

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH EDINBURGH FROM 9-11 JUNE 2016

Freshers' Meeting

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

Opening Eucharist

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SESSION 1 – THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Welcome

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

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

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

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

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

1.3 Tellers

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

1.4 Assessor

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

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2015

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) reported that a minor correction had been identified in the draft minutes of the meeting of General Synod 2015 and that the first full sentence appearing at the top of page 18 in the Synod

Papers for the current meeting ought to have read: "However, if it did not, those who had voted for the least favoured option would have their votes reallocated in accordance with their second preferences." Mr Gordon explained that the version of the minutes for signature would include that correction. He then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion: –

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

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.6 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.7 Voting

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

1.8 Video Streaming of Proceedings

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

1.9 Elections

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

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

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

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

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

1.10 Roll Call

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

1.11 Permission to Speak

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

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

2.1 Anglican Communion Matters

2.1.1 Report from Primus on Primates' Meeting

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

The Synod Papers contained a copy of the Communiqué, including the "consequences" which that meeting had decided upon in relation to The Episcopal Church of the United States. The Primus suggested that, for Synod members, the primary question was likely to be whether the same consequences would apply if the Synod approved the proposals for canonical change in respect of marriage in 2016 and 2017.

The Primates had agreed to "walk together" albeit some, to his great regret, had walked away almost immediately. The Primates had agreed to establish a task group "to maintain conversation among ourselves with the intention of restoration of relationship, the rebuilding of mutual trust, healing the legacy of hurt, recognising the extent of our commonality and exploring our deep differences, ensuring they are held between us in the love and grace of Christ".

In relation to the decision of The Episcopal Church of the United States to allow same-sex marriage, the Primates had required that for a period of three years, The Episcopal Church would no longer represent the Anglican Communion on ecumenical and interfaith bodies nor would its members be appointed or elected to any internal Standing Committee or take part in decision-making on any issues pertaining to doctrine or polity while participating in the internal bodies of the Communion.

The Primus reported that two weeks earlier he had met with the Archbishop of Canterbury specifically to ask whether similar consequences would apply to the Scottish Episcopal Church if the process of canonical change were completed in 2017. The Primus confirmed that such consequences would indeed apply, including the fact that he would be removed from the role of Anglican Co-Chair of the International Anglican-Reformed Dialogue. Other

effects, however, would be limited. Scottish Episcopal Church Bishops would be fully present and involved in the Lambeth Conference planned for 2020 and the Church would continue to be actively involved in diocesan companionships and Anglican networks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.2 Report on Anglican Consultative Council (ACC–16)

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) reported on the meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC-16) which had taken place in Lusaka in April 2016.

"God is good ... all the time" was the call and response affirmation he had encountered for the first time in Lusaka. One of many first encounters, it had stuck with him as had the exhortation to "shake his body in praise of the Lord", which he had been happy to do!

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

34 out of the 38 provinces of the Communion had been represented at the meeting and there had been little desire to rake over past arguments or rub salt into old wounds. There had been a genuine desire to find commonalities. He had discovered the hugely important force for positive

change which the Anglican Communion represented across the world. It was possible that that sense of the Communion's real power and influence resonated more in Africa than in other parts of the world but when the worldwide Anglican Church spoke about gender justice, peace and reconciliation and climate change, it was listened to. Also, for all of his personal frustrations about the Communion tensions regarding human sexuality issues, it was the case that when the Archbishop of Canterbury restated the opposition of the Primates to criminal sanctions for homosexuality in a country which maintained such sanctions, that was of great significance. The perception of the Anglican Communion as an agent of progress and a courageous speaker of truth to power had come as an inspiring surprise.

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

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

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

The Synod then engaged in group discussions.

2.1.3 Motion Regarding Primates' Meeting

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

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

Bishop Gillies then proposed the following Motion: –

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion of the amended Motion ensued.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed his understanding (and asked to be corrected if he were wrong) that a "take note" Motion did not imply agreement with all of the texts which were referred to in the Motion. That had been a problem about that at the Anglican Consultative Council meeting. Based on his understanding, he was happy to support the Motion. With regard to the Primates' meeting and what the Primus had said, Provost Holdsworth wished to stand in solidarity with him. It was difficult to have someone look into your eyes and tell you that if certain matters took place, you would be removed from a role you

performed within the Church. If that happened, the Primus would enter a club to which a number of Synod members already belonged. Provost Holdsworth referred to the press conference which had taken place at the end of the Primates' meeting at which the Archbishop of Canterbury had been asked whether, if another church followed a similar route to that taken by The Episcopal Church, similar consequences would follow. The Archbishop had responded that he could not know and that the actions of one Primates' meeting did not bind another. He had indicated that he had one vote along with the others. Provost Holdsworth suggested that it now appeared that something had changed between the time of that press conference and the Primus' recent meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Was it possible to know what had changed? He wondered whether the Primates had been consulted again or whether there had been consultation with the ACC or its Standing Committee. Would it be possible to obtain an answer to that question?

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

The Primus responded to points made by Dr Routledge. He emphasised that in what he had said he had implied a very careful provisionality. It was reasonable, if the Synod were to debate changes to the marriage Canon, to endeavour to find out what the consequences might be but to raise such a question was not to pre-empt the decision nor to make any assumptions about what that decision might be. In response to Provost Holdsworth, the Primus said he had come away from the Primates' meeting not quite sure what the consequences might be for provinces acting similarly to The Episcopal Church. There was, for example, also lack of clarity as to what would happen at the end of the three-year period referred to in those "consequences". A letter had subsequently been sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Primates in the context of the Anglican Consultative Council meeting which indicated that all of the actions which had been agreed by the Primates had been completed. The Primus had assumed from that that the application of "consequences" had therefore begun and ended with The Episcopal Church and that it might require a further Primates' meeting to extend those consequences to others. It was, however, very hard to know how to interpret matters which is why the Primus had sought a meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Anglican convenerships of formal dialogues between the Anglican Communion and other traditions lay within the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Membership of such dialogues was for the Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council. It was, however, clear that where matters lay within the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop would act

accordingly. The Primus had no knowledge whether a change had taken place and if it had, he had no knowledge of why it might have taken place.

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

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the Motion and thanked those who had brought the amendment because for him it meant that the Church would go forward to walk together with brothers and sisters in The Episcopal Church. However, he expressed disappointment that the agenda only contained a Motion regarding the Primates' meeting, particularly in the light of Alistair Dinnie's excellent presentation on the meeting of the ACC. He considered there was something of an "episcopalisation" in the Anglican Communion. To have a Motion only regarding the Primates' meeting seemed to follow that trend. He suggested it would be good to be able to react to the meeting of the ACC.

The Rev Canon Paul Watson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that one of the reasons he had become an Episcopalian was to do with the Anglican Communion. His first contact with Anglicanism had been in Bangladesh where he had caught the end of two centuries of Anglican church planting around the world. Returning, some years later, to explore possibilities of overseas working, he had been told "don't expect to come here and solve our problems, but come and live with us in the problems". He had ended up in Sri Lanka and lived with the Church of Ceylon in the problems of that country. There was a richness of texture and depth to relations with fellow Anglicans which was precious and unique. The fellowship of living within one another's problems gave rise to bonds of affection which deserved more than simply a "take note" Motion. In entering into a time of change for the Anglican Communion, the Scottish Episcopal Church owed it to its forebears and brothers and sisters across the world to make as much of an effort as possible to sit together with each other in one another's contexts. "Supporting its commitment to walk together" expressed that desire to maintain bonds of affection and to struggle towards understanding, even if, ultimately, different destinations were arrived at. Another reason for being an Episcopalian was that he valued Anglicanism's theological diversity. The Scottish Episcopal Church would be much impoverished in the long term by taking a road which led it out of the Anglican Communion. It was important to grapple with the realities of life and mission in 21st-century Scotland but that did not need to be done alone. It could be communicated to sister churches so that they could be helped on their own journeys. It was difficult to be vulnerable and ask for understanding and patience from sister churches as the Scottish Episcopal Church wrestled with the wording of the marriage Canon. Ultimately, policy might not be sufficiently orthodox for many in the Anglican Communion but it was too early to start to slowly

disengage. Only to "take note" of the Primates' Communiqué was definitely a cooling and slight distancing. No vulnerability was being displayed and already the Synod would be seen to be moving to defensive and pre-emptive mode. He called on Synod to give a warmer response to the Communiqué's commitment to walk together even if it disagreed with the Primates' actions towards The Episcopal Church.

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

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

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

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

2.2 Faith and Order Board

2.2.1 Process for Discussing Alteration to Canon on Marriage

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

In relation to the text of the Canon itself, it was proposed to delete the current sections 1 and 2 and replace them with a new section 1 which

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

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

A further recommendation concerned Appendix 26 to the Canons. It had previously been discovered that the present appendix was out of line with the civil law and the Board had thought to address this by having the revised Canon indicate simply that the prohibited degrees were the same as those

in the civil law of Scotland for the time being in force. However, the sub-group had recommended that there should continue to be an appendix to the Canon setting out the Church's own list of prohibited degrees. The Board had agreed that the Church ought to take its own decisions in such matters. The sub-group had also recommended that the College of Bishops adopt revised criteria for the recruitment and selection of candidates for ordination and lay readership recognising that candidates might hold different views on the doctrine of marriage and that no candidate should be discriminated against on the grounds that they believed that marriage constituted a union between a man and a woman only. These matters were under active consideration by the College.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bishop Duncan responded to Provost Holdsworth and indicated that any guidelines issued by the College of Bishops would not be intended to make marriage of same-sex couples more difficult. The College of Bishops was at quite an early stage in relation to such guidance and had already discussed the possibility of consultation. That would likely involve the Faith

and Order Board but would also involve interested parties who might be able to offer helpful comment. As yet, however, no decision had been taken as to how that might happen.

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

2.2.2 Committee on Canons – Canons for Second Reading

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

2.2.2.1 Canon 52, Section 5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.2.2 Canon 57, Section 6

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.2.3 Canon 60, Section 5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.2.4 Canon 63, section 4

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

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

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

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

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

2.3 Doctrine Committee

In the absence of the Convener of the Doctrine Committee, the Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) who was a member of the Committee, reported on the new Grosvenor Essay. He explained that it was devoted to "prayer and spirituality". It started with the idea that prayer was "a complete waste of time" as the Dominican Herbert McCabe had said. That was because prayer was a matter of love rather than utility. The more that people prayed, not for the sake of doing something useful, but simply for the love of God, the more they became a home for Christ. For the early church, "spirituality" had meant the new spirit-filled life made possible by participating in the body of Christ.

That seemed a long way away from the more private sense of spirituality which might pertain today. On the other hand, spirituality had become institutionalised outside the Church – in health care, education, prisons, etc – and in business was looked to as that which focused on values, connectedness and the meaning of life. For those who liked to read the Grosvenor Essay in groups, there was plenty to discuss about what helped people to pray. The focus of the Essay was that prayer was more God's activity than that of people and that prayer changed people as they made room for Christ's spirit. The Essay looked at the Scottish and Anglican heritage of prayers, the social outworking of prayer and the liturgical and Eucharistic shape of prayer. The Committee would be most satisfied if it aided prayer amongst its readers.

2.4 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

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

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

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

The Chair thanked Dr McPake for his greetings.

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

3.1 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee.

He paid particular tribute, and made a presentation, to the Rev John Humphreys, representing the United Reformed Church, who was retiring and for whom the Synod was his last public engagement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to say something difficult. He appreciated the spirit of what the Primus had said but the difficulty was that sometimes on the ground matters were not the same as they were in ecumenical committees. It had been reported to him within the Presbytery of Glasgow that locally people within the Church of Scotland had indicated that they now considered Anglicans moving to Scotland as "fair game". That was a very different tone from what had just been said. His perception was that some things had changed as a result of the report. Also, responding to the comment by the Primus that there was a need for the Scottish Episcopal Church to reflect upon its own role in the situation, he was aware that some people felt that the fulfilling of an ecumenical goal was of paramount importance and was worth huge

sacrifices. There were, however, others who were just as committed to working together as Christians in Scotland who believed that strong fences made good neighbours. He asked the Synod to reflect on whether there were enough people of both views within the Synod's Inter-Church Relations Committee – were the hawks as representative as the doves?

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the Synod had just voted to share the commitment of the Primates to walk together. She had in fact voted in favour of that Motion. Her concern with the *Columba Declaration* was that she believed the Church of England was saying to the Scottish Episcopal Church that it did not really wish to walk together in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church anymore. She had appreciated the remarks by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the General Synod of the Church of England and at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland apologising for the manner in which details of the report had been released just before Christmas 2015. However, she believed he had misjudged the mood in Scotland, particularly in the Scottish Episcopal Church, by failing to understand that there were issues of substance and not just of style. She hoped that it would be possible to move towards an ecumenical agreement and make stronger ties with the Church of Scotland. She expressed regret that the Church of England had not seen fit to send a delegate to the current Synod.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comment was invited but there was none.

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

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

3.2 Church in Society Committee: Refugees

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

A video from Mr David Bradwell, who acted as Secretary to Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees was shown. He spoke of how Germany's policy on refugees had been altered following an encounter between their Chancellor, Angela Merkel, with a child who was a refugee. Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees had been established following the massive publicity given to the refugee crisis. It built on the experience of many churches actively working with refugees and asylum

seekers. His own work was to support churches proactively so that people could pull in the same direction. Whilst goods could be donated, gifts of money were preferable and Christian Aid already had well-established processes for accepting these. In Scotland refugees from Syria had been arriving over the previous nine months. There were many asylum seekers who had been in Scotland for many years but asylum seekers and refugees had different needs and a different status. Churches could have a role in helping with integration. If Synod members wished to know more, he suggested that they contact him. Fundamentally, the work was to foster human dignity and promote the values of the kingdom of God. He thanked the Scottish Episcopal Church for its support.

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

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

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) referred to passages of Scripture which spoke of people coming into a new country from outside and referred to how they should be treated and what they might do in return. Mr Dinnie explained that he was a local government officer with Edinburgh Council and had been involved in the resettlement of 15 Syrian families as part of a Scotland-wide initiative. This was part of the settling of 20,000 refugees in the UK in the lifetime of the present Parliament. It involved all local authorities. The question of what the churches could do was difficult to answer because circumstances varied from place to place. In Edinburgh, for example, there was a particular pressure around accommodation but that was not so elsewhere. Edinburgh was blessed with a large number of

Arabic speakers, whereas other areas were not. Before any church embarked upon a plan, it was essential to find out what the local needs were. He urged that the wheel should not be reinvented and that churches should work with others. Churches could have a role in longer-term settlement and integration. He suggested that the public sector was quite good at the crisis response but found the longer term more of a challenge. The experience of resettlement involved turning a house into a home. The public sector could not do that easily but churches could assist.

Synod members then engaged in group discussions around tables.

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

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

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

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

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

SESSION 4: THE REV PROF TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

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

Mr Hugh Donald (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) reported on behalf of the Committee. He referred to the Committee’s written report in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2015. The Committee, along with the Provincial Officers, was tasked with promoting and encouraging safe and protected environments for all children and vulnerable adults within the Church. In the previous year, the focus of the Committee had been in ensuring compliance with the PVG scheme and the delivery of training for those with responsibilities for children and vulnerable adults. The Committee, with the Provincial Officers,

continued to explore the best ways of delivering such training in order to maximise engagement across all churches. The Committee was only too aware of the devastating impact which cases of historic abuse, committed by well-known figures such as Jimmy Savile, had had in recent years. The high profile which those had received in the media had generated a number of enquiries and the Committee continued to monitor the robustness of the Church's own systems and processes. The challenge going forward was to ensure that the policies and processes were in fact a reality and were being put into practice. At times, the Committee had had some cause for concern around the level of compliance with policies when it saw sometimes a low level of safeguarding returns or perceived lack of commitment to training. Members of the Church should be able to expect that children and vulnerable adults were safe. Sadly, in modern society safety could not be guaranteed. The approach of the Committee was to look beyond the legal wording of complex regulations and to embrace the idea of a safe church. In closing, he expressed appreciation to the members of the Committee and the provincial staff Mr Donald Urquhart, Dr Daphne Audsley assisted by Miss Betty Robertson (who had now retired) and Mr Peter Cozens. He was delighted that, as he stood down as Convener, he would be succeeded by Mr Chris Townsend, one of the Committee members.

Questions were invited but there were none.

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

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

4.2.1 Canon 22

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

changes to liturgy which were necessary as a result of changes to the Canons.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) seconded the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The original Motion, namely: –

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

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

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

4.2.2 Canon 31

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

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

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

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

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) expressed surprise at how little time had been allocated to the debate. The Doctrine Committee paper of the previous year had released him to be able to support gay marriage. At the meeting of the Edinburgh Diocesan pre-Synod meeting the previous week reference had been made to a paper by Prof Oliver O'Donovan. That paper had disputed much of the methodology of, and the conclusions drawn by, the Doctrine Committee paper. The dry approach of Prof O'Donovan's paper distracted from the fact that the debate was a matter of fundamental importance to the humanity and spirituality of real people. Gay people were created in God's image as much as heterosexual people and God had seen that his creation was good. Mr Thompson said he could not believe that God intended to cast a shadow over so many of his created children as certain members of the Church through homophobia or intransigent interpretation of Scripture appeared determined to do. God's call was to love all people. Being gay was not just about sex. Whilst he could be married in church, his gay friend who had been in a faithful relationship for many years, could not. For years, the Anglican Communion had fudged the issue. The evangelicals sat on their hands and argued that Scripture was clear. Sadly, the Primates' meeting had continued the fudge by putting the American Episcopal Church on the naughty step for three years. What would happen after that? The final paragraph of Prof O'Donovan's paper had asked the question as to how to conceive of new pastoral initiatives in faithfulness to the catholic Christian identity which the Church professed. The paper had suggested that if an Anglican Church was convinced of the

need to provide new support for same-sex couples, might it find a way of imagining that innovation in a way that would not result in a shipwreck of its identity. If it could not so imagine, it did not matter what others thought of it because it would have given up the attempt to be true to its self. Mr Thompson suggested that if a theologian of Prof O'Donovan's stature believed that there was a way of embracing the homosexual community within the Church's catholicity, then surely that ought to be pursued as a matter of urgency. Surely, there was a pathway of reconciliation and he did not believe that God wanted the Anglican Communion to disintegrate. If the Church were to arrive at an academic solution, it needed to use academic techniques. He understood that there was much theological material on the subject in the Church but it was not co-ordinated. Simply to see one paper arguing in one direction and another in the opposite left him feeling confused. The Anglican community was better than that.

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

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

about to do what The Episcopal Church of America had done in that a new definition of marriage was not being incorporated within the Canons. What was being done was to allow a self-nominating group of clergy to perform marriages the sacramental validity of which was not universally acknowledged.

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

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

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

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Faith and Order Board for seeking to fulfil its remit. There was much in the Canon which he welcomed but he remained concerned at the deletion of section 1. The view in that section that marriage was between a man and a woman was upheld by Scripture and he therefore could not agree to a change in the definition of marriage. The traditional view was articulated in the book of Genesis and upheld in the teaching of Jesus. If marriage was written into the Creator's design, the Church was not at liberty to change that. Where a province acted unilaterally relationships could be damaged and if the Scottish Episcopal Church made the proposed change it would be at odds with the vast majority of the Anglican Communion. He was proud that the Scottish Episcopal Church had given birth to the Anglican Communion through Samuel Seabury and also for its role in other parts of the

Communion such as the Eastern Cape in Southern Africa. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a place in history of bringing blessing to the Anglican Communion and he did not want it now to bring damage. He would vote against the Motion.

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

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

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

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

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said she did not follow the liturgy of marriage which Adam and Eve followed. The way that marriage was done today was very different from how it had been 5,000 years previously. In relation to the idea that marriage was ordained in Scripture, she suggested that the understanding of marriage then was very different from current understandings. It had only been in the preceding 300-400 years that marriage had been addressed by the civil law, let alone in Church Canons. There were some who could no longer hold to the definition of marriage as expressed in the current section 1 of the Canon. They had come to the conclusion through their reading, prayer and spirituality that that doctrine was no longer valid. The new section 1 allowed everyone to hold their respective doctrines of marriage. The view of the sacraments had changed through the ages and the Church's view of looking at society through God's eyes changed with every generation. It was essential to change the Canon because there were people present at Synod who were otherwise being forced to hold to a doctrine of marriage which they could no longer accept.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said that many people thought that what was being debated was whether a gay couple could get married in a Scottish Episcopal Church. It was partly about that but it was also about bigger issues. It was about the kind of church which one wanted it to be – whether the Scottish Episcopal Church was one where there was room for everyone, whether there was room for minorities in the Church (not just gay and bisexual people but others such as refugees, ethnic minorities, single parents, single people and people of diverse gender identity). It was about whether the Church was willing to play its part in dismantling social systems which oppressed the oppressed. The proposed new Canon represented where the Scottish Episcopal Church now was. She did not believe that it excluded those who disagreed with her view on marriage. The new Canon would accept that there was more than one voice. She suggested that Synod members should not think that maintaining the *status quo* would mean comfort. There was already pain and she urged Synod members not to underestimate the pain and hurt which would be felt if the Motion were

not passed. It would mean saying that there was not room for people like her. If the Synod could accept diversity, it could be a model of Anglican fellowship and love throughout the Anglican Communion. She would be very proud of that.

The Rev Canon Scott Robertson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that whilst he understood the pastoral and political impulse which had led to the proposed new section 1 he had some concerns about the logic of the phrase "differing understandings of the nature of marriage". Did such wording not open up the Canon to all sorts of understandings, for example "open" marriage. If "differing" actually meant two understandings then why did the Canon, for the sake of clarity, not say so. If "differing" did mean "two" then in effect the change would replace one understanding with another. He sought clarification.

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

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

Dr Julia House (Aberdeen and Orkney) described herself as an untrained theologian. She struggled with the proposed change in the definition of

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

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) had been a member of The Episcopal Church in America in the 1990s and had been irritated by Bishop Gene Robinson's attempt to move the Church forward. Now, however, she was very grateful for what he had done. The following week, she would have been married for 42 years. How could she deny that joy, love, physical closeness and companionship which was blessed by the Church she loved to anyone else? Human sexuality appeared to exist on a continuum and was not necessarily binary. It seemed sensible to her to allow the Church's liturgies to develop in recognition of that. The proposed change to the Canon would open up the love of the Church to all.

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

The Most Rev David Chillingworth (Primus, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that it had been the preoccupation of those in leadership in the Church to provide a process which would enable the Synod to arrive at a measured, mature decision. As Provost Holdsworth had already said, this was the best chance of achieving that. The other preoccupation had been about the unity of the Church. He had been encouraged to hear from the Rev Alastair MacDonald, the Rev Canon Ian Ferguson and the Rev Canon Malcolm Round that the work which had been done could be honoured and would be sufficient to enable them with integrity to remain in the life of the Church. They were not being asked to unbelieve what they believed or to deny it or to live or minister in any way against their conscience. The question for the Synod was whether its understanding of unity and koinonia and of walking together was generous

enough to allow people to vote as conscience dictated? Would the Scottish Episcopal Church be the kind of church which would honour its diversity? If so, just possibly the Scottish Episcopal Church could be a model for the Anglican Communion.

Mrs Judy Robinson (Brechin) asked whether the third sentence of the proposed new section 1 of the Canon needed to be repeated in section 2, as it appeared to be. Solemnisation of marriage between two people of the same sex in church seemed to her to be quite fair. However, she was not happy with the proposed text and would vote against the Motion. The actual service for same-sex couples would have to be different from a marriage service for a man and a woman. The two unions would not be the same and so the wording of the service could not be the same. It therefore followed that there would have to be differentiation in the wording of the Canon. She suggested that "union" might be used in relation to same-sex couples instead of "marriage". She suggested further amendment to the text was needed before undertaking a first reading.

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) indicated he would vote in favour of the Motion. It had been his privilege to be part of the Cascade Conversations. There, in a dignified and searching process, he had encountered theology which he did not feel qualified to assess. He had learned that for those who saw the issue differently from him, the matter was as intrinsic to them as his sexual orientation was to him. He believed he had made some good friends who had enriched his life amongst people who saw the issue very differently. He was satisfied that people of intellect and integrity had approached the issue with equal care and come to different conclusions. He came to the matter in a way which he regarded as entirely consistent with the Church's mission imperative. As long as marriage was closed to same-sex couples people both within the Church and people outwith it would conclude that the Church had a problem with LGBTQI people. Was that the case?

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) believed there was an opportunity for the Synod to have a leading role. There was a need for something to start the process of change. The Episcopal Church in America had started and the Scottish Episcopal Church could now take the opportunity to be a cog to change the Anglican Communion. One group which had not been mentioned during the debate was transgender people. He fully supported the Motion and adopted the approach of "not what you want but what you can live with".

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

Communion had changed and grown from that point. She urged Synod to be brave again.

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

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

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

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the wording in section 1 was in the context of the "necessary preliminaries" including the question of forbidden degrees. In contrast, where the phrase appeared in the proposed new section 2, it was part of a complete and

discreet paragraph dealing with the concept of the law of nullity. The repetition served to underscore the vital importance of the matter since to get the matter wrong would have disastrous consequences.

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

House of Bishops: 5 in favour, 2 against
House of Clergy: 43 in favour, 19 against
House of Laity: 49 in favour, 12 against, 3 abstentions.

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

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

5.1 Mission Board

5.1.1 Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy – *Inspiring Mission*

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

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

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

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

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

5.1.2 Church in Society Committee

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

5.1.2.1 Poverty

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

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

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

- a) *Reaffirm its support for the minimum wage to be set at the level of the real Living Wage;*
- b) *Call on the relevant public authorities to ensure that benefit levels are adequate and that benefits are humanely and efficiently administered in order to reduce the need for food banks and other support services.”*

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

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

The Very Rev Francis Bridger (Brechin) spoke as a trustee of the same care home mentioned by the Bishop of Brechin. He indicated that he

would have been happier if the Motion, which he supported as a matter of justice, had reflected the complexity of implementation on the ground. He would vote noting that there would be a serious impact which needed to be recognised.

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

The inclusion of initial capitals in the Motion was agreed.

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

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

5.1.2.2 Climate Related Issues

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

“That this Synod

- a) Welcome the historic agreement of the world’s nations in Paris in December 2015 on the need for urgent and substantial reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and recognise that creating a ‘low carbon’ future depends on practical implementation and far reaching changes throughout society;*
- b) Urge all parts of the Scottish Episcopal Church to play an active part in finding means of reducing the consumption of fossil fuels, including their use in heating and transport;*
- c) Call upon Scottish and UK Governments to increase financial and other incentives for domestic and housing sectors in energy saving and renewable energy implementation that will lead to the very substantial reductions that are needed and as part of this simultaneously to address the issues of fuel poverty which currently impact on over a third of households in Scotland;*
- d) Recognising the importance of economic drivers in moving to a low carbon energy system, commend the joint discussions which have been taking place between the Church in Society and Investment Committees and invite the Committees to continue to work together and report to General Synod in 2017 on the complex issue of investment in the exploration, production and burning of fossil fuels.”*

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

Dr Bruce explained that he had formerly been the Director of the Society, Religion and Technology Project at the Church of Scotland for 15 years and had undertaken significant work in relation to climate change matters. The question of whether there should be divestment from fossil fuels had been much debated in recent years and a number of institutions had made specific steps to divest. The question was whether the Scottish Episcopal Church should do so also. The issue was a much more complex one than, for example, divesting from tobacco and discussions with the Investment Committee had illustrated that complexity. Steps taken in Scotland to produce renewable energy had focused on electricity which amounted to only 20% of use. There was also a need to distinguish between the use of fossil fuels used in the production of plastics and the burning of fossil fuels to produce energy. Institutions which had divested had focused on particular areas such as coal and extracting oil from tar sands. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not a big investor. Two thirds of the Church's investments were held in a pool and it was therefore not a straightforward matter to pull out. It was also an area in which approximately only 2% or 3% actually engaged with that field. A further consideration was whether or not one could bring more influence to bear by remaining as an investor. The Investment Committee had joined the Church Investors Group which was a collective

body and Dr Bruce was due to attend one of their meetings shortly. The suggestion was that dialogue between the Church in Society and Investment Committees continued with a view to bringing a report to General Synod 2017 once there had been some experience of participating in the Church Investors Group. As a result of the Paris meeting, nations were now "on board". The question was whether the Church and church members, were similarly on board. It was now for everyone to take steps. The Eco-Congregation programme currently included 43 Scottish Episcopal churches – not as many as there might be. He would like every church to join the scheme. The Eco-Congregation website included an environmental check-up for churches. The Church now needed to put its actions where its mouth was.

The Rev Ken Webb (Edinburgh) said that many congregations would love to be able to do more. At the same time, there was a desire to keep churches warm and welcoming. He wondered whether the Committee could do anything to encourage Government to provide grants to help congregations.

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

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

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

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the Motion because it was the right thing to do and it was also financially prudent. The Paris Conference had been a game changer but developed countries would have to switch to a low carbon economy much more rapidly than was currently planned. It was a matter of justice that this should be undertaken. The countries which had suffered the greatest impact were also the poorest. However, he also believed taking such steps were financially prudent. Generally, charity trustees were charged with obtaining the best returns. Fossil fuel investment had previously provided good returns. The vast majority of fossil fuel reserves were in fact difficult to exploit and burn. This would mean that the assets of fossil fuel companies over time would become worthless. Already some investors were acting on such a basis. If the Scottish Episcopal Church choose to divest it would be joining the Church of Scotland, the Church of England, the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church. He commended the Motion.

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

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

5.1.2.3 Trident

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

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

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

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

Mrs Helen Hood (Edinburgh) explained that she was a pacifist and therefore opposition to Trident renewal was straightforward. However, she wished to speak to those who held other views. General Sir Hugh Beach along with others had argued that the UK Government

should fund more realistic military needs rather than perpetuating Trident since nuclear weapons were useless as a deterrent to the threats currently faced, particularly international terrorism. In the days of the Cold War, he had supported nuclear deterrence but had nevertheless opposed British Trident from the outset as a misapplication of funds. She agreed with the Primus who had previously described Trident as an excessively expensive, increasingly irrelevant and inherently immoral weapon system.

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

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

Mrs Karen Willey (Breachin) wished to make a general point applicable to Motions 16, 17 and 18 (the motions from the Church in Society Committee) on the Synod agenda. She considered that the workings of the Committee would be much more robust if it had engaged in discussions with people of opposing views. That should be done before Motions came to Synod. The Committee could have a role in influencing such opposing groups directly.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said she was baffled by the Motion. Prof Atkinson had explained that different people would have different views and the Church in Society Committee had reflected on the question of expenditure and usefulness of nuclear weapons. However, the Motion presented a moral stance and did not reflect the fact that the matter was about projected expenditure. She was not convinced that the Synod was qualified to make any decision about national defence and

nuclear weaponry. She would abstain from voting and that had nothing to do with her own personal view on Trident. She lived in a diocese where jobs were dependent on the continued existence of Faslane. She urged members of Synod, whatever their views, to lobby their own elected members of Parliament.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) had once been in favour of nuclear weapons but after the birth of her son had become concerned as to how she could protect the new life she had brought into the world. She had decided that she did not want to live in a world which would be left behind after the dropping of a bomb so with her husband she had chosen to move inside the area close to Faslane which would be subject to a first strike. She had changed her mind about nuclear weapons. They did not make peace because peace was not about an absence of war but about how life was lived.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that 20 years previously he had had the privilege of an argument with the Admiral responsible for Britain's nuclear weapons and had argued against such weapons. Now he fully supported the desire to get rid of such weapons but did not believe that unilateral disarmament was the way forward. The world was in fact now more unstable than it had been. The Cold War appeared to be reigniting and the possibility of nuclear weapons spreading was more likely. To say that the money should be spent on other purposes in effect meant that the UK would depend on other nations to maintain the deterrence. The UK had a responsibility to decide for itself how to make the world safer.

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

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

Prof Atkinson said that he took the point about the Committee consulting with a wide range of people. However, the Committee itself was not unanimous in its views and it engendered discussion internally. Supporting paperwork had been supplied to the Synod in the current and previous years. He had heard that perhaps paperwork might have

addressed more issues. He would think about that for next year. The Motions in the current year were invitations to the Synod to give instructions to the Committee. He emphasised that the range of issues brought to Synod by the Committee had a common theme in relating to poverty. Since the Government vote on Trident would take place later in 2016, the Committee had considered it important to bring the issue to the current Synod.

The Motion was put to the vote but not carried.

SESSION 6: THE VERY REV SUSAN MACDONALD IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Institute Council

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bishop Pearson then proposed the following Motion: –

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

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

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

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

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

The Motion, as amended, was debated.

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

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

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) emphasised that a curate was not an extra pair of hands but that a curacy was a place for training. Curates had tended to go to wealthy charges which were not necessarily the places where ordained

clergy might end up. She had undertaken a curacy at a time when she had three children under the age of two. Clergy were not known for maintaining a good work/life balance. The matter had been handled creatively by her then Bishop. It was critically important for women in the Church that curates should be supported by the whole Church. Initial Ministerial Education 4-6 remained part of the Institute's initial training.

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

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

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

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

The Motion was passed *nem con*.

6.2 College of Bishops

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

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) believed that as President of the Rites of Initiation the Bishop should encourage multiple avenues of entry – Baptism, Confirmation, admission to membership, etc. He was happy with the

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

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) suggested that Confirmation presented an ideal moment where a number of things happened simultaneously. It gave the person being confirmed the chance to confirm for themselves the vows made on their behalf at infant baptism or to repeat the vows taken by themselves at adult baptism. It also allowed the wider community of the Church to affirm its support. Increasingly, it also admitted of the possibility for a wider testimony of faith to be shared. All this was done in the presence of a Bishop who represented the worldwide church and responded in prayer by the laying on of hands and by anointing. That represented a deeply personal and powerful sacramental moment.

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

The Rev Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and the Isles) responded warmly to what he had heard. He loved Confirmation and had come to love the rite of baptism used in the Scottish Episcopal Church. He asked how Confirmation fitted in with chrismation and the laying on of hands contained in the baptism service?

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and the Isles) wished to affirm what his fellow Bishops had said. He wished to respond to a question which Canon Ind had asked earlier in the Synod. The Scottish Episcopal Church used the Church of England Bishops Advisory Panels for selection and recruitment. Confirmation was required as part of that. The point he wished to make was that the churches of the Porvoo Communion took confirmation very seriously and the Scottish Episcopal Church was trying to do the same in its own context.

The Very Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) responded warmly to what the Bishops had said. Specifically, he wished to ask that the point made by the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway not be lost, namely that the question of whether the act of Confirmation could happen prior to the asking of questions to the candidates. At an earlier stage there had been a proposed baptismal liturgy which had done that but the Synod at that stage had not been willing to countenance it.

It was possibly an example of a small change which the Synod could make without having to go through two years of liturgical provision.

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

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

6.3 Liturgy Committee

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

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

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

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

The Committee had recognised that some of the instructions in relation to emergency baptism in Holy Baptism 2006 were vague and some of the prayers were not suited to situations of extreme urgency. Also, insufficient attention had

been given to the rite of welcoming into the congregation those who recovered after such a baptism had been administered. The Committee had concluded that there was a real possibility that baptism might in effect be repeated or the validity of the emergency baptism brought into question. The inclusion of a baptismal rite in the books of Pastoral Offices would seek to rectify those deficiencies and the Faith and Order Board had commissioned the Liturgy Committee to begin work on such rites.

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

Dr Davies thanked the Committee members for their work and Mr David Todd for his arranging of the worship for the current Synod.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) suggested that in a church which was seeking to be mission oriented, there was a need for a little more freedom in relation to worship. He was worried that there was little scope for deviation from authorised texts.

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

6.4 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

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

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

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

Questions were invited but there were none.

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

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

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Acting Convener, Faith and Order Board) explained the proposed alteration to Canon 63, section 3. The policy of the Board which had considered representations from a lay member of Synod from the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness, was to make provision in the Canon for alternate lay representatives to be *ex officio* members of the vestry, on the same basis as lay representatives. The lay representative and alternate lay representative were supposed to know the life of their charge and one way of making sure that that was the case was for them to be Members of the vestry.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) spoke to the specific wording of the proposed change to Canon 63, section 3.

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

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

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

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) expressed gratitude to the Committee on Canons for bringing forward the proposed alteration. One of the reasons for seeking the amendment was that in exercising all the powers available to the lay representative, the alternate lay representative became a shadow

Trustee. The change would give protection to the individual in question. Also, vestry members were required to sign a number of declarations and it was possible that the alternate lay representative might not have signed similar declarations. He had hoped that the words "unless otherwise provided in the constitution of the congregation concerned" in section 3 would be removed. The Canons trumped constitutions.

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

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said he was a lay representative. He had an alternate and as far as appearing at Diocesan Synod was concerned, they were in effect one person. Only one person could attend at a time. The same was true of alternate members of General Synod. The proposed change marked a first step away from that principle. He was not convinced that this was a step which the Synod should take.

Bishop Duncan said that barring death, accident or poisoning, there was no episcopal election about to take place in his Diocese.

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

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

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

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

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

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

House of Laity: passed by majority, one against, two abstentions

House of Clergy: passed by majority, three against, three abstentions

House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

SESSION 7: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Greetings from Army Chaplaincy

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

The Chair thanked Padre Maynard for his presentation.

7.2 Pension Fund Trustees

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

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

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

by thanking his fellow Trustees and also Daphne Audsley for inducting him and handling the day-to-day administration of the Fund.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Mr MacIndoe and the other Trustees of the Fund.

SESSION 8: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Information and Communication Board

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

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

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

One of his churches, St Columba's Brora, was in a formal ecumenical agreement with the Religious Society of Friends through which he had experienced the liturgy of silent worship. He had invited the Board, as it considered a renewed communication strategy, to consider first what "communication" meant in a world of constant noise. If the Church were to add to the "beauty of silence", rigour

needed to be applied to the "why" and the "what" of the Church's communications. The communication of the Church was linked to its sense of mission. Despite the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and much good work happening at local level, there was a need to grasp how to communicate with a prophetic and pastoral voice to society. As both a Quaker in membership and an Episcopalian priest, he had, during his recuperation phase, compared the news being put out by both ecclesial communities. The Quaker website in particular evinced a deep sense of faith in action, which was less obvious from the Scottish Episcopal Church website. If the Church was asking his Board to be responsible for what the Church communicated, then some seriously hard thinking needed to be done about what the Church was spending its time doing and how it was reported. There were examples of substantial engagement with society in the Scottish Episcopal Church but he reminded Synod members that it was their responsibility to inform the General Synod Office of what was going on at local level. Diocesan representatives on the Board could be a channel for this communication or they could be passed on via Diocesan Bishops and Diocesan Secretaries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.2 Administration Board

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

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

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

Mr Elliott Glen-Esk (Convener, Retirement Welfare Committee) explained that the Committee, as currently constituted, had been formed in 1991 out of the former Housing and Pensions Committees. The Committee had oversight of the Housing and Supplementary Funds. The insertion of "welfare" in the title of the Committee had related to the original purpose of the Supplementary Fund which in time past had been a significant resource augmenting the pensions of clergy and widows in the period to 1988. However, the Supplementary Fund was now a source of only

small grants of up to £500. It also provided a Christmas gift to all pensioners of £90. The Supplementary Fund could no longer be described as meeting any significant welfare needs of pensioners. The Committee believed that its name ought to reflect its core activity namely the provision and maintenance of retirement housing for eligible clergy and widowed pensioners.

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

“That

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

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

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

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

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

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

8.2.2 Personnel Committee

Mrs Maureen McKellar (Convener, Personnel Committee) explained that the Committee was responsible for reviewing and updating personnel policies and procedures mainly for clergy. That was not as straightforward a task as might be thought. Whilst most clergy were office holders, and not employed, the Committee had accepted ACAS guidelines as best practice helping to protect both clergy and the Church. The Committee had been working hard to update present policies and procedures and to add new ones as necessary. She hoped that soon an updated Clergy Personnel Handbook would be available online. It would take the form of a series of guidance notes, templates, policies and procedures. One section would enable greater clarity about clergy roles and was currently being piloted in one diocese. Other sections of the former Handbook would be updated.

Currently there was little guidance as to how sickness absence should best be dealt with, nor its reporting, which was mandatory. Other new policies would include bullying and harassment, drugs and alcohol, guidelines for fees for weddings and funerals and for supernumerary fees. Work was also being undertaken on a capability policy. Some of these would require change to the Canons and it was hoped to bring forward canonical change in 2017.

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

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

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

8.2.3 Dissolution of Finance Committee

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

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

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

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

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

- *that subparagraph 2.3.5 be deleted in its entirety and the remaining paragraphs 2.3.6 to 2.3.8 be renumbered 2.3.5 to 2.3.7 respectively;*
- *that the final sentence of paragraph 2.9 be deleted in its entirety;*
- *that in paragraph 4.1.2 the words “Maintenance/Development Fund” be replaced by the words “Building Grants Fund” and that the words “Dunderdale Building Fund” also be replaced by the words “Building Grants Fund”;*
- *that in paragraph 4.1.3 the words “Hymn & prayer books” and “Free and Open Church Association” be deleted;*
- *that paragraphs 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 be altered by the deletion of the words “on the recommendation of the Finance Committee” wherever they appear.*
- *that paragraphs 4.4, 4.5 and 4.7 be deleted in their entirety and be replaced by the following new paragraph 4.4:-*

“Building Grants Fund

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

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

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

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reminded Synod that it had passed a Motion the previous day regarding fossil fuels and questions had been asked as to how assistance could be provided to congregations in relation to energy consumption. He wished to commend

the Eco-Congregation Scotland resource *Greening Church Buildings* which was available from the Eco-Congregation website. Dr Ferguson-Smith also confirmed that note had been taken on behalf of the Buildings Committee in relation to comments made the previous day during the climate change debate.

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

SESSION 9 THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS AND THE CHAIR

9.1 Provincial Youth Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

9.2 Global Partnerships Committee

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

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

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

The priority theme of the 60th session of the Commission on the Status of Women had been women's empowerment and its link to sustainable development. The Sustainable Development Goals had been adopted by all 193 UN member states in September 2015. They followed on from the Millennium Development Goals and comprised 17 goals to be achieved by 2030, including goals relating to gender equality, climate change, quality education and access to clean water and sanitation. She urged Synod members to familiarise themselves with the Sustainable Development Goals and to think about how they could be worked towards within the local church context. The Scottish and Westminster Governments had both committed to achieving the goals in the UK. The Church ought to work to hold the Government to account.

The Anglican delegation had adopted a statement for the Anglican Consultative Council which recognised that the Sustainable Development Goals were a unique and remarkable platform for action on a vision which affirmed the longing of Christians to work for the kingdom of God on earth. Helen Dennis of Christian Aid

had commented that they should be thought of as "the floor, not the ceiling" – in other words they were the foundation of human rights. The "takeaway" message from the Commission had been "leave no one behind". Sadly, it was often women and girls who were left behind.

The delegation had met with the Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church in the USA who had sent his warm wishes to Scotland and to the Primus. He had reminded the delegation that God remembered the least, the lost and the left out.

Ms Fraser reported that she had heard from her fellow delegates that across the Anglican Communion it was often the case that women were not included in decision-making affecting churches and communities. She commended the work of Elaine Cameron in the gender audit which had been carried out on Scottish Episcopal Church a number of years previously but further work was required. The delegation had looked forward to the day when ACC resolution 13.31, affirming the goal of equal representation of women in decision-making at all levels of the Church, became a reality.

The political intent to achieve social justice, and especially gender equality, had never been higher. She had noticed that intent amongst young people within the Scottish Episcopal Church. Children were not the future of the Church; they were the present. There was a need to bring them to the table and engage with them and their hopes for the Church in society. She urged Synod members to talk to young people in local congregations to see how their hopes could be made a reality.

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

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

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

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

Mrs Nellist then reported on other aspects of the Global Partnerships Committee's work. She drew attention to the Companion Partnerships Day being organised by

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

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

The Primus thanked all who had participated for their work.

9.3 Standing Committee

9.3.1 Accounts

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

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

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

Mr Gordon explained that the financial results showed that, instead of a budgeted deficit, a surplus had been achieved and this had been the case for a number of years. Coming new to the convenership of the Standing Committee, he had been surprised by this. Expenditure under the old Grants for Ministry system had tended to be lower than budgeted.

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

Mr Gordon then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion: –

“That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2015.”

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

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

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

9.3.2 Budget and Quota

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

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

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

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

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and the Isles) referred to the Primus' remarks in his charge to Synod regarding the need to move to a culture of growth. The Scottish Episcopal Institute was key to that. In the light of the comments made by Dr Peden, might it be appropriate to take money from capital in order to provide funding?

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

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

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

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

9.4 Vote of Thanks

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

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

9.4 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

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