscious choice was involved. Non-heterosexual sexual preference might be a minority but it was as “natural” as heterosexual preference. For the Church’s legal structures to deny that was in danger of showing contempt for the glorious diversity of God’s creation.

The Rev Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said that many people thought that what was being debated was whether a gay couple could get married in a Scottish Episcopal Church. It was partly about that but it was also about bigger issues. It was about the kind of church which one wanted it to be – whether the Scottish Episcopal Church was one where there was room for everyone, whether there was room for minorities in the Church (not just gay and bisexual people but others such as refugees, ethnic minorities, single parents, single people and people of diverse gender identity). It was about whether the Church was willing to play its part in dismantling social systems which oppressed the oppressed. The proposed new Canon represented the Scottish Episcopal Church now was. She did not believe that it excluded people from the Church. There were people present at Synod who were otherwise being forced to hold to a doctrine of marriage which they could no longer accept. It would mean comfort. There was already pain and she urged Synod members not to underestimate the pain and hurt which would be felt if the Motion were not passed. It would mean saying that there was not room for people like her. If the Synod could accept diversity, it could be a model of Anglican fellowship and love throughout the Anglican Communion. She would be very proud of that.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) appreciated the work which had been carried on during the previous year. The O’Donovan paper which had been referred to was available on the Fulcrum website. Canon Round appreciated the proposed new section 1 to the Canon which might be crucial in years to come to help people to walk together. However, the proposed change to the Canon as a whole would also remove the existing first section. He was personally unable to accept the removal of the definition of marriage as being between a man and a woman. He would therefore vote against the Motion. He was worried about the consequences for the Scottish Episcopal Church in terms of its internal unity, its unity within the Anglican Communion and the consequences for mission and evangelism. Other denominations had gone down a similar path and were dropping in numbers. Reluctantly, therefore, he would vote against the Motion.

The Rev Dr David Greenwood (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that as the people of God, the task was to look at the world through the lens of theology. As Anglicans, that theology was built through Scripture, tradition and reason. He reminded Synod of the words in Isaiah that “my ways are higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts”. Sometimes, God’s ways were not as fully explained as one might like but it was necessary to live with that. The Church had to accommodate itself to God’s terms. What was being contemplated was a redefinition of one of God’s sacraments on what he believed to be a rather shaky foundation. When Jesus had been asked about marriage, he had responded in terms of male and female. Dr Greenwood said it had been put to him that the proposed canonical change could be accepted on the basis that Jesus had never explicitly addressed homosexual marriage. The Scottish Episcopal Church was at a crucial point and he urged Synod members not to risk the unity of the Church and its relationship with the wider Anglican Communion on the basis of an argument from silence.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) respected the arguments advanced on both sides of the debate. His own decision would be strongly conditional upon how the decision would be implemented. If the Synod decided to change the Canon on marriage, many would feel excluded and pained by that decision. He was pleased to see that the Canon included safeguards for those who in conscience could not go along with any such decision and he was reassured that the existing understanding of marriage would be preserved within the authorised liturgies. However, there was still much more to be done to protect the interests of those clergy and vestries who were opposed to same-sex marriage. If members of the Church were truly to walk together in love and grace, neither understanding of marriage should be privileged over the other. Prof Werritty referred to St Paul’s letter to the Ephesians in which the call was to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Whatever the outcome, he prayed that unity would be maintained.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said that sex marriage. If members of the Church could no longer hold to the definition of marriage as expressed in the current section 1 of the Canon. They had come to the conclusion through their reading, prayer and spirituality that that doctrine was no longer valid. The new section 1 allowed everyone to hold their respective doctrines of marriage. The view of the sacraments had changed through the ages and the Church’s view of looking at marriage. If members of the Church were truly to walk together in love and grace, neither understanding of marriage should be privileged over the other. Prof Werritty referred to St Paul’s letter to the Ephesians in which the call was to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Whatever the outcome, he prayed that unity would be maintained.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said that sex marriage. If members of the Church could no longer hold to the definition of marriage as expressed in the current section 1 of the Canon. They had come to the conclusion through their reading, prayer and spirituality that that doctrine was no longer valid. The new section 1 allowed everyone to hold their respective doctrines of marriage. The view of the sacraments had changed through the ages and the Church’s view of looking at marriage. If members of the Church were truly to walk together in love and grace, neither understanding of marriage should be privileged over the other. Prof Werritty referred to St Paul’s letter to the Ephesians in which the call was to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Whatever the outcome, he prayed that unity would be maintained.
The Rev Canon Scott Robertson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that whilst he understood the pastoral and political impulse which had led to the proposed new section 1 he had some concerns about the logic of the phrase “differing understandings of the nature of marriage”. Did such wording not open up the Canon to all sorts of understandings, for example “open” marriage. If “differing” actually meant two understandings then why did the Canon, for the sake of clarity, not say so. If “differing” did mean “two” then in effect the change would replace one understanding with another. He sought clarification.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) believed that the proposed new Canon provided the best chance to enable the Church to walk together. Enormous work had been put into the proposal to enable people to remain walking together as one church. The previous year, the Synod had decided to ask the Boards and Committees of the Church to produce something which would not lead to one side winning since if one side won, the other had to lose. An explicit definition of marriage would mean that some people would be losers. He urged Synod to grasp the chance which was being offered. Referring to the presence of the BBC at Synod, he said he would prefer the BBC to hear what the Synod were saying about refugees and mission. The Synod could not focus on such issues if it was going to fight to the death with one side winning and the other losing. He urged Synod to support the Motion.

The Rev the Hon Sydney Maitland (Glasgow and Galloway) said that the proposed change represented a development to keep up with modern times. It would be a material change to the doctrine of marriage and hence to the sacramental integrity of marriage. It elevated questions of gender identity above all other considerations, including people’s spiritual identity as sinners in need of redemption. Not all gay folk were Christian. Not all Christian gay people were determined to publicise their private lives or demand that their situation be written into the Canons of the Church in a manner that would be inherently divisive. He therefore had to question how representative of the whole Christian gay community the proposals in question actually were. Was sexuality to take a priority in the life of the Church above considerations of life, teaching and mission. The path of canonical obedience required clerics to conform to the Canons of the Church as conforming to the teachings of Scripture. Acceptance of the ministry of women in the Church continued to be subject to the doctrine of reception. No management of similar tensions would be possible in relation to the change now being proposed because orthodox clergy might well be unable to give the oath of canonical obedience without violating their consciences. In time, that would lead to a theological purging of the Church.

Dr Julia House (Aberdeen and Orkney) described herself as an untrained theologian. She struggled with the proposed change in the definition of marriage but she came from a background in medicine and her work had similarities with that of clergy. She did not have the comfort of certainty when it came to the rules of human relationships. She saw hypocrisy in many requests for church marriage and she wondered if the attention which had been paid to heterosexual couples was now being paid to homosexual couples. In the New Testament she saw many examples of natural justice being shown rather than dogmatics and “set apart” holiness. She could not take the Canons too seriously. How would it be possible to honour God and the people one knew if the Church stuck with traditional definitions. How would the younger generation and the unchurched respond? She was deeply committed to the worldwide Anglican Communion but the calling to be salt and light was as important within the Church as it was outside it. Perhaps the Scottish Episcopal Church could be the grit in the oyster.

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) had been a member of The Episcopal Church in America in the 1980s and had been irritated by Bishop Gene Robinson’s attempt to move the Church forward. Now, however, she was very grateful for what he had done. The following week, she would have been married for 42 years. How could she deny that joy, love, physical closeness and companionship which was blessed by the Church she loved to anyone else? Human sexuality appeared to exist on a continuum and was not necessarily binary. It seemed sensible to her to allow the Church’s liturgies to develop in recognition of that. The proposed change to the Canon would open up the love of the Church to all.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) said he had been privileged for 18 years of his ministry in the province to have been involved with young people, many of whom were no longer young. He now had that wonderful privilege of baptising, confirming and sadly burying some of the young people. The one moment when that broad group of young people could not be united in their expression of their faith was when it came to marriage. He had had the privilege of conducting weddings all over Scotland for those with whom he had ministered except those who still walked the extra mile but who loved someone of the same gender. Such people were still walking with the Church but they were struggling with how long they could continue to walk with the Church. He urged support for the Motion.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that it had been the preoccupation of those in leadership in the Church to provide a process which would enable the Synod to arrive at a measured, mature decision. As Provost Holdsworth had already said, this was the best chance of achieving that. The other preoccupation had been about the unity of the Church. He had been encouraged to hear from the Rev Alastair MacDonald, the Rev Canon Ian Ferguson and the Rev Canon Malcolm Round that the work which had been done could be honoured and would be sufficient to enable them with integrity to remain in the life of the Church. They were not being asked to unbelievably what they believed or to deny it or to live or minister in any way against their conscience. The question for the Synod was whether its understanding of unity and koinonia and of walking together was generous enough to allow people to vote as conscience dictated? Would the Scottish Episcopal Church be the kind of church which would honour its diversity? If so, just possibly the Scottish Episcopal Church could be a model for the Anglican Communion.
The Motion was put to the vote by ballot in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the wording in section 1 was in the appropriate to marry people who had been divorced. On the suggested use of the word “union” the fact was the Church believed that marriage was a sacrament. There were also those who did not think it was the case that there were differing understandings within the Church about marriage. For example, not everyone in the Church believed that marriage was a sacrament. There were, however, other understandings within the Church about marriage. For example, not everyone in the Church had not made a decision on its understanding of marriage. It was the case that there were differing understandings of marriage within the members of the Church. He agreed that the proposed new section 1 was almost as much a declaration of theology as the current section 1. It was not necessary for the Scottish Episcopal Church to follow a society which rejected the Anglican Communion. One group which had not been mentioned during the debate was transgender people. He fully supported the Motion and adopted the approach of “not what you want but what you can live with”.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) welcomed the proposed new section 1 in large part because it honoured her marriage as a heterosexual woman and her love for her husband. In that honouring, it also honoured love between other people whether heterosexual or not. In 1784 Samuel Seabury had set sail from America to discover when he arrived on British shores that he could not have what his people wanted. He had then come to Scotland and the predecessors of those present in Synod had been brave and had consecrated him as Bishop. The Anglican Communion had changed and grown from that point. She urged Synod to be brave again.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and the Isles) said he believed that God had made everyone and loved everyone equally. He was disappointed that some people supporting the Motion had suggested that to reject the Motion would be tantamount to rejecting people in same-sex relationships. That was not the case. He had many friends in same-sex relationships but he would be voting against the Motion. He believed that the statement that there were differing understandings of marriage in the Church was wrong. He believed the Church had not made a decision on its understanding of marriage. It was the case that there are differing understandings of marriage within the members of the Church. He agreed that the proposed new section 1 was almost as much a declaration of theology as the current section 1. It was not necessary for the Scottish Episcopal Church to follow a society which rejected the Church. It was for the Church to determine its own theology. Many relationships could be loving and supportive but still not be marriage. Same-sex relationships might have many of those characteristics but he did not believe that they constituted marriage. He welcomed the suggestion of a previous speaker that the word “union” might be used. It was not up to the Synod to redefine what words meant. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a unique place in the Anglican Communion and if it were to be an aid to reconciliation, that unique position ought not to be squandered.

Bishop Duncan thanked Synod members for their various contributions and the range of reflections. He also expressed thanks for the manner and graciousness of the debate. In relation to the issue of pastoral guidance by the Bishops, he was grateful for the comment that a same-sex couple might need to be referred on by a member of clergy. The Bishops would also consider the interests of clergy, vestries and congregations who did not wish to be involved in solemnisation of same-sex marriages. It was a matter of great sensitivity and difficulty to draft such material but the Bishops would do the best they could. In relation to Canon Robertson’s point about differing understandings of marriage, the context which the Faith and Order Board had in mind was marriages between men and women and between people of the same sex. There were, however, other understandings within the Church about marriage. For example, not everyone in the Church believed that marriage was a sacrament. There were also those who did not think it was appropriate to marry people who had been divorced. On the suggested use of the word “union” the fact was that the General Synod had instructed the Faith and Order Board to undertake a particular task which did not involve differentiating between types of union.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) sought clarification regarding the point which had been raised earlier regarding duplicated wording in the proposed section 1 and section 2.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the wording in section 1 was in the context of the “question of preliminaries” including contrasted characteristics. He had not made a decision in the church about how to present the concept of the law of nullity. The repetition served to underscore the vital importance of the matter since to get the matter wrong would have disastrous consequences.

The Motion was put to the vote by ballot in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows: –
House of Bishops: 5 in favour, 2 against  
House of Clergy: 43 in favour, 19 against  
House of Laity: 49 in favour, 12 against, 3 abstentions.

The result was received in silence, as the Chair had requested, and Bishop Duncan led the Synod in prayer. The Chair thanked members of Synod for their contributions and the manner of debate.

SESSION 5: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF ABERDEEN AND ORKNEY IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Mission Board

5.1.1 Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy – Inspiring Mission

The Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) reminded Synod members that the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy said that the Church’s primary task was God’s mission. The new Mission Board had the responsibility for the strategic oversight of provincial mission work for the Scottish Episcopal Church. Bishops were leaders of mission and the dioceses were the primary locations for the engendering of that mission. The Mission Board wanted to do more than that – it wanted to inspire the Province in mission. She was passionate about mission. At times it could be challenging and demoralising but it was also exciting and deeply humbling as the Church responded to the promptings of the Holy Spirit. It was not something to be done because the Church appeared to be in decline but because it was the calling of baptised followers of Jesus. The Scottish Episcopal Church would continue to be a missional church even when its churches were overflowing. There were exciting things happening all over the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Mission Board hoped to inspire Synod members in their own missional communities. She hoped that new ways of collecting annual statistics would record this. Three video presentations from different contexts would be shown shortly and the table groups would be asked to consider the following questions: –

- Reflecting on the presentations and on your own experiences of mission, what excites you? What challenges you?
- How can we be strong and courageous; not frightened or dismayed?
- In what ways would you like to see the Mission Board further inspiring and resourcing you in mission?

Responses to those questions would be recorded on flipcharts and considered at a future meeting of the Mission Board.

There then followed video presentations from St Oswald’s, Kings Park and Castlemilk; St Luke’s Café Church, Dundee; Holy Trinity, Dunoon and St Paul’s, Rothesay. These were followed by discussion in table groups.

In closing the session, Mrs Ross asked for other examples of success stories to be passed to the Mission Board or the Communications Officer.

5.1.2 Church in Society Committee

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the report from the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015. He also drew attention to the partnership booklet which had been provided to Synod members. Because the Scottish Episcopal Church was a small church, working in partnership with others was important. The Committee worked with both faith-based and secular bodies and also worked in partnership with others in the Church such as the Investment Committee on issue of fossil fuels. The Committee was fortunate in having a broad range of talented members. It had real strengths in areas currently providing challenges to society such as plans to modify both human and animal genomes. The Committee was setting up a study group to look at these issues, especially the ethical and spiritual aspects and would report to General Synod 2018.

5.1.2.1 Poverty

Prof Atkinson referred to the background information set out in the paper contained in the Synod Papers. Work continued following the Motion of General Synod 2014 on the Good Society and in 2015 General Synod had agreed a Motion calling on employers to pay the Living Wage. The reason for returning at the current Synod to the subject of the Living Wage with a further Motion was the need to maintain pressure on Government and employers. Prof Atkinson made reference to the recent appearance of the founder of Sports Direct before a House of Commons Select Committee in which he had admitted that ways had been found to avoid paying the minimum wage. After the most recent Budget, there had been pressure from care homes, catering establishments and others indicating that they could not afford to pay the Living Wage and needed exemptions. There was a need to maintain pressure. During the previous year the Scottish Episcopal Church had been a signatory, along with other churches, to a report entitled Enough: Our Responsibility to Meet Families’ Needs. That had highlighted the number of children in need and the arbitrary nature of decisions sanctioning those in breach of benefits rules. Such developments had led to record numbers accessing food banks. The Committee supported the work of the Poverty Truth Commission operating in Glasgow. There was a need for change in the way local government was funded through Council Tax. In closing, Prof Atkinson reminded Synod of the injunction in Leviticus 19 not to cheat or deceive fellow countrymen.
The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed, and the Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) seconded the following Motion: –

“That this Synod, aware of the level of poverty in Scotland, recognising and valuing the work done by food banks in Scotland and other work done at local level by charges in loving service to help alleviate the consequences of poverty

a) Reaffirm its support for the minimum wage to be set at the level of the real Living Wage;

b) Call on the relevant public authorities to ensure that benefit levels are adequate and that benefits are humanely and efficiently administered in order to reduce the need for food banks and other support services.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) supported the Motion but had a couple of issues with it. He paid tribute to the diligence of the Church in Society Committee in its work but wondered whether there were too many Motions for Synod to address adequately. He believed that “less was more”. Also, in relation to the Living Wage, he wondered how it would be defined and how people could be supported beyond food banks?

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) said that the implementation of the Living Wage was a welcome challenge to issues of low pay. He would support the Motion but there were certain unhelpful consequences. He chaired the trustees of a care home in Dundee which consistently achieved good ratings from the Care Inspectorate. Most of the 32 residents were funded by the local authority and the home’s charging policy was to treat both local authority and private residents equally. However, the sustainability of the home’s charitable business plan was under increasing pressure because the cost of implementing the Living Wage for 55 staff was very significant. Since April 2016 the national Living Wage had been £7.20 per hour. In practice, it was actually £7.70 per hour because the Scottish basic care workers rate was agreed by the National Care Homes Contract with local authorities. Unless that rate were paid, a local authority would not place residents in the home. The pay differentials for qualified and senior staff were significantly inflationary, being of the order of 6-10%. The ability to make improvements in the home might simply come to an end. The Scottish Government had indicated that in October 2016 it wished to raise the Living Wage to £8.25 per hour. The home was pleased to pay but the local authority was not increasing the rates which it paid on behalf of residents and the shortfall was becoming wider. While the Church should support the Living Wage there was equally a need to advocate better funding for care homes. Otherwise, homes would have to close which could be catastrophic both for the elderly and for care workers.

The Very Rev Francis Bridger (Brechin) spoke as a trustee of the same care home mentioned by the Bishop of Brechin. He indicated that he would have been happier if the Motion, which he supported as a matter of justice, had reflected the complexity of implementation on the ground. He would vote noting that there would be a serious impact which needed to be recognised.

Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh) suggested that, in terms of definition, references in the Motion to “Living Wage” should have initial capitals. She also spoke of her knowledge of a small local charity which had implemented the Living Wage albeit that it had not been easy.

Prof Atkinson thanked those who had contributed. He took seriously the point about there being too many Motions. However, it was important that the Church should speak to society which was why the Committee presented Motions on a number of subjects. He would take the other comments made by the Synod back to the Committee and recognised that it had more work to do.

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

5.1.2.2 Climate Related Issues

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) proposed, and the Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) seconded, the following Motion: –

“That this Synod

a) Welcome the historic agreement of the world’s nations in Paris in December 2015 on the need for urgent and substantial reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and recognise that creating a ‘low carbon’ future depends on practical implementation and far reaching changes throughout society;

b) Urge all parts of the Scottish Episcopal Church to play an active part in finding means of reducing the consumption of fossil fuels, including their use in heating and transport;

c) Call upon Scottish and UK Governments to increase financial and other incentives for domestic and housing sectors in energy saving and renewable energy implementation that will lead to the very substantial reductions that are needed and as part of this simultaneously
The Rev Ken Webb (Edinburgh) said that many congregations would love to be able to do more. At the same time, there was a desire to keep churches warm and welcoming. He wondered whether the Committee could do anything to encourage Government to provide grants to help congregations.

Mr Neil Stewart (Edinburgh) indicated that he would abstain on the Motion because of his day job but nevertheless remained committed to the issues at stake.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked whether the Buildings Committee could produce a guide to help churches take a more proactive approach.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that on the whole he welcomed the Motion. However he suggested that paragraph b) of the Motion could pose difficulties for rural charges where some congregational members travelled long distances to church and where taking steps to reduce consumption could be costly. He wondered whether support could be given to such charges either provincially or by the Scottish Government.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the Motion because it was the right thing to do and it was also financially prudent. The Paris Conference had been a game changer but developed countries would have to switch to a low carbon economy much more rapidly than was currently planned. It was a matter of justice that this should be undertaken. The countries which had suffered the greatest impact were also the poorest. However, he also believed taking such steps were

to address the issues of fuel poverty which currently impact on over a third of households in Scotland;

d) Recognising the importance of economic drivers in moving to a low carbon energy system, commend the joint discussions which have been taking place between the Church in Society and Investment Committees and invite the Committees to continue to work together and report to General Synod in 2017 on the complex issue of investment in the exploration, production and burning of fossil fuels.”

Speaking to the Motion, Prof Atkinson spoke to slides on climate change which had been presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Climate change was real and if no steps were taken, there would be a 4° increase in average temperatures above pre-industrial levels. Current Government commitments would reduce that but only to an increase of 3°. The limits agreed in Paris in December 2015 would result in a 2% rise in average temperatures but the target was to achieve a reduction of only 1.5%. Currently, temperatures were 1° above former levels. The meeting in Paris had decided that it was important to reduce emissions and limit global warming and also that there was open and transparent reporting. It was also important to help countries in the global south to recover from the impact of climate change. The reality was that whatever was done now, a legacy would be passed on to future generations. The impact of climate change would fall disproportionately on the poor both in this country and globally. As weather conditions in Scotland over the last winter had shown, climate change was already having an effect. Pressure needed to be maintained on both Westminster and the Scottish Governments and it was important to assist everyone in society to make changes in relation to the use of energy. Also, fuel poverty affected one in three people in Scotland. Even though an individual could only do a little, it nevertheless mattered. Churches needed to assess the effect which the use of their buildings would have and to consider purchasing policies and also investments. The Church of Scotland and Church of England had taken decisions as to how they invested. The Church in Society Committee was now suggesting that the Scottish Episcopal Church needed to undertake some serious work in that area. Prof Atkinson introduced Dr Donald Bruce, a member of the Committee, who had also been working with the Investment Committee in recent months.

Dr Bruce explained that he had formerly been the Director of the Society, Religion and Technology Project at the Church of Scotland for 15 years and had undertaken significant work in relation to climate change matters. The question of whether there should be divestment from fossil fuels had been much debated in recent years and a number of institutions had made specific steps to divest. The question was whether the Scottish Episcopal Church should do so also. The issue was a much more complex one than, for example, divesting from tobacco and discussions with the Investment Committee had illustrated that complexity. Steps taken in Scotland to produce renewable energy had focused on electricity which amounted to only 20% of use. There was also a need to distinguish between the use of fossil fuels used in the production of plastics and the burning of fossil fuels to produce energy. Institutions which had divested had focused on particular areas such as coal and extracting oil from tar sands. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not a big investor. Two thirds of the Church’s investments were held in a pool and it was therefore not a straightforward matter to pull out. It was also an area in which approximately only 2% or 3% actually engaged with that field. A further consideration was whether or not one could bring more influence to bear by remaining an investor. The Investment Committee had joined the Church Investors Group which was a collective body and Dr Bruce was due to attend one of their meetings shortly. The suggestion was that dialogue between the Church in Society and Investment Committees continued with a view to bringing a report to General Synod 2017 once there had been some experience of participating in the Church Investors Group. As a result of the Paris meeting, nations were now “on board”. The question was whether the Church and church members, were similarly on board. It was now for everyone to take steps. The Eco-Congregation programme currently included 43 Scottish Episcopal churches – not as many as there might be. He would like every church to join the scheme. The Eco-Congregation website included an environmental check-up for churches. The Church now needed to put its actions where its mouth was.

The minutes had included an environmental check-up for churches. The Church now needed to put its actions where its mouth was.
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financially prudent. Generally, charity trustees were charged with obtaining the best returns. Fossil fuel investment had previously provided good returns. The vast majority of fossil fuel reserves were in fact difficult to exploit and burn. This would mean that the assets of fossil fuel companies over time would become worthless. Already some investors were acting on such a basis. If the Scottish Episcopal Church choose to divest it would be joining the Church of Scotland, the Church of England, the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church. He commended the Motion.

Prof Atkinson responded to points made in debate. Pressurising the Government was included within the scope of the Motion. In terms of guidance for churches, the Committee would refer people to the Eco-Congregation website which already offered much helpful advice. The Committee would look again at whether there was a need for something which was SEC-specific. In relation to rural issues, such matters were already on the agenda of the Rural Network under the Mission Board. Climate justice required the Church to look at its investments for the future, hence the final part of the Motion.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, two against, seven abstentions.

### 5.1.2.3 Trident

The Chair declared that his son worked for the atomic weapons establishment at Aldermaston but assured Synod that that did not affect his view on the subject or his chairing.

Prof Atkinson explained that the question of the Trident nuclear programme was a complex one. In current discussions in the run-up to the Referendum on the European Union there had been much discussion about what sort of country people wanted the UK to be. The issue of Trident gave rise to similar questions. This was linked to the question of how the country spent its money. There were many traditional views on the morality of nuclear weapons and their use and Prof Atkinson did not intend to repeat such views because they were well known and understood. Different people would have different views and there was a need to respect that diversity of view. The Church in Society Committee wished to focus on the impact of the projected expenditure on Trident. It had great significance for total defence expenditure and the concern was that other forms of defence would be impoverished. The expenditure on Trident would have an effect on how much was available to spend on other areas also. The Government had indicated the intention to make a decision about Trident in the autumn of 2016. The initial cost of Trident was likely to be in the order of £25 billion and £167 billion over the lifetime of the system. It was appropriate to reflect on whether now was the time to press the Government not to renew.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed, and the Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) seconded, the following Motion:

> "That this Synod, affirming that as Christians we are called to be peacemakers and stewards of creation, call on HM Government to cancel the renewal programme for Trident."

Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh) explained that she was a pacifist and therefore opposition to Trident renewal was straightforward. However, she wished to speak to those who held other views. General Sir Hugh Beach along with others had argued that the UK Government should fund more realistic military needs rather than perpetuating Trident since nuclear weapons were useless as a deterrent to the threats currently faced, particularly international terrorism. In the days of the Cold War, he had supported nuclear deterrence but had nevertheless opposed British Trident from the outset as a misapplication of funds. She agreed with the Primus who had previously described Trident as an excessively expensive, increasingly irrelevant and inherently immoral weapon system.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) quoted Jesus’ commandment to "love your neighbour" but asked who was that neighbour? Mr Swain believed there was a stronger moral and Christian case for retaining Britain's independent nuclear deterrent than for abandoning it. There was such a thing as a just war. Mr Swain suggested a number of hypothetical future scenarios such as North Korea passing nuclear weapons to Islamic State and the subsequent surrender of British forces to the Caliphate. He urged rejection of the Motion.

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) said that at the end of the Second World War the UK had been insolvent. The Marshall plan was put into operation to help rebuild Europe but had also put in place a lend lease. In response to the threat from the USSR, NATO had been created and the majority of the burden rested with the US, the UK and France. Since that point, Europe had experienced 70 years of peace and war in Europe now seemed inconceivable. The nuclear stand-off between East and West had prevented war. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, it now appeared to many that holding nuclear weapons was pointless. However, Russia had now placed significant power in the hands of Vladimir Putin. Russian power had been steadily ramped up and he had used the perceived weakness of the West to reclaim Crimea and eastern Ukraine. In addition, there were rogue nuclear states such as North Korea. If the UK abandoned its nuclear weapons, there was no turning back. Over the years, a number of situations had arisen which might have led to war but for the existence of nuclear deterrence.

Mrs Karen Willey (Brechin) wished to make a general point applicable to Motions 16, 17 and 18 (the motions from the Church in Society Committee) on the Synod agenda. She considered that the workings of the Committee would be much more robust if it had engaged in discussions with people of opposing views. That should be done before Motions came to Synod. The Committee could have a role in influencing such opposing groups directly.
Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said she was baffled by the Motion. Prof Atkinson had explained that different people would have different views and the Church in Society Committee had reflected on the question of expenditure and usefulness of nuclear weapons. However, the Motion presented a moral stance and did not reflect the fact that the matter was about projected expenditure. She was not convinced that the Synod was qualified to make any decision about national defence and nuclear weaponry. She would abstain from voting and that had nothing to do with her own personal view on Trident. She lived in a diocese where jobs were dependent on the continued existence of Faslane. She urged members of Synod, whatever their views, to lobby their own elected members of Parliament.

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) believed that the Motion was not radical enough. He had never believed that the possession of nuclear weapons with the intention of using them was justifiable in terms of just war theory. He was not a pacifist but such weapons were indiscriminate. Whether or not the Trident system was renewed, weapons of mass destruction would still be possessed because there was no proposal to get rid of them altogether. He was a pacifist but did not believe that unilateral disarmament was the way forward. The world was in fact now more unstable than it had been. The Cold War appeared to be reigniting and the possibility of nuclear weapons spreading was more likely. To say that the money should be spent on other purposes in effect meant that the UK would depend on other nations to maintain the deterrence. The UK had a responsibility to decide for itself how to make the world safer.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) said he would abstain from voting as a serving military officer. However, he wished to assure Synod that there were also complex, difficult and unresolved questions about the morality of the use of cyber weapons.

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) believed that the Motion was not radical enough. He had never believed that the possession of nuclear weapons with the intention of using them was justifiable in terms of just war theory. He was not a pacifist but such weapons were indiscriminate. Whether or not the Trident system was renewed, weapons of mass destruction would still be possessed because there was no proposal to get rid of them altogether. He was also acutely aware of where the weapons were stored, namely within his diocese. The fact that they had been placed close to the largest centre of population in Scotland was a scandal. Also, there were many people in his diocese whose employment was dependent on the existence of the Trident weapons system. He intended to abstain from the vote.

Prof Atkinson said that he took the point about the Committee consulting with a wide range of people. However, the Committee itself was not unanimous in its views and it engendered discussion internally. Supporting paperwork had been supplied to the Synod in the current and previous years. He had heard that perhaps paperwork might have addressed more issues. He would think about that for next year. The Motions in the current year were invitations to the Synod to give instructions to the Committee. He emphasised that the range of issues brought to Synod by the Committee had a common theme in relating to poverty. Since the Government vote on Trident would take place later in 2016, the Committee had considered it important to bring the issue to the current Synod.

The Motion was put to the vote but not carried.

SESSION 6: THE VERY REV SUSAN MACDONALD IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council) thanked the members of staff of the Scottish Episcopal Institute: the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden and Mrs Denise Brunton. Under the heading “mission”, Bishop Pearson said that mission was the heart of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Episcopal Institute was the pacemaker. The Church sought to give the communities in which it found itself an experience of the living God which enabled the still small voice of the Spirit to whisper “you can be the change you want to see”. SEI had been brought into being because there were those in the Synod who believed that.

One of the questions he had been asked at General Synod the previous year was how SEI would train the future leadership of the Church in leading mission. There was a need for leaders who could form missional communities and who had missional entrepreneurial skills. There was a need for modes of training that embodied a mixture of academic study alongside hands-on experience in a congregation – in other words, training for pioneer ministries - although all ordained ministry included a pioneer element. Bishop Pearson explained that St Mellitus College in England had led the way in exploring such mixed mode training programs. The previous year he had been asked whether SEI was playing its role in facilitating the mission of the Church. In the course of the previous year, SEI staff had visited St Mellitus in London and Liverpool and there had been two residential weekends on Cumbrae specifically looking at the Scottish Episcopal Church’s response to mission and pioneer ministry. There had been an inspiring evening seminar in January led by the Church of England Officer for Pioneer Ministry. The Rev Gerry Bowyer, who had asked that question the previous year had led two sessions on fresh expressions of church to embody the imperative “you must
be the change you want to see”. In negotiation with St Paul’s & St George’s, it was hoped to be able to fund a part-
time extra member of SEI staff to help with mixed mode programs.

Under the heading “ministry” Bishop Pearson said that the voice of the Holy Spirit was speaking through the number of
new students entering training in the current year. There would be 17 new students in the autumn bringing the SEI
student community to 25. A fifth of the community was under the age of 30. This was the largest student community
for a generation.

The depth of theological knowledge, the excitement of academic study and the breadth of the programme had been
highlighted and applauded by the team from Durham University who had attended to validate the course for Common
Awards in February 2016. The University team had commended the Institute for the “simplicity but depth” of the
program. SEI had been invited to be a part of a research project with the University on the topic of how liturgy was
taught and experienced in theological training. SEI was therefore making a contribution to Anglican Communion
thinking and practice. The Principal had been invited by the Church of Scotland to be part of the work of their
Ministries Council and the Church of Scotland wished to adopt the SEI formational ethos. This was the wider Church
hearing the SEC’s experience of mission.

The new students in the autumn would be the first ones to experience real field education in the sense of longer
placements with congregations over a period of months in which congregations would be trained as well as students.
Much of the distilled knowledge of SEI was shared with those already involved in ministry through recently produced
handbooks for lay readers and clergy.

At this point, a video of three current SEI students in conversation was shown.

Bishop Pearson then turned to the question of “money”. In 2015, £42,000 had been raised through the joint Lent
Appeals of Bishops. Collections at ordination and institution services were also being passed to the Institute. There
was a need for an additional 50p per week per church member and the question was how to raise that new money.
Budgets would have to be examined and realigned. Synod members had been provided with leaflets setting out the
need for new money. He urged Synod members to take the leaflets back to individuals and congregations. The vision
was of the community of the Scottish Episcopal Church being led by ordained ministers facilitating the mission of the
whole church. That mission was to give sisters and brothers, made in the image of God, an experience of the living
God. In the year ahead consideration would be given to establishing a body such as the “friends of SEI” which would
allow giving on a longer-term basis. There was a need to “pay for the changes we long to see”. He commended the
work of SEI to Synod members for their prayers and giving.

The Rev Canon Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed the positive news which he had heard.
He wondered whether there was less emphasis being placed on pioneer ministry because all were called to pioneer
ministry. Bishop Pearson responded that there was some reluctance to use the word “pioneer” because all ministry
included an element of that. In the presentations which the Mission Board had showed earlier in the day, the people
who had led those various initiatives were pioneers in the sense of responding to their local context. To train people in
one particular mode was not the answer. People were not being recruited specifically for one kind of ministry.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) referred to the report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the
General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015. He asked that figures for lay readers be included in the
statistics as well as for candidates for ordination. He was concerned that he was the youngest lay reader in his own
Diocese.

Bishop Pearson responded that lay readers were a theological resource for the Scottish Episcopal Church. He agreed
that the age profile of lay readers tended to be older but lay readership was not disappearing.

Bishop Pearson then proposed the following Motion: –

“That paragraph 4.3.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read:

“Grants shall be paid to dioceses by the Institute Council to assist in payment of stipend, employers’
contributions to the SEC Pension Fund, National Insurance contributions, housing provision and expenses in
respect of Curates undertaking training as part of their initial ministerial education. Such grants shall be of
such amounts as may be determined from time to time by the Institute Council.”

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded the Motion. She expressed thanks for the privilege
of being a member of the Institute Council. Problems of success were preferable to problems of failure. She referred
to a recent BBC Alba documentary about the Free Church College in Edinburgh. It had been fascinating because it
was personal and, if asked, she would have written a cheque to support the work. Putting a face to those undertaking
training would be helpful.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald proposed an amendment that the words “and approved by the Standing Committee” be
added at the end of the proposed wording for paragraph 4.3.1 of the Digest of Resolutions as set out in the Motion.
The amendment was seconded by Mrs Virginia Irvine-Fortescue.

The amendment to the Motion was put to the vote and passed, two against, eight abstentions.

The Motion, as amended, was debated.

The Rev Dean Norby (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said it had been a privilege to be involved in the church
graft in Fife and he expressed thanks to his Bishop, the Diocese and the Province. He had learned two things thus far.
Firstly, the harvest was ripe. People were looking for God and God was looking for people who did not yet know him. The workers, however, were few. In south-west Fife, there was a population of 70,000 people but there were only two stipended priests. He fully supported the Motion because it helped to address the issue of lack of workers. It would help to give the opportunity for curates to go into the harvest field.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) said the Church had to find the resources to make SEI work. There were financial consequences and this would trickle down to a need for greater giving locally. He believed the funding should be from mainstream budgets rather than relying on special appeals.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) emphasised that a curate was not an extra pair of hands but that a curacy was a place for training. Curates had tended to go to wealthy charges which were not necessarily the places where ordained clergy might end up. She had undertaken a curacy at a time when she had three children under the age of two. Clergy were not known for maintaining a good work/life balance. The matter had been handled creatively by her then Bishop. It was critically important for women in the Church that curates should be supported by the whole Church. Initial Ministerial Education 4-6 remained part of the Institute’s initial training.

Bishop Pearson responded that the proposals were an attempt to move away from the fact that only large churches with housing could take curates. The Institute Council was reviewing the matter. The original TISEC Review Report had suggested increasing curate grants to the level of 100% and the Council was working on what the actual costs of curacy were. Bishop Pearson suggested that Mr Norby was a pebble in a pool which was growing bigger and bigger.

The amended Motion was put to the vote in the following form: –

“That paragraph 4.3.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read:

“Grants shall be paid to dioceses by the Institute Council to assist in payment of stipend, employers’ contributions to the SEC Pension Fund, National Insurance contributions, housing provision and expenses in respect of Curates undertaking training as part of their initial ministerial education. Such grants shall be of such amounts as may be determined from time to time by the Institute Council and approved by the Standing Committee.” ”

The Motion was passed nem con.

6.2 College of Bishops

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that the College of Bishops had decided to use its session during Synod to offer three perspectives on Confirmation. The College was committed to, and enthusiastic about, the rite in whichever context it might be celebrated. Speaking personally, he explained that Confirmation was one of the most wonderful privileges he had as Bishop. The Church’s liturgy for Confirmation was splendid and represented a profoundly sacramental moment. The 1982 Liturgy described Christ Jesus as the one in whom “our life and God’s life” were brought together in a wonderful exchange. Over the years that had become a key expression for him. All sacraments and all sacramental moments flowed from that exchange. In Confirmation, the life of the candidates was represented by their promises and the life of God by the laying on of hands with prayer and anointing. He wondered sometimes whether there was a case for laying on hands first and hearing the promises later. The promises would then become a loving faithful response to the divine gift rather than the ground for that gift. As far as he knew, however, the Church had never done Confirmation that way and he was not advocating that it should.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) believed that as President of the Rites of Initiation the Bishop should encourage multiple avenues of entry – Baptism, Confirmation, admission to membership, etc. He was happy with the view that Baptism represented initiation to the Church but his concern was that over the years there had been an increasing variety blurring the distinctions between the various avenues because such rites had not always been accompanied by adequate preparation. Time was when the Catechism had formed the basis for learning about the faith. These occasions were wonderful opportunities to engage with growing Christians in a flexible and “fresh expressions” way. There were two reasons for doing this well. Firstly, being knowledgeable and articulate about the faith was a prerequisite of being a more effective mission-focused church. Secondly, religious illiteracy was a real and present danger in the modern, multicultural and global world. Ignorance about one’s own faith was a failure of nerve, in the face of both secularism and radicalised believers in other faiths. He encouraged both clergy and laity to bring a lively 21st-century Catechism back into preparation for Confirmation.

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) suggested that Confirmation presented an ideal moment where a number of things happened simultaneously. It gave the person being confirmed the opportunity for a wider testimony of faith to be shared. All this was done in the presence of a Bishop who represented the worldwide church and responded in prayer by the laying on of hands with prayer and anointing. That represented a deeply personal and powerful sacramental moment.

The Rev Canon Dominic Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that at a recent meeting of the Diocesan Directors of Ordinands those present had shared their vocational stories. A common factor had been the importance of Confirmation. He wondered whether there was a sense within the Scottish Episcopal Church that Confirmation was slipping away and was therefore delighted to hear the affirmation from the Bishops.

The Rev Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and the Isles) responded warmly to what he had heard. He loved Confirmation and had come to love the rite of baptism used in the Scottish Episcopal Church. He asked how Confirmation fitted in with chrismation and the laying on of hands contained in the baptism service?
The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) wished to affirm what his fellow Bishops had said. He wished to respond to a question which Canon Ind had asked earlier in the Synod. The Scottish Episcopal Church used the Church of England Bishops Advisory Panels for selection and recruitment. Confirmation was required as part of that. The point he wished to make was that the churches of the Porvoo Communion took confirmation very seriously and the Scottish Episcopal Church was trying to do the same in its own context.

The Very Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) responded warmly to what the Bishops had said. Specifically, he wished to ask that the point made by the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway not be lost, namely that the question of whether the act of Confirmation could happen prior to the asking of questions to the candidates. At an earlier stage there had been a proposed baptismal liturgy which had done that but the Synod at that stage had not been willing to countenance it. It was possibly an example of a small change which the Synod could make without having to go through two years of liturgical provision.

Bishop Duncan thanked Provost Holdsworth for his comments. The question of the place of Confirmation in the vocational journey resonated strongly with him. Bishop Gillies said that the intention of chrismation in the context of the baptism of a baby was to baptise, not to confirm. There was no reason why there should not then be a further anointing with oil at the time of the person’s Confirmation, perhaps as an adolescent. If the person being baptised was an adult, it seemed to him that there was sense in combining all aspects, including chrismation, in the one liturgy so that Baptism and Confirmation were intentionally combined.

The Chair thanked the three Bishops for their presentations and the College of Bishops as a whole for all they did for the Church.

### 6.3 Liturgy Committee

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) reported that the Faith and Order Board had commissioned the Committee to produce Pastoral Offices for use with the sick and dying. The drafting of the first stage of that project had now been completed and forwarded to the College of Bishops for approval for experimental use. It was hoped that such authorisation would be granted later that month. The Offices in question comprised four basic rites: reconciliation of a penitent; Holy Communion outside public worship; a rite for laying on of hands and anointing (as part of Holy Communion); a rite for ministry with the dying.

The vital ministry to the housebound, sick and dying would continue to be exercised by priests, deacons and lay people. The Church had nonetheless reserved certain functions, particularly in the administration of the sacraments, to the ordained priesthood. It was important that the rites affirmed the ministry of all engaged in such work and respected the particular priestly authority of bishops and presbyters. The Committee also wished to affirm the distinctive role of the diaconate.

Given the pastoral circumstances in which the Offices were likely to be needed, the Committee had produced three pocket sized booklets for use by licensed and authorised lay ministers, deacons and priests respectively. Certain broader theological and ecclesiastical issues had emerged and been clarified during the course of the Committee’s work and these might have implications for some existing authorised liturgies.

The general decline in church attendance had meant that increasing numbers of adults and older children were entering the life of congregations unbaptised. It was more than a theoretical likelihood that serious illness or impending death might be a factor in bringing families into the life of the Church. There needed to be adequate provision for baptismal rites to be administered to the sick and dying and to be included in the books of Pastoral Offices.

The Committee had recognised that some of the instructions in relation to emergency baptism in Holy Baptism 2006 were vague and some of the prayers were not suited to situations of extreme urgency. Also, insufficient attention had been given to the rite of welcoming into the congregation those who recovered after such a baptism had been administered. The Committee had concluded that there was a real possibility that baptism might in effect be repeated or the validity of the emergency baptism brought into question. The inclusion of a baptismal rite in the books of Pastoral Offices would seek to rectify those deficiencies and the Faith and Order Board had commissioned the Liturgy Committee to begin work on such rites.

A number of years previously, the Faith and Order Board had asked the Committee to respond to a demand for a version of the Eucharistic Prayer of the traditional Scottish Communion Office rendered in a modern idiom. That prayer had been authorised for experimental use since 2011 and an online survey would be sent round to pastoral charges soon. Dr Davies encouraged responses so that the prayer could go forward for formal consideration by General Synod 2017. Again, in response to a popular demand, the Faith and Order Board had asked the Committee to work on a Eucharistic Prayer more explicitly focused on Christmas and Epiphany. It was hoped that it could be authorised by the College of Bishops for experimental use in time for Christmas 2016. Finally, the Board had commissioned rites for Lent, Holy Week and Easter since the only authorised provision currently on the books was that produced in 1967. Preliminary work would begin on this in the autumn. Dr Davies also hoped that the appointment of new members to the Committee would allow it to give greater professionally informed attention to the worshipping needs of people with sensory impairments, to the issues of gender in liturgical texts and practice and to issues of worship and the child.

Dr Davies thanked the Committee members for their work and Mr David Todd for his arranging of the worship for the current Synod.
The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) suggested that in a church which was seeking to be mission oriented, there was a need for a little more freedom in relation to worship. He was worried that there was little scope for deviation from authorised texts.

Dr Davies responded that discipline in liturgy was essentially a local matter for the Bishop.

6.4 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

The Rev Cedric Blakey (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) reminded Synod that the Committee was a pendant committee of the Church in Society Committee under the Mission Board, rather than under the Faith and Order Board as the agenda suggested. He was aware that some people thought that Christians ought not to cultivate relations with people of other faiths. However, interreligious dialogue enriched one's understanding of other people and deepened one's own faith. It also built peace in a world increasingly fractured by ignorance and fear of the unknown. He had been delighted that Mr Shabir Beg had been nominated to represent Interfaith Scotland at the Synod. Mr Beg's arrival was still awaited but Mr Blakey paid tribute to what he had done in leading serious dialogue with Christians, with other faith communities, with the Scottish Parliament and with the Sunni Muslim majority in Scotland.

The best interreligious dialogue was undertaken in the context of friendship. In Scotland there were over 20 local interfaith groups in cities and rural areas the links to which were on the Interfaith Scotland website. He would be interested to hear from any member of the Scottish Episcopal Church who was involved with them. The Edinburgh Interfaith Association was inviting its members, in an act of solidarity with their Muslim friends during Ramadan, to fast on 22 June 2016. The Bishop of Edinburgh had indicated his intention to participate and Mr Blakey invited others to do the same.

Mr Blakey commended the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015. There was much work to do. He was delighted that, along with colleagues from the United Reformed and Methodist Churches, one of the Committee's meetings each year was held with the Scottish Roman Catholic Bishops' Committee for Interreligious Dialogue. The work was not an optional extra but was at the heart of endeavours to know Christ better, to build peace and safety in the world and to serve the most vulnerable. He asked for Synod’s continued support and prayers.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Mr Blakey and other members of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths for their work.

6.5 Faith and Order Board: Committee on Canons: Canon for First Reading Canon 63, Section 3

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) explained the proposed alteration to Canon 63, section 3. The policy of the Board which had considered representations from a lay member of Synod from the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness, was to make provision in the Canon for alternate lay representatives to be in the vestry group of a church which was seeking to be mission oriented, there was a need for a little more freedom in relation to worship. He was worried that there was little scope for deviation from authorised texts.

“That the amended text for Canon 63, Section 3 be read for the first time.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) felt that the proposal was too prescriptive. In his own charge, the alternate lay representative was in fact a member of the vestry but he considered that requiring people to be vestry members was too prescriptive. He would vote against the change.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) expressed gratitude to the Committee on Canons for bringing forward the proposed alteration. One of the reasons for seeking the amendment was that in exercising all the powers available to the lay representative, the alternate lay representative became a shadow Trustee. The change would give protection to the individual in question. Also, vestry members were required to sign a number of declarations and it was possible that the alternate lay representative might not have signed similar declarations. He had hoped that the words "unless otherwise provided in the constitution of the congregation concerned" in section 3 would be removed. The Canons trumped constitutions.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said that St Mary's Cathedral in Glasgow had an excellent alternate lay representative. The Cathedral constitution already allowed for the alternate lay representative to be a vestry member. Dr Routledge was herself the lay representative and she would be uncomfortable that an alternate lay representative could perform duties, including perhaps duties in an episcopal election, if they had not been party to vestry discussions.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said he was a lay representative. He had an alternate and as far as appearing at Diocesan Synod was concerned, they were in effect one person. Only one person could attend at a time. The same was true of alternate members of General Synod. The proposed change marked a first step away from that principle. He was not convinced that this was a step which the Synod should take.
Bishop Duncan said that barring death, accident or poisoning, there was no episcopal election about to take place in his Diocese.

The Rev Paul Romano responded to the comment regarding the reference to constitutions in section 3 of the Canon. Such was the variety of constitutions in the Church it was felt best to leave the Canon as it stood. Lay representatives and alternate lay representatives needed to be members of vestry for the reasons set out in trustee legislation. He disagreed with Mr Gibson's view about the provision being too prescriptive. He commended the change.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) said he understood the reference in section 1 of the Canon to “any meeting” to refer to a meeting of the Diocesan Synod, not of the vestry. Did this now mean that alternate lay representatives should automatically be members of the Diocesan Synod? However, if it referred to meetings of vestries, then he understood the point of the proposal.

The Rev the Hon Sydney Maitland (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether an individual under the age of 18 could accept liabilities of trusteeship.

Mr Romano responded that a person aged 16 or over could take on trusteeship. In response to the role at Diocesan Synod, he suggested that an individual could not represent a congregation at Diocesan Synod if they did not know the mind of their congregation and the best way to achieve that was to be a member of vestry.

The Chair clarified that the Motion about to be voted on concerned only section 3 of the Canon, not section 4 since that had already received second reading earlier in Synod.

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

- House of Laity: passed by majority, one against, two abstentions
- House of Clergy: passed by majority, three against, three abstentions
- House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

SESSION 7: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Greetings from Army Chaplaincy

The Rev Cole Maynard CF, Deputy Assistant Chaplain General, HQ 51 Infantry Brigade and HQ Scotland addressed Synod. He brought greetings from 51 Division and from the Army Chaplaincy Department. He gave a moving presentation on the role of an army chaplain. It was a vocation within a vocation. Chaplains lived alongside their fellow soldiers and shared the same experiences. Chaplains were the only commissioned members of the military who did not carry weapons. He encouraged members of Synod to consider whether God might be calling them to serve as a military chaplain. He encouraged churches to pray for their work and explained that churches also had a role in caring for those returning from conflict zones. There were possibilities of service within the regular and reserve forces as well as local cadet forces.

The Chair thanked Padre Maynard for his presentation.

7.2 Pension Fund Trustees

Mr Richard MacIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) introduced himself as the new Chair of the Trustees. He explained that the sole purpose of a pension fund was to pay pensions and the SEC Pension Fund was in the happy position of being able to do that. A valuation was carried out every third year and the valuation as at the end of 2014 had been completed during the previous year. It showed that the scheme was in surplus, funded to 103%. That had been achieved through sensible decisions taken by previous Trustees and the Synod. Judging from a report which he had seen the previous day from the Pension Protection Fund, many pension funds were underfunded and the SEC Fund was one of only 25% of schemes which not in deficit.

Investment strategy was fundamental to a fund’s ability to be able to continue to pay pensions. The Trustees had a sensible investment strategy with 60% invested in fixed income assets and 40% in growth assets. The latter provided a higher return but were more volatile. He hoped that Synod was assured by that position.

In relation to 2016, the Fund had paid £1.7 million of pensions and had received £1.5 million of contributions. The total value of the Fund had contracted a little to £46 million. During the year the Trustees had attended to a large number of consequential and technical matters arising from the triennial valuation. The Trustees had also looked at investment strategy and carried out a review of the investment manager, Schroder. The Trustees were looking at developing the investment strategy, in particular liability-driven investment. Mr MacIndoe closed by thanking his fellow Trustees and also Daphne Audsley for inducting him and handling the day-to-day administration of the Fund.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Mr MacIndoe and the other Trustees of the Fund.
SESSION 8: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Chris Mayo (Convener, Information and Communication Board) explained that his illness with cancer during the previous year had led to a number of medium and longer-term projects being put on hold until his own situation had resolved itself. Day-to-day operational work had been maintained by Lorna Finley, the Communications Officer, with the Secretary General and sub-groups of the Board. He expressed gratitude to them.

He was aware that certain aspects of the provincial website required attention including refreshment of content, greater turnover of video material, improving navigation, etc. These were underway but the Board welcomed helpful and constructive suggestions. Enthusiastic feedback about *inspires* magazine had been received. The viability of the print format of *inspires* would be reviewed in March 2017 and he encouraged all Synod members, if they did not already subscribe, to do so and encourage others to do so.

During the previous year the Board and also the Standing Committee, had reflected upon conversations that often took place in the realm of social media. On a fair number of occasions, it had been distressing to read ill-informed and occasionally wildly inaccurate criticisms. Instead of receiving a helpful critique through official channels, people had been belittled in the public domain. As an example, on the final day of Synod 2015 the audio stream had stopped working for reasons entirely due to a problem at the supply end – not just for the Synod but for many other customers. Instantly the Twitter feed and Facebook Timeline had been filled with people questioning competency and pointing fingers. Mr Mayo offered the words of Thich Nhat Hanh that “when we say something that nourishes us and uplifts the people around us, we are feeding love and compassion; when we speak and act in a way that causes tension and anger, we are nourishing violence and suffering”. Mr Mayo suggested that as members of the body of Christ, there was a responsibility to nourish compassion in the public domain. Ultimately, the Board wished to encourage a culture of communication where words resonated with integrity. For that reason, prior to moving ahead with an updated communication strategy the Board at its next residential meeting would ask how Christ was calling the Scottish Episcopal Church to nourish itself and Scotland with compassion and love.

One of his churches, St Columba’s Brora, was in a formal ecumenical agreement with the Religious Society of Friends through which he had experienced the liturgy of silent worship. He had invited the Board, as it considered a renewed communication strategy, to consider first what “communication” meant in a world of constant noise. If the Church were to add to the “beauty of silence”, rigour needed to be applied to the “why” and the “what” of the Church’s communications. The communication of the Church was linked to its sense of mission. Despite the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and much good work happening at local level, there was a need to grasp how to communicate with a prophetic and pastoral voice to society. As both a Quaker in membership and an Episcopalian priest, he had, during his recuperation phase, compared the news being put out by both ecclesial communities. The Quaker website in particular evinced a deep sense of faith in action, which was less obvious from the Scottish Episcopal Church website. If the Church was asking his Board to be responsible for what the Church communicated, then some seriously hard thinking needed to be done about what the Church was spending its time doing and how it was reported. There were examples of substantial engagement with society in the Scottish Episcopal Church but he reminded Synod members that it was their responsibility to inform the General Synod Office of what was going on at local level. Diocesan representatives on the Board could be a channel for this communication or they could be passed on via Diocesan Bishops and Diocesan Secretaries.

Ultimately, everything was about communications. There had been occasions in the recent past where a relatively simple reflective and impartial eye cast over a document could have helped to reduce potential conflict and the risk of misrepresentation. The Board requested that those who had to release information or comment within the public domain use the skill set provided by the Communications Officer.

Reporting on the video stream which had operated during the current Synod, he reported that 300 people had viewed the proceedings at Synod (compared with 17 using the audio stream in 2015). It was humbling to think that at over 300 locations throughout the world people had wanted to know what was happening at the Synod. He thanked members of Synod for the way Synod had conducted itself.

Mr Mayo closed his presentation with a short period of silence.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked for Synod members to indicate if their church produced a local magazine. He was aware that some dioceses also had magazines. He wondered whether the Communications Department could pick up good news stories from such publications.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) wished to commend what Mr Mayo had said. He thanked the Synod for its pastoral concern during the debates which had taken place the previous day. He had been aware when he had sat on Standing Committee of how hurt could easily be caused by unthoughtful words in social media. He himself had previously maintained a blog but had stopped because he had found himself increasingly wanting to criticise others. Scripture already provided a form of social media policy in the words of Ephesians 4:29 “do not let any unwholesome talk come out of your mouths but only what is helpful for building others up … be kind and compassionate to one another”.

Mr Graeme Hely (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed thanks for printed *inspires*. To continue the print version would do a great service to the Church. He regularly received comments on the printed version in his own congregation.

Mr Mayo indicated that personally he would be sad to see the print version of *inspires* being discontinued but the onus would be on the Church as a whole to make it viable since it was currently still making a loss. He recognised that there were still many people who did not have access to the Internet and for whom print format was important. In
terms of parish magazines, there was a need for due diligence on the part of the dioceses to highlight those matters which were important for broader communication.

The Chair thanked Mr Mayo and the Information and Communication Board.

8.2 Administration Board

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) reported that the Finance Committee had made a major contribution over many years but had become redundant under the new Block Grant process which had been agreed by General Synod 2015. During the previous year, the Board had also established the Clergy Remuneration Review Group. That had emerged from discussions within the Administration Board, preceeded by discussions in both the Finance and Personnel Committees. Standard Stipend had been benchmarked to the Church of England for a number of years and it had been decided that it was time to review the package and the benchmarking. The work was currently in process and would result in recommendations to the Board later in the year.

In relation to Buildings Grants, there had been a moratorium in the preceding years. More recently, there had been a modest reintroduction of the smaller Dunderdale Grants and a provision had been retained for emergency works necessary to address building integrity and public safety. Major maintenance and development grants had not been reintroduced. However, the Standing Committee had agreed to the Administration Board's recommendation that there should be a limited further reintroduction of budget provison for building grants with the intention that the former Dunderdale and Maintenance and Development grants would be merged into a single fund. The new system would be put into place later in the year and a group was being established, comprising individuals with finance and buildings experience, to make grant allocations. Part of the reason for the reintroduction of grants was to encourage a focus on the timely maintenance of buildings. In parallel, there would be training support not in the form of one-off training sessions but in supplying dioceses with a training package which could be used locally.

Dr Ferguson-Smith commented that the Retirement Welfare Committee had reflected on its function and work and had recommended to the Board that it should be renamed the Retirement Housing Committee. The Board had accepted that recommendation.

Mr Elliott Glen-Esk (Convener, Retirement Welfare Committee) explained that the Committee, as currently constituted, had been formed in 1991 out of the former Housing and Pensions Committees. The Committee had oversight of the Housing and Supplementary Funds. The insertion of "welfare" in the title of the Committee had related to the original purpose of the Supplementary Fund which in time past had been a significant resource augmenting the pensions of clergy and widows in the period to 1988. However, the Supplementary Fund was now a source of only small grants of up to £500. It also provided a Christmas gift to all pensioners of £90. The Supplementary Fund could no longer be described as meeting any significant welfare needs of pensioners. The Committee believed that its name ought to reflect its core activity namely the provision and maintenance of retirement housing for eligible clergy and widowed pensioners.

Dr Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following Motion: –

"That

paragraph 2.3.3 (c) of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-

“the Retirement Housing Committee consisting of a Convener and up to six other members;”

paragraph 2.3.6 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-

“The Retirement Housing Committee shall make recommendations to the Administration Board relating to the provision of retirement housing to clergy members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund, their widowed spouses or civil partners and dependants. It shall make recommendations to the Administration Board relating to the administration of the Supplementary Fund for the welfare of pensioners of the Scottish Episcopal Church. It shall have responsibility, unless otherwise resolved by the Administration Board, for the oversight of the Housing Fund and the Supplementary Fund.”

paragraph 6.3.9 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words "Retirement Welfare Committee’s practice” and their substitution by the words "Retirement Housing Committee’s practice”."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

8.2.2 Personnel Committee

Mrs Maureen McKellar (Convener, Personnel Committee) explained that the Committee was responsible for reviewing and updating personnel policies and procedures mainly for clergy. That was not as straightforward a task as might be thought. Whilst most clergy were office holders, and not employed, the Committee had accepted ACAS guidelines as best practice helping to protect both clergy and the Church. The Committee had been working hard to update present policies and procedures and to add new ones as necessary. She hoped that soon an updated Clergy Personnel Handbook would be available online. It would take the form of a series of guidance notes, templates, policies and procedures. One section would enable greater clarity about clergy roles and was currently being piloted in one diocese. Other sections of the former Handbook would be updated. Currently there was little guidance as to how sickness absence should best be dealt with,
nor its reporting, which was mandatory. Other new policies would include bullying and harassment, drugs and alcohol, guidelines for fees for weddings and funerals and for supernumerary fees. Work was also being undertaken on a capability policy. Some of these would require change to the Canons and it was hoped to bring forward canonical change in 2017.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted the reference to possible canonical change and suggested that it would be best if any Canon contained a statement of overall principle with detail being set out elsewhere. Mrs McKellar confirmed that the idea was for an overarching Canon but that detail would be contained in separate policies which could be changed more easily than requiring the full canonical process.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that personnel matters extended beyond simply clergy. He asked whether the Committee could provide support to clergy in their capacity as managers in relation to both lay workers and volunteers. His own congregation employed more lay people than clergy.

The Secretary General responded that provincial resources were limited and that the Committee’s focus to date had been in relation to clergy personnel matters. Arrangements had recently been put in place to provide some external HR advice to the Province. He recognised that, subject to the question of resource, it would be helpful if the Committee were able to address the wider issues mentioned by Provost Holdsworth.

8.2.3 Dissolution of Finance Committee

Dr Ferguson-Smith explained that owing to the new Block Grant system and the new arrangements for Building Grants, it was proposed that the Finance Committee be dissolved. He then proposed, and the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney seconded, the following Motion: –

“That the Digest of Resolutions be altered as follows:–

• that the final sentence of paragraph 2.3.2 be altered so that it read as follows: -

"It shall also have responsibility for the oversight of the Administration Board Miscellaneous Funds, the Dunderdale Fund for the Endowment of Charges, the Building Grants Fund and the Building Loans Fund."

• that subparagraph 2.3.3 (b) be deleted in its entirety and that remaining subparagraphs of paragraph 2.3.3 be re-lettered accordingly;

• that subparagraph 2.3.5 be deleted in its entirety and the remaining paragraphs 2.3.6 to 2.3.8 be renumbered 2.3.5 to 2.3.7 respectively;

• that the final sentence of paragraph 2.9 be deleted in its entirety;

• that in paragraph 4.1.2 the words "Maintenance/Development Fund” be replaced by the words "Building Grants Fund" and that the words "Dunderdale Building Fund” also be replaced by the words "Building Grants Fund”;

• that in paragraph 4.1.3 the words "Hymn & prayer books” and “Free and Open Church Association” be deleted;

• that paragraphs 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 be altered by the deletion of the words “on the recommendation of the Finance Committee” wherever they appear.

• that paragraphs 4.4, 4.5 and 4.7 be deleted in their entirety and be replaced by the following new paragraph 4.4:-

“Building Grants Fund

There shall be a Building Grants Fund under the charge of the Administration Board to assist congregations to purchase, build, extend, improve, maintain or repair churches, parsonages or other church buildings. This fund shall be administered in accordance with such rules or policies as the Administration Board may from time to time adopt."

• that the former paragraph 4.6 be renumbered 4.5 and that the former paragraphs 4.8 to 4.11 inclusive be renumbered respectively as paragraphs 4.8 to 4.9 inclusive.

Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) noted that the Motion deleted reference from the Digest of Resolutions to the Free and Open Church Association grant provision for hymn and prayer books. The Secretary General responded that the availability of hymn and prayer books would be unaffected. The fund in question was financed by the provision to the Church of an external grant and would in future be treated as one of a large number of miscellaneous funds already overseen by the Administration Board.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.
Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reminded Synod that it had passed a Motion the previous day regarding fossil fuels and questions had been asked as to how assistance could be provided to congregations in relation to energy consumption. He wished to commend the Eco-Congregation Scotland resource ‘Greening Church Buildings’ which was available from the Eco-Congregation website. Dr Ferguson-Smith also confirmed that note had been taken on behalf of the Buildings Committee in relation to comments made the previous day during the climate change debate.

The Chair expressed thanks to Dr Ferguson-Smith and the Committee Conveners Mr Elliott Glen-Esk, Mrs Maureen McKellar, Mrs Rebecca Cadie, Mr Adrian Tupper (who had been present at Synod the previous day) and the Rev Canon Frances Burberry who was retiring as Convener upon the dissolution of the Finance Committee.

SESSION 9 THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS AND THE CHAIR

9.1 Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Youth Committee) sought permission to speak for a number of representatives of the 12–18 and 18–25 age groups and Ms Claire Benton-Evans, Diocesan Youth Officer. Synod granted its permission. Mr Rongong then give a PowerPoint presentation giving an insight into the annual Glenalmond youth week. The youth week had been going for 20 years and hundreds of young people had attended it. Many came back year after year. He passed on to Synod some of the comments which the young people themselves had made about Glenalmond. The “Glen community” also met at other times during the year and some “Glen bombing” had been undertaken with young people descending on a local church for a weekend.

Members of the 12–18 age group addressed Synod and explained how Glen operated like one large family. They had found the experience encouraging and confidence building and had led to them being able to serve in their local churches. A member of the 18–25+ age group addressed Synod and explained the particular value of the group for those who had left school and had perhaps moved away from home. Bonds between the members made it a family. He had had the opportunity to participate in a Porvoo pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela which had been a very spiritual experience.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained how the experience of attending Glen could lead to wider things. He had had the opportunity to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church at the National Youth Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It had been inspiring to see how young people were involved there. The Scottish Episcopal Church Youth Committee was looking at whether similar things might be possible within the Episcopal Church. He himself also now supported youth and children’s work in his own congregation and was involved in the life of the Diocese.

Ms Emily Alldritt reminded Synod that she had addressed Synod 2015 following her attendance at the UN Commission on the Status of Women. She herself had come through Glen in the past and was now in the discernment process for ordination. She was currently teaching in inner-city Glasgow in an area of incredible poverty. She encouraged vestries to be generous in supporting young people to attend Glen where they could not afford to do so themselves.

Mrs Claire Benton-Evans spoke as the Diocesan Youth and Children’s Officer for the Diocese of Edinburgh. She was also a leader at Glen. She spoke of the participation in the wider Church of Glen delegates and leaders. She shared the “participation ladder”, a useful tool which she had introduced in her own Diocese. It was a version of a tool developed for UNICEF by sociologists in order to encourage participation of young people at all levels. At the lower levels, there were activities which were adult-led leading through to the top of the ladder where activities were led and inspired by young people. She had recommended the use of the ladder to churches for use in their work with children and young people. She illustrated how the tool had been used at the Glen youth week and how the young people had felt able to move up the ladder during the course of the week.

Mr Rongong concluded the presentation by emphasising that the key was valuing young people and enabling their participation in their local churches.

9.2 Global Partnerships Committee

The Rev Val Nellist (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) introduced Ms Rachael Fraser who was a graduate of the provincial youth weeks and who had represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at the UN Commission on the Status of Women Session in New York earlier in 2016.

Ms Fraser explained that she was studying international relations at the University of St Andrews with a particular focus on issues of gender and human rights. She had served as a delegate, and now as a leader, at the Glen youth camps.

The Commission on the Status of Women was committed to the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women and met annually to consult with non-governmental organisations, UN entities and UN member states. The Anglican Communion sent a delegation of around 20 people each year. This year’s delegation comprised representatives from all corners of the world. She had been asked why faith-based organisations were invited to participate in the Commission. She explained that the Church was often uniquely placed to reach the most vulnerable and also it had the networks, resources and capacity for social mobilisation to be able to do so. It was a vital partner in civil society.

The priority theme of the 60th session of the Commission on the Status of Women had been women’s empowerment and its link to sustainable development. The Sustainable Development Goals had been adopted by all 193 UN
The Church ought to work to achieve the goals in the UK. The Church ought to work to engage with them and their hopes for the future equality among men, women and everyone in between. There was a need to bring them to the table and engage with them and their hopes for the Church in society. She urged Synod members to talk to young people in local congregations to see how their hopes could be made a reality.

The most important thing she had learnt from her experience of the meeting in New York was that the power of working together ought never to be underestimated. Co-operation was essential and gender-synchronised approaches were very important, in particular the need to engage men and boys. There was a need to ensure equality among men, women and everyone in between.

Attendance at the Commission had been inspiring, faith affirming and transformational and she reiterated the comments made by Emily Alldritt the previous year regarding the importance of ensuring funding for future attendance. She thanked Elspeth Davey, the Rev Val Nellist and the rest of the Global Partnerships Committee for enabling her to attend as well as Emily Alldritt, Elaine Cameron, Ann Glen-Esk and John Stuart for their support and guidance.

She closed by reading out the collective statement adopted by the Anglican delegation and reminded Synod that in Christ there was neither Jew nor Gentile, slave nor free, male nor female.

Mrs Nellist thanked Ms Fraser for her address and explained that she was the newest member of the Global Partnerships Committee. Ms Fraser had been invited to undertake training at the World Council of Churches in faith-based organisations and human rights advocacy.

Mrs Nellist then reported on other aspects of the Global Partnerships Committee’s work. She drew attention to the Companion Partnerships Day being organised by the Committee in October. The Bible study material referred to in the Committee’s report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015 would be available in November. It was being prepared in conjunction with Christian Aid. Moumita Biswas, who was the Secretary of the All India Council of Christian Women and also a member of the steering group of the Inter-Anglican Women’s Network, had been in Scotland the previous week. Work was being done on a proposed colloquium in Kerala drawing people together from the Asia Council of Churches, the Anglican Church in Brazil, churches in the UK and Christian Aid to talk about gender justice.

Mrs Nellist explained that she was retiring as Convener of the Committee. She had enjoyed the role and appreciated the support she had had from her Committee and Elspeth Davey.

The Primus thanked all who had participated for their work.

9.3.1 Accounts

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) commenced his presentation by expressing thanks to all members of the Standing Committee and to General Synod Office staff. He also thanked the Primus who had dealt with a number of challenging issues during the year.

He explained that the accounts and budgets had been scheduled for the final session of the Synod and he encouraged Synod members to respond in the feedback form with views on that.

The Primus, in his review of the year in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015, had referred to the role of the Standing Committee in shaping the financial and
administrative life of the Church so that it reflected mission policy. The Committee had spent time trying to do that and had followed closely the development of the Scottish Episcopal Institute. Following the lively debate which had taken place at Synod 2015, the Committee had looked again at the amounts to be paid out for the new Block Grants for mission and ministry. The Committee had decided not to taper the level of grant but to maintain it at the level of £300,000 to 2019. Provision had been made for an HR resource and significant time had been spent on the future strategic direction of the Church. Initial discussions had also been undertaken between the provincial office and diocesan offices about the balance of responsibilities and other opportunities for efficiencies. Later in the month the College of Bishops and Standing Committee would meet jointly to consider future issues. The Committee also had the responsibility for planning the agenda for the Synod and feedback would be welcomed.

Mr Gordon explained that the financial results showed that, instead of a budgeted deficit, a surplus had been achieved and this had been the case for a number of years. Coming new to the convenership of the Standing Committee, he had been surprised by this. Expenditure under the old Grants for Ministry system had tended to be lower than budgeted. However, under the new Block Grant System that area of underspend would be eliminated. It was also the case that underspends in relation to the new Buildings Grants would not be expected. One of the key issues which had arisen from Bishop Pearson's presentation the previous day was the cost of funding curates and curacies and the fact that an increasing number of people were coming forward for ordination. The numerical increase and the aspiration to increase the level of grant would add very substantially to provincial budgets. He suggested that a war chest was needed to fund that significant increase in demand by around 2018/19. It was also the case that the Committee wanted to keep doing other things. One of the issues for discussion with the College of Bishops was whether ways could be found to release more for missional activity. He assured Synod that Standing Committee was looking seriously to address these issues to see how best use of resources could be made.

Mr Gordon then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (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 2015."

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and the Isles) said that accounts gave an insight into the life of an organisation. He thought it was exciting that the Church had underspent by £1.17 million in the course of the previous six years. The narrative that there was in fact money was encouraging. He suggested that in future years every penny the Church had should be spent for the kingdom. Quoting Bishop Pearson "you have to pay for the change you want to see". Dean Swift suggested that if an underspend became apparent it would be helpful if it could be released for use in the mission field. He supported the Motion.

Mr Gordon thanked Dean Swift for his comment. It was often difficult to find ways of releasing money quickly. There was a need to identify, ahead of time, ways in which money could be spent up to budgeted levels. Standing Committee was “on the case”.

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

9.3.2 Budget and Quota

Mr Gordon spoke to the Budgets 2016–2018. He had already referred to a number of the future budgetary pressures. The budgets predicted a small surplus on the General Fund in 2016 of approximately £5,000, £614 in 2017 but a deficit of approximately £36,000 in 2018. By General Synod 2017, there would be a more complete view of future curacy funding. As noted in the budget report in the Synod Papers, the figures for curate grants could add significant sums to the budget. Standing Committee had debated, in its consideration of the budgets, the level of quota increase. In the light of the future needs, it was felt appropriate to maintain an increase of 3% in provincial quota.

Mr Gordon then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith seconded, the following Motion: –

"That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2017, agree to a quota figure of £719,929 for that year."

The Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) thanked all those who had worked on the production of the accounts and budgets. She favoured the idea of considering the budget at the outset of Synod so there could be a sense of what the financial resource available was and future activity could then be considered in the light of that. That would allow proposals regarding the prioritising of spending to be considered. Synod had heard about the cost of curacies and Synod had heard the previous day at least one voice keen to support such expenditure. The budget report also indicated the pressure arising from the funding of full-time ordination training. In the current year, a second candidate had emerged during the year. There was also the possibility of mixed mode training. Bishop Pearson had talked about the possibility of a new income stream to help fund such matters but she did not think that that could be the full answer. She did not think full-time ordinands could be funded simply by a fund-raising exercise. It might be necessary to shift money from one area to another. Her area of expenditure to another. Her question was how Standing Committee would work with Boards and Committees and how a clear plan could be devised to prioritise spending. She wondered whether the debates at Synod had helped the Standing Committee and was reminded of the maxim "to govern is to choose".
Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and the Isles) referred to the Primus’ remarks in his charge to Synod regarding the need to move to a culture of growth. The Scottish Episcopal Institute was key to that. In the light of the comments made by Dr Peden, might it be appropriate to take money from capital in order to provide funding?

Mr Gordon responded by agreeing that choices had to be made. Some such choices had already been made in the past such as the moratorium on Building Grants. The funding of ordinands and curates was an absolute priority. The Scottish Episcopal Institute was turning out to be a huge success. He wished Bishop Pearson’s fundraising initiative every success but agreed that it could not be the complete answer. Standing Committee was looking to make funding available in future budgets in 2018 and beyond. Work was being done to determine what the actual costs of curacies were so that that could then be worked through in budgetary terms. The Standing Committee itself included the Conveners of the Boards which allowed for fruitful conversation. On the issue of using capital to fund running costs, some of the previous underspends had been transferred into capital and so it would be possible to transfer some back without selling the family silver. However, there was a need for a significant pool of investment to generate income year on year. The income from investments amounted to approximately 60% of the budget. There were opportunities to work at the margins but there was a need for sustainable funding.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) noted that according to the budget summary in the Synod Papers the transfer to capital for 2016 appeared to be approximately £662,000. That was a significant figure. Before addressing the funding of ordinands and curates, there was a question about funding discipleship. If discipleship was to be grown, money needed to be released to support that and that in turn would lead to release of money in the future. He asked whether any provision was made in the budget for the funding of discipleship. How could people be asked to give sacrificially at local level when the accounts disclosed that significant sums were transferred to capital. Such transfers made it difficult for some at local level. His own post would continue to be underfunded unless the levels of local giving could be grown.

Mr Gordon acknowledged that the point raised was an issue. The Church had chosen to organise its finances by way of a significant capital fund to generate income. The Standing Committee would look assiduously at how to avoid adding to the capital apparently without regard to the needs on the ground. It would also see what it could do to release more funds for mission.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed, one against.

9.4 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed thanks to all members of Synod for their attendance and engagement.

He also expressed particular thanks to the following: Mr David Todd and those who had arranged the Eucharist and Morning and Evening Prayer; the retiring Conveners namely the Rev Canon Frances Burberry, Mr Hugh Donald and the Rev Val Nellist; the representatives of other denominations; those who had acted as Chair during Synod; Dr Nicholas Grier as Assessor; Alison Dines and Jamie Woods for operating the IT and audio-visual facilities and the other staff of St Paul’s & St George’s; Pat Ashworth of the Church Times; General Synod Office staff. The Primus also offered congratulations to John Kitchen, (Edinburgh City Organist and organist at Old St Paul’s) who had been awarded an MBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours announced that day.

9.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 12.30pm on Saturday 11 June 2016.
ELECTIONS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

In terms of the Digest of Resolutions, the membership of the Administration Board includes three members appointed by General Synod from its own membership. This year, three vacancies arise. The term of office is four years.

Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

Nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request).

2. Institute Council: Membership

During the course of the year, on the recommendation of the Institute Council, the Standing Committee has appointed the Rev Marjory McPherson as the new ecumenical member of the Council to succeed the Rev James Jones of the Methodist Church. Ms McPherson is the Education and Support Secretary of the Church of Scotland’s Ministries Council.

In terms of the Digest of Resolutions, such an appointment is effective until the following General Synod (ie General Synod 2017) and Ms McPherson is eligible to be appointed by Synod for a term of three years. A resolution will be proposed by Standing Committee appointing Ms McPherson for three years.

One other vacancy on the Council has arisen during the year and the Standing Committee nominates Mrs Patsy Thomson, lay reader in the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness, to fill the vacancy. Brief biographical details are as follows:

Grew up in East Renfrewshire; was an original Children’s Panel member and trained as a marriage counsellor before working for Strathclyde Regional Council and latterly Glasgow City Council, specialising in family and community work. Holds teaching, social work and counselling qualifications and a strong belief that politics and religion are inextricably linked. Delivered the Scottish Churches Open College community component. In 1997, moved to Cromarty; employed in the Highlands most recently by Save the Children Fund and the WEA using solution-focussed counselling methods and encouraging local, individual and national empowerment. Became involved with the Coach House, Kilmuir, completing courses in spiritual direction and prayer guiding before starting training with TISEC. Licensed as a Lay Reader in Moray, Ross and Caithness in 2012 and now largely shared by the Wyvis and Black Isle charges. Member of the Diocesan Mission and Ministry Board and involved in an active Cromarty Peace Group; member of CND and the Progressive Christian
Network. Jointly organises Julian meetings in Inverness. The Highland emphasis on hospitality, welcome and inclusiveness informs church practice within the diocese. Celtic art forms and worship, together with Gaelic language and culture, form bridges naturally in this landscape. Makes use of some Gaelic when presiding, and champions the New Testament Scots translation by Lorimer. Highland Supports Refugees and the Highland Foodbank are integral to local church witness, as is campaigning for the natural Moray Firth wildlife habitat to be protected from ship to ship oil transfer proposals. Enjoys the marginal and prophetic space lay readers can operate within, helping cross boundaries between holy and civic domains. Currently a Diocesan Adviser for the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

3. Membership: Preliminary Proceedings Committee (Canon 54)

Under Canon 54, the General Synod is this year required to appoint, on the recommendation of the Standing Committee, members to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee. The Preliminary Committee comprises three members (two of whom must be practising lawyers and the third must be a lay person) plus one alternate lay member who must be resident in a different diocese from the lay member. It is for General Synod to make the appointments, on the recommendation of the Standing Committee.

During the latter half of 2016, Standing Committee was required to use its power under the canon to fill a vacancy which had arisen in one of the practising lawyer posts (as a result of the former appointee no longer being resident in Scotland). It appointed John Stirling, solicitor, to the post. Standing Committee recommends to Synod that his appointment be ratified and a motion to that effect will be proposed to Synod.

In addition, the post of alternate lay member to the Committee requires to be filled, since Canon David Palmer (the existing alternate lay member) is no longer resident in Scotland. The alternate must be resident in a diocese other than St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane (since that is the diocese of Mary Birch, the current lay member). The Standing Committee recommends to Synod the appointment of Mr Geoff Sage.

Mr Sage was Chief Mental Health Nurse in an NHS Trust 1991-94, General Manager for Mental Health and Learning Disability in NHS Lanarkshire 1994 – 1999 and General Manager for Community Services and Primary Care 1999-2010. He was involved in a full range of HR issues and policies and managing considerable change issues. He was a Charity Chief Executive (St Andrew’s Hospice) employed by the Religious Sisters of Charity 2010-2015. He is currently Vestry Secretary, Worship Leader, and Vestry Chair at St Paul & St John the Evangelist, Monklands.

4. Membership: Clergy Discipline Tribunal (Canon 54)

A number of vacancies arise this year on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal. Under Canon 54, the Standing Committee is required to make nominations for the
filling of posts on the Tribunal. The General Synod this year is responsible for appointing three practising lawyers, of least ten years' standing, one cleric from the order of priest or deacon and three communicant lay members of the Church.

Members serve for three years and are eligible to be re-appointed. The Standing Committee makes the following nominations (all of those nominated are current members, and are recommended for a further term of office, with the exception of Mr George MacWilliam who is a new nomination):

Three practising lawyers:

Lord Bannatyne (Diocese of Edinburgh and also President of the Tribunal)
Lord McEwan (Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway)
George MacWilliam (Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness)

One cleric:

The Rev Canon Professor John Richardson (Diocese of Edinburgh)

(The other two clerics are the Rev Margaret McTernan and the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband whose terms of office continue until 2018.)

Three lay members:

Fraser Falconer (Diocese of Edinburgh)
Sue Horne (Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane)
John Whittall (Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney)

It is proposed this year that unless there is more than one nomination for any of the above vacancies, Synod be invited to fill the vacancies by appointing the person nominated and that this be dealt with during Session 1 at Synod, by general acclaim.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
May 2017
Budget Report

Format

The summary of all Funds (page 59) details the 2016 actual figures in the first column and the 2017-2019 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 60-74) detail the 2016 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2017-2019 budget figures in the final three columns.

Budget setting process

Boards agree budgets each autumn for the subsequent year and indicative budgets for the following two years. The budgets and associated requests for funding from the General Fund are submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration at its November meeting each year. Given that there were a number of decisions made subsequent to November with budgetary implications Standing Committee further reviewed budgets at its meeting in April.

In its oversight of the General Synod’s finances the Standing Committee’s focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget (which can be found at page 60) summarises all unrestricted income and its allocation to the Standing Committee and boards to fund their work. The budgeted allocations in effect represent the planned expenditure of each of the boards. Thus the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position. In considering the budgets the Standing Committee is guided by two underlying principles:

- Budgets should be set with a view to achieving a broadly breakeven position in the General Fund.
- Large one-off receipts (such as legacies) should be capitalised to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

Budget history

The General Synod’s main source of funding is its investment income derived mainly from its investments held in the SEC Unit Trust Pool. This accounts for approximately 62% of income. Until 2008 investment income increased broadly in line with inflation each year enabling a steady growth in expenditure. The rate of distribution paid by the UTP however fell by 15% in 2009 and has not yet fully returned to its former level. The impact of the reduced rate of distribution has been partly mitigated by the investment of substantial legacies and part of the cash generated by recent General Fund surpluses. Market conditions continue to be volatile and it is difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution will be. The Investment Committee continues to work closely with the fund managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates where possible. For budgetary purposes no change in distribution rates is assumed over the period to 2019.
The initial response to the reduction in income was a two year moratorium on all building grants. Such grants have subsequently been reinstated. The combination of reductions in budgets to avoid deficits and further reductions in expenditure against those budgets (and some additional unbudgeted income) has resulted in substantial surpluses on the General Fund being generated in the period from 2010 to 2016. (The total surplus for the seven years is approximately £1.3million.) It is not Standing Committee’s intention to generate such surpluses but they have helped fund the £2million lump sum payment to the Pension Fund agreed by General Synod in 2009 without the need to sell investments thus helping to safeguard future investment income. The level of surpluses generated in recent years has also allowed further funds to be added to the General Fund’s investments. (£200,000 in 2014 and £500,000 in 2016.) The additional income generated by this investment (approximately £27,000 a year) helps avoid or reduce budget deficits. Standing Committee also regards these resources as a significant ‘war chest’ available to support the General Synod’s ongoing activities or to meet some contingency such as a future deficit on the Pension Fund. (It is worth noting that, notwithstanding the income generated by the additional investments made in recent years, annual budgeted investment income is still some £55,000 – or 5% – less than that earned in 2008.)

Why is outcome generally significantly better than budget?

Standing Committee is aware of concerns regarding the continuing generation of significant surpluses and the extent to which in recent years actual financial outcome is generally considerably better than budgeted. For example the General Fund surplus for 2016 was approximately £150,000 – about £145,000 greater than the budgeted surplus of £5,350. Whilst the differences between actual and budget are all for readily explicable reasons Standing Committee is keen to try to ensure that there is greater accuracy in the budgeting process and is working with the Boards to seek to ensure that the budget requests they submit are as realistic as possible and reflect their planned programmes. Inevitably, there will always be some areas of uncertainty which can give rise to actual expenditure being considerably different to that budgeted. The following factors contributed to the variance between budget and actual in 2016:

Unbudgeted income
- Investment Income – UTP distribution rate greater than budgeted resulting in additional income of about £10,000
- Donations approximately £8,000 greater than budgeted

Expenditure less than budget
- The new building grants programme operated by the Administration Board took longer to establish than anticipated. No large building grants were paid in year. Underspend against budget was £64,000.
- The budgets for the Institute Council continue to evolve to reflect the new patterns of training and associated costs. The budget for 2016 proved to be greater than required resulting in an underspend against budget of about £31,000. (Future budgets have been adjusted in light of actual costs.)
• Little of the budget provision made for the various networks operating under the auspices of the Mission Board was required. The work of the networks and their methods of operation continue to evolve.
• The Information and Communication Board underspent against its budget in a number of areas including expenditure on the website which was approximately £8,900 less than budget.

Options considered by Standing Committee

Mindful of the surpluses generated in recent years and the surplus now budgeted for 2017, Standing Committee has considered a number of options including the possibility of not increasing Quota for 2018, increasing the amount paid to dioceses by way of Mission and Ministry Support Grants and the possibility of devising a system for making ad hoc grants during any year in which it appeared that a significant surplus was likely to be generated. After careful deliberation, Standing Committee has concluded against changing the budget assumptions regarding annual increases in the amount of Quota requested from dioceses or the Mission and Ministry Support Grants paid to them. It noted that the system of MMSG was still bedding in and experience of the first year of operation is still being evaluated. Standing Committee will keep the operation of the block grant arrangement under review and will revisit the possibility of allocating further funds to this form of support for missional activity in the light of experience of the effectiveness of the block grant and taking account of other pressures on provincial resources. The Committee is also firmly of the view that it should not distribute ad hoc grants as a reaction to a possible surplus in a given year but that it should continue to focus on the medium to longer term pressures and demands in the use of financial resources.

Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties

There are a number of different areas of budgetary pressure and areas of uncertainty.

Curate funding
There has, in recent years, been an encouraging increase in the number of stipendiary curates in training. It is anticipated that the number will further increase over the next few years. Whilst this is a welcome and important addition to the vitality and potential missional impact of the SEC and reflects the success of the renewed emphasis on formation and training, it has significant implications for provincial budgets (and those of the charges and dioceses involved in the training of curates). Expenditure on curate grants increased from £77,000 in 2013 to £132,000 in 2015 and remained at approximately that level in 2016. The current budgets reflect an increasing annual cost over the next three year budget period with a projected cost of £178,350 in 2019. This assumes a continuation of the historic level of provincial support.

However, to find the required number of appropriate training opportunities for stipendiary curates grant funding in excess of what has traditionally been made available is likely to be required in some areas. Standing Committees has agreed to
the Institute Council’s request that the grant funding in respect of the curate commencing training in 2017 be increased from the usual 50% of stipend and related costs to 75%. The Institute Council continues to work with dioceses and charges in identifying the training places for those commencing curacies in 2018 and 2019. This will involve an assessment of the availability of funding and housing and the extent to which additional grant funding might be required. For budgetary purposes funding for all stipendiary curates, other than the one commencing in 2017, is assumed to be at the traditional rate of 50% of stipend and related costs. By way of illustration of the impact of any enhanced level of funding – grant funding on the traditional basis costs approximately £60,000 over the duration of a curacy; a fully funded curacy (including housing costs and other expenses) could cost approximately £162,000.

As noted above the projected cost of curate grants in 2019 is £178,350. Even assuming no further enhanced curate grants are provided the cost of curate grants is budgeted to increase to about £235,000 in 2020 and £255,000 in 2021 reflecting the anticipated number of new curacies. By way of illustration, if the average curate grant were to increase to 60% the cost in 2021 would be £304,000; an increase to an average 70% would produce a cost of £354,000.

The assumptions made in respect of curate numbers and the grants required to fund appropriate training places continues to be one of the key variables in preparing future budgets.

**Funding of full-time ordinands**

Standing Committee is pleased that it has been possible to reintroduce the option for a small number of ordinands to train on a full time basis combining their studies at the Scottish Episcopal Institute with a three year degree course at a Scottish University. There are currently three full time ordinands in training and a fourth is likely to commence study later in 2017. Currently the costs of the grants provided to such students (each receiving a grant of approximately £12,600 year) is met from the SEI Training Fund and therefore has no impact on the General Fund. The SEI Training Fund was established in 2015 and benefitted from the generosity of individuals giving to the Lent Appeals of all the Bishops and to the General Synod offering that year. During 2016 further funds were transferred to it from two other miscellaneous funds administered by the General Synod. Following the launch of a fundraising initiative to raise funds for such training in 2016 there is now also a small number of regular donors to the Fund. Standing Committee welcomes the fundraising initiative and the further steps the Institute Council are planning to promote it and to identify other sources of funding to support the costs of those training for authorised ministry in the SEC. Currently the resources of the SEI Training Fund are sufficient to fund the projected costs of grants to full time ordinands to 2019. It is however likely that from 2020 the continued provision of such grants will require some support from the General Fund. Assuming no new funds are identified the cost is likely to be in the region of £25,000 to £30,000 a year. The more successful the current fundraising initiative is the less this cost will be.

**Context Based training**

Standing Committee is excited by the prospect of the provision of the option of a Context Based Training route for ordinands. Such opportunities have existed in the
Church of England for a number of years and Standing Committee endorses the Institute Council’s plans to make similar provision within the SEC. Ordinands undertaking training through this route combine their studies with a locally funded placement in a charge. Grant funding will also be provided to ordinands. Plans are in hand to recruit a Director of Context Based Ordinand Training to the staff of the Scottish Episcopal Institute to oversee the development of this programme. It is hoped that the Director will be in post from the start of 2018 and that the first intake of ordinands will commence training later that year. This new initiative is to be partly funded by an anonymous donation of £50,000 to be paid over its first three years. The budgets incorporate assumed costs for this training provision from 2018. It is not yet known how many ordinands are likely to wish to pursue this form of training or how many charges are likely to be willing and able to provide appropriate placements. Much of the detail of training and associated costs will not be known until a Director is in post and plans more fully developed. For current budgetary purpose it assumed that three ordinands will commence training in 2018 and every two years thereafter. The budgeted costs for Context Based Training are £62,360 in 2018 and £76,980 in 2019. (Net costs of £45,690 and £60,310 after allowing for the annual donation of £16,670.) The average annual cost from 2020 once a full complement of ordinands is in place and the donation funding ceases is currently projected to be in the region of £88,000.

**Pension Fund**

The last Actuarial Valuation of the SEC Pension Fund undertaken as at the end of 2014 provided the welcome news that the Fund had a surplus and that the necessary contribution rate to meet future pension costs had reduced from that of previous valuations. The opportunity was therefore taken to reduce the contribution rate from 34.9% to 32.2% from January 2016. The next Actuarial Valuation will be undertaken as at the end of 2017 and its results and implications will be reported to General Synod 2018. Current indications are that the position has deteriorated since the last valuation. As at 31 December 2016 the Fund had a deficit of £1.1 million and the Scheme Actuary has estimated that the current contribution rate is unlikely to be sufficient to meet the costs of future pension provision. Standing Committee is aware that much could happen throughout the remainder of 2017 that might impact on the final results of the Actuarial Valuation and that the actual outcome might be quite different to that currently estimated. Standing Committee is however mindful of the need to consider the implications of any requirement to fund pension fund deficits and increase contribution rates. Should a substantial deficit be confirmed by the formal Actuarial Valuation the possibility of a one off contribution from General Synod’s reserves, similar to that made in 2009, will need to be considered. Such a payment would inevitably reduce future investment income available to the General Fund. Increased contribution rates, if required, would also increase costs borne by the General Fund. (Each increase of 1% increases annual staff costs by about £5,000. The increased cost of curate and other grants is likely to double that to about £10,000 a year.) Standing Committee is aware too that any increase in contribution rate will place a burden on charges some of whom already find it difficult to meet the cost at the current rate.
General Fund budgeted surpluses and deficits

The General Fund budgets agreed by Standing Committee result in the following budgeted surpluses and deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Surplus of £49,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Surplus of £1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Deficit of £74,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budgets for 2017 and 2018 are for surpluses and whilst there is a sizeable deficit budgeted for 2019 the surpluses generated in recent years are sufficient to fund it. As outlined above and further discussed below the decisions to be made in relation to the funding of curate training grants and the number of stipendiary curates in training will have a significant impact on future budgets with the potential for large deficits being incurred. Standing Committee is committed to ensuring that, as far as is possible, the availability of funding should not be a limiting factor on the number of appropriate candidates being trained for stipendiary ministry within the SEC and will work with all boards and committees in addressing the challenges created by the welcome demand for such training.

Why has there been an improvement in budgeted surpluses?

The budgets presented to General Synod in 2016 indicated a surplus on the General Fund of £614 in 2017 and a deficit of £35,683 in 2018. The current budgets therefore indicate that the budgeted financial outcome has improved by approximately £49,000 in 2017 and £37,500 in 2018. There are a number of reasons why budgets change from year to year. The main factors that have resulted in an overall improvement in the budgeted outcome since the budgets presented last year are:

**Increased income**
- Increased investment income of approximately £10,000 a year is assumed (ie increased 2016 distribution rate assumed to continue throughout budget period.)
- Fee income of £5,675 a year assumed in respect of students from other denominations attending courses at the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

**Reduced costs**
- As the costs associated with the new training provision through the Scottish Episcopal Institute become more clearly established it has been possible to reduce budgeted costs by about £7,000 in 2017 and £15,500 in 2018.
- The net effect of changed assumptions regarding the funding to be provided by the SEI Training Fund and the number of full time ordinands in training is to reduce the budgeted funding required from the General Fund by about £17,000 in 2017 and £30,000 in 2018.
- Following arrangements made in 2016 regarding the provision of HR consultancy services it has been possible to reduce the budget for legal and advisory fees by £15,000 a year.
**Increased costs**

- The major addition to budgeted costs in the last year is the inclusion of provision within the Institute Council budget for Context Based Ordinand Training from 2018. As detailed above costs in 2018 are budgeted to be £62,360 but these will be partly offset by a specific donation of £16,670 resulting in additional net costs of £45,690.

**Changes relating to cost of curate grants**

- The agreement to provide additional funding in respect of the one stipendiary curate starting in 2017 has resulted in an increase in budgeted costs of about £7,000 in 2017. This decision combined with a reduction in the number of curates assumed to be commencing curacies in 2018 has resulted in reduced budgeted costs of approximately £9,500 in 2018.

**Changes relating to inspires magazine**

- The decision to cease publication of inspires during 2017 has resulted in the removal of budgeted annual income of £14,000 and publication costs being reduced by £10,500 in 2017 and by £18,000 a year from 2018. The net effect in 2017 is to increase budgeted costs by £3,500 and to reduce annual budgeted costs by £4,000 from 2018.

**Projections beyond 2019**

Given the number of variables and uncertainties detailed above, producing accurate projections beyond the usual three year budget period is difficult. For example, as noted above, the assumptions made with regard to the number of stipendiary curates in training and the level of grant funding required will have a significant impact on such projections. Uncertainties in relation to levels of investment income and the implications of the next Pension Fund Actuarial Valuation complicate matters further. Standing Committee is however aware that for the reasons outlined above (increasing number of stipendiary curates, introduction of context based training, full time ordinand grants being funded in part from the General Fund) the financial outlook from 2020 is likely to be quite different to that of recent years. The following table provides an indication of the likely future surpluses and deficits from 2017 to 2022 assuming no change in the assumptions used in preparing the three year budgets. The impact of a number of possible changes in assumption are also provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 £000s</th>
<th>2018 £000s</th>
<th>2019 £000s</th>
<th>2020 £000s</th>
<th>2021 £000s</th>
<th>2022 £000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change from budget assumptions</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(170)</td>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed additional income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP distribution - annual increase of 0.5p from 2017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed reduction in income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income reduced following sale of investments to fund Lump Sum contribution to Pension Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed additional costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average curate grant from 2018 of 70% stipend etc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension contribution increased back to 34.9% from 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible budget surplus / (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>(318)</td>
<td>(289)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assuming no change in budget assumptions deficits are projected to significantly increase beyond 2019 with deficits in excess of £200,000 in 2021 and 2022. It would be possible to fund such deficits, at least in the short term, from the General Fund’s accumulated revenue reserves. Should such deficits continue there would however be a need to realise investments from 2023 / 2024 to fund ongoing activities.

- No increase in the level of UTP distribution has been assumed in preparing the budgets. If an annual increase of ½p is assumed then annual investment income would be £10,000 greater in 2017 than budgeted. The cumulative impact of such annual increases over a six year period is additional income of £62,000 in 2022.

- Should it be necessary to sell investments to fund a one off contribution to the Pension Fund investment income will fall. For the purposes of illustration an annual reduction of £15,000 is shown from 2019 – roughly equivalent to reducing the General Fund’s UTP holding by about £500,000.

- There continues to be uncertainty regarding the level of curate grant funding required to ensure appropriate training for stipendiary curates. The impact of an assumed average grant equivalent to 70% of stipend and related costs is to increase projected costs by £45,000 in 2019 and by £80,000 - £99,000 in 2020 – 2022.

- For the purposes of illustration of the impact of any need to increase the pension fund contribution rate a reinstatement of the previous pension fund contribution rate of 34.9% from 2019 has been assumed. This would increase staff costs and the costs of some grants by about £28,000 in 2019 – with small annual increases thereafter.
Total budgeted surpluses

The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 59. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue surpluses and deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Surpluses / Deficits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Surplus of £56,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Surplus of £13,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Deficit of £60,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total budgeted surpluses / deficits differ from those budgeted for the General Fund due to small surpluses / deficits budgeted for some of the miscellaneous and restricted funds. For example the Retirement Housing Fund is budgeted to produce a revenue surplus which is then used as required to fund the purchase of new retirement housing.

Robert Gordon
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2017
QUOTA 2018

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be increased by 3% to £741,527.

The allocation between dioceses is based on dioceses’ quota assessable income. The amount of provincial quota requested from each diocese will therefore vary according to relative changes in its income. The allocation will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change from 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen and Orkney</td>
<td>83,941</td>
<td>80,848</td>
<td>3,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and The Isles</td>
<td>25,360</td>
<td>24,910</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>48,422</td>
<td>46,291</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>286,155</td>
<td>277,461</td>
<td>8,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow and Galloway</td>
<td>164,100</td>
<td>161,192</td>
<td>2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray, Ross and Caithness</td>
<td>48,273</td>
<td>47,227</td>
<td>1,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>85,276</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>741,527</strong></td>
<td><strong>719,929</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,598</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.00%
## BUDGET SUMMARY – includes all revenue funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2018</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1,863,850</td>
<td>1,861,742</td>
<td>1,883,655</td>
<td>1,906,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,713,688)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,812,110)</td>
<td>(1,881,895)</td>
<td>(1,981,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>150,162</td>
<td>49,632</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>(74,919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>1,225,704</td>
<td>875,866</td>
<td>925,498</td>
<td>927,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (to) from capital</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>875,866</td>
<td>925,498</td>
<td>927,258</td>
<td>932,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>848,657</td>
<td>826,210</td>
<td>851,880</td>
<td>870,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>848,657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration Board</strong></td>
<td>65,276</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>313,179</td>
<td>313,749</td>
<td>313,749</td>
<td>313,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>68,849</td>
<td>60,366</td>
<td>74,640</td>
<td>73,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>90,761</td>
<td>(306,373)</td>
<td>(43,161)</td>
<td>(41,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Inst Council misc</td>
<td>(99,076)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>552,143</td>
<td>612,677</td>
<td>366,670</td>
<td>396,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute Council</strong></td>
<td>407,662</td>
<td>365,030</td>
<td>409,215</td>
<td>476,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>39,427</td>
<td>57,455</td>
<td>99,897</td>
<td>96,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(459,070)</td>
<td>(38,100)</td>
<td>(47,058)</td>
<td>(43,484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (to) from capital</td>
<td>(99,076)</td>
<td>(520)</td>
<td>(536)</td>
<td>(552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>69,135</td>
<td>115,632</td>
<td>117,012</td>
<td>69,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Board</strong></td>
<td>354,185</td>
<td>375,565</td>
<td>378,890</td>
<td>385,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>39,427</td>
<td>57,455</td>
<td>99,897</td>
<td>96,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(19,753)</td>
<td>119,330</td>
<td>103,818</td>
<td>88,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>119,330</td>
<td>103,818</td>
<td>88,306</td>
<td>72,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faith &amp; Order Board</strong></td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>18,375</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>121,388</td>
<td>121,388</td>
<td>121,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inform &amp; Comm Board</strong></td>
<td>21,408</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(27,677)</td>
<td>(28,800)</td>
<td>(21,400)</td>
<td>(21,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>(1,329)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,863,850</td>
<td>1,861,742</td>
<td>1,883,655</td>
<td>1,906,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>460,729</td>
<td>492,592</td>
<td>535,034</td>
<td>531,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>226,052</td>
<td>56,386</td>
<td>13,830</td>
<td>(60,054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (to) from capital</td>
<td>(409,837)</td>
<td>(306,893)</td>
<td>(43,697)</td>
<td>(42,182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>1,957,611</td>
<td>1,773,826</td>
<td>1,523,319</td>
<td>1,493,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>1,773,826</td>
<td>1,523,319</td>
<td>1,493,452</td>
<td>1,391,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016 fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

**Investment Income**

- **UPR income**: 1,048,990
- **Interest**: 5,000
- **Net investment property income**: 21,243

**Administration fees**

- **UPR / investment administration**: 2,000
- **Pension Fund administration**: 28,185
- **Restricted Funds**: 18,395

**Quota**: 719,929

**Incomes from other sources**: -

**Total Income**: 1,861,742

#### ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>826,210</td>
<td>851,880</td>
<td>870,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Board</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Council</td>
<td>365,030</td>
<td>409,215</td>
<td>476,865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>375,565</td>
<td>378,890</td>
<td>385,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>18,375</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Communication Board</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total allocations**: 1,812,110

#### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus/(deficit) for year**: 49,632

**Transfer to capital (investment in UTP)**: -

**Balance brought forward**: 875,866

**Balance carried forward**: 925,498

#### Note

In addition to allocations from the General Fund some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources.
### Standing Committee

#### Costs of General Synod Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Variance 2016 fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2018</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>831,410</td>
<td>848,657</td>
<td>17,247</td>
<td>826,210</td>
<td>851,880</td>
<td>870,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Costs of General Synod Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>352,300</td>
<td>358,804</td>
<td>(6,504)</td>
<td>355,800</td>
<td>368,300</td>
<td>375,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>34,222</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>34,900</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I.C</td>
<td>112,800</td>
<td>112,325</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>113,900</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>120,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension contributions</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions ex-staff-old scheme</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,378</td>
<td>4,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training &amp; subsistence</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Costs</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>3,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>511,460</td>
<td>513,360</td>
<td>(1,900)</td>
<td>515,960</td>
<td>533,901</td>
<td>544,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>29,535</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td>31,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building repairs &amp; maint.</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,030</td>
<td>(5,030)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,592</td>
<td>21,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, heat &amp; cleaning</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>7,746</td>
<td>7,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>64,468</td>
<td>(4,768)</td>
<td>59,920</td>
<td>61,710</td>
<td>63,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>4,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,843</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>6,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; stationery</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>11,399</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,360</td>
<td>12,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>15,954</td>
<td>(1,554)</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>14,832</td>
<td>15,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing - Maintenance</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>(2,805)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>6,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Bureau processing costs</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>(1,980)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>(5,636)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment &amp; furniture</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>66,069</td>
<td>(9,069)</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>57,281</td>
<td>58,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>628,160</td>
<td>643,897</td>
<td>(15,737)</td>
<td>631,580</td>
<td>652,892</td>
<td>666,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Provincial Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Primus/Primus' expenses</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>(975)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Diocese</td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>11,794</td>
<td>12,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>9,751</td>
<td>(3,251)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of Bishop</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod Annual meeting</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>24,933</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,780</td>
<td>33,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndoc papers</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>3,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Protect'n of Children &amp; Vulnerable Adults</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Canons</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Clergy Induction Day</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Legal Expenses Insurance</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Liability Insurance</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fee Audit</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>13,632</td>
<td>(882)</td>
<td>13,150</td>
<td>13,545</td>
<td>13,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal / advisory</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>56,187</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>46,350</td>
<td>47,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Sponsors Licence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>(356)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>(730)</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Provincial Costs</strong></td>
<td>148,680</td>
<td>145,255</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>136,450</td>
<td>139,810</td>
<td>143,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standing Committee

### Revised Budget Actual Variance Budget Budget Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C Committee Meeting Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7,161</td>
<td>(5,161)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Review Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cttee for Protec'n of Children &amp; Vulnerable Adults</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Committee Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>(4,952)</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D Subscriptions to church bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of European Churches</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches Together in Britain and Ireland</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action of Churches Together in Scotland</td>
<td>30,370</td>
<td>30,370</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,280</td>
<td>32,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>51,170</td>
<td>51,153</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54,780</td>
<td>55,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primus discretionary</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>831,410</td>
<td>848,657</td>
<td>(17,247)</td>
<td>826,210</td>
<td>851,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Administration Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2018</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Grants Group (Finance Cttee)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Housing Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Allowance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>10,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation to other funds</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>64,133</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Grants Fund</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>64,133</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>132,330</td>
<td>65,276</td>
<td>67,054</td>
<td>198,130</td>
<td>203,130</td>
<td>208,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board
### Building Grants Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Variance 2016 fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2018</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation from General Fund</strong></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>(64,133)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>(64,133)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants - Issued</strong></td>
<td>34,125</td>
<td>21,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>(64,133)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit) for year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance brought forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board
### Building Loans Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>3,689</th>
<th>Interest on loans</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>3,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans)</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>3,689</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>3,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(109,678)</td>
<td>139,192</td>
<td>103,053</td>
<td>(255,559)</td>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126,678</td>
<td>126,678</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>272,559</td>
<td>106,742</td>
<td>272,559</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board
### Retirement Housing Committee
#### Supplementary Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,594</td>
<td>36,957</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>36,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,644</td>
<td>39,708</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>(1,700)</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,965</td>
<td>37,910</td>
<td>7,055</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,321)</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,227</td>
<td>29,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,906</td>
<td>31,025</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administration Board

#### Retirement Housing Committee

#### Housing Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Budget 2018</th>
<th>Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,193</td>
<td>23,422</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>23,422</td>
<td>23,422</td>
<td>23,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>76,418</td>
<td>(1,582)</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104,193</td>
<td>102,704</td>
<td>(1,489)</td>
<td>105,422</td>
<td>105,422</td>
<td>105,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 105,422</td>
<td>£ 105,422</td>
<td>£ 105,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>6,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>29,431</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,050</td>
<td>37,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,011</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>8,487</td>
<td>8,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,350</td>
<td>55,866</td>
<td>7,484</td>
<td>63,775</td>
<td>65,261</td>
<td>66,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,843</td>
<td>46,838</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>41,647</td>
<td>40,161</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51,603)</td>
<td>(48,431)</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>(50,814)</td>
<td>(40,161)</td>
<td>(38,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>10,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>9,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>69,225</td>
<td>29,225</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>167,094</td>
<td>(2,906)</td>
<td>476,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>(13,390)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,293</td>
<td>67,293</td>
<td>67,293</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>305,222</td>
<td>12,929</td>
<td>614,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSALS OF CAPITAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,208</td>
<td>(208)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,397</td>
<td>91,358</td>
<td>(59,961)</td>
<td>315,186</td>
<td>149,839</td>
<td>156,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133,397</td>
<td>187,566</td>
<td>(54,169)</td>
<td>440,186</td>
<td>149,839</td>
<td>156,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,603</td>
<td>117,656</td>
<td>26,053</td>
<td>173,814</td>
<td>40,161</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,213,555</td>
<td>4,213,555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,331,211</td>
<td>4,505,025</td>
<td>4,545,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,305,158</td>
<td>4,331,211</td>
<td>26,053</td>
<td>4,505,025</td>
<td>4,545,186</td>
<td>4,583,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING OF CAPITAL MOVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,603</td>
<td>117,656</td>
<td>26,053</td>
<td>173,814</td>
<td>40,161</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>69,225</td>
<td>29,225</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,603</td>
<td>48,431</td>
<td>(3,172)</td>
<td>50,814</td>
<td>40,161</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Balance carried forward
- Debtor pending completion of sale of property
- Surplus/(deficit) for year
- Total Net Income
- Net additions (disposals) of capital
- Balance carried forward
- Funding shortfall
# Institute Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2017</th>
<th>Budget 2018</th>
<th>Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated from General Fund</td>
<td>438,735</td>
<td>£407,662</td>
<td>£31,073</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated from Training Fund</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>£20,761</td>
<td>£8,351</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>£2,880</td>
<td>£2,880</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>£5,675</td>
<td>£5,675</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>£458,425</td>
<td>£435,731</td>
<td>£22,694</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2017</th>
<th>Budget 2018</th>
<th>Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Board</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
<td>£1,999</td>
<td>£1,251</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scottish Episcopal Institute</td>
<td>£129,700</td>
<td>£129,777</td>
<td>£77</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>£129,700</td>
<td>£129,777</td>
<td>£77</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, pensions etc</td>
<td>£10,800</td>
<td>£10,800</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training / development</td>
<td>£10,800</td>
<td>£10,800</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff costs</td>
<td>£132,700</td>
<td>£134,971</td>
<td>£2,271</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential weekends</td>
<td>£29,000</td>
<td>£17,782</td>
<td>£11,218</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Education (placement) costs</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Tutors</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Awards (YSJ)</td>
<td>£16,050</td>
<td>£7,330</td>
<td>£8,720</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total training costs</td>
<td>£58,350</td>
<td>£42,375</td>
<td>£15,975</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of CBOT salary, pensions etc</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of CBOT travel and other expenses</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement allowance (Intern grants)</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential weekends</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Context based ordination training costs</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£1,973</td>
<td>£1,027</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin / publicity</td>
<td>£700</td>
<td>£3,016</td>
<td>£2,316</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other costs</td>
<td>£3,700</td>
<td>£4,989</td>
<td>£1,289</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scottish Episcopal Institute costs</td>
<td>£194,750</td>
<td>£182,335</td>
<td>£12,415</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2017</th>
<th>Budget 2018</th>
<th>Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fav/adv</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fav/adv</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institute Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Full Time ordinands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance grants</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>51,030</td>
<td>47,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total full time ordinands</strong></td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>51,030</td>
<td>47,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D Curate funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curate grants</td>
<td>125,275</td>
<td>119,550</td>
<td>178,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total curate funding</strong></td>
<td>125,275</td>
<td>119,550</td>
<td>178,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E Recruitment and Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO stipend / salary</td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td>27,950</td>
<td>28,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO expenses (travel etc)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial panels etc</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials etc</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recruitment and Selection</strong></td>
<td>35,050</td>
<td>35,450</td>
<td>35,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Dispersed TISEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Dioceses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dispersed TISEC</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>415,585</td>
<td>485,470</td>
<td>549,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mission Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2018</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

379,600 354,185 (25,415) Allocation from General Fund 375,565 378,890 385,030

10,400 10,443 43 Investment income 10,400 10,400 10,400

1,000 951 (49) Legacies and donations 1,000 1,000 1,000

391,000 365,579 (25,421) Total Net Income 386,965 390,290 396,430

### EXPENDITURE

3,001 2,749 252 Board expenses 3,003 3,095 3,190

303,809 303,809 - Mission and Ministry Support Grants 304,657 307,775 313,705

20,000 13,553 6,447 Provincial Youth Week 20,000 20,000 20,000

### Networks

1,000 20 980 Children 1,000 1,000 1,000

2,400 661 1,739 Lay Learning 2,400 2,400 2,400

1,120 217 903 Mission Planning 1,120 1,120 1,120

1,150 - 1,150 Rural 1,150 1,150 1,150

500 30 470 Spirituality 500 500 500

1,000 - 1,000 Stewardship 1,000 1,000 1,000

2,000 405 1,595 Youth 2,000 2,000 2,000

5,000 - 5,000 Networks Initiative Fund - - -

340,980 321,444 19,536 Sub-total 336,830 340,040 346,065

### Allocation to Committees

- - - Global Partnerships Committee - - -

50,020 44,135 5,885 Church in Society Committee 50,135 50,250 50,365

50,020 44,135 5,885 Total allocated to committees 50,135 50,250 50,365

391,000 365,579 25,421 Total Expenditure 386,965 390,290 396,430

### BALANCES

Revenue

- - - Surplus/(deficit) for year - - -

- - - Balance brought forward - - -

- - - Balance carried forward - - -
## Mission Board
### Global Partnerships Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>97,461</td>
<td>98,426</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>98,426</td>
<td>98,426</td>
<td>98,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Phillips Trust</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>6,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>103,958</td>
<td>105,007</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>104,988</td>
<td>104,988</td>
<td>104,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,338</td>
<td>(2,338)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,353</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (inc Middle East)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td>8,946</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>4,232</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small grants</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companion Relationships</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola Comm Network Support</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>11,311</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGiC (formerly Justice, Peace and Creation Network)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel / meetings</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>85,930</td>
<td>33,570</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>119,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>34,619</th>
<th>(14,512)</th>
<th>(14,512)</th>
<th>(14,512)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>78,943</td>
<td>78,943</td>
<td>98,020</td>
<td>83,508</td>
<td>68,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>63,401</td>
<td>98,020</td>
<td>34,619</td>
<td>83,508</td>
<td>68,996</td>
<td>54,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission Board

**Church in Society Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,020</strong></td>
<td>44,135</td>
<td>(5,885)</td>
<td>50,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,020</strong></td>
<td>45,086</td>
<td>(4,934)</td>
<td>50,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>33,190</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / Aids chaplaincy</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>7,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches Mutual Credit Union</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPOF</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs / participating in consultations / conferences</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,020</strong></td>
<td>45,086</td>
<td>(4,934)</td>
<td>50,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faith and Order Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2016</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2016</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation from General Fund</strong></td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>18,375</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2018</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board expenses</strong></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work of Liturgy Committee</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,899</td>
<td>(3,399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work of Committee on Canons</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work of Doctrine Committee</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Church Relations Committee</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>1,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe Group</strong></td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2019</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>18,375</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2018</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit) for year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance brought forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2019</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2017</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2018</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>(909)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2019</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit) for year</strong></td>
<td>598</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance brought forward</strong></td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2019</th>
<th>Actual Budget 2019</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Income</th>
<th>Actual Income</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>21,408</td>
<td>(17,792)</td>
<td>28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Expenditure</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>8,918</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anglican.org domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training, Promotion and Publicity</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>15,172</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inspires publication / distribution costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>21,408</td>
<td>(17,792)</td>
<td>39,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>Actual Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Balance carried forward</th>
<th>Actual Balance carried forward</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Balance carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Income</th>
<th>Actual Income</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6,269)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>Actual Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,329)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Balance carried forward</th>
<th>Actual Balance carried forward</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Balance carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>8,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.
FAITH AND ORDER BOARD

Process paper for General Synod 2017 on Canon 31, Of the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony

Introduction

The General Synod of 2015, after debate on various options presented by the Faith and Order Board, instructed the Board, through the Committee on Canons, to produce for first reading at General Synod 2016 a revised text of Canon 31, Of the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony which would delete the first section, with its doctrinal definition of marriage, and add a conscience clause. A revised text for Canon 31 was presented to General Synod 2016 and received a first reading.

In 2017, the Board will present the Canon for second reading and this short paper outlines how the Board intends to handle matters this year.

Process for General Synod 2017

Matters relating to the Marriage Canon will be dealt with in Session Two on the Thursday afternoon of Synod. In the past, the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, as Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board, has presented matters. This year, because the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway has unfortunately been absent for an extended period of time owing to illness, matters will be presented on behalf of the Board by the Bishop of Edinburgh.

- In this session the Bishop of Edinburgh, on behalf of the Board, will outline the canonical text to be presented for Second Reading in that Session, including not only the deletion of the old clause 1 but also its replacement by a conscience clause (new clause 1) which acknowledges that there are differing understandings of the nature of marriage in this Church and which provides that clergy be authorised to conduct same-sex marriages by means of the “nominating” procedure under the legislation. He will offer the Board’s rationale for commending this manner of proceeding to Synod and the background of the text on differing understandings of marriage and nomination procedures.

- He will remind Synod of the further recommendations made in 2016 resulting from the Board’s consideration of how best the unity of the Church can be maintained. These include the proposed changes to Canon 22, which will be proposed for second reading.

- He will also outline work done by the College of Bishops on producing pastoral guidance on how, if Synod approves a second reading, the practical implications of the nomination procedure should be addressed. A copy of the draft Principles and Guidance prepared by the College of Bishops, which the College would intend to issue if the alteration to Canon 31 is accepted, is appended to this paper.

- He will speak to motion [4] that the motion to alter Canon 31 be conducted by ballot (see further below).
There will be a full synodical debate, initially on Canon 22 and then on Canon 31, on Motions for a second reading. To secure a second reading there must be two thirds majorities of those present and voting in each house of Synod voting separately.

If the Synod approves a second reading of Canon 31, a motion will be put to alter the table of kindred and affinity comprised in Appendix 26 to the Code of Canons (as indicated to General Synod 2016). This will reflect the current law of Scotland but leaves with the Church the ability to decide for itself which degrees of kindred or affinity should be prohibited.

If the second reading of the Canon 31 is approved, a further motion will also be put to introduce a resolution under Canon 31 making clear that the person authorised to make nominations of clergy wishing to be authorised to solemnise marriages between persons of the same sex is the diocesan Bishop (with the consent of the clergy concerned).

**Note on Voting**

The Board is of the view that the motion to give a second reading to Canon 31 should be by way of ballot. Under the Rules of Order voting must be by ballot on any particular motion if one third of the present and voting members of any house so wish. However, the Board considers it would be tidier and less confusing if Synod is invited to express a mind on this at the outset, hence the inclusion of a motion in the Synod agenda to that effect. This motion will require a two thirds majority of the whole of Synod because such a motion in effect amounts to a temporary suspension of the Rules of Order relating to ballots.

**Nomination of Clergy to the Registrar General**

The Bishops’ Guidelines set out various practical aspects relating to the process for nominating clergy who wish to solemnise marriages between persons of the same sex.

The form used by the Registrar General for Scotland in relation to nominations is appended to the Bishops’ Guidelines, along with the Registrar General’s own guidance.

As will be noted, the form requires details of membership statistics. The Registrar General’s office has confirmed that the membership figures of the relevant diocese would be acceptable as the figure relating to “local members”.

The Registrar General’s guidance notes indicate that he will reject a nomination if he considers that “sufficient persons to meet the needs of that body are already registered as approved celebrants”. His office has confirmed that he would not impose a bar on the number of Scottish Episcopal Church celebrants wishing to be authorised to solemnise marriages between persons of the same sex. It has been confirmed that, as the Scottish Episcopal Church is a well-established religious body with a large membership throughout Scotland, the Registrar General would not exercise his right to reject a nomination submitted by the Church.
The Registrar General’s office has also indicated that nomination forms would normally be turned around within approximately 10 working days. Nomination forms from the Scottish Episcopal Church would not all have to be submitted in a single batch at the outset.

The Registrar General deals with nominations on a three-year cycle. We have been informed that the Scottish Episcopal Church will be included in “Year 2” which means that clergy who are nominated, for example in 2017, will initially be allocated to the current three-year cycle which runs from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018. A set timetable operates in relation to re-nomination and the Registrar General would send out re-nomination forms for completion in August 2018 with a deadline in October 2018 for their return. The letters of authorisation would then be sent out by him at the beginning of December 2018 notifying celebrants that they have been authorised for a further 3 years from January 2019.

**Equality Act**

When the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 was passed certain amendments were made to the Equality Act 2010. Independent legal advice has been sought on behalf of the College of Bishops on the application of certain aspects of the legislation, in particular on the position of vestries or others in congregations who might have difficulties of conscience about participating in some way in a wedding of a couple of the same sex. The College has been advised that a vestry would be considered to be a “group of persons with control” over church premises and could, therefore, lawfully decide that marriages between couples of the same sex should not be solemnised in their church. The College has also been advised that a member of clergy, or a congregational employee or volunteer (such as an organist or flower-arranger) could lawfully refuse to participate in weddings between couples of the same sex. In such cases, as envisaged in the draft guidance of the College set out below, alternative arrangements should be made.

+David
Convener
Faith and Order Board
The following comprise draft guidelines and principles which, if the changes to Canon 31 receive a second reading at General Synod 2017, the College of Bishops would intend to adopt. They are provided in draft form to General Synod by way of background information only.

College of Bishops Principles and Guidelines relating to Marriage

The recent changes to Canon 31 at General Synod in 2017 have been received with support and enthusiasm in many quarters. At the same time, we recognise that not all are content and for some the matter is one of deep distress. The purpose of these principles and guidelines is, firstly, to affirm our respect for the conscience of all in these matters. Secondly, we offer guidelines which seek to address the practical and pastoral issues raised by the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014.

Principles

The Church’s new canonical position does not alter the fact that within the Church there remains a range of views on marriage. We wish to honour this. A clergyperson has always had the right to exercise pastoral discretion as to whether to officiate at the wedding of any couple. Our canons take this further by allowing the validity of a clergyperson’s conscience in these matters. For example, discretion for a clergyperson on the grounds of conscience has long been allowed when a couple wish to marry when one or both has been divorced.

Our revised Canon 31 now extends this protection of conscience to the marriage of same-sex couples. It permits those clergy who, on the grounds of conscience, wish to conduct the marriages of same-sex couples, to seek nomination to do so; it also allows that there will be those who, on the grounds of conscience, will not seek such nomination. We believe that the consciences of both are protected in the revised Canon.

We would also wish to recognise that the range of views on marriage in our church means that individuals, by reason of conscience, will make particular principled choices. There are those who, being divorced or separated, choose to remain celibate because they believe their marriage vows are indissoluble. There are those who opt for a celibate lifestyle in response to their sexual orientation. There are those who choose a civil partnership because they believe that marriage is not for same-sex couples. We acknowledge the integrity of these choices, and recognise that they may represent considerable self-sacrifice on the part of the individuals concerned.

In the light of this, we affirm the following four guiding principles and commend them to our church.
1. Acknowledging the internal diversity of the Scottish Episcopal Church, we seek to maintain the highest possible degree of generosity and communion within the Church’s life.

2. Those who minister within the Scottish Episcopal Church must be prepared to acknowledge that the church has reached a clear canonical position but one which recognises diversity of view and practice.

3. We remain committed to the flourishing within the Church’s structures of all those whose understanding of marriage lies within the spectrum of teaching and tradition of the Anglican Communion. This includes those in authorised ministry in the Province and those who may seek such authorisation and those who may seek ordination.

4. We acknowledge that the Church’s new canonical position is set within a broader theological and pastoral conversation within the Anglican Communion and the whole Church of God.

These Principles inform each other and they should be read and understood together.

Guidelines
In offering these guidelines, we know that couples approach marriage with excitement and joy. Many look to the Church to help them celebrate their loving commitment to each other and it is our hope that we will use this privilege well. We expect that all couples will be received with respect by clergy and congregations even if, for reasons of conscience, they cannot offer to solemnize the marriage.

Bearing this and the above principles in mind, we offer the following guidance.

Nominating Procedures
All marriages in Scotland take place with the permission of the civil authorities. Under Canon 31.1 clergy who wish to solemnise a marriage between a couple of the same sex must first be authorized to solemnize such marriages by way of nomination to the Registrar General, as provided by the relevant Act of the Scottish Parliament. The Diocesan Bishop is responsible for nominating clergy to the authorities. The official procedure for nominating is contained in the Registrar General’s Form M13(R) and Guidance Notes which are set out in the Appendix.

In the process of considering the nomination of any clergyperson with charge for authorization to solemnize the marriage of same-sex couples according to the law of Scotland, the Diocesan Bishop will expect to have a conversation with the said clergyperson in which account will be taken of the clergyperson’s pastoral context. The Bishop will expect to see a minute indicating the range of views on the vestry and what provision may be made to respect the consciences of involved lay volunteers. The bishop may also wish to explore the consequences for ecumenical relationships in the charge.

In the process of considering the nomination of any clergyperson without charge for authorization to solemnize marriage of same-sex couples according to the law of Scotland, the Diocesan Bishop will expect to have a conversation with the said clergyperson and the Rector of the church to which they belong in which account will be taken of the clergyperson’s pastoral context.
In the event of disagreement between the vestry and the clergyperson or between the Rector and other clergy in the charge, all parties should seek the pastoral guidance of the bishop.

The Registrar General will customarily issue authorisation for a period of three years and at that point all nominations must be renewed. At the time of renewal, the Bishop will expect written confirmation from the clergyperson that since the original nomination was made there have been no material changes in circumstances.

**Respect for the conscience of all**
Some marriages may give rise to issues of conscience for lay people too. This comes especially to the fore when that lay person has duties or responsibilities related to weddings in their church building. The issue may be felt keenly by a church organist, for example, or Verger, flower arranger, chorister etc. We have indicated above that we would expect clergy to respect the consciences of their employees and volunteers and to have procedures in place to provide alternative cover should this be necessary. We would also expect lay members of our church, whatever their views, to respect the principles set out above.

When the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 was passed certain amendments were made to the Equality Act 2010. Independent legal advice has been sought on behalf of the College of Bishops on the application of certain aspects of the legislation, in particular on the position of vestries or others in congregations who might have difficulties of conscience about participating in some way in a wedding of a couple of the same sex. The College has been advised that a vestry would be considered to be a “group of persons with control” over church premises and could, therefore, lawfully decide that marriages between couples of the same sex should not be solemnised in their church. The College has also been advised that a member of clergy, or a congregational employee or volunteer (such as an organist or flower-arranger) could lawfully refuse to participate in weddings between couples of the same sex. In such cases, as mentioned above, alternative arrangements should be made.

**Marriages in SEC Church Buildings and Canonical Districts other than those of the clergyperson with charge**
A clergyperson who wishes to conduct a marriage in a church or canonical district other than his or her own, or other than where he or she normally officiates, must seek permission from the relevant diocesan bishop.

**Marriages not in SEC Church Buildings**
Written permission for marriages to take place in buildings other than a church building of the SEC must be sought from the bishop in whose diocese the alternative venue is situated. In such a case the bishop would wish to be assured that such permission, if granted, would be acceptable to the Rector/Priest-in-Charge in whose Canonical District the proposed marriage would take place. This includes canonical districts where there is no church building.
If the building where the marriage is to be celebrated belongs to another Christian denomination, the bishop will also wish to take into account whether the clergy of that denomination would be allowed to conduct the marriage in question.

Where a request for marriage cannot be met for reasons of conscience
If a clergyperson is approached to conduct a marriage which for reasons of conscience he or she cannot perform the application must be referred to the Bishop.

Re-marriage after divorce
Provision is made in Canon 31 for the proposed solemnisation of a marriage after divorce, where one or both of the previous spouses is still living. In such cases the Bishop’s decision is final.

Guidance for Clergy and Lay Readers in the light of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014
The above-named document, issued previously by the College of Bishops, is regarded as superseded by these Principles and Guidelines and no longer has force.

Review
The College of Bishops may review this guidance in the future in the light of experience across the Province.
[Date…..]
APPENDIX

Registrar General Guidance Notes

APPROVAL OF CELEBRANTS OF RELIGIOUS OR BELIEF MARRIAGES IN SCOTLAND

GUIDANCE NOTES

A Requirements for approval

1 A nominating body may nominate to the Registrar General any of its members who it desires should be registered as empowered to solemnise religious or belief marriages in Scotland.

2 The nominating body must complete a separate form of nomination for each nominee.

3 The Registrar General will reject a nomination if he considers that:
   3.1 the nominating body is not a religious or belief body; or
   3.2 the marriage ceremony used by that body does not include the declarations set out at 2.1 and 2.2 of the nomination form; or
   3.3 the nominee is not a fit and proper person to solemnise a marriage; or
   3.4 sufficient persons to meet the needs of that body are already registered as approved celebrants.

4 A nominee may not solemnise a marriage until the Registrar General has accepted that person’s nomination and has registered the person as an approved celebrant.

5 The Registrar General will issue written authorisation to each approved celebrant stating the period of authorisation and any other conditions.

6 When authorisation expires, a nominating body may make a fresh nomination in respect of the approved celebrant.

7 The Registrar General may remove the name of a person from the list of approved celebrants if:
   7.1 the nominating body, or the approved celebrant, asks for his removal; or
   7.2 the marriage ceremony used no longer includes the declarations set out at 2.1 and 2.2 of the nomination form; or
   7.3 the person has, while registered as an approved celebrant, been convicted of an offence under the Marriage (Scotland) Act 1977; or
   7.4 the person has, for profit or gain, been carrying on a business of solemnising marriages; or
   7.5 the person is not a fit and proper person to solemnise marriages; or
   7.6 the Registrar General considers for any other reason that the person should not be registered as an approved celebrant,
   provided that the Registrar General gives the approved celebrant at least 21 days’ notice in writing of his intention to remove his name from the list on any of the grounds 7.3 to 7.6 inclusive.

8 A nominating body should notify the Registrar General of any of the following events, if practicable within 21 days of its occurrence:
8.1 any change in the name of address of the nominating body or any amalgamation with any other religious or belief body, giving the name and address of any approved celebrant who is a member of the nominating body; or
8.2 any change in the name, address or designation of an approved celebrant; or
8.3 the cessation of an approved celebrant from acting as such, including the death of an approved Celebrant

B Requirements at marriage ceremonies
9 Before an approved celebrant solemnises a marriage:

9.1 the celebrant must be in possession of the relevant Marriage Schedule, and
9.2 the parties to the marriage must both be present at the ceremony, and
9.3 two other persons of at least 16 years of age must be present at the ceremony as witnesses.

10 The celebrant must not alter the date or the place of marriage on a Marriage Schedule without first receiving the permission of the issuing registrar.

11 The celebrant must use a form of marriage ceremony including the declarations set out at 2.1 and 2.2 of the nomination form.

12 Immediately after the ceremony the celebrant, both parties and the witnesses must sign the Marriage Schedule. The parties should then arrange for the Marriage Schedule to be returned within 3 days to the issuing registrar for the marriage to be registered.

13 A celebrant who fails to carry out the above requirements may be committing an offence under the Marriage (Scotland) Act 1977 and may therefore be liable to prosecution.
Faith and Order Board
Process re Marriage Canon

NOMINATION FOR APPROVAL AS A CELEBRANT OF RELIGIOUS OR BELIEF SAME-SEX MARRIAGES IN SCOTLAND

This form is for nominating a person as an approved celebrant of religious or belief marriages in accordance with section 9 of the Marriage (Scotland) Act 1977. Before completing it please read the enclosed Guidance Notes M12(R).

Please complete the form in BLOCK CAPITALS, except for the signatures of both the nominating person and the nominee, and return it to the Marriage Section, NRS, New Register House, Edinburgh EH1 3YT

NAME OF RELIGIOUS OR BELIEF BODY:
Number of members locally ________________ Number of members in Scotland as a whole ________________

NOMINATING PERSON

Full name ___________________________________________

Designation __________________________________________________________________

Address ______________________________________________________________________

Telephone No: _______________________________ Mobile: __________________________

email: __________________________________________

I certify that
1 the body named above is an organised group of people which meets regularly for religious worship; or the principal object (or one of the principal objects) of which is to uphold or promote philosophical beliefs and which meets regularly for that purpose, and therefore can be regarded as a religious or belief body for the purpose of the Marriage (Scotland) Act 1977;
2 the marriage ceremony to be used by the nominee has been approved by the religious or belief body and includes:
   2.1 a declaration by the parties, in the presence of each other, the celebrant and two witnesses, that they accept each other in marriage; and
   2.2 a declaration by the celebrant, after the foregoing declaration, that the parties are then married.
3 I have been authorised by the religious or belief body to nominate persons to solemnise marriages on their behalf;
4 the person I have nominated below is regarded by the religious or belief body as a fit and proper person to solemnise marriages.

Signature of nominating person ______________ Date __________________

NOMINEE

Full name ____________________________________________________________ (Dr/Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms)

Designation (eg: minister, priest, pastor, chaplain, imam, marriage officer) __________________________

Address ______________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________ Postcode __________

Telephone No: _______________________________ Mobile: __________________________

email: __________________________________________

I have read and understand the requirements set out in Guidance Notes M12(R) and I shall ensure that these requirements are fulfilled when I solemnise any marriage on behalf of the religious or belief body.

Signature of nominee ______________________________ Date __________________
ALTERATIONS TO THE CODE OF CANONS

VOTING PROCEDURES – AN EXPLANATORY NOTE

The alteration of a Canon contained in the Code of Canons requires two “readings” in successive years at the General Synod. The voting procedure on each reading is different. An alteration, for these purposes, includes any modification or abrogation of any Canon, any addition to a Canon and the enacting of any new Canon. The process is set out in Canon 52, Section 17.

Canons for First Reading

A first reading requires a simple majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. Voting is, therefore, in houses.

Canons for Second Reading

A second reading requires a two-thirds majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. (Again, therefore, voting is in houses.) Before confirming any alterations at a second reading, the Synod must consider any opinions received from Diocesan Synods.

On a second reading, amendments may be incorporated provided they are not, in the judgement of the chair, irrelevant to, beyond the scope of or inconsistent with the general subject-matter and purport of the Canon as put to Diocesan Synods after the first reading. Such amendments must themselves receive a two-thirds majority.

Also, no amendment may be moved on a second reading which, in the judgement of the chair, does not substantially reflect an opinion communicated by a Diocesan Synod or is not merely a verbal or drafting amendment unless due notice has been given or the Chair grants leave to dispense with notice. Due notice, for this purpose, means that notice must have been received by the time limit stipulated for the receipt of resolutions when the notice convening the Synod is despatched (Canon 52, Resolution 10).

John F Stuart
Secretary General
Committee on Canons
Canon for Second Reading

CANON TWENTY-TWO

OF DIVINE WORSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS AND OTHER RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH

The current text of Canon 22 and its schedule is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

1. Except in so far as sections 3 and 4 hereof otherwise provide the conduct of divine worship and the administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church shall at all times be in accordance with the authorised services.

2. The authorised services are those listed in the schedule to this Canon which the General Synod may by resolution passed on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board amend by way of addition, deletion or other alteration. The authorised services are those listed in the schedule to this Canon. Any proposed addition, deletion or other alteration shall be initiated only on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board and shall proceed by way of the process set out in Canon 52, section 17 and by no other process.

3. The College of Bishops may authorise the use for a defined experimental period of other services which may be added to the schedule by resolution of the General Synod at the end of that defined period.

4. A bishop may in the exercise of the powers traditionally vested in the episcopal office permit the use of services other than those specifically authorised under this Canon if that Bishop deems such use to be pastorally appropriate. The Episcopal Synod may, however, restrain such exercise of these powers or impose conditions thereon and may do so either generally or with reference to particular localities, cases or circumstances.

5. It shall be within the competence of the College of Bishops to determine from time to time what hymns, litanies, translations into Gaelic and other languages, versions of the Psalter and the Bible, and lectionaries shall be authorised.

6. In every congregation the Holy Communion shall be celebrated, when in the opinion of the Bishop it is reasonably practicable, at least on every Lord’s Day, on the Great Festivals, and on Ash Wednesday, and appropriate provision shall be made for public worship on Good Friday.

7. Subject to the rights and duties of the Bishop, responsibility for divine worship in every congregation shall rest with the Rector, and shall extend to overall control of all aspects of divine worship, including organ, music and choir. Before making any material change to the conduct of worship or form thereof, it shall be the duty of the Rector to consult with the Vestry and congregation in order to ensure that any proposed change is adequately prepared and explained, and is not unacceptable to the congregation generally. Should any serious difference arise within a congregation regarding the matters to which this Section relates, the Rector shall endeavour to
resolve the same and, if requested to do so by the Vestry, shall refer the matter to the Bishop to be determined as the Bishop may think best.

8. The celebration of Festivals and the observance of Holy Days shall be according to the Scottish Calendar (1991), and the commemoration of the Saints and Heroes of the Faith shall be as prescribed therein. The Scottish Calendar (1991) may be amended from time to time by Resolution of the General Synod on a motion approved by the Faith and Order Board. A Diocesan Bishop may authorise additional commemorations within the Diocese, subject always to any restraint imposed by the Episcopal Synod.

**SCHEDULE TO CANON TWENTY-TWO**

The General Synod authorises the undernoted services in terms of Canon 22, Section 2:

2. Services for Lent and Holy Week (Scottish Episcopal Church) (1967).
5. The Liturgy (Scottish Episcopal Church) (1970).
12. Communion from the Reserved Sacrament (administered by a Deacon or Lay person) (Scottish Episcopal Church) (1997).
CANON THIRTY-ONE

OF THE SOLEMNISATION OF HOLY MATRIMONY

The current text of Canon 31 and Appendix 26 is set out below for information. The text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

1. The Doctrine of this Church is that Marriage is a physical, spiritual and mystical union of one man and one woman created by their mutual consent of heart, mind and will thereto, and is a holy and lifelong estate instituted of God.

2. No cleric of this Church shall solemnise Matrimony except in accordance with the civil law of Scotland for the time being in force in relation to civil marriages and unless satisfied that compliance has been made with such preliminaries as are therein required for the Solemnising of Religious Marriages.

1. In the light of the fact that there are differing understandings of the nature of marriage in this Church, no cleric of this Church shall be obliged to conduct any marriage against their conscience. Any marriage which is to be conducted by a cleric shall be solemnised strictly in accordance with the civil law of Scotland for the time being in force and provided said cleric is satisfied, after appropriate enquiries, that the parties have complied with the necessary preliminaries as set forth in the civil law. No cleric shall perform the Marriage Service, nor permit it to be performed in Church, for parties who are within the forbidden degrees as specified in Appendix No.26. No cleric shall solemnise a marriage between persons of the same sex unless said cleric shall have been nominated on behalf of the Church to the Registrar General for Scotland.

32. No cleric shall perform the Marriage Service, nor permit it to be performed in Church, for parties who are within the forbidden degrees, as specified in Appendix No.26. No cleric shall perform the Marriage Service, nor permit it to be performed in Church for parties, for one or both of whom a decree of Nullity of Marriage Ab Initio has been pronounced by a Civil Court, nor for parties, either of whom has had a previous marriage dissolved quoad civilia in a Civil Court, so long as the other spouse in the marriage so dissolved remains alive, unless that cleric shall have been given a Certificate of Authorisation on the grounds that there is no ecclesiastical impediment to the marriage in terms of Section 43.

43. In cases where a decree of Nullity of Marriage Ab Initio has been pronounced by a Civil Court, or in any case where either or both parties to a proposed marriage has, or have had, a previous marriage dissolved quoad civilia in a Civil Court, but the other spouse to that marriage remains alive, any cleric to whom an approach is made by or on behalf of either party with a view to the solemnising of such proposed marriage shall refer the matter to the Diocesan Bishop. Upon receiving such reference, the Diocesan Bishop shall make such enquiries into the circumstances of the case, and take such pastoral and legal advice, as shall seem appropriate, and thereafter may issue, or decline to issue, to an officiating cleric, a Certificate of Authorisation in terms of Appendix No.27 authorising and approving that cleric's
officiating at the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony of the parties concerned according to the Rites and Ceremonies and Canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church. No Bishop shall entertain an application which has already been before another Diocesan Bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church without the agreement of the Bishop of that other Diocese and the Episcopal Synod.

54. A cleric may use the form of Benediction provided in the Scottish Book of Common Prayer (1929) to meet the case of those who ask for the benediction of the Church after an irregular marriage has been contracted or after a civil marriage has been legally entered into, provided only that the cleric be satisfied that the marriage is not contrary to Sections 3 and 4 of this Canon.

65. The solemnisation of Marriage shall take place in Church except with the written sanction of the Bishop.

*If the above alteration receives a second reading in 2017, the amended text of Appendix 26 will be proposed for adoption as set out below:*

**APPENDIX No. 26**

**A TABLE OF KINDRED AND AFFINITY, WHEREIN WHOSOEVER ARE RELATED ARE FORBIDDEN BY OUR ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS TO MARRY TOGETHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A man may not marry his:</th>
<th>A woman may not marry with her:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's mother</td>
<td>Father's father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's mother</td>
<td>Mother's father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son's daughter</td>
<td>Son's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter's daughter</td>
<td>Daughter's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister or half-sister</td>
<td>Brother or half-brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's mother</td>
<td>Husband's father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's daughter</td>
<td>Husband's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's wife</td>
<td>Mother's husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son's wife</td>
<td>Daughter's husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's father's wife</td>
<td>Father's mother's husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's father's wife</td>
<td>Mother's mother's husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's father's mother</td>
<td>Husband's father's father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's mother's mother</td>
<td>Husband's mother's father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's son's daughter</td>
<td>Husband's son's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's daughter's daughter</td>
<td>Husband's daughter's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son's son's wife</td>
<td>Son's daughter's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter's son's wife</td>
<td>Daughter's daughter's husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's sister or half-sister</td>
<td>Father's brother or half-brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's sister or half-sister</td>
<td>Mother's brother or half-brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother's or half-brother's daughter</td>
<td>Brother's or half-brother's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister's or half-sister's daughter</td>
<td>Sister's or half-sister's son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Relationships by consanguinity
   Parent
   Child
   Grandparent
   Grandchild
   Sibling
   Aunt or uncle
   Niece or nephew
   Great-grandparent
   Great-grandchild

2. Relationships by affinity
   Child of former spouse
   Child of former civil partner
   Former spouse of parent
   Former civil partner of parent
   Former spouse of grandparent
   Former civil partner of grandparent
   Grandchild of former spouse
   Grandchild of former civil partner

3. Relationships by adoption
   Adoptive parent or former adoptive parent
   Adopted child or former adopted child
CANONS FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Canon 22, Sections 2 and 3

Aberdeen and Orkney:
Approved unanimously. Voting was as follows:

- Interim Bishop in favour
- Clergy 27 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
- Laity 37 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Total 65 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Argyll and the Isles:
Approved unanimously.

Brechin:
Approved.

Edinburgh:
Approved, *nem con*. Voting was as follows:

- Bishop in favour
- Clergy 54 in favour, 0 against, 4 abstentions
- Laity 43 in favour, 0 against, 7 abstentions

Total 98 in favour, 0 against, 11 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:
Approved.

Moray, Ross and Caithness:
Approved. Voting was as follows:

- Bishop in favour
- Clergy 20 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
- Laity 30 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions

Total 51 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:
Approved. Voting was as follows:

- Bishop in favour
- Clergy 24 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
- Laity 35 in favour, 10 against, 0 abstentions

Total 60 in favour, 10 against, 0 abstentions
Canon 31

Aberdeen and Orkney:
The Canon was not approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Interim Bishop in favour
- Clergy 8 in favour, 18 against, 2 abstentions
- Laity 15 in favour, 23 against, 5 abstentions

Total 24 in favour, 41 against, 7 abstentions

Argyll and the Isles:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Bishop in favour
- Clergy 5 in favour, 2 against,
- Laity 12 in favour, 7 against

Total 17 in favour, 9 against

Brechin:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Bishop abstention
- Clergy 11 in favour, 4 against, 0 abstentions
- Laity 14 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstentions

Total 25 in favour, 10 against, 3 abstentions

Edinburgh:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Bishop in favour
- Clergy 45 in favour, 17 against, 3 abstentions
- Laity 39 in favour, 14 against, 1 abstention

Total 85 in favour, 31 against, 4 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Clergy 26 in favour, 14 against
- Laity 33 in favour, 19 against

Totals 59 in favour, 33 against
Moray, Ross and Caithness:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Bishop: in favour
- Clergy: 18 in favour, 4 against, 0 abstentions
- Laity: 25 in favour, 5 against, 1 abstention

Total: 44 in favour, 9 against, 1 abstention

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

- Bishop: in favour
- Clergy: 17 in favour, 6 against, 1 abstention
- Laity: 29 in favour, 16 against, 0 abstentions

Total: 47 in favour, 22 against, 1 abstention
Canon 63, Section 3

Aberdeen and Orkney:
Approved unanimously. Voting was as follows:-

Interim Bishop in favour
Clergy 27 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
Laity 43 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
Total 71 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Argyll and the Isles:
Approved unanimously.

Brechin:
Approved.

Edinburgh:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

Bishop in favour
Clergy 57 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions
Laity 50 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
Total 108 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:
Approved.

Moray, Ross and Caithness:
Approved, *nem con*. Voting was as follows:-

Bishop in favour
Clergy 21 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention
Laity 30 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention
Total 52 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:
Approved. Voting was as follows:-

Bishop against
Clergy 18 in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions
Laity 41 in favour, 4 against, 0 abstentions
Total 58 in favour, 11 against, 0 abstentions
PROPOSAL FOR THE SEC TO RESUME ITS MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN CHURCHES

The Conference of European Churches (CEC) is an ecumenical grouping of some 115 Orthodox, Protestant, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches from all countries of Europe. CEC describes its work in the following way:

In its commitment to Europe as a whole the Conference seeks to help the European churches to renew their spiritual life, to strengthen their common witness and service and to promote the unity of the Church and peace in the world. CEC works on a number of issues of common concern for European churches. These include bioethics, peace and reconciliation (including commemorations of World War I), labour and economic issues, climate change, education, economic and social issues, environment, climate justice, human rights and religious freedom, inter-religious dialogue, migration, minority and majority churches, and theological education.

Of particular urgency in our current context is a significant programme of work to address the challenges faced by migrants, refugees and minority groups through the Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe (CCME) which is rooted in a collaboration between CEC and the World Council of Churches. CEC member churches are working with migrants and refugees in countries where this need is most acute.

The SEC was previously a member of CEC but chose not to renew its membership in 2009 over concerns about the organisation’s effectiveness and governance. CEC has since undertaken a significant organisational review and we are satisfied that it now operates effectively and with a strong focus on its key work. At a time when the United Kingdom is preparing to leave the European Union, it is vital that churches across our continent are committed to working together to address matters of common concern. We therefore propose to Synod that the SEC resumes its membership of CEC. (CEC ask that those applying for membership do so at the level of member’s highest decision-making body.)

The proposal has already been endorsed by the Faith and Order Board. The precise cost of the annual subscription can only be determined once the application has been submitted but it is expected to be of a similar order to the amount payable when we were previously a member (approx £2500) and Standing Committee has agreed the matter in principle.

Rev Canon John McLuckie
Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee
REVIEW OF EPISCOPAL, METHODIST, UNITED REFORMED (EMU) PARTNERSHIP

Proposal for Synods of Spring 2017

The Partnership Statement signed in Perth in January 2010 between the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Synod of the Scotland District of the Methodist Church and the National Synod of Scotland of the United Reformed Churches included a commitment to a Review of the Partnership on a 5 yearly basis. This Review was undertaken by a Review Group convened under the auspices of ACTS in December 2015.

The Review Group’s Report invited the EMU Partners to consider four possible outcomes for its future:

1. to disband the Partnership
2. to continue making more effort to fulfil the 6 Partnership statements
3. to move forward possibly through ACTS or with other new partners
4. some other option not yet thought of.

The EMU Group discussed the Review Group’s Report at a meeting with representatives of the Review Group on 19th January 2016; their 4 recommendations were then forwarded to the appropriate ecumenical committees and / or other bodies within the Partners’ own structures. The views and recommendations from this consultative process were considered by the EMU Group on 7th November 2016.

After a lengthy and honest conversation, which recognised that the responses from each of the Partners, whilst indicating a preference for a different option (viz 1, 2, and 3, but not 4) also contained many similarities in underlying analysis, reflection and background, the Group came to a common mind for a further way forward together (possibly an option 4).

The Group therefore sends to each of the Synods and invites support for the following proposal for the immediate future of the EMU Partnership:

Giving thanks for the companionship, faithfulness, creativity and prayers of each of the Partners hitherto for their colleagues, and believing that the common work which has been possible and the friendships made still form a basis for continuing to strive for enhanced ways of working ecumenically in Scotland, the EMU Partners undertake during the next 2 years to work, with a sharpened focus

a) to produce realistic proposals for identifiable progress in specifically identified areas of work, particularly those impacting locally, such as recognition of ministries, learning and training, creative mission initiatives, and
b) to open a process of conversation with ACTS regarding the relationship of the formal EMU Partnership to and within ACTS and, in the light of outcomes under (a), the ways in which EMU can contribute to and enhance ACTS’ own agenda, life and work.
CANON SIXTY-THREE

OF THE OFFICE OF LAY REPRESENTATIVE

The text to be added in Section 3 is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

1. In every Incumbency or Joint Incumbency and in private Chapels qualified under Canon 40 Section 4, in such Dependent Congregations as are qualified under Canon 39 Section 2, and in every body of communicants permitted under section 2 below to elect a Lay Representative, the cleric in charge or, in the event that there is a vacancy or no cleric in charge, such person as the Bishop shall direct, shall once in every year convene a meeting of the lay communicants of each congregation for the election of a Lay Representative to represent that congregation in the Diocesan Synod together with an Alternate Lay Representative who, in the absence of the Lay Representative from any meeting, shall be entitled to exercise all the powers of the Lay Representative. These office-bearers shall enter office immediately on election.

2. Where, for a continuous period of at least three years in any diocese, there has existed a body or bodies of lay communicant members of that diocese (not less than thirty in number) whether or not comprising a congregation for the purpose of the preceding section, who regularly worship together but have no right to elect a Lay Representative under any other provisions of the Canons, the Bishop may, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by resolution, and the approval of the Diocesan Synod, sanction a scheme or schemes to enable the members of such a body or bodies to elect a Lay Representative and upon such a scheme being sanctioned the members of each such body may elect a Lay Representative. In the case of a religious community with a private chapel sanctioned under Canon 40, the requirement that the lay communicant members of the diocese belonging to that body number not less than thirty, shall not apply.

3. The Lay Representative and the Alternate Lay Representative shall, unless otherwise provided in the constitution of the congregation concerned, become members ex officio of the Vestry of that congregation.

4. The Lay Representative and Alternate Lay Representative should be members of the congregation electing them, but any lay communicant member, not under sixteen years of age, of a congregation or body as specified in Section 2 above within the diocese and resident within the diocese is eligible to hold office.

5. No person shall hold office of Lay Representative or Alternate Lay Representative for more than one congregation or body, other than a linked charge, in the diocese at the same time.
MOVING FORWARD IN MISSION

The Whole Church Mission and Ministry policy is a position paper from 2011 and was followed by two Next Steps reports – 2012 and 2013. In 2015, after appropriate synodical processes, the Mission and Ministry Board was replaced by two new Boards; the Mission Board and the Institute Council which acts as the governing body of the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

The Board intends at its meeting in the autumn to consider how best to undertake a review of the Whole Church policy and mission strategy. As a first step towards that, it felt it would be helpful to produce a short summary of the policy, drawn from existing papers and reports, which is offered below.

**Summary of Mission Content of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy**

Mission is seen as “God’s unceasing work of lovingly drawing back the world to himself [sic]” and “sharing the good news of Jesus Christ and God’s love for all” which involves making disciples, baptising and teaching. The policy affirms

1. The primacy of mission in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church.
2. Bishops as leaders of mission and dioceses as the primary location for engendering missional energy. The establishment of funding via Block Grants has shifted allocation of resources directly from province to dioceses.
3. The role of inter-diocesan networks as a means of sharing resources and good practice.
4. The value of Diocesan Missioners in enabling congregational missional activity on the ground, aligning it with the needs and strategy of the diocese.
5. Ecumenical work, inter-faith links, and partnership with others of faith or none.

**The Role of Mission Board envisaged in the policy documents**

The Mission Board has strategic oversight of the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church. It supports and encourages the mission of dioceses and their congregations, enables the development of consistent and coherent patterns of mission across dioceses, and its structures encourage appropriate inter-diocesan collaboration and cooperation.

**The Structure of Mission Board**

The structures are illustrated in the organogram on page 2 in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod (the Blue Book).

The Mission Board oversees the work of three committees:

- Church in Society (and its pendant committee, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) which is tasked with the missional areas of social, economic and environmental issues,
• Global Partnerships which works with mission and development programmes overseas, including the Scottish Episcopal Church Mission Association,
• Youth which is responsible for Glen Youth Camps and other initiatives for young people.

At present, there are six Networks; Retreats and Spirituality, Rural, Youth, Children, Mission Planning and Lay Learning. Networks are inter-diocesan groups of motivated, experienced and skilled people whose goal is to share information and good practice. They are not grant awarding bodies and they do not necessarily host events. The Mission Board has ‘light touch’ oversight of the Networks and their operation and discerns the need for different Networks at any particular time.

Each diocese has a representative on the Mission Board who serves as a conduit for information between Mission Board and dioceses. The other members of the Board are the convener (appointed by General Synod), a representative for the College of Bishops and the Committee Conveners. Certain staff members from the General Synod Office also attend meetings.

Documents used in producing this summary:

• The Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy 2011 (A Position Paper)
• Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy Next Steps 2012
• Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy Next Steps 2013
• Digest of Resolutions 2.4 Mission Board and Pendant Committees

Rev Jane Ross
Convener, Mission Board
May 2017
INTENTIONAL DISCIPLESHIP AND DISCIPLE-MAKING
AN ANGLICAN GUIDE FOR CHRISTIAN LIFE AND FORMATION

The following is a summary paper, produced by the Anglican Communion for the meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Lusaka in 2016, regarding a longer publication available at:-


Summary Paper

*The best decision anyone can ever make, at any point in life, in any circumstances, whoever they are, wherever they are, is to become a disciple of Jesus Christ* - Archbishop Justin Welby

The first invitation which Jesus offered to those who showed an interest in his life and teaching was to follow (to be a disciple), and that was quite literally what they did on the roads and through the villages of ancient Palestine. But it was not just a physical following. It also involved a μετάνοια (a radical turning around) of life-style, worldview and spiritual orientation, a total transformation of the self so that Paul is led to claim, ‘Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, the new creation has come: The old has gone, the new is here’ (2 Cor 5.17). Discipleship encompasses this total God-ward transformation which takes place when individuals and communities intentionally, sacrificially and consistently live every aspect of their daily life in commitment to following Jesus Christ.

Our daily walk as disciples of Jesus Christ and the impact on the environment and community we are present in, and our inherent desire to see others join us in this Way of Truth and Life can be, and has been, described in many different ways using such terms as *theosis*, sanctification, spiritual transformation and discipleship, but in each case it requires, in response to the outpouring of the life of God, an intention, a choosing of life rather than death, a deliberate rejection of one life-style in favour of another. Discipleship is a deliberate prioritising of these actions individually and as a Christian community.

To be a disciple is to follow, and the nature of that discipleship is defined by the One we follow. To be a disciple-maker is to have been transformed as we follow Him who calls us so that we share in the calling and lifelong transformation of others. ‘*Follow me and I will make you fishers of [people]*’ (Mt 4.19).

Discipleship and the whole life of the whole people of God

Discipleship can never be about a single aspect or a part of our life, our behaviour within the Christian community, or our religious expression. It is by definition about the whole of the life of a Christian and Christian community, and this means the whole people of God, young and old, lay and clergy and in everything they do and say on a daily experience. God’s will is that as adults become disciples, so do children, youth and young people become disciples of Jesus and disciple-makers, as also those who are differently-abled both physically and mentally, and others.
Meanwhile, intentionally following Jesus Christ will place demands upon individuals, our family relationships, the way we handle money, our attitude towards employment and leisure activities, our exploitation of the environment, our political choices and the whole of our life. *Intentional* discipleship is radically transformative of the whole of life. It is the totality of our living in God, through the power of the Holy Spirit following the ways of Jesus – and that demands internal coherence.

Therefore, there is also incoherence in our discipleship if intentional disciple-making does not follow. This may be a shared process within the local Body of Christ but where new life is missing the presence of living discipleship may be in doubt.

Finally, making disciples is not the goal of mission. Discipleship and disciple-making are the natural outcome or/and expression of mission, and the sole goal of discipleship and mission is to honour and glorify God - experienced as God’s reign and manifests in the lives and actions of the disciples.

**Biblical, Patristic and historical theology and praxis of Discipleship**

The study of Scriptures, the life of the early Church, and the witness of different Christian traditions over two thousand years show that intentional discipleship and the regular practice of making disciples is central to our understanding of salvation, mission and ecclesiology. The book, *Intentional Discipleship and Disciple-making – an Anglican Guide to Christian life and formation*, provides a comprehensive survey of this theology and historical practice, contributed by a number of Anglican/Episcopalian leaders and theologians.

**Anglican understanding and practice of Discipleship and Disciple-making**

Anglican spirituality, liturgy, hermeneutics and ecclesiology all point to a deep commitment to intentional discipleship and disciple-making. At the very birth of what was to become the Anglican Communion, the 1701 charter granted to SPG (now Us) placed upon the new society two obligations (a) to ‘minister to’ believers (to disciple) and (b) to ‘evangelise non-Christian people’ (make disciples). As is demonstrated by the book, the Instruments of the Communion, the Lambeth Conferences and Anglican Consultative Council in particular, have regularly returned to this issue and stressed its importance.

In 1948, for example, in Resolution 37, the Lambeth Conference issued this very clear call:

*The Conference urges all Church people to look upon their membership of Christ in Church as the central fact in their lives. They should regard themselves as individually sharing responsibility for the corporate life and witness of the Church of the Church in places where they live. They should discharge this responsibility and give a distinctive witness*

- by the regularity of their attendance at public worship and especially at the Holy Communion;
• by the practice of private prayer, Bible reading, and self-discipline;
• by bringing the teaching and example of Christ into their everyday lives;
• by the boldness of their spoken witness to their faith in Christ;
• by personal service to Church and community;
• by the offering of money, according to their means, for the support of the work of the Church, at home and overseas;
• thus there will be in every locality a living centre of Christian faith, witness, and fellowship.

Current practice of Discipleship and Disciple-making within the Communion

Within the contemporary life of the Communion we find a rich diversity in the understanding and practice of discipleship and disciple-making. In some contexts there is a strong intentionality about this ministry whereas in others the Church needs to be called back to its roots as a community of disciples who make disciples. Part B of the book provides a stimulating overview of this diversity of ministry. The book provides case studies from different geographical regions, followed by a consideration of the role of children and young people, and the significance of the Bible, worship, sacraments, and Eucharistic community for discipleship. This is followed by brief descriptions of some resources which have been found helpful in some parts of the Communion as they have become more intentional in their approach to discipleship and disciple-making.

Why we need a Communion-wide focus on Discipleship and Disciple-Making

While ‘making disciples’ is Christ's mandate given to his followers and those after them, in recent decades, in the Anglican Community and in some other traditions, there has been very little intentional emphasis on recognising, equipping, mentoring, forming, teaching, and maturing those who believe in Jesus (all the baptised) to be lifelong disciples whose faith is to have impact in or influence every sphere of their daily life.\[ii\]

Even where Christianity is still popular in terms of numbers, the effectiveness of its members is often minimal, and can also be described as nominal and minority. In other areas there is a growing danger that faith becomes a private matter, a personal moral exercise, rather than a whole-life-shaping discipleship in devotion and obedience to Christ.

Anglicans/Episcopalian\[s\] all over the world are witnessing to Christ's reconciling love in all sorts of ways and circumstances, a sign of commitment to discipleship. However, many leaders in the Anglican Communion will also recognise that we could do better if we became more intentional in allocating resources and focused on nurturing and equipping, not only new believers but existing ones too, to deepen their discipleship and Christian witness. Many leaders are seeing discipleship as central to real growth and the potential to transforming society with the Gospel of Christ.
The real question is not whether or not something is already being done but rather what value a coordinated Communion-wide movement, that is *intentional*, would add to what is happening rather than do things in isolation.

There is thus, an urgent need for a Communion-wide *Season of Intentional Discipleship* – a period of emphasis on *intentional* Discipleship - *intentional* resourcing and equipping of all the baptised members to live out their faith with their gifts and skills in everyday life as Christ's ambassadors.

There is need to mobilise and share resources, to collaborate and learn from each other’s experience and good practice, to build up the Body of Christ in its witness to Christ's reconciling love today and tomorrow.

It is important to appreciate that putting emphasis on *Intentional* Discipleship will have implications for the whole life of the Church, including its structures, liturgy, prayer and worship, for selection and training of ordination candidates, for leadership, and deployment of clergy. All these will have to be aligned in accord with the *intentional* Discipleship vision.

**Recommendation to the ACC-16**

That in light of the experience in the Communion and the Gospel and theological imperative the ACC-16 calls upon the Anglican Communion (corporately and in individual provinces, dioceses and parishes) to adopt a clear focus on teaching ministry of *Intentional* Discipleship and Disciple-making for a period – a *Season of Intentional Discipleship* - from ACC-16 to ACC-19 in 2025 (nine years).

And further that at the Communion level, in Provinces, Dioceses and Parishes, resources be set aside to equip and enable Families, Children, Young People, Laity, Clergy and Bishops to be effective in personal and discipleship, in encouraging the discipleship of others and in making new disciples of Jesus Christ.

---

1 'My Father is glorified by this, that you bear much fruit and become my disciples' (John 15.8)

2 "The command to "make disciples of all nations" (Mt 28.19f) must go hand in hand with emphasis on how disciples ought to live their life. "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind... And a second is like it: You shall love your neighbour as you love yourself" (Mt 22.37-39; Mk 12.28-34; Lk 10.25-28). "You are the Light of the world. A city built on a hill cannot be hid" (Mt 5.14). "You are the salt of the earth" (Mt 5.13a).
Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments: A joint report from the Church in Society Committee and Investment Committee

Executive Summary

This paper has been prepared by the Church in Society and Investment Committees in response to the motion passed by General Synod in 2016: *Recognising the importance of economic drivers in moving to a low carbon energy system, commend the joint discussions which have been taking place between the Church in Society and Investment Committees and invite the Committees to continue to work together and report to General Synod in 2017 on the complex issue of investment in the exploration, production and burning of fossil fuels.*

Both Committees recognise the urgency of action on climate change at all levels in Society, and reiterate the call made at General Synod in 2016 to everyone in the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) - province, dioceses, congregations and members - all to play an active part in moving towards a low carbon economy. The paper reviews key issues in the wider debate on reducing fossil fuel use in response to climate change, and in the light of this, considers practicable options for the SEC as an investor.

It is important to understand the context of how SEC’s assets are invested. This is done by what is called the Unit Trust Pool (UTP). The paper explains in some detail what the UTP is, how it is managed via our current investment manager Baillie Gifford, the investment objectives and risks, and the impact of changing the SEC’s investment strategy.

The paper then explains how the existing ethical policy is implemented. Two thirds of the UTP’s assets are currently held in pooled funds where they are managed with those of other investors. In pooled funds, the decision about which investments to hold are made by the Investment Manager on behalf of all the investors, so ethical screening on behalf of any of the participating investors is not possible. The SEC’s ethical policy is applied to its direct share holdings, which comprise about a third of the UTP. A policy for the SEC of partial divestment is proposed. This would restrict directly held investments in the UTP in companies deriving more than 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands.

The paper sets out the potential of engaging as an investor with companies in order to influence their policies in relation to climate change. The Committees believe that membership of the Church Investors Group (CIG), which the SEC joined in 2016, will give the SEC a greater voice and influence on companies than it could ever achieve through working alone. In addition, the two Committees will continue to engage with the UTP investment managers on ethical investment issues, but with greater frequency and formality. It is proposed to draw up a protocol which will provide the SEC with wider options on voting at shareholder meetings.

The SEC’s participation in positive engagement with companies through CIG and exercising options for voting its shares through its investment manager is proposed as an attainable and effective alternative to greater divestment.

The paper concludes with a composite motion for Synod’s consideration (see page 118), which is also set out on the Synod agenda.
Introduction

In December 2015, the world’s nations gathered in Paris to produce a historic agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move towards a low carbon future. This came into force in November 2016, with the formal ratification by the necessary number of nation states. This bears unequivocal witness to the global acknowledgement, at the highest levels, of the seriousness of climate change as one of the greatest threats facing the whole of humankind for the foreseeable future.

The 2016 General Synod welcomed the Paris agreement and passed the following motion in response. That this Synod

a) Welcome the historic agreement of the world’s nations in Paris in December 2015 on the need for urgent and substantial reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and recognises that creating a ‘low carbon’ future depends on practical implementation and far reaching changes throughout society.

b) Urge all parts of the Scottish Episcopal Church to play an active part in finding means of reducing the consumption of fossil fuels, including their use in heating and transport.

c) Call upon Scottish and UK Governments to increase financial and other incentives for domestic and housing sectors in energy saving and renewable energy implementation that will lead to the very substantial reductions that are needed and as part of this to simultaneously address the issues of fuel poverty which currently impact on over a third of households in Scotland.

d) Recognising the importance of economic drivers in moving to a low carbon energy system, commend the joint discussions which have been taking place between the Church in Society and Investment Committees and invite the Committees to continue to work together and report to General Synod in 2017 on the complex issue of investment in the exploration, production and burning of fossil fuels.

Thus Synod acknowledged that the implementation of climate change goals ‘depends on practical implementation and far reaching changes throughout society’ and focused on three key areas for future work:

1. the need for action by national governments to increase energy saving and renewable energy incentives and address fuel poverty

2. the need for action at all levels of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and

3. the need for continuing work in relation to the principles which should underpin the church’s financial investments in the area of fossil fuels.

The Church in Society and Investment Committees have taken forward their previous discussions on the complex issue of investment in the exploration, production and burning of fossil fuels and present the following report and an associated motion for discussion within General Synod 2017.

As part of the work involved in the production of this report a representative of Church and Society Committee attended the Church Investors Group annual conference on 23-24 June 2016. This conference provided an opportunity for an
update on the area of ethical investments, particularly on climate change, through presentations from the CEO of Centrica and the head of strategic planning for BP. Subsequently, members of the Church in Society and Investment Committees met with Edward Mason, Head of Ethical Investment for the Church of England’s Church Commissioners, and James Corah of the investment managers CCLA, who is Secretary to the Church Investors Group, which represents institutional investors from many mainstream church denominations and church related charities, with a particular focus on ethical investment issues. This gave a valuable opportunity to explore the question of engagement with fossil fuel companies with the people who are spearheading this in the UK churches. In addition discussions have continued with other churches, especially with the Church of Scotland’s Church and Society Committee.

In providing information and guidance to Synod on what actions it should authorise, we have considered not only the impact on climate change of fossil fuel extraction and use, but also the practicalities of managing the investments of a relatively small organisation, and noted what has been done by other churches and charitable bodies. In offering the advice that follows, we have sought to assess where the use of the Scottish Episcopal Church’s (SEC) investments can most effectively carry forward the aim of reducing climate change, while at the same time avoiding having a major adverse impact on our investments and on the income we receive and which is vital to the continuing work of the church.

The Urgency

The urgency is that we humans are changing the very physical balances of the climate of our whole planet. As we continue to allow levels of greenhouse gases to rise, processes are set in train that heat the overall temperature of the earth’s land surface, its oceans and atmosphere. Through the Paris agreement the nations have agreed to act aiming to hold ‘the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognising that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change.’ (Article 2a) The underlying understanding from the scientific consensus is that if the average global warming goes beyond 2°C that there will be major adverse impacts to the planet as we know it resulting in melting ice caps, rising sea levels, widespread loss of agricultural soils and water, and associated movements of the human population on an unparalleled scale.

There is a significant time lag in the physical effect in the atmosphere. We will already pass on to future generations an immense legacy of our emissions since the industrial era began. The level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is now approaching 50% higher than it has ever been in human history prior to 1800. On no conceivable ethical grounds can we simply continue ‘business as usual’ and leave it to them to clear up, after we have left. It is imperative upon us to do everything we can in our times. God calls humans to be stewards of the creation, which God has entrusted to our care, and no area is more urgently important in this stewardship than to reduce radically our emissions of greenhouse gases.

Moreover, global warming is a question of both justice and peace. The impacts are already falling disproportionately on the world’s poor and disadvantaged, who have
the least means to respond and adapt. This is especially true of regions of sub-Saharan Africa facing cultivated lands becoming desert or Pacific islands facing permanent inundation as sea levels rise. But the poor in Scotland will also bear an unfair share of the burden, for which fuel poverty acts like a ball and chain. The awful human disruptions we are seeing of those fleeing war in the Middle East may yet prove small by comparison with the future refugee crisis, which many fear will arise as the impacts of global warming hit the poorest hardest.

The Ethical Investment Advisory Group of the Church of England has recently reviewed theological and Biblical issues linked to the consequences of Climate Change and their analysis is included as Appendix 1 of this document. There are key issues from scripture related to both care of creation and justice.

Our Response

The burning of fossil fuels is embedded in the lifestyle of industrialised countries, such that every major economic sector, and every household and citizen, is to a greater or lesser extent dependent on the availability of fossil fuels. We burn them to heat our homes and places of work and leisure, to drive and fly, to provide electricity, to fuel thousands of industrial processes to provide us with the food, goods and materials on which we and our society depend. To move urgently from this dependence to a low carbon economy, without intolerable social and economic disruption is a task of immense magnitude and complexity, which should not be underestimated or oversimplified. It has far reaching social and infrastructural implications, as the ground-breaking report of the 1999 Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution and many subsequent high-level reports have made abundantly clear. But it has to be done, and by every sector of society and the economy.

As the report to General Synod 2016 identified, the issues related to reducing our carbon footprint are complex. The General Synod report said:

‘There is need for Governments within our own country and elsewhere to take action to reduce the quantities of CO2 being released as a result of the sum of all of our activities. As recent discussions of the viability of steel making in Wales have identified this is far from a simple issue. Blanket actions are unlikely to have their intended effects while there is also a need to allow strategic industrial activity to continue. Exporting carbon gas production to other parts of the globe, by exporting our manufacturing, will not deal with the basic global issue. The overall need to reduce emissions of carbon and especially those from fossil based fuels are clear but the actions, which are required, will be wide in both range and scope. In addition to industrial use of fossil fuels, heating at home and work and transport are significant generators of greenhouse gases. While decisions on these uses will need to be taken by all owners of buildings it is clear that this represents an issue where as individuals and as members of church communities we can take both responsibility and action.’

An important factor in the Paris negotiations was the acknowledgement by the global business community of the need to move to a low carbon economy, and to manage the far-reaching implications with wisdom and foresight. Many leading companies in the field are taking serious steps to adjust their future strategies in response to the anticipated impact. This was acknowledged by the churches in an address by Rev.
Dr Olav Fykse Tveit, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, on behalf of faith-based organisations at a high level dialogue during the Paris negotiations, ‘Many in the financial and business sectors are changing their investments and practices. They are turning towards de-carbonisation, renewable energy, and new methods of production and transportation. The green shift is already happening. We all must follow suit. The next generations are depending on us.’

There has been much discussion about financial investments in companies whose main activity is the production of fossil fuels. To what extent does this exacerbate climate problems, send entirely the wrong signals to the economy, and sit incompatibly with the ethical principles of organisations like universities and churches? Several leading Scottish universities have publicly ceased investments in some major oil and gas companies. The Church of England, Methodist Church, Church of Scotland and United Reformed Church have all in recent years passed motions at synods and assemblies divesting in companies majorly involved in thermal coal extraction and tar sands.

This report assesses what the SEC should do. It is important next to understand the way in which the SEC manages its investments.

**Background to the Management of the SEC’s Assets**

For the avoidance of doubt the scope of this paper does not include investments held in the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund which is subject to independent governance and has specific funding requirements and regulatory controls.

The SEC operates an investment vehicle known as the Unit Trust Pool (UTP) the purpose of which is to provide income to investors. Investors hold units in the fund, and an annual dividend (known as the distribution) is paid on each unit by instalments in February and August. All of General Synod’s investments are held in the UTP and these account for about two thirds of the total fund value. The scheme is also open to dioceses and congregations which collectively account for about a third of the total value. Currently all dioceses hold at least part of their investments in the UTP and about 180 congregations also invest in the UTP.

The UTP comprises underlying investments held in both shares in registered companies and corporate bonds. A varied holding of this type permits the unit holders to earn a return on assets which maintains the real value of the distribution; monies which are needed to cover some of the costs of running the SEC. As detailed later two thirds of the assets are pooled i.e. are invested together with the funds of other organisations while around one third are invested directly on our behalf. Making choices as to where we invest is relatively straightforward for this part of our investments. As part of its responsibility for the management of the UTP, the Investment Committee has appointed Baillie Gifford to invest the SEC’s assets. The Investment Committee sets the investment objectives, i.e. the income and capital requirements, and the returns relative to a benchmark which it expects the investment manager to achieve. This is set out in the Investment Management Agreement (IMA). Within the terms of the IMA Baillie Gifford has freedom to choose where to invest the SEC’s assets.

Baillie Gifford is an Edinburgh based investment company which is active throughout the world with offices or associated companies in Hong Kong, South Korea, Japan,
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Australia, South Africa and North America. Baillie Gifford invests the monies entrusted to it, buying and selling within the portfolio to take advantage of where it sees potential for increasing returns either through growth in stock price or from company dividends. Over the longer term the returns Baillie Gifford has gained for the UTP have generally been higher than the market benchmark.

Currently the Investment Committee meets twice-annually with Baillie Gifford to review performance and to discuss related issues, including ethical and governance issues. For the last two years the Church in Society Committee has been actively participating in these meetings. As part of their management of our holdings Baillie Gifford will vote at shareholder meetings of many of the companies in its managed portfolios including those held within the UTP. It reports on how it has voted at general meetings of the companies in the UTP in quarterly written reports to the Investment Committee. There would be potential for them to vote in accord with an instruction from the SEC but only for the segregated part of our holdings. For this to happen there would need to be a mechanism for identifying issues being raised at the AGMs of companies in this part of the portfolio and deciding on how we would wish our shares to be voted and conveying such a decision to Baillie Gifford.

From time to time, the Investment Committee reviews the Investment Manager’s record and may explore alternative arrangements if it believes that a different Investment Manager might offer a superior service.

Investment decisions are generally a case of maximising returns while minimising risks, or uncertainties. Unfortunately, the two are closely related. Chasing higher returns means taking more risks. Risk, in the context of investments, is often misunderstood. The easiest way to think of it is ‘volatility in a given period of time’. The element whose volatility is most usually worried about is Capital Value; however, Income can be volatile for some investments. So, one has to consider which is more important to the investor: Capital Value or Income and over what period of time. The Investment Committee believes that SEC is most concerned about security of Income over the relatively short term and only concerned about Capital Value over the medium to longer term. To that end, volatility of Capital Value is tolerable if, over the long term, growth in Capital Value is more likely as a result and if, over the near term, Income from those collective investments can be relatively assured. It is in this context that our regular monitoring of Baillie Gifford as Investment Managers of the UTP, with its judicious mix of Equities and Corporate Bonds, is undertaken.

The yield on UK government bonds would represent a risk free return but would be insufficient to meet the aim of the UTP, which is to maintain the real value (after inflation) of the distribution to unit holders. Consequently, riskier assets, in the form of corporate bonds and equities, form the investment portfolio. Currently the investment portfolio is managed in three parts.

A) ‘Global Income Growth’ (GIG) portfolio of managed assets to suit the requirements of the SEC (£21.2m, 33.6%, as at 31 December 2016)

The GIG portfolio is made up of directly held investments. The portfolio is constructed on Baillie Gifford’s long-term global equity strategy, which aims to deliver both a dependable income stream, which grows at a rate above inflation and real capital growth, together combining to provide a total return ahead of equity
markets. The SEC’s ethical principles on areas where we do not wish to see investment can be applied to this part of the portfolio. It is important to note that this is the only part of the UTP where we can take ethical decisions under the current IMA. Also it is increasingly unusual for investment managers to provide a segregated portfolio for small funds such as the SEC UTP.

B) ‘Long Term Global Growth’ (LTGG) pooled fund (£20.9m, 33.1%, as at 31 December 2016)

In 2009 when the new mandate was being discussed, Baillie Gifford proposed the LTGG Fund as being appropriate to our revised investment objectives. This is a pooled fund, the objective of which is to achieve long term capital growth, by investing in a relatively concentrated but well diversified portfolio of global equities, without being constrained by a specific benchmark. Baillie Gifford often describes this as a high conviction fund where each stock is included on its merits. Up to (but no more than) 10% in value of the Fund may be invested in a single stock. It is noted that it is primarily through the LTGG Fund that Baillie Gifford invests in alternative technologies e.g. Tesla Motors (electric car manufacturer).

C) ‘Corporate Bond’ pooled fund (£20.8m, 32.9%, as at 31 December 2016)

The existing segregated bond portfolio was retained when the UTP was realigned in 2009, but moved to the pooled Baillie Gifford Corporate Bond Fund in 2012. Baillie Gifford advised the Committee that moving to a pooled bond fund would be beneficial. It was acknowledged that this was part of a wider exercise at Baillie Gifford to move more holdings into pooled funds, however it was clear that that the level of diversity would increase with transfer to the pooled fund. Baillie Gifford advised that the Corporate Bond Fund was a good match for the UTP, would provide sustainable growth whilst generating a relatively high income and limited volatility thus the risks would be better managed.

The balance of the portfolio is held in cash which is necessary for operational reasons and to pay the twice-yearly distribution to unit holders.

Only the first of these investment vehicles can be easily tailored to suit any specific demands placed on it by the UTP and General Synod. The two pooled funds are investment vehicles used by us and by a large number of other investors, the use of which allows for greater diversification thereby reducing risk, and keeps down the costs of managing the UTP, but it makes it difficult for us to influence where our funds are held. As at 31 December 2016 as a percentage of the entire portfolio direct oil and gas holdings were 0.69% (indirect 1.71%) and direct utilities holdings 0.69% (indirect 0.93%). The key issue is that SEC is a relatively small investor, our investment of around £60m has to be compared with the Church of England’s £6bn. This necessitates us being part of a pool of smaller investors with inevitably more limited scope for action.

The SEC’s Existing Ethical Policy

The SEC has an ethical investment policy which thus far means the exclusion of shares in companies with more than 15% of their revenues arising from one or more of: pornography, armaments, tobacco and gambling. This policy was last updated in 2013 and will be reviewed again in the light of decisions made by General Synod this year. The presumption here is that these companies are the ‘worst of the worst’
and we consider it un-Christian to profit from their activities. The Investment Committee and the Investment Manager both agree that the exclusion of the small number of companies which are active in the excluded sectors have little effect on the risk and the returns of the segregated portfolio. The policy, however, cannot be imposed on pooled funds, where our investments are combined with those of other investors. This is clearly a potential problem for us, not only for areas such as extractive mining or tar sands companies but also in respect of companies with significant involvement in the existing excluded categories that are held in the pooled funds. Consequently, only the GIG portfolio is subject to this policy. The regular review meetings of the Investment Committee with Baillie Gifford allow the SEC’s views of current issues to be fed into both Baillie Gifford’s investment and voting decisions.

In theory, the current ethical investment policy could be extended to exclude investments in companies involved in other areas of concern, but this would not be without consequence. The more sectors that are excluded as a matter of policy, the more difficult it becomes for a fund manager to identify good investment opportunities. While the impact of current exclusions on income has been absorbed through good performance of other investments, meeting the performance objectives would become more difficult if the range of restrictions were increased significantly. Reducing the scope of investments which a manager may select for a portfolio lowers the diversification which in turn increases investment risk. This ratio of return/risk, also known as the Sharpe Ratio, is key to managing investments. Ideally the ratio should be as high as possible, i.e. high return for minimal risk; however increasing the range of exclusions lowers it.

A further and significant consideration would be if an ethical policy extended to the whole of the UTP so that pooled funds could not be used. This would result in higher management fees and administrative costs, and potentially greater investment risk.

Fossil-fuel-related investments: laying out the issues

The Church in Society Committee has examined the ethical aspects of this question for some time, and began a process of dialogue with the Investment Committee in 2014. This has led to much mutual learning of the factors important in each committee’s responsibilities. These have revealed a far more complex picture than a simple ‘yes’ or ‘no’ question of divesting from companies involved in fossil fuel extraction and production. Our discussions have led us instead to reframe the question in the following terms.

Given that there is an urgent imperative to move to a low carbon economy in every sector of UK and Scottish life, how then can SEC be of best influence in speeding the difficult and long transition that is now required, in the use of its power to invest the funds entrusted to it?

We have considered the two alternative responses which we can make:

1. Divestment from fossil-fuel-related companies

2. Engaging as an investor with such companies, in order to influence their policies in the right ways.
We have explored these approaches in the light of the third significant factor, which has been discussed above; namely that SEC is a relatively small investor with limited in house infrastructure, and that it invests about two-thirds of its assets via pooled funds over which it has little influence. This presents a quite different context from bigger organisations like the Church of England or a major university who have very large directly held investments.

There is an added complexity in deciding just what we mean by a fossil fuel company. This is clearly a rather important question both absolutely and in the context of the management of our investments. Different organisations, which have divested, have used very different definitions. We have confined ourselves to those whose primary business is in the extraction and production of fossil fuels and not, for example, road/rail/air transport providers, retailers, and electricity generators, as these have a more ‘second order’ involvement. In doing so, we inherently accept that fossil fuel use is embedded in the day-to-day life of our culture and its economy.

It is important to stress at the outset that consideration of its financial investments would be of little meaning unless the church also acts on the commitments it has made in several recent Synods. Motions with a bearing on these issues are reproduced in Appendix 2.

In summary, these are:

1. To engage, in so far as we are able, with the shapers of public policy on energy, transport, construction, agriculture etc., and

2. Taking our own actions to achieve low carbon lifestyles and choices across the whole reach of the SEC’s activities, all churches and dioceses, and by its entire individual membership.

It is inconsistent to work out appropriate moral actions over investment, if we do not at the same time work out how we should respond to the challenges of moving to low carbon lifestyles, personally and in our dioceses, churches and central structures.

**Option of Divestment**

A large investor such as a major university can write to the CEO of an oil company and say it is withdrawing its considerable direct investments. This could result in both reputational and financial damage to the company although even this is debated. For the SEC, as a far smaller investor, the option of divestment will have limited impact, however. Firstly, the SEC has only limited direct investments and such an action would make a clear ethical statement but would have comparatively small influence over the companies concerned. A second difficulty is that the majority of the SEC’s investments are in pooled funds in which it participates along with other investors. To divest in particular companies would require us to persuade both the Investment Manager and all the other contributors to the pooled fund to do so. If this was not possible, or if the SEC considered that the present and future direction of the Investment Manager took insufficient account of climate related issues, the SEC might be faced with changing its manager. This would result in significant upheaval and expense to the church.
Potential Impact of Divestment

The potential impact of divestment varies according to the level of adjustment to the investment strategy

(a) Applying fossil fuel divestment only to directly held investments, i.e. the GIG portfolio (around one third of the UTP). This would have some impact on the Fund the extent of which could be assessed in consultation with Baillie Gifford. Baillie Gifford have confirmed that they could apply a restriction on companies materially involved in extracting thermal coal and tar sands to the GIG portfolio.

(b) Applying fossil fuel divestment to all UTP investments. This would have a significant impact on the Fund, as investment in pooled funds would not easily be possible. The Investment Committee is not aware of any pooled funds currently available that would satisfy divestment criteria and meet the investment objectives of the UTP.

Full divestment could lead to a reduction in investment returns (reducing income to unit holders), a less diverse portfolio (leading to increased volatility and risk), and higher management fees. Furthermore, Baillie Gifford have advised that they would not be able to manage the UTP on this basis. Therefore, if the SEC wished to divest completely from fossil fuels an alternative manager would need to be identified.

The Investment Committee has considered the implications of this. The cost of changing investment managers is significant as it involves the sale of the entire portfolio and purchase of new holdings. The current management fee is approximately £220k (0.4% fund value) per annum; for a fully segregated portfolio under a different fund manager this would be anticipated rise to between 1-3% (£630k to £1.9m) per annum (figures indicated by other fund managers). The administration of a segregated portfolio would also require greater ongoing involvement of General Synod staff.

Unintended Consequence of Divestment

Baillie Gifford are currently retained as fund managers because they have achieved good results for the Church. An investment manager needs to be able to use discretion in order to outperform the benchmark. It follows that the more we restrict the choice of assets, the lower the return may be, and the higher the risk, owing to reduced diversification. The challenge is to develop a policy, which combines our stated ethical positions with financial health and the desired returns.

Although the UTP’s size is vanishingly small in the financial marketplace, these discussions are happening at much larger organisations than us. One hypothetical consequence of a potential mass sell-off of fossil fuel companies by investors is that share prices in these companies become depressed and consequently an attractive investment for those who have no equivalent ethical policy. Investors, such as sovereign wealth funds or corporate magnates, who have no interest in reducing the operations to which we object, might then wholly acquire fossil fuel companies thus removing them from public participation and scrutiny. Fortunately, there are alternative approaches, to which we now turn, that keep the companies’ shares in the marketplace yet make sure they get a strong message of where investors like us believe change should happen. Owning shares in a company means two things.
First it means receiving a periodic dividend from the profits that the company makes. Second, it (usually) confers voting rights, entitling the holder to vote at company meetings. While the dividends, along with the potential growth of a company’s assets, drive investment decisions, this section considers the importance of voting at company meetings.

We label these approaches: Engagement and Voting.

**Engagement**

The alternative model to divestment is to engage with a company in which the SEC has investments, with a view to influencing its policies in respect of climate change. Once again the small size and lack of direct investments of SEC means it is likely to have much less influence on its own than a large investor such as the Church of England. However, the SEC has recently joined the Church Investors Group (CIG). The aims and objectives of the CIG are detailed in Appendix 3. This is a membership organisation representing the charitable and pension funds of denominations, dioceses, religious orders and Christian based charities. The CIG has 58 members, predominantly drawn from the UK and Ireland, with combined investment assets of over £17bn. CIG helps its members develop and implement ethical policy on investment, and seeks to use the power of its joint investments to engage with and influence companies on ethical matters which its members consider important. It also acts as a Christian witness in the City of London on more ethical and value-based ways of doing investment.

In relation to climate change, CIG has been working for several years with the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) to get companies to declare their greenhouse gas emissions and their systems, opportunities and risks with regard to moving to a low carbon economy. Companies are assessed on a scale from A (best) to E (worst or not declaring at all). The investment group CCLA, acting on behalf of CIG, identified 56 UK FTSE 350 companies, which had not scored at least C, and engaged with them. 23 have since improved their score. Independent research conducted by the University of Edinburgh Business Management School concludes that CIG’s intervention was the main cause of the change.

This has led to the ‘Aiming for A’ initiative which has targeted the ten largest extraction and energy utility companies in the UK and most are now at A or B level. The large CIG members have used the mechanism of shareholder resolutions to get companies to commit to measures and systems in line with addressing climate change. In the UK, this requires at least 100 shareholders or 5% of the shareholder base. This is very challenging, but as a result of CIG’s efforts, Shell and BP passed a resolution in 2015 to begin reporting under the scheme, and in 2016 the major mining and transport sector companies Anglo American, Glencore and Rio Tinto each passed resolutions with 96-99% support. Other companies are now being targeted for 2017.

The Church Commissioners of the Church of England have also joined with the United Methodist Church in the USA to co-file a resolution with Exxon Mobil on its portfolio resilience to climate change. Despite the company fighting extremely hard to block the motion, 38% support was gained at the first time of asking, which is considered a real breakthrough to one of the most recalcitrant oil companies.
These examples indicate that shareholder engagement can be effective in ways that lobbying as activists ‘from outside’ cannot be. But it should also be recognised that the biggest oil and gas producers are state-owned organisations in the Middle East, Russia and China, which are thus far fairly impervious to this type of engagement.

Voting

CIG engages with companies but it does not place votes on behalf of others at shareholder meetings. Shareholder resolutions are currently in the domain of Baillie Gifford. Baillie Gifford’s ethical voting policy addresses corporate governance issues such as boardroom pay and accounting transparency. It does not, however, extend to climate issues.

Baillie Gifford have outlined options for voting shares in the GIG portfolio. These are under consideration, but it is anticipated that a policy that would allow the SEC to differ from Baillie Gifford’s voting policy will be the favoured approach.

Action by Large UK Churches

The Church of England began looking at the issue in 2007, and did a comprehensive assessment, drawing on expert advisors, and its own Ethical Investment Advisory Group. It decided to sell its investments in the highest carbon fossil fuel companies, with over 10% of their revenue from thermal coal or oil from tar sands, as not consistent with the church’s theological and ethical stance on climate change. Other churches have adopted similar positions (e.g. Methodist and Church of Scotland). But the Church of England Synod also laid a strong emphasis on engagement with companies in the ongoing effort to change things, for example in the complex areas of companies which are heavily involved with greenhouse gases, like the utilities that burn fossil fuels, and the automobile, aviation and mining sectors.

The policy of a combination of engagement and not investing in companies in certain major problem industries (thermal coal extraction and tar sands) is suggested as a model that the SEC should follow. The Church of England has developed Transition Pathway Initiative, which will work with the Grantham Institute of LSE on Climate Change and Environment and a data provider to support the development of a methodology to plot the progress of companies against transition to a 1.5/2 degree world. It will:

1. Define what a low carbon transition path is for companies in different sectors (in the first year it will profile; automobiles, mining, oil and gas, and utilities sectors).

2. Provide a clear, transparent and online tool hosted by an academic institution and free at the point of use that can monitor and track company and sector performance, as well as provide objective analysis that can be used to assess risk and opportunities relating to climate change transition.

3. Invite other asset owners and the wider market to adopt/support this approach to maximise its impact.

4. Outline how individual asset owners will use this tool to:
Church in Society Committee/Investment Committee
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i) Inform investment decision-making;
ii) Inform and structure engagement interventions to strongly encourage companies to move along the path;
iii) Inform and potentially align voting at AGMs with other shareholders that support this approach.

In addition, the Anglican Consultative Council has recently called on Anglican Churches to follow a series of principles in their response to Climate Change. These are detailed in Appendix 4.

Practical Considerations for the SEC

The Investment Committee recognises that the SEC might want to enhance its ethical investing policy at intervals. Expertise in ethical investing is in short supply, and while it might be apt to have an Investment Committee that has members with both investment and ethical experience, finding such members could be a problem.

We therefore recommend that the SEC’s membership of CIG be the vehicle through which detailed future ethical proposals are channelled. Such a decision recognises both the benefits of being part of a discussion forum of people with similar ethical challenges and the power of acting collectively. This recognises the limitations of the SEC’s resources and the considerable benefit the members of CIG derive from its bringing together like-minded participants. The largest member of CIG is the Church of England, with some £6bn of investments. They are a few years ahead of us in the process of encouraging changes to corporate decision-making and transparency. Their human resources are somewhat greater than ours too. We recognise that our ethics are likely to be very closely correlated for the foreseeable future, and consequently we can benefit from economies of scale by following in their footsteps. Baillie Gifford is also one of the investment managers of the Church of England and so is familiar with their ethical policy. So while we continue having Baillie Gifford as Investment Manager, it makes sense for us to use these investment processes where possible.

Implications for the SEC

The work of the CIG is impressive. We are continuing to monitor progress, but the evidence to date indicates that this sort of investor engagement can indeed be very effective. It is thus clearly very valuable that the SEC, as a relatively small investor, is able to access the activities being done on a much wider frame than anything it could hope to do alone. In terms of policy, we recommend a policy centred on a combination of not investing directly in companies in certain major problem industries (thermal coal extraction and tar sands) in common with the Church of England and Church of Scotland, and of engagement with the rest, seems to be a model that the SEC could follow.

Currently Baillie Gifford do not have investments which exceed the proposed guidelines for thermal coal or tar sands, so such a policy would not result in a need to sell off shares. There would however seem to be value in seeking to restrict any future SEC investments in thermal coal and tar sands companies, and to keep under review other companies heavy in fossil fuel extraction or burning.
Since the UTP’s investments are managed entirely by Baillie Gifford we need to focus much of our actions on influencing Baillie Gifford as much as attempting to influence fossil fuel related companies. It relation to this we need to ask Baillie Gifford to provide the greenhouse gas emissions, policies and climate resilience of all the companies in its pooled equity and direct equity funds for the SEC. In addition we should:

1. Encourage Baillie Gifford to seek to push any ‘laggard’ companies to Aim for A, and
2. Inform Baillie Gifford that we will anticipate comparably good results from assessments under the Church of England’s Transition Pathway Initiative as it unfolds, and
3. Establish a policy with Baillie Gifford that allows us to vote our shares independently where appropriate.

**Resolution**

Synod conscious of its responsibilities as a Christian Church

A) Calls on all members, congregations and Dioceses to develop approaches consistent with a low carbon economy;

B) Encourages the Church in Society and Investment Committees to work with and as part of the Church Investors Group as a means of informing and setting the Scottish Episcopal Church’s policy on investment in an era of climate change and helping small investors to implement such policies;

C) Seeks to follow the example of other churches by restricting its direct investments in companies deriving over 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands;

D) Asks for an annual meeting with the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Investment Managers, currently Baillie Gifford, at which the means of agreeing any limits to investments in companies with a poor environmental profile and encouraging the use of targets and processes suggested by the Church Investors Group might be discussed;

E) Seeks to put in place a mechanism, which would allow the policy of the Church Investors Group on voting at company meetings, to be put into effect;

F) Encourages the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund Trustees to follow similar approaches.

David Atkinson  
Convener Church in Society Committee

Adrian Tupper  
Convener Investment Committee

12 April 2017
Glossary

The interpretations provided in this glossary are in the context of this paper. Other meanings may apply to some of the terms when used in different situations.

**Church in Society Committee**
A pendant committee of the Mission Board which addresses major issues facing Scottish society and encourages positive change in government policy and within the global community.

**Investment Committee**
A pendant committee of the Administration Board with responsibility for investment strategy and monitoring the performance of the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Unit Trust Pool.

**Unit Trust Pool (UTP)**
A fund of £63m (as at 31 December 2016) in which General Synod’s funds are invested. It is available to dioceses and congregations as a means of investment, generating income and capital growth. The UTP is managed by Baillie Gifford in accordance with the objectives set by the Investment Committee.

**Baillie Gifford**
An investment manager based in Edinburgh appointed by the SEC to manage the investments held in the UTP.

**Investment Management Agreement (IMA)**
The contract between the investment manager and the client that sets out how the investments are managed. The terms include the benchmark with discretion to vary the allocation, outperformance targets (expected performance over the market average), and fees. It also sets out what the manager may invest in and any exclusions. The investment manager has full discretion to buy and sell investments within the terms of the contract.

**Distribution**
The annual payment to unit holders in the UTP. The 2016 distribution represented a yield of 3.3% of the year end value.

**Investment Strategy**
The aims and objectives set by an investor.

**Equities**
Stocks or other securities representing an ownership interest in a company.
Corporate Bonds
Debt securities issued by a company and sold to investors. The backing for the bond is usually the payment ability of the company, which is typically money to be earned from future operations.

Fixed interest securities
Includes both corporate bonds and gilts (Government Bonds). A fixed interest security pays a fixed rate of interest for a specified period. The face value is returned when the bond matures.

Benchmark
The benchmark is the allocation to different types of investment within a portfolio. Performance is measured against a relevant market index for each sector. The current benchmark for the UTP is:

- Fixed Interest 35% Pooled Corporate Bond fund
- Global Income Growth 35% Segregated Equity fund
- Long Term Global Growth 30% Pooled Equity fund

Corporate Bond Fund
A pooled fund managed by Baillie Gifford in which the UTP invests. The fund aims to produce a high level of monthly income by investing primarily in a diversified portfolio of sterling bonds.

Global Income Growth (GIG)
A portfolio of directly held investments in shares of companies making up around one third of the UTP. Managed by Baillie Gifford with a focus on income and capital growth.

Long Term Global Growth Fund (LTGG)
A pooled fund managed by Baillie Gifford. The objective is to produce superior capital returns over the long term by investing primarily in a concentrated, unconstrained global equity portfolio.

Pooled Fund
An investment vehicle where funds from many individual investors are held in a single fund. The fund manager chooses which shares or bonds to hold in order to achieve the fund’s stated investment objective. A multi-asset pooled fund can provide a cost effective and administratively straightforward solution for a smaller investor if the fund meets the required investment objectives.

Segregated portfolio
A group of investments that are held directly by the investor.
Engagement
A term that is used primarily in relation to equities. Shareholder engagement with companies is a way of promoting good corporate governance and socially responsible business practices. Engagement may take the form of meetings with company executives, shareholder resolutions, research and awareness raising. Responsible investors also regularly vote their shares at meetings.

Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG)
The main factors used to measure the sustainability and ethical impact of an investment in a company or business.

Socially Responsible Investment (SRI)
An investment strategy which seeks to consider both financial return and social good to bring about social change.

Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund
A fund in which the assets are subject to a trust deed. The Pension Fund Trustees are responsible for the investment of the Fund.

Church Investors Group (CIG)
A membership group which represents institutional investors from many mainstream church denominations and church related charities, with a particular focus on ethical investment issues.

CCLA
An investment managing specialising in charities, religious organisations and the public sector. CCLA manages six funds for the Church of England.

Ethical Investment Advisory Group (EIAG)
A Church of England body that provides support and advice to the Church of England's National Investing Bodies (NIBs) on matters of ethical investment.

Church Commissioners
The body with responsibility for the investments of the Church of England.

National Investing Bodies (NIBs)
The Church Commissioners, Church of England Pensions Board and the CBF Church of England Funds managed by CCLA.
Appendix 1: Papers from the Church of England on Climate Change

An extract from *Climate Change: The Policy of the National Investing Bodies of the Church of England and the advisory paper of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group of the Church of England* (April 2015)

2.1 Biblical reflections

2.1.1 We begin our reflections with the great story across the whole of the Bible, with a systematic treatment in turn of the major Christian doctrines of the Creation, the Fall, the Election of God’s people, the Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection and Eschatology, which will lead into further theological reflections drawn from the history of the Christian tradition down the ages, before coming in Section 3 to Ecclesiological reflections on the various views and positions in the Church today.

2.1.2 The Christian faith starts where the Bible starts, with the doctrine of Creation, to explain why we, and the whole universe, are here in the first place. At every stage, after the creation of the stars and planets, vegetation, fish, birds and animals, God sees that ‘it is good’. (Gen 1.4, 12, 17, 21, 25). This faith in the essential goodness of the physical universe is unusual in ancient (and some modern) religions which treat the universe as evil or something to be escaped from into the intellectual or spiritual realms. However, the Bible declares that God is the Creator of everything and considers it to be good, and therefore he has his purposes for the physical world as well as for non-human species, with biodiversity being part of the glory of creation. However, it is only after the creation of male and female human beings that the adjective becomes superlative: ‘God saw everything that he had made and indeed, it was very good’ (Gen 1.31, emphasis added). This placing of the man and woman at the pinnacle of the created order suggests a mediating place for the human race between God and his creation, which is reinforced by the following story of Adam being placed in the garden ‘to till it and keep it’, as well as his giving names to all the animals (Gen. 2.15, 20). This means that Christians have a divinely mandated responsibility for the physical world, its creatures and for one another.

2.1.3 However, the next story of the Garden of Eden explains why we tend to get things wrong. It recognises that human beings are sinful, and make wrong choices out of greed or pride which leads to mutual recrimination, blaming each other or a creature, which comes between them and the good creation, leading ultimately to pain and suffering and to alienation from both the creation and its creatures (Gen. 3.6, 12-13, 14-17). Thus it is not surprising that the ‘dominion’ over the creation given by God to human beings (Gen. 1.26) has often become ‘domination’ in which human greed and selfishness have exploited the earth, its produce and its creatures for our own ends, rather than for the glory of God and the good of his world. This places upon us a responsibility to protect the planet, not only because of its own fragility, but also because of our tendency to (ab)use it for our own ends. The history of the human race also warns us to beware our human pride and overweening confidence that we can do anything (see the story of Babel in Gen.
11.1-9) and calls for a proper sense of humility in the face of challenges like climate change.

2.1.4 God’s reaction to this is not to give up and destroy the world utterly (as in the Flood, Gen. 6.13), but to call into being a people to serve him in caring for his world through the story first of Noah (8.21-9.17), then the whole history of the call and choice of Israel as God’s people, and eventually to enter himself into the experience of the physical universe in the incarnation of Jesus Christ (John 1.1-14). Even then human greed and pride, sin and selfishness responded by inflicting unimaginable pain and attempting to destroy him – yet through the cross and resurrection, God was making peace and reconciling everything to himself in a new creation, a task he has passed onto us (Col. 1.15-20; 2 Cor. 5.17-18).

2.1.5 Ultimately, in the End, the physical world is destined not for the destruction of global warming or the doom of heat death among the stars, but for ‘a new heaven and a new earth’, where the relationship between God and human beings, his creation and his creatures will be perfected (Rev. 21-22). This is the ultimate Christian hope. Before that, there is an inevitable judgement where those who ‘sow the wind shall reap the whirlwind’ (Hosea 8.7). Jesus’s parables are full of ideas of rendering account or facing judgement and harvest (e.g. Matt. 13.24-30, 47-50; 25.14-46; Luke 16.19-31) while Paul warns that we must all stand before the judgement seat of God and Christ (Rom. 14.10; 2 Cor. 5.10), which is later depicted in the story of the great white throne (Rev. 20.11-15).

2.1.6 Therefore we now live ‘between the times’, in the current age where we are called to continue God’s reconciling work among his people, his creatures and his creation. This means that we are all engaged in the process of change and adaptation, looking towards the coming age of God’s perfection and doing what we can to make his sovereign rule, the ‘kingdom of God’, an increasing reality. Paul uses the image of the creation ‘groaning in labour pains’ as it is ‘waiting in eager longing’ for that consummation (Rom. 8.18-24). Paul also stresses the urgency of the need for action: ‘You know what time it is, how it is now the moment for you to wake from sleep.’ (Rom. 13.11)

2.1.7 Therefore we must do all we can to mitigate whatever is damaging creation and God’s creatures, and to promote all that is good and brings the kingdom nearer (Rom. 13.11-14). In making decisions about investments, as with anything else, we are to reflect the loving, generous and just nature of God, to be holy, merciful and perfect as he is holy, merciful and perfect (Lev. 19.2; Luke 6.36; Matt. 5.48). In particular our response to the commands to show mercy and love our neighbour as ourselves (Lev. 19.17) must recognize that our neighbour may be from a different race, religion, or part of the world (see for example Jesus’ clarification to the lawyer in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke 10.29-37). The judgement on the sheep and goats turned on how they had treated ‘the least of my brothers and sisters’ (Matt. 25.31-46). Such ‘neighbours’ and ‘least’ must not only be ‘intragenerational’, that is to include not only the poor who are ‘always with us’ (Matt. 26.11), but also ‘intergenerational’, with regard for those of future generations whose very existence may be damaged or precluded by our actions at this critical time. Other biblical
concepts which may be of significant assistance include the ideas of Sabbath (Exod. 20.10-11; 31.14-16) and the year of Jubilee (Lev. 25.1-15), which suggest that both human beings and the land (and perhaps by extrapolation we should apply this to the very planet itself) need periods of rest and recuperation in order to be fruitful. Similarly, the story of God feeding his people with manna in the wilderness challenges us with the notion of ‘what is sufficient or enough’ as there was enough for everyone’s need, but those who were greedy gained nothing (Exod. 16.17-18); equally, the early church’s practice of sharing resources ‘as any had need’ should impact upon our consideration of this crucial issue (Acts 2.44-45; 4.32-35).

2.2 Theological reflections

2.2.1 These biblical themes of attentiveness to the least in the community, the balance between work and rest, and concentrating on sufficiency and meeting needs rather than desires, all lead to the conclusion that Christian discipleship involves a calling to simplicity as a contrast to rapaciousness.

2.2.2 There is a very long and deep tradition within the Christian churches of adopting simple lifestyles which impinge as little as possible on the finite resources of the earth as an expression of Christian discipleship and trust in God. There is plenty of warrant for this in the gospel accounts of Jesus’s life (Luke 9.58), although Jesus was not against the idea of eating and drinking well (Matt.9.11) or the symbolism of lavish celebration in the right circumstances (Mark 14.3-9). The early church seems also to have encouraged lifestyles of simplicity and generosity (Acts 2.44) and the vow of poverty became one of the central features of life in many religious communities, the Franciscan order being especially noted for this. The vocation to live simply is followed in faiths other than Christianity (“live simply so that others may simply live” as Gandhi put it) and Pope Francis’s adoption of such a way of life, symbolised in his choice of papal title, has rekindled interest in this approach to faith among many people who would not claim any faith at all.

2.2.3 Simplicity of life has not, however, been uncontentious in the church. As Christianity accommodated, in some respects, to temporal power, the church moved away from an emphasis on simplicity and simultaneously generated a more extreme asceticism in reaction. These tensions became acute at periods during the middle ages, and have not disappeared today – as growing interest (at least in the West) in Mennonite theology, and communities such as the Amish, testifies.

2.2.4 It is possible that the question of simple lifestyles, vows of poverty and so on became (like many things) more complicated as time forced the early church to revise its theology of the end of all things, which had been expected imminently but came to seem further away. An ethic for a community which expects to be around for generations has to take a rather different form from an ethic for “end times”. A viable and sustainable economy, for example, becomes a necessity and not an irrelevance. Chosen poverty, not least because it often relies on others who are not poor, becomes morally more ambiguous in a context where the long term is a major consideration. But, paradoxically, it is precisely that long term view which today re-emphasises the significance of simplicity and minimising humanity’s impact on the environment.
2.2.5 Once the early church had, perforce, to move beyond its initial focus on an imminent parousia (popularly referenced as the Second Coming), a greater emphasis on long term issues became more deeply embedded in Christian ethics. The New Testament marks a movement from a dependence on descendants to ensure the continuity of one’s family, blood-line and inheritance into the future, to a dependence on the Christian community as the new family which ensures the persistence of the gospel ethic as a shared inheritance. Thus, as the need for a long term ethic developed, the church became the vehicle for ensuring that people could understand how what they did today held a deep significance for how the world would be after their death. This sense that discipleship means living for others, not only in the present but in generations to come, orientates Christians towards a concern for a future which they will never themselves see. With the decline of public belief in any kind of afterlife, contemporary culture has become increasingly casual about the continuities between the present and the long term future, and the Christian world-view with its developed long termism has become more explicitly counter cultural. Nor is this perspective unique to Christians. Many religions which, in their own ways, express the eternal nature of religious truths and the ephemerality of individual human life are profoundly concerned with the long term fate of the earth.

2.2.6 In Jesus’s teaching, there is a clear strand of condemnation for those who seek enjoyment and consumption now at the expense of the long term (Matt.16.24-26). He contrasts immediate consumption and the desire to possess and control (which Augustine called the libido dominandi) with the concern for one’s immortal soul. The implication is that the person who treats the fruits of the earth as his or her plaything, existing only in order to satisfy personal wants, has forfeited the rewards that God offers to those who live in ways which reflect God’s own love for all that he has made. He includes, among those who have had their reward already, the ostentatiously pious as well as those who act rapaciously (Matt.6.2), but simplicity of life versus the desire for rewards now, is a constant thread in Jesus’s message and, hence, an abiding theme in the church’s teaching about humanity’s relationship to the created order.

2.2.7 This theological focus helps shift the debate away from the dilemmas of growth and development to the ways in which consumption becomes treated as a good or as an end in itself. It is not that growth is bad, or that developing nations should be stopped in their tracks. Following the emphasis in the teaching of Jesus, amplified by Augustine, the theological (and, some would say, the economic, political and environmental) problems arise when humanity behaves rapaciously toward the created order. To seek simplicity of life is not to oppose growth and development per se. God has given humanity a creative role which echoes God’s own, and our imaginations, skills and labour should be directed to transforming the material world and discovering the potentials that God has placed within it. One of the tasks of business and industry is precisely to enable people to participate in this co-creativity. But growth directed to satisfying as many of humanity’s desires as possible is another matter. This consumerist mind-set has, in many developed nations, obscured humanity’s relationship to, and trust on, God and skewed unsustainably
our relationship with the rest of God’s creation. God provides enough for all. Human activity, including industry and commerce, has the potential to develop God’s created order for the benefit of all. But consumerism, by justifying the desire to accumulate beyond need, prevents the creation from serving the needs of all.

2.2.8 When this perspective is coupled with Jesus’s especial love for the poor, those who have little and those who are nothing in the world’s eyes, the place of simplicity in Christian discipleship is made even clearer. It is the converse of the attitude which treats everything – people, natural resources and artefacts alike – as existing only for personal benefit. It is the converse of the life which seeks fulfilment in consumption or in human acclaim. Given the extent to which consumerism has contributed to the threat to the world’s resources and natural systems today, the gospel focus on an ethic of simplicity is ripe for re-emphasis. In so far as anthropogenic climate change is a consequence of the exponential rise in consumption in the last decades, and a consequence of the demand for natural resources, especially fossil fuels, which consumption has driven, then the approach to simplicity, and the gospel concern for the long term are, together, part of a very direct response. The churches are faithful to the gospel in emphasising the importance of respect for creation, epitomised in simple lifestyles which put God, not humanity, at the centre of all things, and a long term view of history which allows God to be in charge rather than assuming that all God has made is our plaything. As human consumption of natural resources accelerates, the gospel message of simplicity is a crucial corrective which might call us back from hubris to faithfulness.

2.2.9 Thus these biblical and theological reflections about the place of human beings within God’s good creation, and our divinely mandated responsibility for the physical world, its creatures and for one another, especially the weakest and least, must drive any Christian response to the challenges of climate change, assisted by the lessons from the experience of the church down through history and around the globe today.

2.2.10 The basic theology that we have presented in this policy – that the world is God’s and that we all have a responsibility to Creation and to our neighbour – is not contested within the Christian church. Nor is it contested that we all have a personal Christian responsibility to live more sustainable lives and to challenge ourselves about our patterns of consumption, our use of fossil fuels and our personal contribution to climate change.

2.2.11 However, our work in preparing our policy recommendations has exposed various differences which revolve around how urgently we should seek to end our dependence on fossil fuels. Should we make this our top priority, now, regardless of any short-term negative consequences for the economy? And should the Church divest, now, from all fossil fuel companies, regardless of any negative consequences for the Church’s investments? For some divestment campaigners with whom we have dialogued, this a ‘kairos’ moment like that in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, which demands instant attention which overrides everything else.

2.2.12 Meanwhile, others expressed their preference for a more cautious approach based upon their assessment of the scientific detail and urgency. A further
approach believes that through human ingenuity and new scientific discoveries, the human race will be able to meet and offset the challenge of climate change without having fundamentally to change our attitudes to wealth creation and economic growth which have enriched many (but arguably also impoverished other parts of the human race).

2.2.13 Having received this variety of representations, the EIAG believes that mitigating climate change and effecting the transition to a low carbon economy is a task of great complexity that will not be accomplished simply through divestment from fossil fuel companies, but by sustained efforts on many fronts over many years, as is recognised by those governments who have committed to a process of carbon emissions over the decades through to 2050 and by the Shrinking the Footprint campaign, which recognises that the Church of England cannot cut emissions to 20% of their level in the first decade of this century until 2050.

2.2.14 We also believe that such an approach which seeks to set the highest goals and aspirations while attempting to earth this in the realities of daily life along the way reflects the approach of Jesus Christ as portrayed in the gospels whose words and ethical teaching was always demanding at the highest, yet his actions and pastoral care was equally directed to the poorest and weakest, who struggled to follow him along the way.

The full paper may be found at:

https://www.churchofengland.org/media/2235218/climate%20change%20policy%2030%2004%2015.pdf

Introducing the Transition Pathway Initiative


Appendix 2: Resolutions of the SEC General Synod

The following lists motions passed by the General Synod since 2005 on the subject of climate change or related issues.

General Synod 2005

That this Synod note with concern that time is running out to tackle environmental injustice, in particular the effects of climate change on the development of poorer countries; urge all dioceses to promote the Churches’ Environmental Programme, ‘Eco-Congregation Scotland’; and call on the G8 Summit members to take radical action at home to reduce the impacts of climate change, including a change in consumption patterns and a meaningful switch to the use of renewable energy sources.

General Synod 2010

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

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

General Synod 2011

A Statement of Principles by the Scottish Episcopal Church

The whole of creation belongs to God. As human beings we are part of that whole and have a responsibility to love and care for what God has entrusted to us; so that we may experience God’s delight to gift peace and abundant life. Recognising the interdependence of human beings with the rest of creation means the ethical basis of our living, as individuals and communities, rests on respect rather than control of our living planet. Accordingly, for the pursuit of social and environmental justice, we need responsible and sustainable stewardship as well as a dialogue with modern science and technology. Our quest is a proper faithful response to the potential harm that destructive living brings.

Understanding too, that our primary task, as Church, is the work of mission and serving Christ’s Kingdom. This means that we have a responsibility as stewards of creation to live sustainably for the welfare of future generations and the world we are privileged to enjoy, especially in Scotland.

The SEC is continuing to shape its Whole Church Mission & Ministry policy and this now offers the context for a Statement of Principles concerning environmental sustainability and its place within the mission of our Church.

These following Principles require us to accept an obligation to develop and learn about sustainable living.

- Our daily thanksgiving, prayer life, and worship should acknowledge the wealth and beauty of God’s creation.
- Sustainability has to be applied to an environment that is constantly shaped by the forces of a dynamic Earth.
- Pressure on sustainability from economic expansion and an increasing human carbon footprint cannot be ignored.
- Exploitation of human and material resources, the global energy demand, and uncontrolled consumerism undermine the basis for sustainable living in Scotland.
- A dialogue with modern science & technology is required to address global sustainability issues.
• Understanding the systems that sustain life as a whole should shape our responses and actions for sustainable living.

• Natural biodiversity of the land mass and its surrounding seas is a precious resource which we lose at our peril.

To ensure environmental sustainability in all SEC activities and minimise the risk of environmental damage:

That this Synod accept this Statement of Principles... so as to encourage action by its Dioceses and its Charges recognising the targets set by the Scottish and UK governments [Scottish Government - 42% reduction in emissions by 2020, UK Government 50% reduction by 2025, both governments 80% reduction by 2050]

That this Synod encourage each Diocese and Charge to conduct its own environmental sustainability audit using the form recommended by the Church in Society Committee and to identify opportunities to reduce energy consumption to help the SEC become a more environmentally sustainable Church.

That this Synod request Diocesan bodies responsible for the care of church property to consider that the recording, monitoring and encouragement of energy use improvement is an integral part of the environmental sustainability audit and that if appropriate this be considered in the context of quinquennial building surveys.

General Synod 2015

That this Synod endorse:

• the actions being taken by Scottish Churches to influence Government so that the United Nations Climate Change Conference, to be held in Paris in December 2015, can result in firm and clear proposals to limit the rise in global mean surface temperature to no more than two degrees Centigrade;

• the following practical steps being taken by the Scottish Episcopal Church through the Church in Society Committee:

  • Encouraging congregations to join Eco-Congregation Scotland;
  • Working collaboratively with other concerned organisations.

Appendix 3: The Church Investors Group (CIG)

https://churchinvestorsgroup.org.uk/

The Aims of the CIG are:

To encourage the formulation of investment policies based on Christian ethical principles and to assist each other in putting such policies into practice.
The CIG helps members actively develop and maintain investment policies that represent their faith and wider responsible investment practice. It publishes in-depth research on issues that matter to its members and their constituents. Previous topics have included executive remuneration and climate change.

To encourage responsible business practices through engagement with company managements.

The CIG engages with business collectively with the goal of raising corporate standards. It has a track record of delivering the change that its members want to see.

To share information and views on ethical matters related to investment.

The group meets together each June for a two day conference as well as a one day member meeting in November. These gatherings allow members to both hear from expert speakers and build contacts with fellow church investors.

The CIG does not dictate policy to its members, nor does it make public statements that are attributable to them.

Appendix 4: The Anglican Consultative Council Resolution 16.08: Response to Global Climate Change

1. receives and commends for study *The World Is Our Host: A Call to Urgent Action for Climate Justice*, a statement from seventeen Anglican archbishops and bishops who met at Volmoed, South Africa, February 2015;

2. notes the dire consequences of climate change for future generations and for all of God’s creation;

3. recognises the global urgency of the crisis of climate change and its impact on the well-being of all people, especially the most vulnerable in societies and encourages Anglicans everywhere to join in pastoral, priestly, and prophetic action as we seek together the redemption of all things in Christ praying and fasting, including special fasts on the first day of each month and a ‘carbon fast’ during Lent;

   ▪ designing and taking strategic actions toward sustainability and resilience in our dioceses, communities and congregations, taking into account local ecological and economic contexts and opportunities;
   ▪ reviewing and making necessary changes to church investments to ensure these are visibly supportive of a move towards a low carbon economy;
   ▪ making energy efficiency and access to renewable energy a priority in all church operations;
- teaching the Fifth Mark of Mission in theological and church-sponsored educational bodies;
- urging political, economic, social, and religious leaders in our various constituencies to address the climate change crisis as the most pressing moral issue of our day consistent with the United Nations’ 21st Climate Change Conference, Paris 2015;
- recognising and supporting indigenous peoples’ right to free, prior and informed consent in decisions concerning the environment and the well-being of communities; and
- advocating for sustainable water, food, and agricultural practices in our communities consistent with the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals.

4. requests provinces of the Anglican Communion to consider appointing a contact person to the Anglican Communion Environmental Network who will report to the Network on actions taken so that a full report may be made to the next ACC.
Introduction
This paper details work which the Church in Society Committee (CinS) has undertaken since the preparation of material for the reports in the Blue Book. This paper is presented as a way of keeping members of Synod informed but also as an invitation to members of General Synod to become involved in these ongoing studies. Here work is reported in relation to organ donation and to gene/genome editing. The motion accompanying this paper simply asks Synod to note that work on these topics is in progress.

Organ Donation
The Scottish Government currently has an “Opt in” System for end of life organ donation. Those who after their death wish to have their organs made available for transplant need to opt in by indicating that this is something which they would wish to happen. In 2016 CinS and representatives of other faith bodies were involved in a consultation with MSPs about a possible move to an Opt Out System. In February of 2017 Scottish Government began a formal public consultation on this change to which CinS responded on behalf of the SEC. The tone of the consultation suggested that a move to opting out seems likely. The current system is being termed a soft opt out system because it does involve the possibility of some consultation with families prior to transplantation taking place.

Organs being made available for transplantation is a good thing and something, which most churches including the SEC have supported. It is something, which we both support and encourage. However, moving to an Opt Out system we believe raises a number of issues, which go beyond the importance of encouraging organ donation. We see these issues as falling into four main categories.

1) Donating organs is a gift and the final gift, which can be given to others in need. Gifting life in this way we see as being consistent with Christian theology and traditions. We are supportive of moves to encourage voluntary donation. However, once a gift becomes an expectation then it ceases to be a gift and moves to being an obligation so moving the balance of perceived ownership. It could be seen as changing the importance of the life of someone coming to the end of life.

2) Moving to an Opt out system involves the introduction of the concept of “Presumed Consent”. This would be a relatively novel concept to Scottish life. In no other part of life is it assumed that if you have not explicitly indicated opposition is it assumed that you have given consent to action. In recent years in much of medical treatment consent is not assumed and patients are involved in a discussion of proposed treatment. Presumed consent in this area can be seen as moving towards a view of the State owning the body. Questions in the recent consultation ask for views about treatments to be carried out on potential donors and prior to death and aimed at improving the success of subsequent transplants. We see the medical advantages of this but also see concerns when the value of the donor moves from the respect which should be the right of all humans and perhaps particularly close to the end of life to the major concern being the preservation of organs for transplant.
In addition, introducing the concept of presumed consent in relation to organ transplant could become a precedent for its use in other areas of life and so these developments need further study.

3) Opting out requires that Scottish government is able to put in place an IT system which is able to identify those who have opted out and probably with complete accuracy. Recent Government IT initiatives question whether this is achievable. The question of what happens following a transplantation of the organs of someone who had opted out but had not had this identified is one which needs consideration following public concern over the Baby Parts controversy. While transplantation is to be encouraged transplants are expensive to carry out. Maintaining life in people who need transplants such as dialysis in those needing kidney transplants can also be expensive. No data has been produced to date on what might be increased costs in NHS care of a significant growth in the number of organ transplants to be performed and how such costs would be met in an era of static NHS budgets and where less glamorous areas such as mental health and care of the elderly are both struggling for additional funding.

4) Death is an area, which people do not like to discuss yet for all of us we know it is inevitable. As church, we have significant experience of engaging with people when they are about to be in or are in the bereavement process. We also have experience of working with people coming towards the end of their lives. As such we see a real and continuing role for church in helping society discuss these issues. This we see as a key area for further work.

New Biotechnologies

There have been several recent innovations in biotechnology with significant ethical and theological implications: Mitochondrial Replacement Therapy, Editing the human genome and modifying human embryos, and Genome Editing in Animals and Crop Plants.

Mitochondrial Replacement Therapy

Mitochondria are a special part of our genetic make-up, which are found in every cell of the human body except red blood cells, and convert the energy of food molecules into energy for the cell. They form a separate genome and they do not produce the heritable characteristics, which we associate with our main ‘nuclear’ DNA. Mitochondria are inherited only from our mother. Dysfunctions in maternal mitochondria may lead to a wide variety of serious medical conditions in a child born to her. The same mutation might cause liver disease in one child and a brain disorder in another. Generally, there are no effective therapies, and mitochondrial disease is a cause of great distress in families where it arises.

The use of somatic cell nuclear transfer (a technique made famous in the Roslin Institute’s cloning of Dolly the sheep) made it possible to replace all the mitochondria DNA in an embryo produced by IVF by mitochondria taken from the egg of a healthy woman. Professor Turnbull’s research group at Newcastle University pioneered Mitochondrial Replacement Therapy, and after very extensive consultations over several years, the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority granted in December 2016 the first licence to perform up to 25 such treatments. The risks
involved in the technique have been reviewed in great detail and are considered no greater than in conventional IVF/ICSI fertility treatments. The UK is the first country explicitly to allow this, although some unlicensed techniques have apparently been performed in the USA, Mexico and Ukraine.

At first sight it would seem to raise several major ethical objections: the use of ‘cloning’ technology in human reproduction, altering the human germ line, and what has unfortunately become the media sound byte to describe the therapy as ‘3 parent babies’. On closer examination, none of these three issues is quite what it seems. Although the cell replacement method is derived from cloning, it is not to produce a human clone, but to replace faulty mitochondrial DNA. Though mitochondrial DNA is inherited in all subsequent generations, this is not what is normally understood by human germ line gene therapy (see below), i.e. changing the primary heritable characteristics in an embryo. For this reason also, the sense in which the child has ‘two’ mothers is very limited. Perhaps a more appropriate analogy would be giving an organ transplant from a healthy donor.

It may be argued that none of these constitutes an overwhelming ‘in principle’ objection, whereas the seriousness and intractability of the condition to any other likely medical approach are powerful arguments in favour. With such a ground-breaking method, it remains to be seen how well it will work. Thus raised expectations constitute an important consideration in counselling families who might consider undergoing the treatment.

**Genome Editing**

Genome editing has recently emerged as a set of powerful scientific tools potentially capable of a wide range of genetic modifications in plants, animals and perhaps even human embryos. In particular, the CRISPR-Cas9 technique has opened up far wider possibilities than the much-hyped technical promise of ‘GM’ has delivered. The method is cheap, easy to perform and remarkably precise in being able to cut the DNA at a chosen location, and then to delete, replace or insert specific genetic material. Although some doubts remain of ‘off-target’ effects, the precision of the method is much greater than genetic modification methods pioneered in the 1980’s and 90’s. Although crop plants were the first uses of GM, first commercial applications of genome editing may be in food animals, which had not hitherto been considered worthwhile for genetic modification by the animal breeding industry.

For example, the Roslin Institute has altered the genome of typical UK pigs to create a mutation, found in some African warthogs, which confers tolerance to the deadly pig disease African Swine Fever. This could not be achieved by normal breeding, because the two species, while close, do not interbreed. In this case, no ‘foreign’ DNA has been added to the pig, so this does not constitute ‘transgenesis’, which was one of the main ethical concerns about ‘conventional’ GM methods. The mutation might occasionally exist unobserved within the UK pig population. Such examples have prompted hopes in its proponents that genome editing might change both the ethical and regulatory picture of genetically altered organisms. In practice things are more complex. But if other applications added significant numbers of DNA bases, these might be considered similar to genetic modification. National regulatory bodies are struggling whether to regulate the methods as ‘GM’ or with less stringent rules.
The same CRISPR technique has been used by Chinese researchers to modify human embryos. This is highly controversial because it involves modifying the main human germ line, reviving debates on the subject from the early 1990’s. In practice, such methods are seen to be far off, if even feasible, but the ethical considerations are immense, were these to become possible. For some any intervention in the human embryo is wrong in principle. But also many, who consider the human embryo to be special, but not yet equivalent to a live baby, will have concerns about permanent heritable changes to an embryo. Some make an ethical distinction between doing so for research purposes, destroying the embryo at the end of the experiment, and performing genetic changes to babies in embryo, to avoid such extreme diseases as Huntington’s. Research uses have recently been allowed in the UK and in Sweden, for example to understand the causes of miscarriage, but some object that this research is too speculative to justify such interventions in embryos. A major objection to genome therapy on embryos is that to test the technique for safety in clinical use would in effect mean treating some babies as experimental subjects. Some would go further still and see in CRISPR the potential to make genetic ‘improvements’ to the human race.

SEC is considering these issues, building on the model of the 1993-98, Engineering Genesis working group study of the Society, Religion and Technology Project of the Church of Scotland.
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Alteration to Digest of Resolutions

The Personnel Committee has been considering, in conjunction with the Committee on Canons, how best to include an enabling power in the Code of Canons or Digest of Resolutions to adopt a range of personnel policies in relation to clergy.

Those discussions have concluded that, whereas higher level issues such as clergy discipline ought properly to continue to be regulated by canon, not least because clergy discipline procedures might ultimately result in loss of office, it would be appropriate for the Digest of Resolutions to contain a broader power than it does at present to adopt "lower level" policies, and procedures.

The relevant existing paragraphs of the Digest of Resolutions read as follows:-

2.3.7 The Personnel Committee shall make recommendations to the Administration Board in relation to personnel matters affecting clerical or lay appointments in the Church in general (except to the extent that any such matters are already dealt with by other provincial bodies) and may provide general advice or guidelines on such matters.

6.8 Maternity and Paternity Provision

Maternity and paternity provision shall be made for stipendiary clergy in accordance with rules adopted from time to time by the Administration Board. The Board shall also have power, by the adoption of appropriate rules, to make provision for leave or time off in relation to the adoption of children or for the care of dependants.

It is not intended to alter paragraph 2.3.7 which gives power to the Personnel Committee to make recommendations to the Administration Board and also for the Personnel Committee itself to provide advice or guidelines. What is lacking is a general power to adopt firm rules or procedures in appropriate cases. It is suggested that such a power should properly lie with the Administration Board.

It is therefore recommended that a motion be proposed to Synod in order to broaden the scope of paragraph 6.8 so that it would read as follows:-

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

The Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, have power to adopt policies, procedures, rules, and guidance in relation to personnel matters in respect of clergy, not otherwise covered by the Code of Canons.

A motion to that effect is included in the Synod agenda.

Maureen McKellar
Convener, Personnel Committee
RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(Amended 12 June 1997, 7 June 2012, 12 June 2014)

1. Application

These rules of order shall apply to the proceedings of the General Synod whether sitting as one body or in separate Houses of Bishops, other Clergy and Laity.

2. The Chair – Powers and Duties

Deference shall at all times be paid to the authority of the Chair. All points of order shall be addressed to the person occupying the Chair, stated briefly and audibly, and raised immediately the perceived irregularity occurs, otherwise the person occupying the Chair shall disallow them. Points of order shall not introduce new subject matter. Speeches shall not be allowed on points of order. Where, in the view of the person occupying the Chair, the matter raised does not constitute a point of order, the person occupying the Chair shall rule accordingly. On all points of order the ruling from the Chair shall be final and not open to discussion. When the person occupying the Chair rises to speak, any member of the Synod who is addressing the meeting shall sit down.

It shall be the responsibility of the person occupying the Chair to preserve order and secure that members obtain a fair hearing, to decide all matters of order arising at meetings of the Synod and to decide, if two or more members rise in their places, which to call to speak. In the event of disorder arising at any meeting of the Synod, the meeting may be adjourned by the person occupying the chair who shall also, then or subsequently, fix a time for its reconvening. Quitting the Chair in such circumstances shall, without further procedure, have the effect of a formal adjournment of the meeting.

3. Order of Debate

Members desiring to speak shall indicate their desire to do so in the manner directed by the person occupying the Chair, or in the absence of any other direction, by raising their hand. Those called upon to speak shall address the Chair. Speeches shall be directed to the motion or amendment being proposed, seconded or otherwise under discussion or to a question of order. No member shall be allowed to speak more often than once on any subject under discussion, save on a point of order or, with consent of the Chair, to make an explanation, but the mover of a motion shall have a right of reply. A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall stop speaking until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.

4. Matters Taken in Private

The Synod may decide by a majority of those present and voting that:-
(a) any business shall be taken in private;

(b) the Synod shall go into Committee for the informal discussion of any subject;

(c) the Synod shall go into groups for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chair shall have power to direct that the Synod shall break into small groups, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes, for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

5. **Adjournment**

(a) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to such other place, time or day and hour as may be set by the person occupying the Chair.

(b) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to a later time on the same day and such an adjournment may be made on the direction from the Chair, or failing such direction, on the motion of any member, the vote on which motion, on being seconded, shall without amendment or discussion be taken by a show of hands as one House.

6. **Quorum**

The Quorum of the Synod shall be one half of the eligible membership of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity and not less than three members of the House of Bishops, but no business shall be invalid because transacted without a quorum being present, unless the attention of the Chair has been called to the absence of a quorum. The person occupying the chair shall then ascertain, in such a way as seems fit, that no quorum is present, and declare the fact. This shall be a responsibility of the person occupying the chair, whose declaration, whether or not a quorum is present, shall be final. If it has been declared from the Chair that no quorum is present, no business shall be transacted until a quorum is declared from the Chair to be present except: (a) the consideration of a motion to adjourn; (b) such non-contentious business as the meeting, with consent of the person occupying the chair, sees fit to transact. If, however, a division is challenged on any subject other than on a motion for adjournment, the same shall not be dealt with by the meeting. No motion for adjournment shall be submitted until at least fifteen minutes after the declaration from the Chair that a quorum is not present, except with the consent of the person occupying the Chair.

7. **Obstructive or Offensive Conduct**

(a) In the event of any member at any Synod meeting disregarding the authority of the Chair, or being guilty of obstructive or offensive conduct, a motion may thereupon be moved and seconded to suspend
such member for the remainder of the sitting. The motion shall be put without discussion.

(b) The person occupying the Chair shall warn any member of the public who interrupts the proceedings at any meeting. If that member of the public continues the interruption the person occupying the Chair shall order the person concerned to leave the meeting, and not return.

8. Duration of Speeches

The mover of a motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes except with the consent of Synod. All other speakers taking part in the discussion on the motion or amendment shall not normally speak for more than five minutes, subject to the discretion of the person occupying the Chair. The mover of the original motion shall have the right to speak for five minutes in reply, but shall not introduce any new matter into the debate. Thereafter the discussion shall be held closed and the question shall thereupon be put from the Chair.

9. Motions

(a) The Synod shall consider only the following motions:

(i) motions which have been included in the agenda and papers for that meeting;

(ii) motions which the Synod has agreed to consider in terms of Rule 10;

(iii) formal or procedural motions.

(b) All motions and amendments shall be stated, immediately on their being proposed to the meeting, by the mover, before being spoken to. All motions under Rule 9 (a) (ii) and all amendments shall be submitted in writing, signed by the mover and seconder and delivered to the Secretary General immediately on being moved.

(c) Every amendment shall be relevant to the motion on which it is moved. A motion may be amended by the mover with the consent of the meeting, which consent shall be by the majority of those present and voting. In the case of a motion emanating from a Diocesan Synod or from a Board or Committee of the General Synod, the mover of that motion shall have the power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the motion has emanated, to accept the amendment to that motion, thus altering the text of the motion on which the Synod is asked to vote.

(d) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the seconder of the motion or amendment, but the Synod shall have power by simple majority of those present and voting to refuse to allow such withdrawal, in which case the motion shall stand.
(e) Motions or amendments which are not seconded shall not be discussed or inserted in the minutes.

(f) If, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, more than one motion deals with the same subject matter, only the motion first lodged with the Secretary General (whether by hand delivery or by post) shall be considered and if, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, any motion deals with a matter already under consideration by a Board or Committee, that motion shall not be considered.

(g) If a member who has submitted a notice of motion is not present to move the motion, the motion shall fall, unless Synod agrees that another member may move the motion.

(h) No motion of any kind which involves a grant of money shall be competent unless it is printed in the programme of business with the observations of the Board or Committee within whose budget the grant would fall, with power to the Chair on special occasions to take the sense of the meeting with reference to matters appearing in the programme of business and, if satisfied, to dispense with the necessity of observations by the appropriate Board or Committee. Except as above provided, no motion (other than votes of thanks) shall be entertained unless notice has been given to the Secretary General in reasonable time to enable it to be entered in the programme of business, unless the person occupying the Chair sees fit to put the question to the meeting that want of notice shall be dispensed with and interprets it as the evident sense of the meeting that this be allowed. There shall be no poll on the question, but a show of hands may be taken to assist in coming to a decision.

10. Rule 10 Motions

(a) Notice of Rule 10 motions should normally be given in writing (to the Secretary General) before Synod starts.

(b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by the signatures of twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who are present at the meeting.

(c) The mover of a motion under this Rule shall be given the opportunity to address Synod briefly (maximum of two minutes) as to why the Synod should consider the motion at that time before a vote is taken on whether the Motion should be considered.

(d) Subject to any contrary provision in the Code of Canons, in order for a Rule 10 motion to be considered by Synod, a two thirds majority of those present and voting shall vote in favour of its being considered.
11. **Motion: “That the Question be now put”**.

(a) The amendment called “The previous question” shall not be allowed.

(b) It shall be competent for any member who has not spoken on the question before the meeting to move “that the question be now put”. On this being seconded, if it seems to the person occupying the chair that the question before the meeting has been sufficiently discussed, a vote shall be taken, without amendment or discussion. If the motion is carried, the mover of the original motion shall have a right to reply, and the question under discussion shall then be put to the meeting. If the motion “that the question be now put” is not carried, a similar motion may be made after every three additional members have spoken.

12. **Voting**

(a) After the question on which the vote is to be taken has been announced, and voting has commenced, no member shall be permitted to offer an opinion, or ask a question, except on a point of order, or otherwise interrupt the proceedings until the result of the vote has been intimated.

(b) Save as otherwise provided, all motions and amendments shall be passed by a majority of the members of the Synod present and voting.

(c) The person occupying the chair shall have a deliberative but not a casting vote. Where the matter which is the subject of the vote relates to the appointment of a member of the Synod to any particular office or committee, voting shall be by ballot.

(d) When the question is put to the vote, tellers shall be named from the Chair and shall give in their report of each division taken. Except where otherwise stated in these Rules of Order, the vote may be taken in the first instance on a show of hands, the result, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, being declared therefrom. In all cases of doubt the vote shall be taken by counting the hands held up. On any question, if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wish, voting shall be by ballot.

(e) When voting by Houses, the Houses must meet separately if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wishes. When the Synod votes by Houses, the numbers of the vote in each House shall be recorded, and a majority of those present and voting shall be required in each House for the passing of the motion.

(f) A challenge to the accuracy of the minutes shall be made by way of amendment to the motion that the minutes be approved. Only those members who were present at the previous meeting to which the minutes relate shall be entitled to vote on the said amendment.
13. **Election, Selection or Appointment of Members to Office**

In the case of election, selection or appointment by Synod of a member of the Synod or of any other person to any office where the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies, the member or person to be elected, selected or appointed as the case may be shall be determined by a vote (or votes) by ballot in (each of) which members will be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. No member may record in the ballot more than one vote for any candidate. The candidate or candidates having the highest number of votes shall be declared duly elected. If there is equality of votes for the last vacancy, this shall be resolved by ballot or by a show of hands.

14. **Assessor**

The Standing Committee of the General Synod shall nominate an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, but the assessor shall intervene as assessor only on the call of the Chair, without prejudice to the right of the assessor when a member of the Synod to speak and vote as such.

15. **Suspension of Rules**

The application of any or all of these Rules of Order may be temporarily suspended or amended by a majority amounting to two-thirds of those present and voting. Voting shall be as one House.

---

**RULE 10 MOTIONS: PRACTICE NOTE**

Before considering presenting a motion Synod members are encouraged to liaise with the Secretary General in order to consult with the Board to whom the matter will be delegated if the motion is passed. It is expected that in a majority of cases this will result in a co-operative response where the matter is taken on to the Board's agenda, and the need for a Rule 10 Motion will pass. Most matters can be dealt with using this process during the year through consultation with the relevant diocesan representative.
GENERAL SYNOD: A REFLECTION ON MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER

You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy (Psalm 65.8)

Within the daily rhythm of life, we become aware, when day breaks and when night falls, of moments of significance. A day begins and a day ends, never to return. Time has moved on during that day, and we have drawn a little nearer to whatever our end will be. Tomorrow will be another day, with a significance of its own. It will not be merely a repeat of today, no matter how many similarities there may be. Each day thus comes to us as a distinctive gift. We do not make it. We can only receive it. We may learn to receive it with gratitude and to return thanks for it to the God of creation, the giver of life.

Every day will I bless you and praise your name for ever and ever. (Psalm 145.2)

Thus it is that human beings, whatever their religious persuasion, have instinctively offered prayer at each day`s beginning and ending. At daybreak, prayer expresses gratitude for the passing of the night and for the gift of the new day. It offers to God all that is to be done and experienced as the day runs its course. At nightfall, prayer again expresses gratitude for what the day has brought and invites reflection on our use or perhaps misuse of it, entrusting our lives once again to God`s care during the hours of darkness.

Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come. (Luke 11.2)

Prayer becomes part of the rhythm of life, of waking and sleeping, of working and resting. The sun and the moon, as time`s markers, bring the further seasonal rhythms of winter and spring, summer and autumn. All these rhythms lead us to celebrate and reflect on the mystery of life itself, of our waking to life and of the coming sleep of death. Faith leads us further, to see in the passage from light to darkness and from night to morning an image of Christ`s surrender to death and, with his being raised from death, the promise of a new creation, the goal towards which all our labours, as people of faith, are directed.

Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, give thanks in all circumstances, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus. (1 Thessalonians 5.16f)

Morning and Evening prayer thus form the frame within which the activities of each day take place. They are the beginning and the ending of each day`s work. When, for example, the General Synod of our Church meets, Morning Prayer begins the day`s business and Evening Prayer brings it to a conclusion. Both express the context of faith which informs the entire work of Synod. Both offer us the opportunity to draw deeply on the words of the sacred writings (psalms, canticles, readings and prayers) and allow them to become the voice of our own prayer.

“[The Psalms] are the bright mirror in which we become more deeply conscious of what is happening to us”. (Cassian, conferences X,11)

Both Morning and Evening Prayer are there, not as optional extras for the piously inclined, but as the means by which we are reminded, as we begin and as we end the business of Synod, of the heart of the matter: the God through whom, in whom and for whom we exist.

“He prays unceasingly who combines prayer with necessary duties and duties with prayer. Only in this way can we find it practicable to fulfill the commandment to pray always. It consists in regarding the whole of Christian existence as a single great prayer. What we are accustomed to call prayer is only a part of it.” (Origen, On Prayer)

Note: Copies of the most recent edition of Daily Prayer (which includes Morning and Evening Prayer, Night Prayer (Compline) and the Psalter) are available from the General Synod Office, Price £9.00.
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Brechin Laity Alternates

Mrs Elizabeth Howson  
Dr Jaap Jacobs  
Mrs Judith Robinson  

Attending 2017

Edinburgh Clergy

Very Rev Frances Burberry  
Rev Markus Dünzkofer  
Rev Canon Anne C Dyer  
Rev Peter Harris  
Rev Dr Stephen M Holmes  
Rev Canon Allan Maclean  
Rev Dr Sophia Marriage  
Rev Canon John McLuckie  
Rev Canon Ian Paton  
Rev Canon David Richards  
Rev Canon Malcolm Round  
Rev Sarah Shaw  
Rev William J Shaw  
Rev Canon Fred Tomlinson  
Rev Dr Kenneth Webb  
Rev Dr Jenny Wright

Edinburgh Clergy Alternates

Rev Oliver Brewer-Lennon  
Rev Canon Dean Fostekew  
Rev David Paton-Williams

Edinburgh Laity

Mrs Kate Campbell  
Mrs Caroline Daye  
Ms Pam Dugan  
Mrs Karen Ellis  
Mrs Pamela Gordon  
Dr Michael Green  
Canon Helen Hood  
Dr Chris Johnston  
Miss Sheila Kidney  
Mrs Margaret Kieran  
Mrs Janet McKinnell  
Mr Barnaby Miln  
Mr Matthew Pemble  
Mr Alex Stewart  
Ms Victoria Stock  
Mr Howard Thompson
Edinburgh Laity Alternate
Mrs Pat Boyd

Glasgow Clergy
Very Rev Ian D Barcroft
Rev Cedric Blakey
Rev Lesley-ann Craddock
Rev Kirstin Freeman
Rev David Gifford
Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth
Rev John B M Macleod
Rev Canon Dr Scott Robertson
Rev Jane Ross
Rev Canon Drew Sheridan
Rev Dr Tom Wilson

Glasgow Clergy Alternates
Rev Martin Ayers
Rev Andrea Hagenbuch
Rev Moira E Jamieson
Rev the Hon Sydney Maitland

Glasgow Laity
Mr Kevin Boak
Mr Kennedy Fraser
Mr Jim Gibson
Mrs Margaret Hanley
Mr Graeme Hely
Mrs Anne P Jones
Dr Beth Routledge
Mr Alan Rumble
Prof Rob Smith
Ms Jenny Whelan
Mrs Linda Whitby

Glasgow Laity Alternates
Mr Ian Ansdell
Miss Trudy Hill
Mrs Carol Lovett
Mrs Maggie Sheen
Moray Clergy

Rev Canon Kathy Collins
Rev Dr James Currall
Rev Sarah Murray
Rev Christine Mylne
Rev Canon Cliff Piper
Rev Jenny Sclater
Very Rev Alison Simpson

Moray Clergy Alternate
Rev Christopher Mayo

Moray Laity

Mr Michael Campbell
Mr Iain Foyers
Ms Alison Garraway
Mr Colin Gregory
Mrs Jean Grimshaw
Mr Christopher Phillips
Mr Grant Swain

St Andrews Clergy

Rev Liz Baker
Rev Christine Fraser
Rev Diana Hall
Rev Prof Trevor Hart
Rev Canon Dominic Ind
Rev David Mackenzie Mills
Rev Dean Norby
Very Rev Kenneth Rathband
Rev Graham Taylor

St Andrews Clergy Alternates

Rev Andrew Frearson
Rev Capt Nick Green CA

St Andrews Laity

Mrs Emma Barrie
Dr Anthony Birch
Mr Chris Brown
Mrs Linda Brownlie
Mr James Gardner
Mr Brendan Grimley
Mrs Shirley Mann
Mrs Ruth Warmer
Prof Alan Werritty
St Andrews Laity Alternates

Mrs Charmian Paterson
Mr David Stacey
Mr Alan Thornton
Mr Alastair Williamson
SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS

There follows a list of current representatives appointed to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on a variety of other bodies and organisations.

Most positions are held by volunteers but in a few cases the SEC is represented by staff members and the list is annotated to show this.

Vacancies arise from time to time in the positions in question and if you have an interest in serving in any of the areas in question, please make your interest known to the General Synod Office.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
April 2017
## SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

### REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS – April 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABERLOUR CHILDCARE TRUST</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGELICAN COMMUNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>Alistair Dinnie</td>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>2016-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>John Re</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Network</td>
<td>Alan Werritty Bishop of St Andrews (Episcopal Rep)</td>
<td>Mission Board College of Bishops</td>
<td>2003* 2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Refugee and Migrant Network</td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Interfaith Concerns and for the Anglican Communion</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>CRPOF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Justice Network</td>
<td>Angela Daye</td>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>2010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Network</td>
<td>Emily Alldritt</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Reformed Dialogue</td>
<td>Bishop of St Andrews</td>
<td>Anglican Communion</td>
<td>2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Lutheran Dialogue</td>
<td>Rev Canon John Lindsay</td>
<td>Anglican Communion</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Board</td>
<td>Paul Goldfinch</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2008-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Mrs Pat Boyd</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>Mr Nick Cooke</td>
<td>ACTS</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Churches Racial Justice Group</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Churches’ Rural Group/RHS Committee</td>
<td>Rev Bob King</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Churches’ Children’s Group</td>
<td>Lorraine Darlow</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Church Relations Officer appointed as third SEC Representative. The position is non-voting. Officer presence helpful because of general overview of ecumenical relations.

² Since this is the successor to the body which previously oversaw Local Ecumenical Partnerships throughout Scotland, it is appropriate that the Church Relations Officer, as the ecumenical officer for the SEC, should also participate in this. This is mirrored in appointments from other denominations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEAS (formerly Scottish Sunday School Union)</td>
<td>Lorraine Darlow</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIAN AID SCOTTISH COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Elizabeth Doig</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OF SCOTLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Art and Architecture</td>
<td>Rebecca Cadie Alex Stewart (Alternate)</td>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>2008* 2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society Council</td>
<td>EMU representative Rev J Sanderson</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCHES’ MUTUAL CREDIT UNION Scottish Support Group</td>
<td>Rev Kenny Macaulay</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJN (Churches Racial Justice Network)</td>
<td>Rev Timothy Njuguna</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Society</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group on Ministry Among Children</td>
<td>Lorraine Darlow</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Society Project</td>
<td>Mrs Val Dunford Mrs Suzanne Horne Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Representatives Forum</td>
<td>John Stuart</td>
<td>ex officio Secretary General</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconal Association of the Church of England</td>
<td>Rev Norma Higgott</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in Community Scotland</td>
<td>Very Rev Ian Barcroft</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in Community Scotland Action Fund</td>
<td>Rev Canon Fay Lamont</td>
<td>Church in Society (annual reappointment)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenalmond Council</td>
<td>Primus Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway</td>
<td>ex officio College of Bishops</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Group on Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Naomi Browell</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Faith Scotland</td>
<td>Rev Cedric Blakey</td>
<td>CRPOF</td>
<td>2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Faiths Board on Community Justice</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meissen Commission (Celtic Churches Observer)</td>
<td>Rev Kenneth Fleming</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission to Seafarers</td>
<td>Bishop of Brechin</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Spiritual Care Development Committee</td>
<td>Rev Carrie Applegath Sister Clare Lockhart (Alternate)</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2004* 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The Forum comprises senior denominational officers ex officio.
## Representation on Other Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIP FOR WORLD MISSION</strong></td>
<td>Gill Young</td>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORVOO CONTACT GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye⁴</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUILLY CONTACT GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Rev Canon J McLuckie</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTLAND4PEACE STEERING GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Very Rev David Mumford</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td>John Whittall John Stuart⁵</td>
<td>Admin Board</td>
<td>2013* 1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Donald Urquhart/ Daphne Audsley</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES HERITAGE RESEARCH</strong></td>
<td>Richard Fawcett</td>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES HOUSING ACTION</strong></td>
<td>Joe Cassidy</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHA Affordable Housing Group</strong></td>
<td>Elliot Glen-esk</td>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH FAITHS ACTION FOR REFUGEES</strong></td>
<td>Rev Joan Lyon</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH JOINT COMMITTEE FOR RELIGIOUS AND MORAL EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>Patricia Boyd Alastair Macdonald</td>
<td>Church in Society Mission Board</td>
<td>2003* 2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH PILGRIM ROUTES FORUM</strong></td>
<td>Margaret Pedersen</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH STAINED GLASS SYMPOSIUM</strong></td>
<td>Edwina Proudfoot</td>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>2012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITY ENTERPRISE</strong></td>
<td>Rev Les Ireland</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td>Ms Sian Harris Ms Angela Daye</td>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>2007 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye One other</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)</strong></td>
<td>Rev Jeanette Allan</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK PLACE CHAPLAINCY SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Officer well placed within the denomination to act as liaison point with the Porvoo Communion.
⁵ Much of the agenda of the Committee deals with issues of a legal/regulatory nature. The two SEC representatives have traditionally comprised one officer and one other.
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ATTENDANCE SLIP

GENERAL SYNOD 2017

Name: __________________________________________

Diocese: _______________________________________

PLEASE PUT THIS IN THE BOX PROVIDED AT THE SYNOD
TRAVEL AND MEALS CLAIM FORM

Travel: £

________ miles at 45p/mile
Public Transport (receipts must be attached) ______

Overnight Accommodation Allowance (dinner, bed and breakfast):

________ nights at £_______ (up to max of £80 per night)
(receipts must be attached) ______

TOTAL COSTS
Balance due from Scottish Episcopal Church ______

Name (please print): ________________________________

Address: _______________________________________

__________________________________________

Payment will be by cheque or electronic bank transfer. If you wish payment to be made by bank transfer, please indicate as follows:

Either: Use my bank details already provided to General Synod Office*
Or: Use the following bank details*:
* Delete as appropriate

Account in the name of: ________________________________
Bank sort code: ________________________________
Bank account number: ________________________________
Email address: ________________________________

Signed: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

(see notes overleaf)
NOTES:

1 Please ensure that this form is returned by not later than 30 June 2017 to the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5EE.

2 If you have decided not to claim expenses, please return the form marked accordingly.

3 Please state if attending as an alternate.

4 Notification of payment of expenses made by electronic transfer will be sent by email.
General Synod 2017

Feedback Form

The Standing Committee values the comments of General Synod Members on the operation of the General Synod. If you have any comments, which you would like to have considered by the Standing Committee, you are invited to complete this Feedback Form and place it in the box at the exit when you leave after the final session of this General Synod. If you wish to make additional comments there is space at the end of the Feedback Form for that purpose. The Feedback Form can be submitted anonymously.

Please CIRCLE your multiple choice response and PRINT any other information

1. Sessions were generally chaired competently and clearly
   AGREE       NEUTRAL       DISAGREE

2. I would prefer more time in Synod to be given over to decision making rather than presentations of information
   AGREE       NEUTRAL       DISAGREE

3. I appreciated the worship at General Synod
   AGREE       NEUTRAL       DISAGREE

4. I liked the layout used for the Opening Eucharist
   AGREE       NEUTRAL       DISAGREE

5. I would have liked to have seen the following on the agenda:

6. If I could make one change to the way General Synod meets it would be:

7. I enjoyed the General Synod Dinner
   YES       NO

8. My Diocese held a pre-Synod meeting
   YES       NO

9. I attended my Diocese’s pre-Synod meeting
   YES       NO

10. I am a new member of General Synod
    YES       NO

11. My Diocese allocated me a “Buddy”
    YES       NO
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I am from the Diocese of

- Aberdeen & Orkney
- Argyll & the Isles
- Brechin
- Edinburgh
- Glasgow & Galloway
- Moray, Ross & Caithness
- St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane

I am a member of the House of

- LAITY
- CLERGY
- BISHOPS

If you would like to include your contact details: name, address, e-mail then please use the space below:

Thank you for completing the Feedback Form.  

Please remember to put it in the box at the exit before you leave for home on Saturday.  
If you have any further comments you wish to make please do so in the space below: