

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT ST PAUL'S AND ST GEORGE'S CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 12–14 JUNE 2014

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 and St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 12 June 2014.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. The Primus reflected on Jesus' presence with his disciples. The Church was called to be a community of disciples and not an institution with members. Jesus breathed on the disciples the breath of the Spirit. Disciples were called to become a God-breathed group of people – forgiven and forgiving – whether at worship, in pastoral care, in mission and service, in vestry meetings and in General Synod.

The Primus highlighted three exciting current challenges in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The first was the scale of the changes being proposed for the creation of a new Scottish Episcopal Institute and a new Mission Board. These were probably the most significant organisational changes for a generation and complemented one another. The Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy placed the focus of missional energy in dioceses and congregations under the leadership of Bishops as leaders in mission. That was the Church for which the new Institute would train people with a view to the next generation. The training would be formation-led.

Secondly, less than 100 days remained before the Referendum on Scottish independence. That would be a hugely important choice for Scottish society. Since the question on the ballot paper would be political and constitutional, churches and faith groups had felt they should remain impartial. Within the Scottish Episcopal Church there were people on either side of the debate. Whether Scotland's future lay inside or outside the United Kingdom, the Scottish Episcopal Church would remain a Scottish Church. Whilst it might remain impartial on the Referendum question, the Church was not passive in its concern for the kind of society which Scotland would be in the years to come. The Church was part of the active debate going on about the place of faith in any new Scotland and about the place of faith in a written constitution. Churches and faith groups should act carefully in the debate. Referring to his Irish background, the Primus indicated that people tended to make assumptions that members of a particular church would have particular views on political or constitutional matters. That was why he was uncomfortable when the Scottish Episcopal Church was called "the English Church". It carried an implication that the Scottish Episcopal Church was less Scottish, or less

Christian, than others when in fact the Church's desire was to serve the community and all its people whatever the Referendum outcome.

The passing of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 had been a significant event. Rapid societal change was a challenge for all churches because they held within them a number of very different ways of looking at such issues. Those different ways honoured different approaches to the understanding of the authority of Scripture, a passion for justice and inclusion, understandings of holiness of life, and they honoured Jesus whose ministry included rather than excluded. The challenge for the Church was a spiritual one – to find out what it meant to live in its context faithfully and yet together. Whilst one was very aware of the diversity of the Anglican Communion, the Primus suggested that the first duty of the Scottish Episcopal Church was to explore and respond to its own diversity while staying in relationship as a community of disciples bound together in the love of God. The Pentecost season was the moment when anxious disciples were filled with the Spirit and became people of energy, courage and truth.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Christian Aid in Syria. The offering amounted to £1,280.28 (excluding tax reclaims).

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 and faiths: –

The Rev Gary Barclay (United Free Church of Scotland), Major Alan Dixon (Salvation Army), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev Eder Goncalves (Baptist Union of Scotland), the Rev John Humphreys (United Reformed Church), Msgr Philip Kerr (Roman Catholic Church), the Very Rev Dr Sheilagh Kesting (Church of Scotland), the Rev Matthew Ross (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), Margaret Peacock (Religious Society of Friends), Astrid Bunne (Interfaith Scotland) and the Rev Tim Cole, Assistant Chaplain General.

The Venerable Christine Wilson (Church of England) was welcomed later during the meeting.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Rev Canon Dr Scott Robertson and the Very Rev Nicki McNelly were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively by the House of Clergy.

Mrs Helen Hood and Mr Alex Stewart 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 and Mr Donald Urquhart were appointed tellers for the meeting.

1.4 Assessor

The Primus announced that Dr Joe Morrow, Advocate, had been appointed as his Assessor. Dr Morrow was congratulated on his appointment as Lord Lyon.

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2013

Mr Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 6-8 June 2013.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.6 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.7 Matters Arising from New Venue for Synod

The Secretary General welcomed members to General Synod 2014, being held for the first time in St Paul's and St George's Church. He explained that a number of matters would be different from previous years including the fact that throughout Synod members would sit at discussion group tables. A number of procedural motions had also been included on the agenda to allow for Synod to meet in different modes. Flipcharts had been provided for the discussion tables and these would be collected at the end of Synod and typed up so that they could be made available along with the formal minutes of the meeting.

1.8 Elections

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by General Synod in 2014 comprised the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, one lay post on the Standing Committee, two vacancies for General Synod representatives on the Administration Board, three vacancies for General Synod representatives on the Mission and Ministry Board, vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee for one practising lawyer, a lay member, an alternate lay member and the Secretary and vacancies on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal for three practising lawyers, two clerics and three lay members. In addition, a motion would be proposed later in Synod for the extension of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont's Convenership of the Home Mission Committee for one year.

As was explained in the Synod papers, the Rev Christopher Mayo was nominated by the Standing Committee for the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board and nominations were also made by the Standing Committee in relation to all of the vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and Clergy Discipline Tribunal. In relation to the nomination of the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as a cleric on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal, in the light of her prospective appointment as the new Principal of the new Scottish Episcopal Institute, Dr Tomlinson had indicated she would resign from the Clergy Discipline Tribunal at the point of taking up office as Principal. The Standing Committee had power to fill vacancies arising during the year and so would be invited to fill the vacancy at that point.

The Secretary General reported that a nomination of Mr Jim Gibson had been received in relation to the vacancy for a lay member on the Standing Committee and a nomination of Mrs Nan Kennedy had been received in relation to one of the vacancies for General Synod members on the Administration Board.

He explained that, in the past, where there had been no competing nominations for vacancies, the practice of Synod had been to fill the vacancies by general acclaim. Synod confirmed that it would be willing to do so again at the current meeting.

1.9 Audio Streaming of Proceedings

The Secretary General indicated to Synod that, as had been done in previous years, the proceedings of Synod would be audio streamed through the provincial website.

1.10 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 137 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: the Rev Bob Fyffe, Ms Ruth Jeffries, Mr Andrew November and the Rev Matthew Ross.

1.12 Doctrine Committee

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

“That the Synod meet in groups for informal discussion of this item under Rule 4 (c).”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

The Rev Dr Harriet Harris (Convener, Doctrine Committee) introduced the most recent Grosvenor Essay which had been produced by the Doctrine Committee entitled *The Church and Scottish Identity*. The Grosvenor Essays were produced annually by the Committee and were intended for group or individual use to aid reflection on theological and social matters. The Committee hoped that the most recent Essay would have relevance for people before and after the Scottish independence Referendum. The idea for the Essay had begun with the Committee asking questions as to whether the Church, being by its nature both local and global, diverse, and in some ways divided, yet nevertheless still the body of Christ, and being in the world but not of it, could shape thinking about identity. She expressed thanks to those who had assisted the Committee in its task including the Primus, Dr John Reuben Davies, the Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo, the Very Rev Gerald Stranraer-Mull, the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden, the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan, the Rev Matthew Ross and Prof Will Storrar. Implicit in the Essay was a commitment to certain values, especially to peaceable and respectful relations. However, the Essay had been compiled as an invitation to its readers to draw out values and reflect further on the values they wished to see embedded in Scottish life. Shortly, the Synod would be invited to address certain questions in discussion groups and the comments recorded on flipcharts would be written up so that they could be reflected back to Synod.

Opportunity was given for questions but there were none.

The Synod then addressed the following questions in discussion groups: –

1. How does the forthcoming Referendum affect your thoughts about the role and identity of the Scottish Episcopal Church and what the SEC is able to offer?
2. What values do you most wish to see embedded in Scottish life?
3. What can we do to help embed these values?

Session 2 - The Very Rev Susan Macdonald in the Chair

2.1 Standing Committee

2.1.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31 December 2013

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013.

During the year, the Standing Committee had considered a wide range of issues. These had included maintaining an overview of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy including the establishment of a series of networks across the Province; continued monitoring of the financial position of the Synod and the budgeting process; following up the Pension Fund

debate which had taken place at Synod 2013 and the carrying out of the statutory consultation and implementation of recommendations approved by Synod 2013 with effect from January 2014; an overview of the steps taken by the Mission and Ministry Board following the external inspection report received in 2013 on TISEC; overseeing the planning and design of the 2013 Synod and taking account of the recommendations of the Organisation Review Committee which had included the recommendation that a new venue be considered for General Synod 2014; noting the progress made by the Information and Communication Board especially in relation to the development of the new provincial website.

Mr Palmer then commented on the Accounts contained in the Annual Report. The Standing Committee was committed to ensuring that the Synod operated within the financial resources available and it set budgets which, it hoped, would result in a break even position. In recent years, the Boards had been asked to review their budgets on a regular basis and to keep expenditure as tight as possible. In addition to a number of planned savings, the Standing Committee had encouraged Boards and other Committees to exercise restraint in their expenditure and the continuation of such restraint was one of the general contributory factors to there having been a surplus in 2013. The income on the General Fund had totalled over £1.7 million, comprising investment income and interest over £1 million and quota payments from dioceses of approximately £640,000. Overall income had been approximately £60,000 higher in 2013 than in 2012. It had also exceeded the budget projection by almost £30,000. This had been due to higher than budgeted investment income and higher than expected donations and legacies. Expenditure had been just under £1,517,000 and was £64,300 higher than in 2012 but nearly £134,000 below budget. This had produced a surplus of £237,490, more than £163,446 over budget. The Committee had not been deliberately trying to make a surplus, but as would be apparent when looking at the budget for 2015, that surplus would be very helpful. A number of factors had contributed to the surplus including: limited demand on Grants for Ministry resulting in an under-spend of £38,000; an under-spend by the Faith and Order Board of nearly £8,000; savings by the Information and Communication Board of over £15,000 partly because fewer editions of *inspires* had been produced; an under-spend by the Ministry Development Committee of £56,000 arising from the fact that the budget had contained provision for an additional staff member but appointment had been deferred pending the outcome of the review of TISEC; an under-spend by the Home Mission Committee of almost £9,000 due to reduced costs associated with the Glenalmond youth weeks and a saving of £7,500 by the Church in Society Committee arising from a change in the way that ACTS' racial justice work was being undertaken. Mr Palmer thanked all of the Boards and Committees for their excellent work in operating within budgets.

Mr Palmer commented that the capital funds on the General Account had increased by over £2.6 million to £23.8 million, principally as a result of general increases in the stock market. Total capital resources were in excess of £35.4 million, as shown in the provincial balance sheet. Overall, the accounts showed a reasonably healthy financial position but there was still a need to budget carefully in future years to ensure that the Synod lived within the available funds.

Commenting on 2014, Mr Palmer drew attention to the fact that, as stated in the Annual Report, the Standing Committee would focus on: the need to address significant financial deficits projected for future years including whether it was feasible or desirable to reinstate the availability of substantial buildings grants; the need to ensure that resources were used efficiently and effectively; work in relation to the financial relationship between province and dioceses in order to underpin the diocesan-based emphasis of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy (integral to this would be the role of the Grants for Ministry Fund and the phased discontinuation of funding previously made to dioceses for dispersed TISEC); follow-up to the TISEC review including, especially, the governance arrangements likely to arise and which would include alterations to the Board and Committee structure and the composition of Standing Committee itself.

Mr Palmer drew the attention of Synod members to the information included in the Synod Papers regarding the size of General Synod. He explained that the number of members of Synod was recalculated every 10 years in accordance with Resolution 8 under Canon 52. The number of diocesan representatives on General Synod had reduced from 140 to 124 as a result.

In closing, Mr Palmer thanked the Conveners and members of all of the Boards and Committees and the General Synod Office staff. He was willing to take any questions.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) congratulated Mr Palmer and staff on the quality of the financial information which had been produced. At a time of financial pressure he noted from the figures contained in the Annual Report and Accounts that average giving appeared to be in the order of £5 per week. He asked who had responsibility for encouraging sacrificial Christian giving.

Mr Palmer responded that the issue was a very important one. The level of giving was very variable and there was a responsibility on province, dioceses and vestries, but, ultimately, the responsibility had to lie locally.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (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 2013.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

2.1.2 Budgets and Quota Overview

Mr Palmer turned to consider the budgets contained in the Synod Papers for the years 2014 to 2016. He explained that each year there was a detailed budgetary process undertaken by every Board and Committee whose proposals were then considered by the Standing Committee. Boards had again been asked by the Standing Committee critically to review their budget proposals for the years 2014–2016. In considering the proposals from the Boards, the Standing Committee had had, as always, two underlying principles in mind: that budgets should be set with a view to achieving a break even position on the General Fund and that large one-off receipts, such as legacies, ought to be capitalised by investing them in the Unit Trust Pool to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

In 2009, investment income had fallen dramatically and pension costs had increased. As a result, it had been necessary to find significant savings in subsequent years. The Synod was heavily dependent upon investment income. Until 2008, such income had increased broadly in line with inflation. However, it had fallen by 15% in 2009 and there had been no increases in 2010 and 2012 and only small increases in 2011 and 2013. Market conditions continued to be volatile and it was difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution would be. The Investment Committee continued to work closely with its Fund Managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates. As a result, current investment income was estimated to be £1 million, as compared with £1.2 million had previous trends continued.

The reduction in investment income and the increase in pension costs had created a challenging financial situation. Savings had been made, mainly as a result of a reduction in staff at the General Synod Office and restraint in spending on the part of Boards and Committees. However, those savings had not been enough to eliminate the underlying deficit. Major cost reductions had been achieved by the moratorium on building grants but it was becoming clear that there was little prospect of anything other than modest increases in investment income in the short term. These actions had resulted in significant surpluses on the General Fund of £845,000 over the four-year period 2010–2013. These had helped to fund the lump sum of £2 million which had been needed for the Pension Fund and had avoided the need to sell investments which, in turn, would have further reduced income. It had also been possible to increase investments by approximately £200,000 which in turn would produce future income. A number of legacies received had also been invested.

Current budgets reflected a phased reintroduction of building grants but that might not be possible given other financial pressures. Standing Committee recognised that there was understandable concern regarding the impact that a lack of provincial building grants support might have. However, such grants were one of the largest areas of discretionary spending within the budget. Mr Palmer was pleased that the Administration Board and the Conveners of the Finance and Buildings Committees were working together to consider how to deal with the fact that it might not be possible to reintroduce larger building grants.

A further area of financial pressure was the expected increase in the number of curates in the coming years. Budgets had been prepared on the assumption that five stipendiary curates would be appointed in 2014. Since preparing the budgets, one of those curates had in fact opted for a non-stipendiary curacy position but nevertheless the number of stipendiary curates was double the number appointed in any of the previous four years. This was a welcome and important addition to the life of the Church but had financial consequences. Also, the financial impact of the proposed changes recommended in the TISEC Review Working Party report could be significant.

Mr Palmer explained that a surplus of £28,781 was now budgeted for 2014. However, budgetary pressures were continuing and there were projected deficits for 2015 and 2016 on the General Fund of £69,085 and £180,197 respectively, albeit those figures were indicative only. As was noted in the budget report contained in the Synod papers, the indicative budgets did not include the likely costs associated with implementing some of the proposals emerging from the TISEC review. Had such costs been included, the budget deficits in 2015 and 2016 would have been in the region of £125,000 and £273,000 respectively. Synod would have the opportunity to hear more about the proposals later in the meeting. One of the key priorities for the Standing Committee in the coming year would be to review the priorities for expenditure. He emphasised that as outlined in the finance paper accompanying the TISEC Working Party Report, the changes being made in relation to training provision were broadly cost neutral. A number of the aspirations in the report, however, had significant cost implications and the Standing Committee would work with the College of Bishops and others to consider the most appropriate timescale for their implementation and the most suitable strategy for increasing income.

As far as the budget was concerned, the overall budget, including Miscellaneous and Restricted Funds showed a surplus of £56,621 for 2014 with deficits in 2015 and 2016 of £54,880 and £142,177 respectively. He emphasised that the 2015 and 2016 figures were indicative only and would be considered by the Standing Committee again in the autumn. As far as quota was concerned, it was proposed to increase Provincial quota to £678,602, an annual increase of £19,765 or 3%. That increase compared with RPI in April of 2.5% and CPI of 1.8%.

In closing, Mr Palmer explained that at General Synod 2013 there had been requests for a greater quantity of financial information to be provided. The Synod Papers contained such additional information which he hoped would be useful for members. There would also be an opportunity to discuss that information at a lunchtime meeting later in Synod.

Questions were invited but there were none.

2.1.3 Rules of Order

Mr Palmer explained that the Organisation Review Committee had recommended to the Standing Committee a couple of small alterations to the Rules of Order of Synod. At present, Rule 3 required members to stand and sit at various points. In the light of encouraging procedures which were as inclusive as possible of people with disabilities, the proposed change to Rule 3 would allow those who wished to speak simply to indicate this in a manner directed by the chairperson or by raising their hand. Similarly, the direction that a speaker should "sit down" when a point of order was raised would be altered such that the person speaking would be required simply to stop speaking until the question of order had been resolved.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

“That Rule 3 of the Rules of Order be amended as follows:

- *by the substitution of the first sentence by the words*

“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.”; and

- *by the substitution of the last sentence by the words*

“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.””

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mr Alan Rumble (Glasgow and Galloway) was concerned that in some places his Diocese was referred to in the Synod Papers as "Glasgow and Galloway" but in others simply as "Glasgow". He invited Standing Committee to address this and to ensure consistency.

Mr Palmer responded that this would be considered and apologised for instances where dioceses were not correctly designated.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Standing Committee for its work.

2.2 Rule 10 Motion

The Secretary General explained that a motion had been received under Rule 10 of the Rules of Order proposed by Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway), seconded by the Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and the Isles) and signed by twelve other members of Synod. He further explained that under the Rules of Order, Dr Routledge was entitled to a maximum of two minutes to address Synod as to why the Synod ought to consider the motion. A two thirds majority of those present and voting was needed to enable the motion to be considered. If that majority was achieved, the substance of the motion would be debated later in Synod.

Dr Routledge then addressed Synod on the text of the following motion presented under Rule 10: –

This Synod notes:

- 1) *The recent passage of legislation which allows same-sex couples to marry in Scotland,*
- 2) *The principle which is now established in Scots law that no one should be forced to act against their conscience in this area,*
- 3) *That Scottish Episcopalians are not of one mind about these and other matters.*

This Synod resolves:

- 1) *For the wellbeing, peace, and mission of the Church, to endorse the principle that no one should be forced to act against their conscience in this area within the Church,*
- 2) *To request that the Faith and Order Board asks the Committee on Canons to draft an amendment to Canon 31 which will allow for the possibility of same-sex weddings taking place in the Scottish Episcopal Church whilst ensuring that no celebrant be compelled to act against their conscience in this area,*
- 3) *To consider such an amendment for First Reading at General Synod 2015, with consequent discussion in Diocesan Synods as an integral part of the Church's wider conversations within this area,*
- 4) *To notify dioceses immediately after this Synod as to how General Synod intends this matter to be considered.*

Dr Routledge explained that there had been a conversation on same-sex relationships in the Scottish Episcopal Church during the previous year through the Design Group and the Cascade Conversations which it had facilitated. The Conversations which had taken place in Pitlochry had been very positive experiences for many who were there, some of whom had signed the motion.

Whilst many Synod members might think that much time was already being spent at the current Synod talking about this very issue, she explained that Synod was not being given the opportunity to do so in open debate. The discussion planned for the following day was intended to be in the form of a presentation followed by table discussions only. If the Synod agreed to debate her motion on Saturday morning, that would be the only opportunity in the current year to talk about the issue together, as a whole Synod. The motion would allow the whole Church to take forward the positive things which had come out of the Cascade process.

Dr Routledge indicated that people had said to her to be patient and that the conversation would happen "next year, next year". However, the Church had not started talking the previous year with the commissioning of the Design Group - the Church had started talking about it long before the Scottish Government began to seek legislation for equal marriage. It was the case that people had been talking about the subject for years. There were Episcopalians who had been waiting for many years to be married, some of whom did not have a lot of "next years" left.

Dr Routledge said that there were Episcopalians of deep faith and good conscience who took a different view to her and who were frustrated and frightened by the Church's inability to talk openly about what might happen and what it might mean for them.

She was one of the youngest members of the Synod and was not an Episcopalian by birth but rather by choice. She had been proud to join the Church and call herself a member of it – of this Church with its rich history of synodical decision making, its long understanding that to accept more than one idea was to make the Church better and stronger and its deeply held tradition that all were welcome.

The Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) requested that voting be by ballot.

The Chair called for a show of hands from the members of the houses of Synod. After a show of hands, the Chair declared that the requisite majority for conducting the vote by ballot had been achieved.

Ballot papers were distributed on whether the Synod should consider the Rule 10 motion. After a count, the Secretary General declared the results: 77 in favour, 54 against.

In the light of the fact that a two thirds majority of those present and voting was required, the Chair declared the motion not passed.

2.3 Faith and Order Board

2.3.1 Committee on Canons: Canons for Second Reading (Canon 63, Sections 1 and 4 – *Of the Office of Lay Representative*)

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that, as acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board, the Board determined policy and it was for the Committee on Canons to explain how proposed canonical changes implemented such policy. The policy in relation to Canon 63 was to tidy up the procedures for electing lay representatives and to make clear specifically who was entitled to vote in such elections.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the proposed alteration addressed two issues. In its current form, the Canon presupposed that there would always be a cleric in charge to oversee the election of a lay representative. The alteration addressed the situation where in fact there was no cleric in charge or where the cleric was unable, for whatever reason, to fulfil the necessary functions. The alterations also addressed the question as to whether or not a retired clergyperson could act as a lay representative. The answer was "no" and the alteration made clear that any lay communicant member was eligible to hold office as a lay representative or alternate lay representative.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway then proposed, and Mr Romano seconded, the following motion: –

“That the amended text for Canon 63, Sections 1 and 4 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 Laity: passed unanimously
House of Clergy: passed unanimously
House of Bishops: passed unanimously

2.3.2 Liturgy Committee: Alterations to the Calendar

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway), as Acting Convener of the Faith and Order Board, explained that the policy of the Board in proposing a change to the Scottish Calendar of Saints was to make the Calendar as accurate as humanly possible.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Convener, Liturgy Committee) explained that he was retiring as Convener of the Committee at the current Synod. He then

introduced the Rev Canon James Milne who had been appointed by the Faith and Order Board to succeed him as the Convener of the Liturgy Committee.

Canon Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) explained the proposed alteration to the Calendar. John Mason Neale had been a priest who had been very involved in the Oxford Movement and had translated many ancient hymns. He had died on 6 August which was the Feast of the Transfiguration and, therefore, could not be remembered on that day. The custom in such circumstances was to remember the individual on the closest available day. Most Anglican churches had chosen 7 August for that purpose. However, the Scottish Episcopal Church had not been able to remember him on that date because it had already been allocated to St Boisel. The previous year, the date for remembering St Boisel had been altered to the correct date, thereby freeing up 7 August. The proposed alteration was, therefore, to bring the Scottish Calendar into line with the rest of the Anglican Communion.

Canon Milne then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

“That the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended such that the date of commemoration of John Mason Neale, Priest, 1866 be changed from 9 August to 7 August.”

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

Canon Paton then reported on the work of the Liturgy Committee. In addition to the matters covered by the Committee’s report in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2013, he explained that the experimental period for the Service of the Word had been extended by the College of Bishops until General Synod 2015. The Liturgy Committee was keen to receive feedback by the end of September 2014. There was a form available online and from the General Synod Office for people to provide feedback. Also, he informed Synod that the Eucharistic Prayer which had been used earlier in the day in the opening Eucharist had also been an experimental text. It had similarly been authorised for use until General Synod 2015 and feedback was also sought on it. It was based on the 1929 Scottish Prayer Book. For those who might wish to use it, it represented a bridge between the Church’s Prayer Book tradition and the 1982 Liturgy.

As outgoing Convener, Canon Paton expressed his thanks to the Church for the opportunity to serve as Convener, and to members of the Committee and Elspeth Davey, its Secretary. There was currently much work ongoing in relation to pastoral rites. There was also work being done on collects and the Committee had been asked to think about work on the Eucharist in the future. One day, the question of a Scottish Prayer Book might be revisited. He wished the incoming Convener and the Committee all the best for the future. Liturgy was the heartbeat of the Scottish Episcopal Church, saving it from the tyranny of the "here and now".

Bishop Duncan thanked Canon Paton for all that he had done to help form the liturgical life of the Church. His contribution had been inestimable.

The Chair also expressed thanks to Canon Paton for his Convenership and to Bishop Duncan and all who served on the Faith and Order Board.

2.4 Information and Communication Board

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) presented his final report as Convener. He explained that he had been involved in the life of the Board for most of the previous 16 years. As he now stood down from the Board, he reflected on how much the work of the Board had changed during that period. A whole information revolution had taken place. When he had first joined the Board, email had been something of a novelty and blogging was unheard of. The Board had generally been concerned with print medium and was, in effect, a small publishing house which produced a newspaper and a variety of small books, often local histories of one congregation or another. The Board also discussed the reprinting of Liturgies and this had now passed to the Liturgy Committee itself. As the world had changed, so had the work of the Board. The information produced in paper was now much less than that produced and distributed electronically.

One of the early developments during his own Convenership had been the production of *inspires online*. This was now a primary vehicle for communication within the Church. His expectation was that more narrowly targeted electronic publications would be coming. Throughout his Convenership the balance of what was produced online and what was produced in print had always been present. That issue would continue for the Board under a new Convener. He hoped that the collection of articles which constituted the printed version of *inspires* was a showcase for the Scottish Episcopal Church. As editor, he was in awe of those who wrote competently and speedily. While the quantity of printed material was less, he suggested that the quality of what was produced, for example in *inspires*, was rising. He was very grateful to those who used their imagination in the service of the Church.

Over the years, he had witnessed various incarnations of the Church's web presence. He recalled the time when through the website, the Church had offered an online prayer service. The facility had got a little out of hand when more than 400 prayer requests were being received each day. Earlier in the year, the latest incarnation of the website had been launched. A small team of members of the Board had worked under the leadership of the Rev Christopher Mayo to produce the new website. The Wordpress template which had been used for the website was owned by the Church and would be made available to congregations and dioceses who wished to have a site which looked similar. This would replace the template which Provost Holdsworth himself had produced a few years previously. In addition to the new website, the Board had also addressed a number of smaller matters. It had reviewed the heraldry of the Church. The "pub sign" had been digitised and the diocesan crests had been updated.

As he stepped down as Convener, he was very aware of how this area had become integral to the life of the Church. The lines of mission and communication were now more blurred than they had been previously. He suggested that in future mission and communication should be more closely linked.

In closing, he referred to his written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. He thanked all those who had been involved in this area of the Church's life. He had enjoyed being at its heart and working with other members of the Standing Committee. He offered his good wishes to all those who would carry on the work in the future.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Provost Holdsworth for his report and for all that he had done as Convener of the Board and as a member of the Standing Committee.

2.5 College of Bishops

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) and the Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) made a joint presentation on what it meant to be a Bishop in mission, explaining that their presentation was intended to be personal rather than theoretical.

Both Bishops referred to the influences during their upbringing and training. Bishop Gillies had grown up within an elderly congregation but the vicar had instilled within him an appreciation of "holy ground". Bishop Peyton had grown up in a congregation in West London where new members simply seemed to arrive. "Mission" was seen as something which happened overseas. At seminary, Bishop Gillies had encountered clergy who gave him a sense of what it could mean to be part of a missionary Church. In curacies at Falkirk and Edinburgh he had also witnessed congregations which were growing in numbers. Bishop Peyton had trained at Coates Hall under Principal Alastair Haggart who had believed that the Scottish Episcopal Church could operate in all places throughout Scotland. Parish placements had allowed him to experience the breadth of Church life. He had left college in no doubt that clergy and congregations had to "read the context".

Bishop Gillies had been heartened over the years by the ways in which the Scottish Episcopal Church sought to do mission. However, he had also been disappointed in that whilst various initiatives had been adopted to enable the Church to become intentionally more missional, they had tended to last for three or four years and then been allowed to lapse. The Church had not shown a deliberate willingness to keep going with certain initiatives. There was a need to change a mindset within Church members deliberately to become intentionally missional. At a recent meeting, a Church member had asked "what is mission?". The answer to such a question was not in a definition but in the activity which arose when such a question was asked.

Bishop Peyton spoke of his work as a vicar in a deprived area in Nottingham. The ministry had been so demanding that the question of Church growth had not been "on the radar". However, around that time the Church of England had engaged in the Decade of Evangelism. This had had a profound effect by reminding him about the Mark of Mission regarding the proclaiming of the good news of the kingdom. It was important not to be shy of preaching the good news of Jesus Christ. It was possible to be a deeply liturgical and pastoral Church, as the Scottish Episcopal Church indeed was, whilst also proclaiming the good news. He was no longer prepared to accept that church was a shrinking entity, vacating public space. As a Bishop, he had encouraged his diocese to think about what it meant to grow in numbers and outreach. Many congregations did not really think about such questions.

Bishop Gillies said he liked to challenge the assertion that mission was "not about numbers". The more people who met to praise God and pray, the better. However, there was the question of how practically to achieve growth. For example, how could a congregation of only three grow? He suggested that all that was needed was for those three people to have a Transfiguration experience. That was the foundation for growth. The move from being disheartened to being confident was the beginnings of mission. Every congregation could do better in the future than it was doing at present. He accepted, however, that sometimes the Church's buildings did not aid mission. There was a case for reordering some buildings in the spirit of what had been done at St Paul's and St George's.

Bishop Peyton had given much thought to the use of buildings. In his own Diocese, Church buildings were not necessarily in the wrong place but thought needed to be given as to how and when such properties were used. Some congregations were small and struggling only if measured by attendance at Sunday morning services. Measuring life by the use of church halls would give a different picture. St Martin's in Dundee had attracted particular attention when the multi-storey flats on either side of it had been demolished. The city planners were now very interested in the area and he hoped that St Martin's could develop a fresh mission to the people of the Hilltown area.

Bishop Gillies acknowledged that congregations which wished to re-orientate their buildings could face resource questions. However, any congregation, however small, could learn to pray together – for example by introducing the Ministry of Healing. As a start towards intentional mission, he urged every Episcopalian to develop that sense of personal confidence so as to move into couples or triplets in prayer after a morning service. For Christians to pray together on God's grounding Church was a mark of growing confidence and could lead to the sharing of God's love with others.

Bishop Peyton asked what it meant to be a vestry in mission? Did vestry members attend meetings with an attitude to face challenges other than just buildings and maintenance? Did vestries study the Bible together and think spiritually together? The answers to such questions were a measure of the Church's missional intent.

The Chair expressed thanks to both Bishops for sharing their reflections and insights.

2.6 Thanks to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller

The Primus paid tribute to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller who would be leaving TISEC at the end of August 2014. There was a close connection between TISEC, (and its successor the Scottish Episcopal Institute) with the College of Bishops because, ultimately, it was members of the College who decided whether an individual was to be ordained. Changes impacted on people and in moving from TISEC to the new Scottish Episcopal Institute he was aware of the "heart and soul" commitment of many people involved in training and, in particular, Dr Fuller. Dr Fuller had shown immense goodwill and graciousness. The Primus expressed thanks to him for all he had done since joining TISEC in 2000. Whilst conscious of the partnership between clergy and laity, it was in the training of clergy, in particular, that the quality of the next generation of the Church was defined. Dr Fuller had worked unstintingly, with limited resources, to provide quality of training and had helped to shape a generation of clergy.

The Primus presented a gift to Dr Fuller.

Dr Fuller thanked the Primus for his words. It had been a great privilege to serve the Scottish Episcopal Church in TISEC for the previous 14 years. He offered heartfelt thanks to all those who had played a key role during that time. In particular, he thanked Professor Judith George, Dr Peter Smart and the Very Rev Susan Macdonald who had served as Conveners of the Ministry Development Committee, the central staff, in particular, Mrs Denise Brunton, all of the academic co-ordinators, including the Rev Canon Ian Paton, those in the dioceses who had co-ordinated the work of TISEC and all those who had been students and constituted the learning community. He joined with all of those individuals in offering his prayers and best wishes to those who would be involved in the work of the new Institute including the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson and others who would be appointed in future.

Session 3 - Mr David Palmer in the Chair

3.1 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Chair invited the Rev Matthew Ross, General Secretary of Action of Churches Together in Scotland, to address Synod.

Mr Ross expressed thanks, on behalf of the ecumenical delegates at Synod, for Synod's welcome, friendship and hospitality. It was a great joy to gather with brothers and sisters in Christ in taking seriously the prayer of Christ "that they may all be one".

He explained that 24 years previously nine of Scottish churches, including the Scottish Episcopal Church, had created Action of Churches Together in Scotland

(ACTS). The model of being "churches together" was essential because ecumenical relationships could not be something which "someone else does" – everyone was in it together.

In April he had had the privilege of succeeding Brother Stephen Smyth as General Secretary. Previously he had served in parish ministry in Fife and Midlothian as well as spending six years working for the Conference of European Churches in Brussels. He had been touched by the Primus' letter to him upon appointment.

Shortly before his appointment, Mr Ross explained that ACTS had undergone some significant changes. The previous ACTS networks had been replaced by fixed term programme work. Underpinning all of this was a commitment to prioritising ecumenical work at local level. The Scottish Churches' National Sponsoring Body for Local Ecumenical Partnerships had been given a new name and an expanded remit – the "Ecumenical Development Group" was now a core part of ACTS and would give practical, theoretical and administrative support to local ecumenical partnerships and other local forms of co-operation. Organic growth towards unity and an emphasis on value for money might seem unspectacular but could prove crucial for many congregations. The churches of all denominations faced challenges in the years and decades ahead. Both human and financial resources were coming under considerable strain. Declining congregations were not confined to a single denomination and some church buildings were becoming problematic and unaffordable. Effective outreach and mission in Scotland was beyond the ability of any one denomination. In short, could the denominations share? Through effective co-operation, trust and good communication, resources could be maximised so that Christ's prayer of unity could be lived out.

Ecumenism had been treated with suspicion by some in the past, with unity becoming confused with uniformity. The heritage, presence and future witness of the Scottish Episcopal Church was vital to Christianity in Scotland and the other denominations would be diminished without the Scottish Episcopal Church. An example of this was the recent Grosvenor Essay on Scottish Identity to which he had been delighted to be asked to make a contribution. The Essay was a well-informed contribution to the current Scottish independence constitutional debate.

Mr Ross thanked all those from the Scottish Episcopal Church involved in the work of ACTS including Helen Hood, Elspeth Davey, the Rev Canon John Lindsay, the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney and the Primus. Ecumenical relations were as much about journeying together as arriving at a destination. He exhorted the Synod to enjoy journeying together.

Mr Ross indicated he was willing to answer questions.

Mrs Pat Boyd (Edinburgh) explained that she was an Episcopalian member on the Scottish Churches' Education Group. In that capacity, she had been asked to take part in a working group to produce Bible studies for churches to use in the run-up to the independence Referendum. She wondered whether the material had been disseminated.

Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh), speaking as the Convener of ACTS, explained that the material entitled *Values for Scotland* was available for downloading from the ACTS website. Limited hard copies had been produced and a small number had been provided to the General Synod Office. Mr Ross added that copies had been sent to all ACTS member churches. Also, he expected the ACTS website to be upgraded in the coming weeks.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland) mentioned that a Referendum conference had taken place earlier in the year. At that conference, it had been reported that material would be available for churches around the time of the Referendum. He asked that ACTS promote the material as far as possible. Mr Ross responded that the material would be available on the ACTS website during July in good time for use at the time of the Referendum.

The Chair expressed the thanks of Synod to Mr Ross.

3.2 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John Lindsay (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) drew attention to the Committee report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. He expressed a welcome to the Rev Matthew Ross as General Secretary of ACTS. Canon Lindsay also wished a fond farewell to Major Alan Dixon of the Salvation Army who would retire shortly.

Canon Lindsay reported that the Rev Sandy Montgomerie had accepted the invitation to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on the new Ecumenical Development Group of ACTS. With the sanction of the Faith and Order Board, the Committee would explore the possible extension of existing ecumenical agreements to churches with parallel agreements – in particular in relation to Lutheran and Anglican churches in North America. This was known as "transitivity".

Questions were invited on the general work of the Committee but there were none.

3.2.1 10th Assembly of the World Council of Churches (WCC)

Canon Lindsay explained that three motions on the Synod agenda related to the World Council of Churches' Assembly in Busan which he and Elspeth Davey had attended on behalf of the Church. The Assembly had met in plenary and there had been a number of difficult business issues. The Assembly had produced four documents two of which came to the General Synod at its present meeting. The other two comprised a statement on mission which was being passed to the Mission and Ministry Board and *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* which was a sequel to *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*. Both were available from the WCC website and also the Church of Scotland website. He had been a member of the Church of Scotland Ecumenical Relations Committee for a number of years and it had been a godsend.

Canon Lindsay then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod receive and take note of the Message of the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly.”

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

Canon Lindsay explained that a study guide had been produced by Scottish delegates who had attended the WCC assembly. He then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod receive the Unity Statement adopted by the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly and commend it for discussion to the Boards of the General Synod and to the dioceses and congregations of the Church.”

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, two against, one abstention.

Canon Lindsay proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod note the production of a Study Guide regarding the Unity Statement adopted by the 10th World Council of Churches Assembly and commend the Study Guide for use in dioceses and congregations of the Church.”

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority one against, two abstentions.

3.2.2 The Porvoo Communion of Churches

Canon Lindsay explained that from time to time it was necessary to alter the Schedule to Canon 15 which set out the list of Churches with whom the Scottish Episcopal Church regarded itself as being in full Communion. The Schedule already included the Churches of the Porvoo Communion. Two further Churches were about to sign the Porvoo Agreement and the motion which he would propose shortly was so that the Synod could consent to the addition of those Churches to the Schedule. The Churches in question were the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain.

Canon Lindsay then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod consent to the Episcopal Synod adding to the list of Churches contained in the Schedule to Canon 15 each of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain, conditionally upon each of those churches signing their agreement to the Porvoo Declaration, so that following addition by the Episcopal Synod, the Schedule to Canon 15 would be altered by the deletion of the word “and” before the words “The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark” and the addition at the end of the Schedule of the words “and the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and the Lutheran Church in Great Britain”.”

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) supported the motion but considered that it changed the character of the Porvoo Communion. That Communion had originally been set up on a geographical basis and the admission of the proposed additional Churches would alter that. He, therefore, wished clarity on the effect which the admission of the additional Churches would have upon overlapping jurisdictions. For example, in Edinburgh there was a church which belonged to the Lutheran Church in Great Britain and he wondered what the implications would be. Also, he wondered whether there had been any consultations with other full Communion partners in Europe about the proposed changes.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) wished to support the motion warmly. He explained that from time to time Lutheran clergy came to Scotland from North America. An individual who was a priest in the Lutheran Church in Canada would not be authorised under current Canons to minister in Scotland. However, if such an individual were a Lutheran minister in the Lutheran Church in Great Britain then such a person would become part of Porvoo.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) asked about the limits of transitivity. He wondered whether any Lutheran could join the Lutheran Church in Great Britain and thereby find themselves in full Communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church?

Canon Lindsay responded to the questions by explaining that the motion was to add two Churches which admittedly had not been part of the process which had led to the original Porvoo agreement. Initially in the life of the Porvoo Communion, it had been clear to the Contact Group and the Primates that only those churches which had been involved in the original discussions would be members of the Porvoo Communion. However, that door had been opened when the indigenous Anglican churches in Spain and Portugal had been admitted to Porvoo under the auspices of the Church of England's Diocese of Europe. He understood the concerns raised by Mr Duenzkofer

but indicated that the Churches in question had gone through due process and the Primates of the Porvoo Communion had agreed to their admission.

Turning to the question of transitivity, Canon Lindsay indicated that this had been discussed at the Faith and Order Board which had agreed that further exploration should be conducted. It would involve looking carefully at the documentation which described the nature of other agreements. If the principle were adopted, it would only currently apply in relation to Anglicans and Lutherans. Apart from Porvoo, the only other full Communion agreements between Anglicans and Lutherans appeared to be in the USA, Canada and Tanzania. On the question of limits, Canon Lindsay said that matters were restricted to Anglicans and Lutherans. It would, therefore, be true that if the motion were adopted then there would be full interchangeability between members and clergy between the Scottish Episcopal Church and any churches which were members of the Lutheran Church in Great Britain.

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) explained that the motion in question was not one about transitivity but was a distinct issue arising from the admission of the two additional Churches in question to Porvoo. It was important that Synod appreciated that. Transitivity was a hugely complex and distinct issue.

Mr Duenzkofer indicated that his second question about consultation had not been answered. In particular, he wondered whether there had been consultation with the Old Catholic Churches in Europe because he was aware that there had been some concern on their part about Anglicans entering into full Communion agreements with other churches on the continent. He suggested that overlapping jurisdictions might be counter-productive to the ecumenical movement. Canon Lindsay responded that the Old Catholics had been observers in the consultation leading to the original Porvoo agreement. He agreed that they had been upset by Anglicans moving towards full Communion arrangement with Lutherans. It was not a huge issue in Scotland because there were not many Old Catholics in Scotland.

The Rev Canon Dr Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) commented that there were limitations to joint prayer in the ecumenical sphere. At the Roman Catholic Mass whilst a Bishop could turn the elements into the body and blood of Christ, he could not allow an Episcopalian to receive the Sacrament. It was, therefore, necessary to live with certain limitations.

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

Session 4 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney in the Chair

4.1 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Mr Hugh Donald (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) referred to the report of his Committee appearing in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. Work on the implications for the Scottish Episcopal Church of the Anglican Consultative Council's Safe Church Charter was still ongoing. A specific item arising out of the Committee's work during the year had been to ensure that training received the necessary emphasis. This was being addressed in the current year and Mr Donald thanked the College of Bishops who had commended the undertaking of training. He encouraged people to take part in regional training events as they were organised and publicised.

In the previous year, there had been a heightening in society generally of awareness of historic abuse. The Church had procedures in place to address such matters. Also, considerable effort continued to be dedicated to retrospective admission of individuals to the Protection of Vulnerable Groups scheme. Unfortunately, the return rate of forms, owing to inaccuracies, was high and he encouraged Church members to bear with General Synod Office staff where they required to correct inaccuracies on forms which had been submitted to them. He expressed thanks to Donald Urquhart, Daphne Audsley and Betty Robertson for their work in the area of safeguarding.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked why it appeared to be the case that if individuals were being admitted to the PVG scheme for roles in different organisations there appeared to be a need to pay the admission fee twice. Daphne Audsley, speaking with permission, indicated that the system was designed to operate so that only one payment was made. There ought to be an appropriate linking up where an individual undertook work in different organisations.

The Chair thanked Mr Donald for the work of his Committee.

4.2 Mission and Ministry Board

4.2.1 Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy

Synod granted permission to speak to Mrs Gill Young and Mrs Lorraine Darlow. The Chair also explained that the procedural motion appearing in the agenda for the current session did not require to be put to Synod because the presentation to be given on behalf of the Home Mission Committee, as now proposed, would fall within the scope of the existing Rules of Order.

The Primus introduced the session. He indicated that the appointment of the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as the Principal of the new Scottish Episcopal Institute had been greeted with immense pleasure across the Church. No one knew the Church better than she did and she was known for the rigour of her work and her generosity. The new Institute would equip the next generation of those in authorised ministry to provide leadership within the Church.

The Primus reported that the Church had now travelled a long way in its Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and this was linked to the movement from TISEC to the new Scottish Episcopal Institute. As part of that, the Mission and Ministry Board would in future become a Mission Board. The Policy articulated the principle of the diocese as the focus for mission, with Bishops acting as leaders in mission. This was no longer an aspiration but a reality. The Church had let go of the idea of central policy being delivered by provincial officers working across the Province. The challenge now was how to prevent seven different approaches and to ensure an acceptable level of coherence.

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Convener, Home Mission Committee) reminded Synod that the primacy of mission had been affirmed in the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy which recognised the diocese as the focus for mission and Diocesan Bishops as leaders in mission. Since Synod 2013, the Home Mission Committee had been working steadily towards establishing networks in the following areas: youth, children, mission initiatives, stewardship, spirituality, lay learning and rural issues. The networks would support inter-diocesan collaboration for the sharing of information, planning and good practice thereby helping to maximise the resources invested in mission and strengthen the work across the Province. It was important that they gathered together those from across the dioceses who were called and who were passionate about particular areas of mission and who also had the necessary skills and practitioner experience in order to maximise potential.

Canon Lamont hoped that this would bring a degree of provincial coherence to the Church's mission without imposing significant burdens of infrastructure. The networks would operate on a "light touch" basis and would not simply add a new layer of committees to existing structures. How the networks might operate had not been prescribed and it would be for each network to determine for itself its own means of working. It was hoped that contact would be easier, regular and cheaper, saving time, energy, travel miles and paper, by encouraging contact through the website, email, telephone or social media. The new provincial website would offer fresh possibilities for interactive communication. The province would maintain broad oversight in relation to the networks and the Home Mission Committee intended to bring the co-ordinators of the networks together and would do so from time to time to enable connections to be made between work being undertaken by different networks so that no single network would operate in isolation. It was

envisaged that the new Mission Board would effectively be the appropriate provincial body to offer that oversight.

Canon Lamont introduced the Rev Tembu Rongong, Convener of the Youth Committee.

Mr Rongong, speaking with permission, explained that "life story" was the theme of Glenalmond 2014 – the life of Jesus and of everyone else. Bookings could still be accepted and details were available on the provincial website.

Canon Lamont indicated that she was currently the Co-ordinator of the Stewardship Network. Referring to the question asked earlier in the Synod about responsibility for stewardship, she suggested that dioceses had a responsibility to provide leadership. If Synod members knew of any person who was passionate about stewardship she would be pleased to hear from them.

Reporting that the Rev Lisa Eunson was the Co-ordinator of the Lay Learning Network and that the Rev Prof David Atkinson was the Co-ordinator of the Rural Issues Network, Canon Lamont introduced the Rev Canon Fred Tomlinson as the co-ordinator of the Spirituality Network.

Canon Tomlinson (Edinburgh) explained how he envisaged the Spirituality Network operating. For a number of years he had received reports from those in the dioceses responsible for organising retreats. Small grants were provided to dioceses by the Home Mission Committee for this. However, he had had a sense that more could be done together and was therefore encouraged when the idea of networks emerged. He had been struck by the idea of retreats being focused on different groups of people at different stages in life but, having had no direct experience of such retreats, wanted to find out from others who had such experience. He had therefore been pleased to hear from the Rev Paddy Allen.

The Rev Paddy Allen (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said it had been good to have had the approach from Canon Tomlinson. Retreats were a very powerful mission tool. She spoke of her personal experience of retreats which had been profound and had enabled her to meet God in a more authentic way. Many people outside the Church went on retreats such as business or art retreats.

Canon Lamont then introduced Mrs Lorraine Darlow as the Co-ordinator of the Children's Network.

Mrs Darlow explained that the Network aimed to encourage dioceses and local churches to consider how their involvement with children might grow and develop. She commented on six areas. Nurturing spirituality meant affirming children as whole spiritual persons. They had innate spiritual

sensitivity and had much to teach adults. Supporting the faith formation of children meant recognising that belonging to the family of faith was a key aspect for the faith formation of a child. However, some traditional models of discipleship among children had often looked to separate children from adults and segregate them by age ranges. The paradigm of ministry among children was shifting with a greater emphasis on modelling Christian life and worship. There was a huge amount of resources available to help equip the Church and parents for the discipling of children. Involving children in worship could be problematic for many churches and yet was a real priority. If gathered worship had the potential to be not only formational but transformational then there was a need to explore how the Church could engage children in the full worshipping life of a congregation, including Communion. Being child and family friendly meant making room for children and letting them know that they belonged and were free to participate. If that were to happen, there was a need seriously to reflect on how best to welcome and make provision for children and families.

Several denominations had invested in developing Child Friendly Church initiatives and awards and work had already taken place in at least one diocese in Scotland. The aim of this was to encourage churches to assess, develop and regularly review their practices in order to make church gatherings child and family friendly. Simple things such as ensuring that children could see what was happening during a service or considering the way words and images were used would help to include children. A CFC programme could provide mechanisms for a church to develop its provision as part of the mission of the congregation. The Network could help in the utilising of resources by sharing information as to what might be appropriate in terms of materials for different contexts. One example was *Godly Play* which was being used more and more with all ages, not just children. Finally, providing support and development for those working with children, whether clergy, paid workers or volunteers was important. One means of support was the provision of appropriate training. *Core Skills in Children's Work* was a foundational six session course developed by the Consultative Group on Ministry among Children (a network of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland). It covered topics such as child development, teamwork, programme planning, children and community, pastoral awareness, using the Bible with children and prayer. She encouraged people to join in the conversation through the Children's Network Facebook page.

Canon Lamont then introduced Mrs Gill Young, the Co-ordinator of the Mission Initiatives Network. Mrs Young suggested that the advent of the networks meant a change from a top-down approach to one that was horizontal across dioceses. Each diocese had its own way of organising its mission and all congregations had their own calling. She was in contact with people across the dioceses in the various diocesan initiatives for mission. Later that month, a meeting of mission action facilitators from the Dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway and St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane would take

place. The networks were a means of encouraging informal communication. She encouraged diocesan Mission Officers to be in touch with her.

Canon Lamont thanked all of the Network Co-ordinators for their contributions. Questions were invited.

Dr Peter Kemp (Argyll and the Isles) welcomed the emphasis being placed on dioceses and charges in relation to mission. He was excited by the establishment of the networks but suggested that proposals in the Digest of Resolutions appeared to recreate the old structure. He believed that the future lay with the networks and that alterations to the Digest of Resolutions to be proposed the following year should include reference to the networks and invest them with appropriate authority.

4.2.2 TISEC Review

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) reported as Convener of the Scottish Episcopal Institute Implementation Group and as a member of the TISEC Review Working Party. He explained that the Working Party had commenced its work under the Convenership of the Rev Canon Anne Dyer and when she had, unfortunately, had to withdraw for health reasons, Bishop Pearson had taken over the Convenership. He thanked Canon Dyer for her work and support throughout.

The Implementation Group had worked very hard to meet the deadlines dictated by meetings of the Mission and Ministry Board, the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee. He paid tribute to Dr Fuller without whose work and wisdom the Implementation Group would not have been able to complete its task. He wished to report under the headings mission, ministry and money.

As to mission, this was the context within which the reports were presented to Synod. The reports were contained in the Synod Papers and he wished to remind Synod of the ethos within which the work had been carried out. Mission was the gospel imperative. In terms of the Scottish Episcopal Church motto, "Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order" it was the case that mission made real the Word of God as the Church sought his truth and apostolic order made real the sacramental hope of drawing closer to God. The reports and the recommendations within them had been made in the context of the real excitement that, in mission, the Scottish Episcopal Church had something to offer the whole community in Scotland. The holistic approach of the Whole Church Policy was working. The networks pointed to inter-diocesan co-operation which came out of a deep desire to preach the gospel and make God's love real. He did not subscribe to the view that the mission initiatives of the previous 35 years had been temporary enthusiasms which had disappeared. They had in fact made the Scottish Episcopal Church the Church which it was today. The insights of local collaborative ministry had shown that there were real benefits when the Province acted as

a whole. Million for Mission had reminded the Church that if it was not to retreat into cathedrals and leafy suburbs but to remain committed to the whole country, there was a need to grapple with real issues such as rural poverty.

As to ministry, Bishop Pearson said that ministry was that of the whole people of God in which some were called to the specific orders of bishops, priests and deacons. The Quality in Formation Panel report which had been received in 2013 had marked TISEC's coming of age and took up matters which had been on the agenda for some time, including governance, staffing and the placement of curates. The formation of those who exercised ordained ministry in the Church was crucial to the future health and growth of the Church's mission. Formation took prayer and the sacramental life as the basis for all theological reflection and encouraged the individual to seek God as a disciple. The false distinction between initial ministerial education and subsequent years was broken down in the reports. Theological reflection was the tool of ordained ministry which constantly needed use and renewal.

The adoption of the Common Awards validation procedure under the University of Durham was an exciting development in the context of theological study and formation. It would also give the Scottish Episcopal Church the chance to have its own customised validation approach and Dr Tomlinson would lead the process in ensuring that the Scottish Episcopal Church had a programme which suited its own needs. The fact that the report on formation referred to the role of Bishops was very important because it made clear that the role of the Bishop was not just a supervisory one but pointed to the fact that the Bishops were themselves involved in the formational process in their own ministries. The College of Bishops had embraced unanimously and enthusiastically the insights of the report. It was important to note that the Primus had taken the initiative earlier in the year to bring together ecumenical partners to discuss formational issues. TISEC had always worked closely with ecumenical colleagues and the new Institute would continue to do so. Also, at a training day organised by the Provincial Director of Ordinands earlier in the year, Church of England staff had made a major contribution. The same staff had visited the Church of Scotland the following day and explained how and why the recruitment and selection procedures worked so well in the Scottish Episcopal Church. In the United States, Anglican formational training was now seen as a paradigm of business leadership.

TISEC's coming of age could also be seen in relation to lay readership. Lay readers were an incredible asset in the Church and represented a theological resource in congregations which was why canonically they were authorised to preach. They too needed to spend time in a formational context together all of which could be done in the Institute. The reports enunciated an appreciation for that particular ministry.

The governance structures proposed for the new Institute reflected the Church's new confidence in mission. The 35, or more, bodies responsible to, for, or with TISEC were to be replaced by a single Institute Council.

As to money, Bishop Pearson explained that the financial paper included in the Synod Papers pointed to the fact that the training programme would in fact be cost neutral. The big questions arose in relation to full-time training grants and curacy grants which at the present time were aspirational. Over many years, Synod had acknowledged the need to invest more in theological training and formation. The aspirations for more ordinands and more curates could be met if every communicant member of the Church gave £10 extra each year for the sole purpose of ordination training. The College of Bishops had pledged that their individual Lent Appeals in 2015 (or in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney in 2016) would be dedicated to the new training fund. Collections at ordinations would likewise be donated to that fund. It was a very small beginning but represented a pledge to and for the future.

Bishop Pearson commended the reports and the motions in the Synod Papers to Synod.

The Venerable Christine Wilson (Church of England), speaking with permission, indicated how excited she was by the powerful and confident report. She had worked as a vocations consultant and she was delighted that the report contained an emphasis on the formation of the whole people of God out of which ministerial formation emerged. She was excited by the sense of people being equipped for mission and evangelism and she intended to take the report back to the Church of England.

Bishop Pearson indicated that the Church of England had commended the Scottish Episcopal Church for the speed and quality of its response to the Quality in Formation Panel report of 2013.

He explained that the Synod would shortly be invited to go into group discussion and provide feedback on flipcharts and that during the forthcoming coffee break, the Rev Dean Fostekew would endeavour to extract common themes from the flipcharts. Also, during the coffee break, the Primus and he would be willing to answer detailed questions from any members of Synod arising from the material being presented to Synod.

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) then proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

“That the Synod meet in groups for informal discussion of this item under Rule 4 (c).”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

The Synod then discussed the following questions in groups: –

1. What qualities do you hope to see in your clergy?
2. Should ordination training be purely academic or practical as well?
3. What skills do clergy need in today's Church and society?
4. What is the best way of equipping those training for ministry to become effective ministers and leaders?

Following discussion in groups, questions were invited.

The Rev David McCarthy (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether there were any plans to change current recruitment and selection procedures, which involved the use of Church of England Bishops' Advisory Panels, and in particular whether the Scottish Episcopal Church ought to think more independently.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) noted from the report that whereas six pages were devoted to recruitment and selection for ordinands, lay readers received only half a page. The questions which the Synod discussion groups had been asked to consider related only to clergy. There was, therefore, a question as to how the Church viewed its readers. There was also the question of the recruitment of younger people into the reader ministry. He himself was the youngest reader in his diocese. At a recent provincial conference for readers, there had been discussion as to whether the demands of reader training were too much for those in their 20s, 30s and 40s.

The Rev Canon Dr Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that today was a day of thanksgiving for the life of Henry Scougal, a Professor of Divinity in Aberdeen, who had died in the 17th century. Some of his work was available on Google books and he commended the speech made to the Diocesan Synod in 1674 which was entitled *Of the Importance and Difficulty of the Ministerial Function*.

Mr Gordon Aitken (Brechin) indicated from his experience of working with young people that many of them worried about job security. If the Church were to encourage younger people to enter the ministry there was a question as to whether or not the Church would be able to assure them that there would be a place available for them on completion of training.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) indicated that he had taught for many years within TISEC. He welcomed the report. It placed considerable emphasis on curacies but made no mention of placements as part of the training process. He wished to emphasise the importance of such placements. He suggested that thought needed to be given to how support was given to those who supervised placements or curacies.

The Rev Ruth Innes (Edinburgh) expressed thanks for the report and for Bishop Pearson's passion. She offered £10 to start the funding appeal at once instead of waiting until Lent 2015.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked about post-ordination support. She worked for the NHS and following graduation medics were offered a two-year period of support from their higher education institution. This was important for individuals going into jobs where there were significant demands. She expressed enthusiasm for the notion of the Scottish Episcopal Institute taking on post-ordination support. She noted that the Rev Canon Malcolm Round had commented earlier in the year on the need for clergy support.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wondered whether there could be a wider way of viewing ministry that was not sharply differentiated between stipendiary and non-stipendiary but which would allow people "in the world" to remain in the world. Some financial support could help support such ministry.

The Rev Anne Haselhurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that she had a responsibility to look after the newly ordained and newly licensed readers. She wondered whether people directed to train as either readers or clergy were sufficiently clear about what their vocation was. There was a need for a clearer understanding of vocation.

The Rev Canon James Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) wondered whether, if stipendiary clergy were not "in the world", then where were they?

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said there was a vital need for continuing ministerial development. Post-ordination support had been touched upon but there was a need to take that further into areas of appraisal and continuing development.

Bishop Pearson responded to points raised.

He explained that there were no plans to change the current system of using Church of England Bishops' Advisory Panels. Such Panels happened on a regular basis (almost weekly) and provided an objective view. Speaking as a former Provincial Director of Ordinands, he explained that in the past Panel advisers had received threats of physical violence by non-recommended candidates. Whilst it was possible for the Scottish Episcopal Church to do much on its own the external objectivity provided by Bishops' Advisory Panels was very helpful. It was the case that there were Scottish selectors used as part of the Bishops' Advisory Panel system. He was also aware that the current Provincial Director of Ordinands was providing significant input to the Church of England processes. Whilst there were no plans to change, the question was kept under continuing review.

On the question of lay readership, Bishop Pearson accepted that the report was thin on that point. One of the reasons that lay readership was not recruiting younger people at the present time was because, for many years in the province, there had been a lack of clarity about the role of lay readers. The review report, however, appreciated the very distinctive nature of lay readership and acknowledged that lay readers were not clergy. There was a constant tension which needed to be acknowledged and made creative.

On the question of younger people, Bishop Pearson suggested that they were much more adventurous than they were given credit for. Their vocations were being nurtured in many ways and taken seriously. He confirmed that there would be a job at the end of the training process but he could not confirm the parameters within which that ministry would be exercised. The Church had changed significantly in the previous 35 years since his own ordination and patterns of ministry were evolving. New patterns of ministry were being explored. For example, Evening Prayer at Synod the previous day had been led by an intern at St Paul's and St George's.

In relation to curacies and placements, Bishop Pearson said that those who acted as supervisors were heroes because such supervisory work was hard work, and if it was not hard work, the job was not being done properly. A curate was not "an extra pair of hands". There was a need to ensure that students were placed with those who had the appropriate expertise.

On the question of fundraising, Bishop Pearson asked Synod not to despise the offer made by the Rev Ruth Innes. The hospice movement in Scotland had started in a similar way.

As to higher education and support, there were a number of questions. It was essential that continuing ministerial development included support for people in the field. Stipendiary clergy could feel very demoralised at times because other people did not seem to understand what it was like to sustain ministry week by week. However, it was important that clergy used the sources of expertise available. Appraisal and ministerial review were already available as tools for continuing ministry. He personally had found appraisal very helpful throughout his ministry.

On the question of clarity in vocation he agreed wholeheartedly - lay readership was not a consolation prize for those who were not recommended for ordination.

Bishop Pearson then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion: –

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

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

House of Laity: passed *nem con*, one abstention

House of Clergy: passed by majority, one against, one abstention

House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

Bishop Pearson then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion: –

“That for the period from General Synod 2014 until General Synod 2015, the role of the Ministry Development Committee be suspended and that all of its functions be undertaken by a body to be appointed by the Standing Committee and to comprise a convener and such other members as have appropriate skills and experience to manage the transition of the Theological Institute of the Scottish Episcopal Church into the Scottish Episcopal Institute.”

The Rev Ken Webb (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the motion. He asked that the new body should take account of the vast amount of experience which was already present among those involved in delivery of training "on the ground". The body should, therefore, include someone who had experience of "frontline" delivery in the dioceses. Also, would the body include ecumenical representation?

The Chair indicated that those comments were noted.

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, with two abstentions.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) indicated that he would be happy to organise a collection during Evening Prayer later in the day to support the fundraising for training. The Chair noted that this raised a point of order which the Assessor would consider.

Session 5 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness in the Chair

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board: TISEC review (continued)

The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles reported that the questions which he and his colleagues had been asked during the coffee break at the end of the previous session had been incredibly positive. Synod members had appeared "lit up" by what was going on. He suggested that this was a "Holy Spirit moment" in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He reported that the Rev Dean Fostekew had reviewed

the flipchart responses. Some of the issues mentioned had been the need for prophetic and challenging leadership, the need for training to be both practical and academic, the importance of reflective practice, the need for those in ministry to have good communication and people skills and for the different pathways available for training to be used. He thanked all Synod members for their engagement with the process.

5.2 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)

5.2.1 Ministry Development Committee

The Very Rev Susan Macdonald (Convener, Ministry Development Committee) referred to the written report of her Committee contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013. Since, as a result of the motion passed earlier, the Ministry Development Committee had been suspended, she had little to add to the written report. She offered thanks to all those who, in the course of the previous 14 years, had given a breadth and depth of expertise and commitment to the life of the Committee and the Board of Studies, underpinned as always by Denise Brunton in her role as Administrator. Earlier in Synod, the Primus had paid full tribute to the Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller. The Committee also acknowledged and gave thanks for his service and wished him well for the future. Following in the illustrious footsteps of longer serving Committee Conveners Prof Judith George and Dr Peter Smart, Dean Macdonald said it had been an honour to serve as the Convener of the Committee over the previous year. During the year of review, the commitment to the students in training had not wavered and she echoed Dr Fuller's thanks earlier in Synod to those across the Province who currently acted, or who had acted in the past, in different roles in TISEC. On behalf of the Committee, she offered the new transitional Council blessings and support as it managed the transition of TISEC into the new Institute and also to the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson as she took up the post of Principal.

The Chair thanked Dean Macdonald for her work as Convener.

5.2.2 Overseas Committee

The Rev Val Nellist (Convener, Overseas Committee) explained she would update Synod on the work of the Committee since the time of its report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013.

The Mission and Ministry Board had asked that consideration be given to a name change for the Committee which would make more explicit the reciprocal nature of its relations with the Church in other parts of the world. It was intended, therefore, that the Committee would change its name to the "Global Partnerships Committee".

The Committee worked with partners, one of which was Christian Aid. With their Church and Community Worker Val Brown, the Committee had produced the Lent Cookbook. It had been a joy to work with her and Elspeth Davey, learning about the good things which were being done with lives being changed for the better. To the Committee's surprise, the entire print run of 5,000 had been taken up by study groups and individuals across Scotland and beyond. The Committee was now looking, with Christian Aid, at a reprint of a smaller number towards the end of the year. The publication was not year-specific. It was also available to download from the Christian Aid website.

In partnership with Christian Aid and the Episcopal Church in Brazil, the Committee was contributing to work aimed at combating violence against women in society and in the Church. The Episcopal Church in Brazil had produced a study guide for their own use but which would be applicable in other parts of the world and a good English translation was available. Mrs Nellist had already shared it with Dr Elaine Cameron of the International Anglican Women's Network and with the Diocese of Kolkata. She could provide an electronic copy if Synod members wished to be in touch with her via the General Synod Office.

The Committee had supported the attendance by Dr Elaine Cameron at the 58th session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in New York in March 2014. She had been part of the Anglican delegation and the session had focused on challenges and achievements in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals affecting women and girls. A full report was available in the May edition of the newsletter of the International Anglican Women's Network, of which Dr Cameron was the editor.

Mrs Nellist explained that the Anglican networks enabled the diversity of Anglican Churches to come together and to engage with common issues. Twenty years previously, Bob and Rachel Mash had gone from St Paul's and St George's to undertake a pioneer ministry in a shanty town in Cape Town. The now Rev Canon Dr Rachel Mash had become the Co-ordinator for the Environmental Network of the Anglican Church in Southern Africa. The Network's goals were to encourage churches to preach and pray about the environment, to encourage churches to work locally to reduce their carbon footprint and to be involved in advocacy and relief work. Canon Mash and her Archbishop had invited the Scottish Episcopal Church to become partners with them and the Committee had made a financial grant as a first step to enable participation in environmental theology training.

More widely across the continent of Africa, Mrs Nellist explained that the churches were facing the growth of Islamisation linked, in places, with extreme violence. At the same time there were divisions within the Anglican Church relating to the interpretation of Scripture. The Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa was aware of these problems and had launched a

consultation for heads of Anglican theological institutions and universities. The Committee had been happy to provide some finance. The consultation would bring together 60 participants from across provinces in Africa including the chairs of provincial education boards and provincial secretaries.

South Sudan continued to be a place of open conflict. The Diocese of Wau had been investing in more efficient means of food production. Their most recent request to the Committee had been for funding for ox ploughs. The symbolism of beating swords into ploughshares had not been lost on the Committee. Stability in food production could lead to reduction in conflict.

The Committee had also supported church growth in the Diocese of Tarime in Tanzania where substantial progress had been made in building new churches. Much had been achieved in a short time including the construction of a school, a diocesan office, housing for clergy and, most importantly, growing lively congregations.

Finally, Mrs Nellist reported on companionship links. She reported on the visit of representatives of the Diocese of St Andrews Dunkeld and Dunblane to the Diocese of Kolkata where opportunity had been taken to share what it meant for each to be engaged in mission and ministry. On 15 November 2014 the Committee was organising a sharing day for all who were already, or who wished to become, part of a companionship link. This would take place at the St Paul's Centre in Perth. It would include sessions on starting a link, including youth involvement, healthcare links, sharing with the Church of Scotland on how to undertake real time Bible study and how to recognise when a link should be brought to an end. Invitations to the event would be sent out to dioceses shortly.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.2.3 Church in Society Committee

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) indicated that he had only recently taken up office as Convener of the Committee. The Committee's report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013 had been written by his predecessor, the Very Rev Ian Barcroft. Prof Atkinson thanked Dean Barcroft for his work and echoed the thanks which Dean Barcroft had himself expressed in the report.

Dean Barcroft had commented on the importance of partnership and this would be picked up on shortly since the Committee had invited Rev Bob Fyffe of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland to make a presentation on the Good Society project.

Prof Atkinson reminded Synod that the question of the Living Wage had been addressed at General Synod 2013. The Church in Society would shortly be following this up by asking dioceses what had happened as a result. The Committee had also decided that it would establish a small working group to address issues regarding credit unions. There was already work going on in the Church of England and Church of Scotland and there was a need to work out where the Scottish Episcopal Church became part of that picture. A further matter was that of the interrelation between matters of ethical investment and climate change. There was a question as to whether the Church was prepared to invest in companies whose businesses were primarily based on fossil fuels and he proposed to discuss this with the Investment Committee. The Committee was also considering how it should encourage discussion within congregations and dioceses on the question of the independence Referendum. However, the primary matter on the agenda was the question of how the Scottish Episcopal Church could make a positive contribution on issues related to poverty, particularly poverty exhibiting itself in relation to inability to pay for energy or food. The Committee therefore intended to undertake some serious work on those topics. The Committee continued to be ecumenical and included representation from the Methodist and United Reformed Churches. The Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths was also a pendant Committee of the Church in Society Committee and it was recognised that issues of energy and food were interfaith concerns also.

Questions were invited but there were none.

5.2.4 Good Society Project

The Rev Bob Fyffe (General Secretary, Churches Together in Britain and Ireland) addressed Synod. He suggested that contrary to the view of the popular press, faith played a pivotal role in society. It was to be hoped that churches existed not as closed gatherings but rather as having a deep concern for their neighbourhoods. Against the background of the Big Society, seven pilot areas around the UK had been asked to consider "what does a good society mean to you?". What had emerged was a number of projects showing a dedication to others and a commitment to community building. A good society emerged as a place which rebuilt the spirit by offering hope, integrating different generations and faiths and modelled healthy ways of living. Faith groups and faith leaders were expected to stand for shared values and were asked to be voices of truth rather than holders of power. They were challenged to see their buildings as places of sanctuary. The *Good Society Project* listened to the voices of those who were rarely heard.

A short film capturing the voices emerging from the *Good Society Project* was shown.

Mr Fyffe spoke about the work undertaken by Tron St Mary's Church of Scotland whose parish encompassed the notorious Red Road flats. He suggested that a good society needed to have an ethical basis since one that was relativistic would find it difficult to pull together. CTBI was therefore encouraging a year of conversation. The report and brochure which had been provided to members of Synod gave guidance on how to undertake a conversation about good society. These resources could be downloaded from the CTBI or Good Society websites. CTBI hoped that many congregations in the coming year would take part in the suggested conversation.

The Synod then had discussion in table groups. Thereafter comments and questions were invited.

The Rev David Mumford (Brechin) was concerned that the project did not offer a socio-political analysis nor offer recommendations to the Church or Government. In considering the needs of people in Scotland, the Church needed to ask how it could make its love for neighbour effective. It was not just a question of offering individual solutions to problems that were essentially corporate and social. There was a need to ask why so many people were living in poverty. There was a need to articulate transitional demands that would embed structures of justice in society. Apart from the Living Wage there were other matters such as full employment, adequate benefits, defending the NHS or valuing public service. There was indeed a question as to whether an independent Scotland might be better placed to deliver that. His question was whether, if the exercise were to be done again, would Mr Fyffe change his views as to whether socio-political analysis and recommendations to Government ought to be included.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) asked what would be done with the conversations once they had been had? Would there be a subsequent report or petition to Parliament?

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) recalled comments he had made at General Synod 2013 when it had been suggested that the Church was not active in its community. The kind of conversations to which Mr Fyffe had referred were already going on in local communities. The question was whether or not the Church was engaging with them. There were already neighbourhood planning groups in every council area across Scotland. Were churches involved at that level?

Mr Fyffe then responded to the comments which had been made. On the question of including socio-political analysis and recommendations to Government, he indicated that the project had been run by CTBI in partnership with Church Action on Poverty and so plenty of socio-political analysis was already available. The purpose of the exercise was to give a voice to those who normally had none. Provision of analysis at the outset would have prejudged the conversations which the project wished to

encourage. A number of pilot locations had been considered but in a number of communities there had been difficulty in moving beyond contact with clergy because the clergy wanted to speak for their communities. What had emerged more often than not were the voices of people on the periphery. What was to happen following the conversations was up to the local church or diocese – that was not a role for CTBI. He hoped that the conversations would operate across different church and geographical communities. He cited an example from Cornwall where the need for a community laundry had been articulated. However, the Methodist minister had also been able to respond to a need for a breakfast club for young mothers after dropping children off at school. This had not resulted in a proposal to Government but nevertheless made a significant local difference. Mr Fyffe also agreed with the comment which had been made by Mr Harris. There was indeed already much going on and the project would give ideas which could be picked up in other places.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wondered whether there was an opportunity to use the conversations being proposed by the Good Society Project to re-energise the mission endeavour in deprived areas of Scotland which had been the subject of the previous Million for Mission initiative. There might be a place for a network to link and nurture such conversations.

Prof Atkinson indicated that it would be very easy for the Synod to vote for the motion which he was about to propose but not do much about it. He urged Synod members only to vote in favour if they were clear that they wanted to do something about it. He recalled that at the March 2014 meeting of the Mission and Ministry Board, the Primus had spoken about the increasing confidence within the Scottish Episcopal Church and its moving to be an outward looking church and not one that simply provided a chaplaincy service. The motion was a means of the Church providing such leadership. The paper which had been given to Synod members already provided much information and it was an opportunity for congregations to become thoroughly involved in their communities. Much leadership also involved listening.

Prof Atkinson then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod receive the Good Society report produced by Churches Together in Britain and Ireland and commend it to dioceses and congregations of the Church as they consider mission in their local communities.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 12 abstentions.

Session 6 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in the Chair

6.1 Mission and Ministry Board: Same-sex Relationships Discussion Process

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that he was the Convener of the Design Group for discussing same-sex relationships established by the Mission and Ministry Board. Within the membership of the Group there was a range of views and it was committed to providing a Whole Church approach to topics which many found challenging. It had sought advice and made itself available to interest groups.

Members of the Group had visited Diocesan Synods earlier in the year, at some of which facilitated discussions had taken place and the Design Group had arranged the Cascade Conversation in Pitlochry at the end of April 2014 which had drawn together approximately 60 individuals invited by their respective Diocesan Bishops. Five "participants" had also been invited to Cascade, namely: Father Edward Hone (Roman Catholic Redemptorist priest, currently based in Luxembourg), Ms Ruth Jeffries (social worker and lay member of the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness), the Rev Dr Marjory MacLean (former Depute Principal Clerk of the Church of Scotland and member of the General Assembly Theological Commission on Same-sex Relationships and the Ministry), the Rev Canon David Porter (Archbishop of Canterbury's Director for Reconciliation) and the Rt Rev Keith Sinclair (Bishop of Birkenhead and member of the Church of England House of Bishops' Working Group on Human Sexuality). Facilitated group discussion had been at the heart of the Cascade Conversation and some impressions and outcomes had already been reported on in *inspires online*. Overall, the Conversation appeared to have been judged as more helpful than anything which had previously been attempted within the Scottish Episcopal Church and he expressed thanks to the Design Group and General Synod Office staff. There had been courageous, painful, moving and wise moments during the Conversation. In particular, many of those who had been there better understood the views of others and, in particular, there was a better appreciation of how the contemporary social challenge of same-sex marriage pressed upon the Church's theology and practice.

The cascading purpose, enabling as wide a Church discussion as possible, had already been taken up in dioceses. Those who had attended Pitlochry were communicating their experience in their own dioceses where further facilitated discussion opportunities were being arranged in the coming months, including within the College of Bishops. A video which brought to life the encounter between differing viewpoints had been filmed and would be available on the provincial website shortly after Synod as a discussion starter. Bishop Peyton expected the task of the Design Group would be completed by the autumn.

Bishop Peyton explained that from the outset, the Design Group had recognised that the current meeting of General Synod would provide a particular opportunity for facilitated discussion on the part of Synod members, in addition to any motions which Synod chose to debate. Earlier in the current meeting, Synod had expressed a view on whether it wished to debate a motion under Rule 10. However, all

members of Synod were aware that there was much yet to be done to find a common mind while remaining within the same tent. Shortly, he would hand over to Mr Hugh Donald of *Place for Hope* who had generously provided assistance to shape the character and process of the facilitated discussions to date. It was proposed that initially Synod would listen in to a conversation and then Synod members would be asked to address questions in facilitated groups. At the end of the session the Rev Dean Fostekew would invite Synod members to express thoughts anonymously using sealed envelopes.

Before Synod was invited to consider a procedural motion, Dr Peyton invited questions but there were none.

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mrs Anne Jones (member, Standing Committee) seconded, the following motion: –

“That the Rules of Order be temporarily suspended under Rule 15 to enable a series of short presentations regarding the Cascade Conversation held in Pitlochry in late April 2014, followed by group discussion.”

Mrs Christine McIntosh (Argyll and the Isles) indicated she would speak against the motion. The subject matter in question was important business for the Church. Earlier in Synod, Synod had expressed, by a clear majority, the desire that it should be discussed in open debate as per the usual conduct of Synod business. She asked Synod to vote with her against the procedural motion so that Synod could revert to the usual Rules of Order to discuss together the presentation which was about to be received and the questions which would be put.

The motion was put to the vote and passed by the requisite majority with 93 in favour, 32 against, and four abstentions.

Mr Hugh Donald introduced the discussion process and facilitated a discussion among the Very Rev Jeremy Auld, the Rev Samantha Ferguson, Ms Ruth Jeffries and the Rev Canon Malcolm Round. Mr Donald explained that the purpose was to give Synod something of an insight into the Cascade Conversation which had taken place in Pitlochry. At the heart of that Conversation had been the building of relationships. It had also involved the taking of risk in undertaking respectful and honest conversation. Also, it had been about engendering a potential place of reconciliation. The four individuals then reflected with Mr Donald on the Cascade Conversation.

Thereafter, Synod members were invited to consider the following questions in discussion groups:

1. What did you see and hear in the conversation which has just taken place?
2. What has shaped your views about same-sex relationships over the years?
3. What considerations should the SEC take into account when exploring whether to incorporate same-sex marriage into its life?

The Primus addressed Synod. He explained that after the presentation which Synod had just received and following the debate regarding the Rule 10 motion earlier in Synod, he believed he should share some of his current thinking about how the Church should respond to the context in which it found itself in Scotland. Sharing his thinking was part of the leadership which he shared with the members of the College of Bishops. The decision of Synod not to debate the Rule 10 motion had been a decision of Synod. However, he believed that those who had brought the Rule 10 motion could be forgiven if they felt disappointed that it had not reached the Synod agenda. It would be a mistake to conclude that there was not a significant feeling in the Church that it should be moving on human sexuality issues. How far, and in what timescale, would be for the Synod to decide. However, he believed that the changed context arising from the passing of the Marriage and Civil Partnership Act made movement necessary and inevitable. The Church was aware of the rapidly changing social attitudes and which were particularly visible among young people.

Whilst the Church had been talking for a long time, it had not been about the issues which needed to be talked about. Discussion had been conducted on the Anglican Covenant when in fact the Church should have been talking about the underlying issues. The Covenant debate had encouraged churches, mistakenly he believed, to think that the conflict around human sexuality was primarily an inter-provincial matter within the Anglican Communion. Synod had firmly decided not to adopt the Anglican Covenant. What followed logically, as he had mentioned in his charge to Synod, was that the first focus now needed to be on the Scottish Episcopal Church's own internal diversity with the second focus being on the diversity of the Anglican Communion.

The Cascade Conversation had been highly successful and was becoming a model for others. A church-wide process was already underway in the dioceses. This was entirely within the mainstream of Anglican Communion life since provinces were realising that such issues would not be resolved by win/lose votes, at least not without creating winners and losers. Similar movements had been visible at the recent Church of Scotland General Assembly where the report of the Theological Forum had urged that Church to adopt a mixed economy. Interwoven strands of faith and life were carried within the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Those included different approaches to the understanding of the authority of Scripture; a passion for justice and inclusion; understandings of holiness of life; a picture of Jesus whose ministry included rather than excluded.

It was important to remember that the question was about more than same-sex marriage and whether clergy would celebrate such marriages in Scottish Episcopal churches. It was also about the situations which would arise when clergy who were in civil partnerships decided to enter a same-sex marriage or when a person who was already in a same-sex marriage presented themselves in the process of vocational discernment for ministry.

Reflecting on what ought now to happen, the Primus suggested that the Cascade process would run during the rest of 2014. At the end of it, it would be for the Mission and Ministry Board and the Faith and Order Board to discern what they could see of the "mind of the Church". He had also already been suggesting that while the Cascade process continued to run, he and one or two others ought to seek some quiet consultation with particular individuals and groups to explore possible approaches for the future. There was a need for some material for debate including some work on the theology of marriage from the Doctrine Committee. He indicated he would like to see a substantial discussion at General Synod 2015 in which all of those issues could be looked at in a way which would inform action in following years.

Finally, he suggested that churches should model to the world patterns of how to move forward together in relationship even where there was no agreement. He was uncomfortable with "mixed economies" if that actually meant "separate economies". As he had said at the General Assembly, he was happy with diversity but not if it was a diversity without engagement. If the Church were to move on these issues, he hoped that those who found it difficult to agree would be an honoured and respected part of that movement. Whilst such an aspiration was illogical, he reminded Synod that Christians were not members of an institution but Disciples of Jesus Christ.

At the close of the session, the Rev Dean Fostekew invited Synod members to complete a sheet articulating hopes, fears, aspirations and concerns about how the Scottish Episcopal Church responded to the subject of same-sex relationships. These were to be completed anonymously and placed in an envelope and would be available at the end of Evening Prayer for Synod members to take away so that they could pray for the person whose envelope they had taken.

The Chair thanked everyone who had taken part during the session.

Session 7: The Very Rev Alison Simpson in the Chair

7.1 Pension Fund Trustees

Mr Andrew November (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) reported on behalf of the Pension Fund. He explained that a pension fund was composed of two components: liabilities and assets. The liabilities comprised the pensions which had to be paid out to those who had already retired, those who would become pensioners in the future and those who were deferred members (ie who had left the employment of the Church but would be entitled to a pension in the future). It was good that clergy and their spouses lived a long time but that was not quite so good for a pension fund since it meant that the liabilities of the fund were higher. The Pension Fund needed to pay such cash flows over a very long period of time, related to how long people lived. The required cash flows were funded from a pool of assets. Those assets comprised cash or other wealth-generating assets such as Government bonds or equities. The assets also included contributions paid on

behalf of clergy by congregations. The overall intention was therefore to have a pool of assets which would be sufficient to pay all the cash flows required for the liabilities.

In 2008, there had been a deficit of £9 million when the assets and liabilities had been compared. The Trustees had set about a programme to improve that situation in order to return to a position closer to parity. Every three years a full analysis of the liabilities was carried out to work out what size the asset pool needed to be. By the time of the 2011 valuation, the deficit had reduced to £3 million. In addition to reducing the deficit, the Trustees had also managed to reduce the riskiness of the assets. At General Synod 2013, he had been able to report that the deficit had been further reduced to just over £500,000. By the end of 2013, he could report that the deficit had been approximately £200,000. All of this marked very good progress since 2008. Mr November accepted that contribution rates had been very high over that period of time and it had been necessary to reduce the benefits. This had helped the position of the Fund. During the previous year further steps had been taken to reduce exposure to risk in relation to the assets and the Trustees would continue to look for opportunities to do that. The next triennial valuation would be carried out at the end of 2014 by the Scheme Actuary. At that point it would be possible to review how the Trustees would continue to manage the Fund and also, potentially, the contribution rate.

Questions were invited.

Mr Brendan Grimley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that in his workplace, his pension had been altered from a defined benefit to a defined contribution basis. The employer would therefore not guarantee what he would receive by way of pension. He wondered what kind of scheme the Church scheme was. Mr November explained that it was a defined benefit scheme. In 2013 changes had been made to reduce the level of benefits available under the scheme because of the overall cost. It had, however, been decided that the scheme would continue as a defined benefit one.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) said that with small charges having to face significant contributions, he often had to remind vestries that he did not personally receive the contributions. Retired clergy were owed a debt of thanks for all they did throughout the dioceses including the support they provided to churches which did not always have stipendiary clergy. A contribution towards the Pension Fund, however, always appeared to be borne by those charges with stipendiary clergy. He wondered if there was a need to look at a more collective means of contribution.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that in his diocese congregations which did not have stipendiary clergy did contribute towards pension costs.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that his vestry had felt strongly that the Church should continue with a defined benefit scheme. He wondered whether there was any evidence that clergy lived longer than others. He understood that from

surveys conducted south of the border, clergy were recorded as having high job satisfaction. Mr November confirmed that clergy did live longer than average.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and the Isles) asked whether contributions might be reduced if the next revaluation of the Fund showed a surplus. Mr November responded that the Trustees believed that the current level of contribution rates represented the maximum of what congregations could reasonably afford to pay. The Trustees would be willing to look, along with the Standing Committee, at whether any reduction would be possible. He suggested that it would be unlikely that a reduction would be possible in the foreseeable future unless there were to be a significant rise in interest rates.

The Chair thanked Mr November and the other Pension Fund Trustees for their work.

The Secretary General indicated that following the suggestions which had been made earlier in the day, opportunity would be made by way of a retiring collection at the end of Evening Prayer for Synod members to contribute to a fund to support the new training initiative within the Church.

Session 8 - The Rt Rev the Bishop of Edinburgh in the Chair

8.1 Administration Board

8.1.1 Board Report

Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) explained that the reports in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2013 set out comprehensively the range of issues on which all five pendant Committees of the Board had been working in the previous year. He wished to draw attention to two closely linked issues.

Firstly, despite a sound investment performance, the financial position of the Province remained challenging. Whilst the market value of the Unit Trust Pool had grown by over 13% to £47.3 million in the year 2013, the income from the fund at 4.5% of the unit value at the beginning of the year, had not been sufficient to fund fully the distribution necessary to meet all identified budgeted needs. Looking ahead, the budget report contained in the Synod Papers showed predicted budgetary deficits on the General Fund of nearly £70,000 in 2015 and £180,000 in 2016. Those figures assumed that total budgeted expenditure on buildings grants, which for 2014 was £65,000 would rise to £120,000 in 2015 and to £185,000 in 2016. Such increases would be difficult to sustain against the background of the rising budgeted deficits.

Against that background, consideration had been given to the future trajectory of the provincial buildings grants system. Set against the size of the Church's property estate across Scotland, the level of provincial support had never been more than peripheral (it had never been more than £170,000 in a single year). On the other hand, it was clear that even small grants could make a difference to charges which might be faced with unavoidable or unexpected expense. Accordingly, along with the Conveners of the Finance and Buildings Committees, the Treasurer and Mr Lugton had concluded that there was a need to understand better what impact provincial grants had had in the past, how they dovetailed with support from diocesan sources and what expertise was available within the Church for identifying other sources of support. Following consultation with dioceses, a questionnaire relating to buildings grants had been issued at the end of May. He thanked those vestries which had already completed and returned the questionnaire and encouraged others to take the time to do so. Thought was also being given to compiling better information on the extent of the Church's property holdings. That was a longer term task and it was possible that a survey might be piloted in one diocese before any wider exercise was launched.

8.1.2 Investment Committee

Mr Jeremy Burchill (Convener, Investment Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. He noted that whilst it was true that past performance was not a guide to the future, consideration of past performance could be helpful in assessing what constituted a realistic expectation of return for the future. He had considered the pattern of historic returns on different asset classes. Looking at performance of a sample endowment type portfolio comprising two thirds equities and one third fixed interest, annualised real returns (after allowing for inflation) had been 6.4%, over 30 years, 4.3% over 20 years and 4.5% over 10 years. Those figures were gross of the costs of investment management and administration. If one allowed, say 0.7% for such costs, this would give a net annualised real return over 20 years of 3.6% and over the previous 10 years of 3.8%. A real return of approximately 4% (on the 31 December 2013 price) was required on the Unit Trust Pool to fund the current level of distribution.

Mr Burchill noted that in the current year, the unit price was up 2.01% to 31 May. The market in recent months had shown little sense of direction and the distribution for the year represented approximately 3.9% on the market value as at 31 May 2014. Consequently, the distribution was a little above what might be regarded as a legitimate expectation for future performance.

Baillie Gifford, as Fund Managers, had delivered strong performance since their mandate had been changed to a total return basis five years previously. The Investment Committee had considered whether to introduce additional asset classes - many charities held investments in assets such as property, hedge funds, etc. With the exception of property, the Committee was not currently attracted to other asset classes. However, Baillie Gifford was

unable to offer investment in property. The Committee would be reluctant to change managers while performance continued to be strong but it was cognisant of the case for introducing property into the asset mix.

The Committee recognised the importance of increasing the distribution in line with inflation but it nevertheless believed that, for investors, it was critical that any increase in the distribution should be sustainable. The challenge would be to sustain the distribution when the market entered its next bear stage. Mr Burchill suggested that after a sustained bull run the market could arguably be approaching the end of its current bull phase.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether it was the case that one wanted to avoid selling capital in order to fund ongoing expenditure in the budget. Mr Burchill responded that the income stream was approximately 35p per unit and so capital had been drawn down in order to fund the distribution. The management of the Fund had moved from being income-based to a total return basis. The focus on income had previously carried the risk of overexposure to the banking sector. Balance was therefore required and the Committee was considering the possibility of a protocol on how to address such issues but had not so far concluded its deliberations. He was keen that care should be taken not to introduce a level of volatility which could jeopardise the capital base of the Fund.

8.1.3 Buildings Committee

Mr Alex Stewart (Convener, Buildings Committee) referred to the fact that General Synod 2013 had asked the Committee to consider questions of energy efficiency within church buildings. The matter was a complex one but the Committee had been made aware that Eco-congregations Scotland had been addressing it and had produced a very good document which the Committee had commended to all charges. Improving energy efficiency was beneficial for both financial and ecological reasons.

On the question of buildings grants, he noted that when money was tight churches tended to cut expenditure. However, in relation to buildings, lack of proper care resulted in consequences over time. Provincial building grants had been subject to a moratorium but it was not known what effect that had had. He encouraged vestries to ensure the return of the survey which had been referred to earlier. Otherwise, decisions regarding the future of provincial buildings grants would require to be taken in a vacuum. On the question of buildings maintenance generally, he was aware that many in the Church carrying responsibility for such maintenance had no background in the subject. Consideration was therefore being given to devising a series of maintenance training sessions. He had had some contact with the Church of Scotland and if a joint endeavour were not possible, consideration would be given to arranging something specifically within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that he represented the Church on the Board of Eco-congregations Scotland. He thanked Mr Stewart for commending the Eco-congregations document. It was also the case that grants were available from the Government's Climate Challenge Fund and details of this were referred to in the Eco-congregations guidance.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) indicated that for a small congregation with a large building there was a dilemma as to whether resources were applied to the building or in the care of souls and mission. Sometimes there was a sense that the Province was not doing enough and he suggested the need to make available fundraising advice for charges.

Mr Stewart responded that Dalkeith (one of Mr Harris' charges) was a classic example of a congregation carrying responsibility for a large A-listed building. He had noted the comments.

In closing the session, Mr Lugton explained that the respective Conveners of the Personnel Committee, the Finance Committee and the Retirement Welfare Committee were present and available to respond to questions. There were none.

8.2 Motion from Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney

The Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) proposed the following motion: –

“That, recognising that our current annual statistical return does not measure the life and activity of our dioceses, Synod call on the College of Bishops to devise a return which better reflects current patterns of support and activity.”

The Rev Prof David Atkinson seconded the motion. He suggested that the statistics which were collected by the Church tended to show a steady downward pattern. However, that was not the actual experience in practice. There was therefore an imbalance between the figures which were collected and local experience. He was aware that research carried out in relation to *Fresh Expressions* in the Church of England had shown that in 10 dioceses there had actually been an increase equivalent to the size of an 11th diocese. Broadening the collection of statistics would not only give the Church further confidence but was linked to the discussions earlier in Synod regarding future training proposals. It was expected within the Church of England that 15% of activity in future would be in new forms of church life. If that was correct, future training needed to cater for those who could function in such other forms of ministry. The current Synod might be seen in future as having marked some very real changes in relation to training and the Church's relationship with secular society. Making such connections in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney had meant recording actual activity on the ground. He commended the motion to Synod.

The Primus spoke in support of the motion. The task of collection of statistics was a difficult one and the challenge was to ensure consistency of collection over a period of time so that it could be measured and assessed. The existing pattern of statistical collection already appeared to result in some confusion but it was also the case that the Scottish Episcopal Church was not a "Sunday-only" Church. There was a diversity in ways of meeting and there was a need to find a new way of recording that.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) supported the motion but wished to ask the College of Bishops to look at differentiation between communicant members and adherents. He suggested that if baptism were the entry to membership, then the distinction in the current statistics was not correct. The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (member, Standing Committee) explained that he had some concerns regarding a broadening of the statistical collection. It would be important not to lose the snapshot at a point in time which the current statistics provided. A significant broadening of the collection of the statistics was not tenable for larger churches. The mechanics of keeping such figures needed to be considered carefully. For churches with multiple meetings happening during the week the logistics of collecting figures could be very significant. The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (member, Standing Committee) suggested that the placing of the motion between the report of the Administration Board and consideration of the budget was appropriate. It was an opportunity to rethink who the stakeholders were who contributed to the stewardship of resources in the Church. The Rev Canon James Milne (Glasgow and Galloway) said he would welcome a change to the statistics. In his own congregation there were eight weekday services and it was the case that as many people attended during the week as did on Sunday. He suggested, however, that if statistics were gathered only in relation to *Fresh Expressions*, that would not catch the pattern of attendance in his own church.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke of the work carried out by the churches in the Killin area. This included a film club and work with mothers of pre-school children. She welcomed the motion but suggested she would like to see the statistics record the number of pastoral visits which were undertaken. Mr Neil Stewart (Edinburgh) expressed concern that any expansion of statistical collection would pose bureaucratic difficulties for larger churches. Mr Alan Rumble (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that reference had been made to collection of statistics in printed form. He suggested that thought be given to submitting statistics online. The Rev Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and the Isles) urged the need to maintain a sense of proportion. He had no intention of recording pastoral visits and was concerned that statistical collection could lead to a sense of boasting.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the motion but wondered who would have the responsibility of recording the statistics. Mr Gordon Aitken (Breachin) suggested that it should be possible to collect the statistics with minimal effort for the various categories mentioned in the paper included in the Synod Papers. Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said it was important to obtain a snapshot of figures. There was, however, much going on in congregations which could not all be reduced to numbers. Ms Emily Aldritt

(Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that her diocese was popular with tourists. Many people came to Scottish Episcopal churches in July and August and statistical returns might show a skewed result. The Rev Pam Shinkins (Moray, Ross and Caithness) suggested that guidance on how to complete the statistical return would be helpful.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Convener, Information and Communication Board) observed that online preaching reached many more people than were physically present in Church. Figures for such online viewing would be more useful than some others. He suggested that figures for attendance at a church art exhibition were not relevant. He thought it would be difficult for the College of Bishops to respond to some of the suggestions which had been made and asked that the exercise should not result in the imposition of too many additional burdens. The Rev Dave Richards (Edinburgh) thought the discussion was addressing two different issues. He suggested that it would be helpful to have a census every five years to gauge the overall scope of activity. That was different from questions of membership and attendance. It would be helpful to separate the two issues. Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that there was a facility for identifying how many people listened to radio broadcasts. Mr Matthew Pemble (Edinburgh) suggested that those who would review the manner of collection should consider first what any statistics were to be used for. A clear purpose needed to be articulated. Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that the Trustees' Report in the Annual Accounts provided a forum for recording Church activity. He wondered how many congregations took that facility seriously.

Bishop Gillies suspected that members of the College of Bishops, having heard the debate, might not be entirely content that the motion had been brought. He did not wish to respond to the individual comments made but the breadth and depth of response had indicated that the issue was a significant one. The record of the meeting would ensure that everyone's contribution would be taken into account

The motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 10 abstentions.

The Chair thanked all who had contributed to the session.

Session 9 -The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

9.1 Diaconate Working Group

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Convener, Diaconate Working Group) updated Synod on the work of the Group. It had met three times in the previous year (once by telephone) and had conducted a field visit to the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness. The visit was referred to in his written report in the Synod Papers but he emphasised that it had been a very positive experience. Rather than talking about the diaconate, it had been a demonstration of people being diaconal in their daily lives. It had been clear to the Group that the diaconal calling belonged to the whole Church and that the vocation of an individual was deeply rooted in the relationship of the local church with its community. One distinctive deacon would commence

training in the autumn. Others would embark on the discernment process during the year ahead. The deacon called the Church both to share, and be, good news. It was an outward-facing ministry – prophet, evangelist and servant. The deacon was, therefore, likely to make the Church feel uncomfortable at times. Prophecy needed first to be addressed to the faithful. When it came to evangelism, the Church was often bashful despite the fact that, as had been recognised in the current meeting, the Church needed to be more proactive. Earlier in the meeting, the Synod had heard of the Church being both servant and prophet in the context of the *Good Society Project*.

A short film was then shown of the work of General Practitioner and ordained deacon, the Rev Dr James Clark-Maxwell. Bishop Armes explained that it provided a good illustration of diaconal work.

Comment was invited but there was none.

9.2 Standing Committee: Budget and Quota

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that the General Fund budgets for 2015 and 2016 showed deficits of £69,085 and £180,197 respectively. Work was currently in hand by the Standing Committee and other Boards and Committees to reduce the deficit. The budgets reflected a phased reintroduction of building grants and in due course it would be necessary to take into account any financial costs that might result from the review of TISEC and the discussion on building grants funds that had been mentioned previously. To some extent, the priorities for funding which flowed from those areas might determine future budgets. There would, therefore, be changes to the budgets and these would be made by the Standing Committee in the autumn. It might not be possible to eliminate the deficits entirely but every effort would be made to do so. If not, the surpluses built up in recent years could be made available. The recommendation of the Standing Committee was that provincial quota should be increased by 3% to £678,602 for 2015.

Comment was invited.

The Very Rev Richard Kilgour (member, Standing Committee) asked whether a vote on the motion about to be proposed meant acceptance of the proposals regarding curate funding contained in the TISEC review report. Mr Palmer responded that the additional funding of approximately £400,000 required to fully implement the recommendations in the review report were not included in the budget figures now under discussion. No decisions would be made on changes to introduce 100% curate grants until after the Standing Committee had had further discussion and appropriate resources had been identified.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and Mr Michael Lugton (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion: –

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2015, agree to a quota figure of £678,602 for that year.”

The motion was put to vote and passed *nem con*, three abstentions.

9.3 Elections

9.3.1 Information and Communication Board Convenership

There being no competing nominations, the Rev Christopher Mayo was elected as Convener of the Information and Communication Board by general acclaim.

9.3.2 Standing Committee Membership

There being no competing nominations, Mr Jim Gibson was elected as a lay member of General Synod to the Standing Committee by general acclaim.

9.3.3 Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

There being no competing nominations, Mrs Nan Kennedy was elected as a General Synod representative on the Administration Board by general acclaim.

9.3.4 Preliminary Proceedings Committee Membership

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following: –

Practising lawyer: Mr Derek Buchanan

Lay member: Mrs Mary Birch

Alternate lay member: Mr David Palmer

Secretary: Mr Graham Robertson.

9.3.5 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed following: –

Three practising lawyers: Lord Bannatyne, Lord McEwan,
Mr George MacWilliam

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

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

9.3.6 Extension of Home Mission Committee Convenership

Mr David Palmer (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that the normal term of office for Conveners of Boards and Committees was five years. The Digest of Resolutions permitted extension of the term of a Convener for a specified period, on the recommendation of the Standing Committee. The proposed changes regarding provincial boards which had been the subject of discussion in the current meeting, would, if accepted, result in the Home Mission Committee being subsumed by a new Mission Board in 2015. There, therefore, seemed no point in appointing a new Convener to the Committee for just one year. The Mission and Ministry Board and the Standing Committee, therefore, recommended that the term of office of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont be extended by one year until General Synod 2015.

Mr Palmer then proposed, and the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) seconded, the following motion: –

“That the term of office of the Rev Canon Fay Lamont as Convener of the Home Mission Committee be extended until the conclusion of General Synod 2015.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

In concluding his remarks to Synod, Mr Palmer expressed the thanks of Synod to the Primus for his leadership during the previous year.

9.4 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed thanks to all members of Synod for their attendance and engagement; to those who had arranged the Eucharist and led worship during the meeting including the Cantor, organists and worship band; to retiring Conveners, the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth, Mrs Anne Jones, the Very Rev Susan Macdonald and the Rev Canon Ian Paton; to the representatives of other denominations and faiths; to those who had chaired sessions of Synod; to Dr Joe Morrow as Assessor; to those who had acted as table facilitators; to Kennedy Fraser, Paul Deponio and Alison Dines for operating the IT and audiovisual facilities; to the staff of St Paul's and St George's; and to the General Synod Office staff.

9.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 11.30am on Saturday 14 June 2014.