

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 8-10 JUNE 2017

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 the celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 8 June 2017.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. Referring to recent terrorist attacks in London, Manchester and abroad, he suggested that the current period through which people were living was particularly challenging. In all these locations, people had been living ordinary lives and the partition between trustworthy ordinariness and the most unimaginable horror had been dissolved in an instant. In the midst of that horror, ordinary people had acted with self-sacrificing heroism. Religiously motivated violence was one of the greatest challenges of the current period, as was the rise of the politics of populist nationalism, driven by a combination of anger and fear. In such times, he turned to the Scriptures, with relief. They were a challenge to enter a greater humanity rather than a lesser one; a heart of flesh rather than a heart of stone.

Referring to the debate which Synod would have later in the day about the Church's understanding of marriage, he suggested that the matter was one which had stressed and threatened to divide the Church almost as no other in current times. It was not for him to argue the issues but rather to call the Church to unity as it attempted once again to resolve the issue. God privileged agreement: "if two or three agree on Earth about anything in my name, it will be done for you by my Father in Heaven". Inability to agree closed off blessing. The challenge was whether the Church's oneness in Christ could sustain unity in the face of diversity of views. He referred to remarks made by the Very Rev Professor Iain Torrance at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland the previous month who had described the moment when "suddenly the pieces of a long argument come together in a different way; where both sides can flourish, both may be protected and both may be celebrated". He had also talked of the need to enable and celebrate structures of faithfulness.

The Primus indicated that the current General Synod was his thirteenth. The fact that the Synod would address issues in the way it would was a sign of a growing maturity in the Church. The Scottish Episcopal Church was a distinctive church, widely respected in the wider Anglican Communion and had its own history and voice. In recent times, it had tempered radical independent-mindedness with a strengthened commitment to orthodoxy and that had only increased its influence.

The Primus' prayer was that Synod members would honour one another, and God, who was the source of unity, as the Synod met.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees. The offering amounted to £1,339.

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:

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Salvation Army), the Rev Ian Boa (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev Dr Liam Fraser (Church of Scotland), Sue Lycett (Religious Society of Friends), the Rev Dr Peter McEnhill (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Very Rev Steven Mulholland (Roman Catholic Church) and the Rev Canon Jane Charman (Church of England).

Major Steven Turner (Salvation Army) and Mrs Ravinder Kaur Nijjar (Scottish Sikh Community) were welcomed to Synod subsequently on the days of their attendance.

The Baptist Union of Scotland had been unable to send a representative to the current Synod since dates clashed with a meeting of their own.

Synod members introduced themselves in table groups.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Frances Burberry and the Rev Canon Paul Watson were elected as Clergy Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

Dr Anthony Birch and Ms Jenny Whelan were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

1.3 Tellers

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, Mr Donald Urquhart and Ms Miriam Weibye 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 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.

1.6 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of the meeting: Dr Donald Bruce, Ms Rachael Fraser, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, Mr Richard McIndoe, the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, all ecumenical guests at Synod and members of the Provincial Youth Committee who would make a presentation later in the meeting.

1.7 Minutes of General Synod 2016

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

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 9-11 June 2016.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.8 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.9 Elections

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by the General Synod in 2017 included three vacancies for General Synod members on the Administration Board. No nominations had been received in respect of those vacancies by the deadline for submissions and it would therefore be for Standing Committee to determine whether to fill the vacancies for the year ahead. He invited expressions of interest from Synod members.

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 Marjory McPherson as an additional member of the Institute Council for a period of three years be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

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

“That the appointment of John Stirling as a member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Mr Geoff Sage as Alternate Lay Member to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following to the Clergy Discipline Tribunal:

- Three practising lawyers: Lord Bannatyne, Lord McEwan and Mr George MacWilliam
- One cleric: the Rev Professor John Richardson
- Three lay members: Mr Fraser Falconer, Mrs Sue Horne and Mr John Whittall.

1.10 Roll Call

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 131 members attended.

1.11 Procedural Motion

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that in planning for General Synod 2017, the Standing Committee had in mind that the same arrangements for broadcasting as had applied in 2016 would apply again in 2017, namely that the proceedings would be captured by the fixed and unobtrusive cameras in St Paul’s & St George’s and would be live streamed on the internet and that the broadcast media, if they wished access to film with their own cameras, would be admitted only to cover the announcement of the result of the vote on Canon 31. Standing Committee’s rationale had been that the arrangements adopted in 2016 had helped to foster a dignified, conciliatory and reflective atmosphere. In late April, representations had been received from one of the broadcasters arguing that their cameras should be admitted to Synod to film the whole debate. It had been noted that the Church of Scotland General Assembly and the General Synod of the Church of England allowed unrestricted access to their respective proceedings. Was the Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church trying to hide something? Having considered the issues carefully, the Standing Committee had concluded that it should accede to the broadcasters’ request on this occasion and the Secretary General had communicated that position to all Synod members in his letter of 17 May. This had led to further representations from certain Synod members urging Standing Committee to think again and to revert to the 2016 arrangements on the grounds that the presence of cameras could inhibit full and open debate. Standing Committee had, therefore, thought again and had decided to bring a procedural Motion to Synod

to enable the Synod itself to decide what should be done at the current Synod. The Committee would also invite the Information and Communication Board to consider in slower time and in depth the arrangements that should apply in 2018 and beyond and to bring recommendations to Standing Committee. The Convener of that Board and the Director of Communications would be happy to receive views and insights from members of Synod during the course of the current meeting.

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

"That the same policy as applied in 2016 applied to Session 3, namely that TV cameras be admitted to the meeting to film only the announcement of the vote on Motion 6."

Mr Gordon explained that a vote in favour of the Motion supported the continuation of the arrangements which had applied in 2016. A vote against the Motion supported the introduction of TV cameras to film the debates in Session 3 and any other parts of the Synod which the broadcasters wished to film. He himself as Convener of the Standing Committee made no recommendation.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) asked Synod to support the Motion. He explained the sensitivities which he felt as a priest and pastor in the local community. He considered there was a difference between livestreaming the debate and having TV cameras present in the debate. He considered that he would feel gagged if TV cameras were to be admitted. He did not wish to be misunderstood.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) understood the fear of being quoted out of context but considered that being secretive would send an unhelpful message to the world. She thought it was a good opportunity to let people see what the Synod was about.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) wished to support Canon Round and supported the Motion.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) supported the Motion. It was the case that one spoke differently to different audiences. Material captured by the TV cameras would be edited.

The Rev Neil Brice (Aberdeen and Orkney) was proud of the way the Scottish Episcopal Church had conducted its debates and considered it would be good for the world to see how it did this.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) thanked the Standing Committee for listening to General Synod members. He wished to support the Motion.

The Rev Chris Mayo (Convener, Information and Communication Board) reported that certain broadcasters had indicated that they would in any event

make use of the live video stream. Consequently, Synod members could expect the contents of the live stream to be used.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) pointed out that whether or not the Motion was passed, it was the case that the Synod was speaking to the world. The only way not to be heard by the world would be not to speak.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) raised the question of Facebook live. It would give a more accessible platform than any TV network. If the concern was that the Synod was not being open, matters would in fact be communicated through such other channels. He supported not admitting the TV cameras to the debate.

The Rev Captain Gerry Bowyer (Aberdeen and Orkney) shared the concerns of Canon Round. There was a need for Synod members to be sensitive to one another.

The Rt Rev Nigel Peyton (Diocese of Brechin) proposed, and Mrs Karen Willey (Brechin) seconded, that "the question now be put" after the following speaker. Synod agreed that Motion.

The Rev Professor Trevor Hart (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated, as others had mentioned, that he placed a huge premium on the manner in which the debate had been conducted over the previous few years. He did not want anything to affect the continuation of the Synod discussion which had started two years previously. He supported the Motion and urged Synod to vote in favour.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed.

SESSION 2: MS JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Standing Committee – Strategic Direction; Budgets and Quota Overview

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee), indicated that he wished to give an overview and financial context for much of the business which would be considered during the rest of the meeting. His presentation would identify emerging priorities for action and investment in the coming years and was also a response to points made at Synod 2016 where consideration of past, present and future financial matters had been limited to a single session on the Saturday morning of Synod.

Mr Gordon explained that the strategic thinking on the part of the Standing Committee and College of Bishops was summarised on pages 8-15 of the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the year ended 31 December 2016. Synod members would want to engage in discussion with members of Standing Committee and College of Bishops to ask questions, offer views and ideas on how the Church could together most effectively go about its mission in the Whole Church Mission and Ministry policy.

In short, borrowing from the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles, "to provide opportunities for encounter with the living and life-changing God".

The Church faced continuing decline in members and attendance according to traditional measures. However, that had to be set against opportunities for innovation and growth evidenced by developments in different settings in different parts of the Province and revitalised arrangements for formation in the developing Scottish Episcopal Institute leading to an increasing number of ordinands.

Mr Gordon highlighted three emerging priorities: a continuing focus on mission including support of the development of new patterns of ministry to meet new needs and opportunities; planning and action to cope with an imminent retirement bulge and provide appropriate curacies and early incumbencies for the growing number of new ordinands, including those who would come through the new context-based stream; a thorough examination of the "machinery of governance" to identify what was needed and affordable for a denomination the size of the Scottish Episcopal Church in contemporary circumstances yet with aspirations for sustainable growth. A key consideration was to align resources with priorities.

Mr Gordon paid tribute to the Treasurer, Mr Malcolm Bett, who provided great support and both of them were happy to deal with any questions which Synod members might have on any financial matters. Mr Gordon then presented a number of PowerPoint slides. Referring to figures from 2015, he explained that the Scottish Episcopal Church was an organisation with a "turnover" in excess of £22.5 million. Of that, the provincially-generated resources were £1.6 million (7%). Inclusive of quota, the provincial share was £2.3 million (10%). The question for the Province was, therefore, how 10% of the Church's province-wide resources should be spent. Broadly speaking, two thirds of the income of the Province was derived from investments and one third was represented by quota. On the question of expenditure, approximately £630,000 was spent on salaries and £900,000 on grants. The Annual Report and Accounts gave more detail on how the main six "slices" of expenditure were applied. In 2016, 25% of expenditure had been on ministry support and training (including the Scottish Episcopal Institute) and it was expected that that segment would grow in future. Other categories included mission development and support (13%), ecumenical and church relations (6%), promotion, publication and communication (13%), support for retired clergy (6%) and support and advice to dioceses in congregations (37%).

The General Fund accounted for 80% of the resources of the General Synod. The remaining 20% represented restricted or designated funds with limited flexibility. He hoped to persuade Synod that Standing Committee was not wilfully malicious or incompetent. In 2016, the Standing Committee had set off planning to spend up to budget but there had been a number of subsequent developments. Investment yield had proved to be better than forecast which had produced an extra £10,000 and an unexpected donation of £8,000 had also been received. On the expenditure side, £56,000 of Building Grants had been spent against a budget of £120,000, because it had taken much longer to establish the new arrangements than had been expected. In 2017, the spend on Building Grants had been significantly higher than in the previous year. A further round of

applications was currently underway and he encouraged submissions. SEI had also underspent by £31,000, partly because some funding had been received from other sources and £10,000 of the underspend related to the timing of curacy appointments. One of the matters to address in the future would be the timing of curacies and the level of grant available. The Information and Communication Board had also been underspent in the previous year but, in the current year, was spending significantly more because much was happening. The effect of all of this had been that at the end of 2016, the finances had been underspent by approximately £150,000. Recognising that there had been underspends in previous years, Mr Gordon indicated that a "war chest" had been built up and it was going to be needed in the period ahead. Many exciting developments were taking place in relation to SEI and account was being taken of how the Block Grant arrangements had worked during the first year of the new system. The total allocation to dioceses was being maintained at the £300,000 level and was being increased in line with inflation. Standing Committee would review whether more resource ought to be allocated to the Block Grant, particularly to encourage new kinds of ministry and mission.

Mr Gordon indicated that a further matter which would require attention would be the triennial valuation of the Pension Fund which was due at the end of 2017. Information at the present time suggested that the position of the Fund might not be as healthy as at the time of the previous valuation owing to developments in markets. The Chair of the Pension Fund would say more later in Synod.

In short, therefore, there were a number of matters that would require financial resourcing in the period to come which was why later in Synod a Motion proposing an increase of 3% in the level of provincial quota would be proposed.

Questions were invited.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred Synod members to page 52 of the Synod papers and asked for clarification on the level of support for curate funding and, in particular, whether the level of future curate funding was to be at 50% or 75% of stipend and related costs? He asked this as a treasurer of a charge which might support a curate commencing in the coming years and also on behalf of other charges which might be in a similar position.

Mr Gordon responded that there needed to be some negotiation in particular cases as to what could be afforded. In relation to the curate due to start later in 2017, discussion had led to a conclusion that provincial funding would be at 75%. The province was feeling its way as it looked to identify appropriate places for curacies.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and The Isles) believed there was a need to be brave and take some risks. There had been a habit of underspending while indicating that, in future, deficits would arise. Charges self-financed themselves and there was a need for self-confidence in order to be able to do that. Even a small grant from the centre could help significantly to build such confidence. More charges should be encouraged to take up the availability of Building Grants, even

if it were only for a small sum. He hoped that the weak dioceses would not be starved and similarly that small charges would be supported in the costs of ministry. It was encouraging that 75% or even 100%-funded curates were being discussed. A willingness to take risks would build the Church up.

Mr Gordon agreed wholeheartedly that innovative developments were to be encouraged. The Mission and Ministry Support Grant system placed the onus on dioceses to make decisions locally. When it had been introduced, it had been expected that the aggregate amount would be tapered down over time but that decision had been reversed and the overall level had been maintained, with increases for inflation. At the present time, the experience of the first year of the grant system was being assessed and that was important for good accountability and stewardship. It was to be hoped that the grants were being applied to situations which had the potential to grow. He personally believed that if the Fund was helpful in supporting innovative developments then more money should be channelled into the Block Grant. He was aware that some had suggested there should be a separate system for other grants to be made direct by the Province to local situations but such a step would be to defeat the purpose of the Block Grant. The question of whether the reporting arrangements were sufficiently light touch could be considered but it was important to know how resources were being applied and this could be a source of encouragement to Synod. He thanked Dean Swift for his contribution.

In closing the Session, the Chair thanked Mr Gordon and the rest of the Standing Committee.

SESSION 3: THE REV PROFESSOR TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

In opening the Session, the Chair acknowledged, because of Synod's previous history in debating the marriage Canon, that he could prevail upon Synod to conduct the forthcoming debate with mutual respect, humility and generosity of spirit.

3.1 Faith and Order Board: Process for Discussing Alteration to the Canon on Marriage

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) explained that in presenting material during the current Session, he was acting on behalf of the Faith and Order Board, a position which had been filled eminently by the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan at the previous two General Synods. Synod applauded Bishop Duncan's presence at Synod following his illness over the previous months.

Bishop Armes reminded Synod that when the process for change to Canon 31 had begun initially in 2015 the decision had been made at that point to vote by ballot. At the first reading debate of Canon 31 in 2016, the Synod had been similarly minded. The Faith and Order Board proposed that the vote on the second reading of the Canon should, once again, be by way of ballot. Since the Motion required a suspension of the Rules of Order, a two thirds majority of the whole of Synod was needed.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

“That voting in relation to the motion numbered 6 on the agenda be conducted by ballot.”

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed.

3.2 Committee on Canons: Canons for Second Reading

3.2.1 Canon 22 – Of Divine Worship and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church

Bishop Armes explained that the purpose of the amendment to Canon 22 was to make liturgical change subject to the same process as a change to Canons. At present, only a single resolution by Synod voting as one house was needed. Following first reading, the matter had been considered and accepted by all of the Diocesan Synods. Since the Scottish Episcopal Church had no confessional statement, beyond the historic creeds of the Church, it was necessary to look at the approved liturgies to know what the Church believed about other matters. If that was the case, then surely any change to liturgy ought to be treated with at least as much care as a change to the Church's Canons. The proposed amendment would, if passed, require liturgical change to receive two readings over two years with an opportunity for Diocesan Synods to make comment. The matter had been brought to a head by the proposed amendment to Canon 31 to remove the definition of marriage from that Canon. That would mean that in future the Church's definition of marriage would be found only in its marriage liturgies. The specific amendment to Canon 22 had been recommended by a subgroup of the Faith and Order Board whose task had been to explore how change to Canon 31 might best be done in such a way as to keep everyone walking together. The Board had accepted the logic of that approach in the specific context of the Canon 31 debate but also more generally given the significance of liturgy in the life of the Church.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood seconded, the following Motion:

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

Contributions to debate were invited but there were none.

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

House of Clergy: passed *nem con*, one abstention
House of Laity: passed by majority, two against
House of Bishops: passed unanimously

3.2.2 Canon 31 – Of the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony

Bishop Armes reminded Synod that in 2015 it had instructed the Faith and Order Board to work on a revised version of Canon 31, deleting section 1 and adding a conscience clause. That amendment had received its first reading in 2016. He drew attention to the text of the proposed amendments to the Canon and the reports from Diocesan Synods set out in the Synod papers.

The context for the debate was well-known. Bishop Armes reminded the Synod that both in the Scottish Episcopal Church and in wider society many had long campaigned for the acceptance of, stronger protection for, and openness towards LGBTQ people. The Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 had made it possible for couples of the same gender to contract a marriage. That had been met with joy by some in the Scottish Episcopal Church and with sadness by others and it had led to long and careful conversations within the Church.

One of the consequences of the amendment would be that in certain circumstances clergy would be permitted to officiate at the marriages of same-sex couples. At present, the law allowed Scottish Episcopal Church clergy to officiate at the marriage of opposite sex couples but not at the marriage of couples of the same gender unless the Church itself agreed to opt in to the legislation.

At the present time, Canon 31.1 defined marriage as being between one man and one woman, hence the proposal to remove that section in its entirety. The former section 2 would be subsumed into a new section 1 which acknowledged that there were differing understandings of marriage in the Church. In context, those differences clearly concerned whether marriage could only be solemnised between a woman and a man or whether a same-sex couple could also be married. He noted, however, that there were other differences in understanding also: for example, whether marriage was a sacrament or whether someone could be married in church following their divorce.

The proposed new section 1 of the Canon underlined that no cleric would be obliged to solemnise a marriage against their conscience and that only "nominated" clergy (in terms of the Marriage Act) would be permitted to solemnise the marriage of same-sex couples.

Bishop Armes explained that the draft principles and guidelines from the College of Bishops, which were set out in the Synod papers, dealt with some of the practical and pastoral issues around the nominating procedure and how the Bishops expected them to be taken into account by clergy and vestries. Motion 8 on the Synod agenda would also deal with that if the amendment to Canon 31 were passed.

Bishop Armes recognised that the issue of marriage of same-sex couples was a matter on which the Church did not have a common mind. The new Canon, were it to be passed, would protect the consciences both of those who believed that they must not, and of those who believed that they must, offer God's blessing on a marriage of a same-sex couple. It would also continue to protect the conscience of those who believed that remarriage in church after divorce was wrong.

Bishop Armes emphasised that no one was being asked to change their theology of marriage. The change would be that the Church would officially recognise that it contained a diversity of viewpoints. A cleric who did not believe that they should officiate at the marriage of a same-sex couple need do nothing. Such clerics remained authorised to solemnise opposite sex marriages. On the other hand, if a cleric wished to officiate at the wedding of a same gender couple, then nomination would be required. Without such nomination, clergy could only officiate at opposite gender weddings.

Bishop Armes suggested it was important to be clear that divisions in Synod on the issue were not solely on the basis of either being passionately in favour, or being passionately against, the proposed change. Nor was the issue one on which all evangelicals and catholics ranged on one side and all liberals on the other. He suggested that Synod members might find many reasons to vote for or against the amendment. Some might vote for it even if they themselves were not in favour of the marriage of same-sex couples because they wished to protect the conscience of those who were in favour and because such people felt it was important that the Church embodied honest diversity on the matter. Equally, some Synod members might vote against the amendment because even though they believed that God would bless same-sex couples in faithful and covenanted relationships they held that marriage *per se* is only for a man and a woman. Some Synod members would believe that physically expressed same-sex relationships were explicitly forbidden by Scripture and therefore could not possibly be permitted by the Church's Canons. Alternatively, members might be equally convinced that a consenting, covenanted relationship between two persons of the same gender might witness to the faithfulness and holiness of God.

Synod members who had participated in the previous Cascade Conversations would be well aware of the diversity of viewpoints and Bishop Armes hoped that people had learned that those who disagreed with them, whether they did so from a conservative or progressive view, disagreed with integrity. They read the same Bible but interpreted it differently; they worshipped the same Trinitarian God but came to different understandings of what God might bless in human relationships and they sought to love the Lord their God with all their heart and soul and mind and strength and their neighbour as themselves.

Bishop Armes explained that the amended Canon was intended to affirm and honour such diversity. It was permissive not directive. It did not deny disagreement but it did invite the Scottish Episcopal Church to be a church which was large-hearted enough to contain such disagreement. In seeking to be faithful disciples of Jesus, disagreements within the Church ought not to mean that people ceased to walk together in the Way.

Bishop Armes then proposed the following Motion:

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

Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded the Motion. Quoting from introductions to the Church's modern marriage liturgies, she noted that the liturgy spoke of those gathered coming together in the presence of God to witness the marriage and either to celebrate the couple's love for each other or to share their joy. However, they expressed slight differences in the Church's understanding of marriage. At times, the Scottish Liturgy was also used and it spoke in more traditional terms. Nothing which the Synod might do in the current session would alter the beliefs expressed in those liturgies. Speaking as someone happily married for almost 39 years, she felt very much blessed by God and could find no obstacle in her own understanding of Scripture to extending that blessing of marriage to same-sex couples who were committed to each other in a lifelong loving relationship. She respected the integrity of those who disagreed and valued being part of a denomination where members with strongly held divergent views had nevertheless been able to walk together. No one was being asked to change their theology of marriage but the passing of the amended Canon, setting out clearly and without value judgements, that there were differing understandings of marriage in the Scottish Episcopal Church, might allow everyone to walk together more honestly and openly in discerning a way forward for the Scottish Episcopal Church and the contribution it could make to the world.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) also referred to the Church's wedding liturgies and in particular the statement that on journeys people stopped at significant moments and built cairns to which they could return. Life consisted not only in being but also in becoming. He suggested that the Church was now at one of those moments and the Church would decide what it was to become. The choice in the current debate was not whether to maintain the *status quo* or become something different since, whatever the outcome, the Church would not remain the same as it was at present. It would be changed. The new Canon would allow the Church to grow into the stature of Christ Jesus and be transformed by the Holy Spirit. He did not believe that the new Canon changed the definition of marriage, it simply expanded it. As such, it was part of the growing into the will of God for humankind, as the people of God had done since time immemorial. Others would argue that same gender relationships were contrary to the will of God. He suggested that for parts of the New Testament marriage was not the grandiose institution that some made it out to be – it was nothing more than a stopgap measure for people who could not help

themselves falling in love with one another. Some would argue that the Church was caving in to cultural pressure. In fact, the Church would be doing exactly the opposite because it would be encouraging commitment. Those who advocated a change to Canon 31 did so out of a deep love and commitment to Jesus Christ. To doubt that was to violate Matthew 5:22. Others would argue that the proposed change would kill the Church. He was aware that the retired Archbishop of Sydney was in town. That Diocese had invested significant financial and human resources around the globe in those opposed to equal marriage. Was the Diocese of Sydney a glorious example of a missional church? In the past decade, the proportion of Anglicans in the general population of Sydney had dropped from 1.3% to 1%. Some would say that changing the Canon would jeopardise inter-church relationships. Mr Duenzkofer recognised that it would not be easy but the Anglican Communion and even the Global South was bigger than GAFCON Bishops. There were unnumbered LGBTQ brothers and sisters around the world working quietly for an expansive understanding of marriage. A number of sister Porvoo churches had already changed their marriage legislation and the Church of Scotland was also moving in that direction. More and more evangelical leaders were changing their minds. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not alone – God and brothers and sisters and other churches were with us. The vote at Synod would not just be about marriage but about what kind of family the Scottish Episcopal Church wished to be – a family into which he had been welcomed. In a dark period earlier in the year, he himself had been helped by connecting with a spiritual group at St Paul's & St George's – they were part of his family. Provost Kelvin Holdsworth was equally part of his family. The new Canon would allow everyone to stay together. He urged Synod to vote in favour of the new Canon.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that that day was one of the saddest and most painful for many both in Synod and throughout the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Scottish Episcopal Church was broken and there was a need to acknowledge that and to cry out to God. He was concerned that in the passing of the Canon the Church would be disagreeing with the teachings of Jesus. Jesus had made it clear that marriage was the union of one man and one woman. The revisionist Canon deleted the biblical understanding of marriage and, as a result, the Synod would be saying that Jesus, the Lord of the Church and Son of God, had got it wrong when he had defined marriage in Matthew 19, quoting the creation narrative in Genesis. It was beyond belief to think that Jesus had only been talking to the culture he lived in and that his words were not relevant to the current time. The change would allow clergy to disobey the teachings of Jesus and would be a schismatic move that would cause serious harm to the Church's unity and its relations with the brothers and sisters in the Anglican Communion, the majority of whom held to an orthodox position. He was also concerned that if the Canon were passed it would deter those who held a traditional view of marriage from seeking discernment, vocation or ordination into the Scottish Episcopal Church. By passing the Motion, the Synod would not be helping those Christians who experienced same-sex attraction but who chose to pursue a celibate life in

order to follow the teachings of the Lord Jesus. With loving concern for those who put them together, he believed that the guidelines from the College of Bishops were not fit for purpose because they had no legal authority and could be changed in the future. Synod was being told that the Church had a variety of understandings of marriage. Was it being told that all understandings of marriage were correct, acceptable and agreeable? What then was the teaching of the Scottish Episcopal Church on marriage? What would stop any person bringing a charge against him under Canon 54 for teaching an orthodox understanding of marriage. His own diocese, Aberdeen and Orkney, had voted overwhelmingly against the Canon and there were good people in congregations throughout Scotland who were deeply concerned and anxious about the trajectory being taken, in particular in relation to same-sex marriage. Such people believed their voice was not being heard. If the Canon were to be passed, some would feel that the Scottish Episcopal Church was leaving them. Some would quietly disappear seeking a church which held an orthodox doctrine of marriage and others would seek alternative episcopal oversight because they would be unable to live with the change. If possible, one wanted to avoid any such developments but few provisions had been made for priests, like himself, and congregations, like his, who held to orthodox Biblical teaching on marriage. He humbly asked that Synod vote against the Motion.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) suggested that as people came to the debate they might feel that they had to stand up for what was right, that they had to follow the truth of God, that they had to maintain unity. Christians, and Anglicans, had never been a group living in harmonious agreement. Throughout history, people had wrestled with the fact that others might have a very different understanding of God. Had she spoken a couple of years previously, she probably would have said that standing up for what was right was more important than anything else. She would have spoken of the deep hurt and pain which she had experienced at being told that there was something wrong with her and that being attracted to women was a deep psychological flaw and against God's created order. She would have spoken about her struggle to feel accepted for who she was and reconciling that with her own faith and that of the Church. She would have expressed her anger at the apparent need to keep parts of the Anglican Communion on board, at the cost of doing what was right. Now, she still believed that the Church should allow same-sex marriage and she believed that if Jesus were present in the room he would tell the Synod to get on with it. However, it now seemed to her that the vote was far greater than simply allowing same-sex couples to marry in church. The debate was not about one side winning or triumphing over the other. Rather, it was about committing gracefully and bravely to walk alongside one another and of reaching out to one another with compassion and love. As the Church had come together to debate these matters in recent years, new relationships had been formed and she had seen God at work. She had learned that unity in Christ was not about everyone agreeing with one another but about learning to walk alongside one another. It was about grace and about stepping outside of oneself and valuing others. She

believed the Scottish Episcopal Church had something special to offer to the world: generosity of heart. She was truly proud to be part of the small and rather feisty outpost of the Anglican Communion represented by the Scottish Episcopal Church. In a world of increasing fear and prejudice against the other, the Scottish Episcopal Church could be an example of unity and love. She urged the Synod to vote for the Motion.

Dr Christopher Johnston (Edinburgh) said that if Synod agreed the proposed change it would be hailed by the press, the political establishment and most of society as an enlightened, progressive affirmation of same-sex sexual relationships and would be seen as a proxy for God's approval. The Church would be praised for striking a blow for equality. He did not wish to hurt anyone's feelings but the issue of equality was a false notion and was being used against those who upheld a traditional view of Christian marriage and to silence that view. People had been arrested, taken to court, not allowed to follow their conscience in their workplace, lost jobs or been removed from university because they gently had repeated what the Bible said. They had been accused of hatred when in fact the hatred and intimidation was being directed towards them. There was no hatred in the Synod meeting and he hoped there would not be. He had great sympathy for those who called themselves gay. He did not wish to give offence but he believed that restricting sexual union to traditional marriage had protected women and children. Its disappearance from society was one of the causes of sexual abuse of all kinds and of violence against women. If the moral standard were removed, sexual anarchy was promoted. Making the change to the Canon would only follow suit. The Church existed to uphold God's life-giving and societal-supporting standards and it should not be ashamed to do that. To adopt a position where marriage meant anything one wanted it to be would remove an important protection for women, children and families. He was wearing black as part of the "Thursdays in Black" campaign for gender justice but he believed that violence against women would increase if the Synod voted in favour. Some would feel pushed out of their church and some in the Anglican Communion might be exposed to terrorism because of the Synod's decision. The Scottish Episcopal Church would be breaking itself off from the catholic apostolic tradition and the vast majority of Christians around the world. Christians were called to honour God but he believed that to make the change would deny and dishonour him. He respected and honoured everyone but did the Synod know what it was doing?

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) said that one of the themes of the rest of the Synod meeting would be "intentional discipleship" – the move from being passive members of an organisation to being active disciples of Jesus Christ witnessing to God's love which encouraged individuals not only to grow but to flourish. The strap line of his Diocese's current programme was "from membership to discipleship". If the Motion were not to be passed by Synod it would be interpreted as the membership of the organisation deliberately excluding, as it had done in the past, present and potential disciples from the body of Christ represented in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Everyone was made in

God's image and God's will was that people should flourish in His love. When issues such as sexuality, gender, colour or similar characteristics denied people the right to flourish in a relationship such individuals were denied their basic God-given dignity and the witness of the Church was diminished. The sign of the Holy Spirit at work in the life of the Church was turbulence and was to be lived with and rejoiced through. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a long history of living with deeply held but differing views which enabled the Church to flourish in the Spirit. The Scottish Episcopal Institute would present its report later in the Synod. It was flourishing because it held together people with vastly different views but who walked together. Mutual acceptance was a mark of disciples in a body which was flourishing. This was the time for a change to the marriage Canon to enable the Church to walk together and flourish. He urged Synod members to vote for the change.

The Rev Canon David Richards (Edinburgh) welcomed the change in the nature and tone of the debate which was taking place at the Synod. There had been a dramatic change in the way people talked to, and about, one another. He thanked those, including those with whom he disagreed, for the grace and warmth being shown. What was being discussed was not the attitude of the Church to the LGBTQI community or whether gay and lesbian people would be welcomed into church since they were already part of the Scottish Episcopal Church. His own congregation of St Paul's & St George's included gay people some of whom were in partnerships, some of whom felt called to celibacy. A couple in his own church who were in a same-sex partnership had made a deliberate effort to find him the previous Sunday to reassure him of their prayers for him at the current Synod, as he had assured them of his prayers. What was being discussed at the current Synod was the doctrine of marriage. That there were many different understandings of marriage within the Scottish Episcopal Church was obvious. That the State could define and redefine marriage was also obvious but it could not expect the Church necessarily to agree with its definition or to perform marriages in its name. What was being debated in the current meeting was whether the Scottish Episcopal Church had the power and authority unilaterally to change the doctrine of marriage. For some, this was a question of justice, for others, one of holiness, compassion, integrity, inclusion or salvation. His 51 books on the subject gave differing opinions, sometimes on the same Biblical text. What he wished to question was something at the heart of the Church's liturgy. Each week, the Scottish Episcopal Church proclaimed its belief in the one holy, catholic and apostolic church. Could the Scottish Episcopal Church continue to claim to be a catholic and apostolic church if doctrine were changed unilaterally? In what sense was the Church apostolic if it departed from apostolic teaching within the Anglican Communion? In the Ordinal, candidates were asked whether they would be diligent ministers of the Word of God teaching the Christian faith and upholding catholic doctrine, founded on the Scriptures. If the Motion were to be passed and doctrine changed, there would be a question as to whether the Scottish Episcopal Church could continue to describe itself as a catholic and apostolic church. Or were those terms also being redefined? He asked

Synod members to consider such matters and to continue the debate with warmth and mutual respect since, whatever the outcome, people were still stuck with one another for the future.

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Edinburgh) asked what made a marriage Christian? One, reasonable, answer was that it was a marriage between Christians but there was more that could be said about Christian marriage as the Church celebrated it sacramentally. The idea of marriage as a sacrament of creation had been well explored. Nothing in the proposal being considered at the current meeting undermined the place of generative creativity in the wider understanding of marriage. If marriage was also a sacrament of the new covenant then surely it said something about the paschal mystery of Christ and must be at the heart of any Christian understanding of human relationships and society. It had something to do with the divine love as expressed in Jesus' own redemptive self-giving. He believed that that was the intent of Ephesians chapter 5 which spoke of the sacrificial relationship between Christ and the Church in marital language. As one contemporary eastern theological theologian had put it, mutual sacrifice played a significant role in the orthodox understanding of marriage since it was the existential space where each person received the freedom to be generous and forego the self out of a constant desire to enhance the happiness of the other. That was why marriage was a school of unconditional generosity because there could be no true love without giving. Such a pattern of loving was not, of course, limited to marriage but marriage sacramentally focused that giving in a particular way. It demanded much of people but it did not demand that the partners to marriage needed to be of a different sex. The pattern was not limited to a relationship between one man and one woman. In extending marriage to people of the same sex, the Church would expand its understanding of how the love of the Holy Trinity could be reflected in committed human relationships. There were strong arguments from a traditional theology of sacramental marriage which supported the move that would be brought about by the Motion and that was why he happily supported it. What made a marriage Christian was nothing more, nor less, than the self-giving love of Christ.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that some had suggested that the proposed change would not alter in any significant way the Church's doctrine of marriage and that the only substantive change being proposed was to extend the scope of marriage. He believed such thinking to be incorrect. The proposed text that "there are differing understandings of the nature of marriage in this church" would become the official position enshrined in Canon. He suggested that the phrase "understanding" of marriage could not be distinguished from "theology" or "doctrine" of marriage. The Canon, if adopted, would therefore endorse multiple, and undefined, doctrines of holy matrimony. Some might argue that the statement was not one of aspiration but simply a recognition of the situation in which the Church found itself. Having differing understandings of marriage was not something seen as good or desirable – in which case why would the Synod wish to enshrine something which was neither good

nor desirable in Canon Law? The matter raised a challenging question. All were agreed that the Scottish Episcopal Church had but one head, Jesus Christ. If the Canon indicated there were differing understandings of marriage, was the Synod saying that Jesus, as head of the Church, could not make up his mind? He suspected not but then what was the Church saying? Was it saying that the Church had a different view of marriage from that of Jesus, its head? That could not be correct. If there were one thing which united the Church it was that Christ had commissioned it to make disciples and teach them to observe everything he had taught and commanded. If there was any uncertainty about marriage then it behoved the Church to seek a fresh understanding of Jesus' teaching. Secular society scrutinised the Church with an intensity which was unprecedented in recent times. What message was being sent to society? Was it to say that the Church was as confused as society. It was essential that the Church declared, as it had always done, that Jesus' teaching was upheld. If the Church did not adhere to his teaching then it was not the Church of Jesus Christ at all. There was no other reasonable and responsible decision to take but to reject the Motion and call upon the Faith and Order Board to articulate clearly the teaching of Jesus on marriage and derive appropriate guidelines to keep the Church faithful to that through future deliberations on the matter.

Mr Alistair Dinnie (Anglican Consultative Council representative) indicated that, since Synod 2016, he had preached his first sermon. He estimated he had probably heard about 3,000 sermons but he could not recall how many marriages at which, as a chorister, he had sung. These had included marriages of family, friends, church members and others whom he had never seen since. Whoever they had been, he had had the privilege of observing at close quarters the importance of the ceremony to them in the light of the Church. With that formative experience, he suggested that the surprise, even concern, would be if he were not to wish to marry – but he did. He had had the great fortune to meet someone to whom he wished to make a lifelong commitment and who similarly wished to make a commitment to him. Was their relationship some paradigm of perfection? Absolutely not. He and his partner had experienced exactly the same kind of ups and downs, empathy and understanding that could be experienced by anybody in a long-term relationship. Some years previously they had hit a point of profound crisis such that it had been far from clear whether the relationship would survive. His partner had attended evensong on his own and that had been very significant. He believed that, in that moment, God had been there and he hoped that God could be there when he and his partner made a lifelong commitment to each other. It was often said that in the act of choosing something was gained and something was lost. He was aware that there were those at the meeting and in the wider church who would feel that something had been lost if the Motion were to be passed. He would believe that much would be gained. Whatever might be decided, whatever might be gained or lost, he asked that those in the Church not lose each other.

The Rev David Greenwood (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that amid warnings that some individuals or even congregations would feel compelled by conscience to leave if the proposed changes were adopted, the rhetoric on some websites of Scottish Episcopalians suggested to him that there was a view that the Province would be better off without such people. He recalled comments by Greta Garbo that as a result of mass trials in Russia there would be "fewer, but better, Russians". One could speculate on the viability to the Province of having fewer but better Episcopalians but he wished not to reduce the debate to a question of numbers. He wished to address the question of sacramental theology. For anyone who believed that marriage had sacramental value he urged consideration of the following scenario. What if in a small rural church it were discovered that the Communion wafers had run out and that the service proceeded with chocolate bars instead of wafers. In such circumstances, the people would not have communicated because Holy Communion had prescribed elements. The Church could not redefine sacraments without desacralizing them. The early church had taken the view that to celebrate Communion with bread and water (as the Gnostics wished) did not amount to Holy Communion. A similar issue was being set up in the proposal to change the definition of holy matrimony. He accepted that not everyone believed that holy matrimony had sacramental quality but for those who did take that view he urged them to consider that the Church did not have the power to change the elements that had been handed down, namely a man and a woman, opposites joined together by God in one mystical union. Altering the elements might produce a nice ceremony but it would not be the Christian sacrament of holy matrimony. It had been suggested to him that if the Holy Spirit moved the Synod to vote to redefine holy matrimony then the matter had God's imprimatur. However, he thought that that view was too narrow. The Holy Spirit was not hermetically sealed within the Province. Outside Scotland there were tens of millions of Anglicans the majority of whom apparently disagreed with the proposal. The Synod was not choosing to push the boundaries of wider discussion but rather to decide, with finality, without that wider consultation. He believed, therefore, that the decision was being taken in haste. He hoped and prayed that Synod would leave the Scottish Episcopal Church better and not fewer. He urged people to vote against the Motion.

Mrs Linda Whitby (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that she and her husband had been married for 55 years and had four sons. All were married with children but if one had grown up discovering that he was drawn to the same gender she and her husband would have supported him in his decision. Everyone, whatever their gender, needed love, support and companionship throughout life. Love came from God and she urged Synod to let everyone share in that love. She supported the Motion.

The Rev Dean Norby (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that he had been married for nearly 25 years and he and his wife had three children and they were very secure in their love for each other and love from God. That came from somewhere other than just him and his wife.

Likewise, in his relationship with his wife there was something "other" which strengthened it. Another way of describing this was "holy". He feared that no matter what one's view on sexuality was, the proposed canonical change would remove the statement that marriage was "a holy, lifelong estate instituted of God". For that reason, he could not vote in favour of the proposed amendment. He urged the Committee on Canons to include reference to that holiness.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that in his charge at the outset of Synod the Primus had quoted from the Very Rev Professor Iain Torrance regarding the celebration of structures of faithfulness. Marriage was a structure of faithfulness. For those who had been married in the Christian church, they had made vows which were lifelong and yet the Church now, if the priest agreed, married those who had been divorced. Decisions had to be based on scripture but it was also necessary to understand that the understanding of Scripture and of God had changed throughout the Bible. The patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament had not married in the way people married today. Over her life and ministry she had encountered a situation where she had known and worked with several women who were transgender. Before their transition they might have been married in a church to their partner. However, if they wished to marry the same partner after the transition they would not be able to do so. They could not bring God into that structure of faithfulness called marriage. She asked Synod members to pray for the guidance of the Spirit and to seriously consider accepting the Motion.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) apologised to any for whom his opposition to the proposed Canon might bring any sense of rejection, hurt or lack of honour. He was sorry that he was opposing something which had real personal impact on many in the Synod and in the Church and he hoped they would forgive him. Nevertheless, he asked Synod to reject the Motion because what was being debated was not sexuality directly but was about doctrine and Canon law. By changing doctrine, the Church would move away from the clear words of Jesus Christ. He quoted from Matthew 19, verses 4-5. The immediate context of those words was about marriage and divorce but they came in a wider context of statements from Jesus which the Church would never wish to change. Matthew 18 spoke of the absolute importance of forgiveness, Matthew 19 referred to the receiving and blessing of children and the importance of helping the poor and needy. The Church would never contemplate changing Jesus' teaching on such matters and, therefore, the Church was similarly not at liberty to change his teaching on marriage. Some might say that the Church had already changed its teaching on marriage by changing its position on divorce – ironically divorce was the context of Jesus' teaching on marriage. Others suggested that doctrine should be taken out of the Canons but his understanding was that the reference had been included originally as a protection following the change of view in relation to divorce. It was ironic that protections which had been incorporated were now being removed. Scripture should be used to define the boundaries of the Canons. This was not a culturally variable truth since the teaching of the

Bible appeared to be consistent from Genesis to Revelation. Scripture had always taken precedence over tradition, reason or experience. The elements other than Scripture were there to help and support, not to contradict. Neither experience nor reason ought to be used to change Scripture. He asked whether it was the case legally and canonically that the doctrine of the Church was now found in liturgy. He urged Synod members to read the book of 1 John which described God as love but love itself was described as sacrifice and choice. The love of God was made complete in those who obeyed God's word. In John's Gospel, Jesus had said that anyone who loved him would obey his teaching. As an act of love, he asked Synod to vote against the Motion and support Jesus' words in Matthew 19.

The Rev Dr Kenneth Webb (Edinburgh) indicated that he would support the Motion because he considered that it represented the best chance of staying united. Keeping the Canon as it stood held a greater risk of division. What held the Church together was not agreeing on every point of doctrine or practice but rather having the same attitude of mind as Jesus had (as Paul had encouraged the Philippians to do). He had similarly encouraged the Church in Rome to be like-minded. Paul had been exhorting his readers not to have the same view but to have the same attitude. It was possible to be one while holding different convictions. Everyone needed to remain open to God with the possibility of receiving fresh insights. By doing so the Church would be modelling a way forward for the whole of the Anglican Communion even if, for the time being, the Scottish Episcopal Church might be marginalised. He believed it was also a model for the world.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said there were many people interested in what was happening at Synod and one might think the Synod was turning the world upside down. For all that she had said in debates in the previous few years, in all honesty, her love life was not that interesting. When she left Synod, she would resume a life in which her parents would continue to ask her why she had not produced a daughter-in-law thus far, her friend would continue to nudge her towards internet dating and perhaps, when she met the perfect woman, the director of music would continue to try to persuade her that the trumpets from the Verdi Requiem did not make a wedding processional. However, perhaps the Synod was after all trying to turn the world upside down and if the kingdom of heaven were to be built on earth, perhaps that was what the world needed. The question of repercussions within the Anglican Communion on any decision by the Synod had been raised many times. The Anglican Communion was a very broad church indeed and operated in a very wide world. There were many people who were in fact cheering the Scottish Episcopal Church on, praying for it to shine a light into places on earth where LGBT brethren lived, and too often died, in systems which oppressed and persecuted. To presume that brothers and sisters in the Anglican Communion were of one mind was to do them a disservice. Similarly, not to speak on the issue was also a disservice. It was possible to do better and she wished to be part of a Church, and a world, where everyone could flourish. Canon

Ian Ferguson had referred to the fact that the decision today would break the Church. With respect, she suggested that the amended Canon could make the Church more whole than it had ever been. The Motion gave the opportunity for the Church to say that there was room for everyone, that all were welcome and that there was more than enough of God's love to encircle all God's children. She was proud to have walked the long road to the current debate with so many others some of whom agreed and some of whom profoundly disagreed with her. It had been a journey which had been transformational for everyone. The wording of the Canon gave room for all to flourish. She was proudest of the fact that in the current debate everyone was walking hand in hand. If the Motion were passed, the Church would become a more welcoming and inclusive place for people like her. It would allow her to say "yes" when she found the perfect person and she did not wish Synod to underestimate the importance of that. The current debate, however, was about much more than that because it was an opportunity to show all the world that matters could be handled in this way. Anything was possible if there was love. God was love and love could turn the world upside down.

The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said there had been much prayer, reading and discussion. She wanted to return the debate to asking what kind of church people wanted to belong to. She took seriously Paul's admission that even he saw through a glass darkly, as in a mirror. Everyone was stumbling along in their faith in the great mystery of God. There was a choice before the Synod. The Synod could affirm that everyone was seeing partially and that no one had the full vision or understanding of God. Alternatively, the Synod could affirm something very different, namely that there is only one understanding of God. The different dioceses had prayerfully participated in the debate. There were people of great integrity and faith with widely differing views, and these were not dependent upon whether individuals were members of the homosexual or heterosexual community. If the amendment was rejected by Synod, it would be saying to everyone who had a different view that they were mistaken and that there was no room for them in the body of Christ. If the Synod accepted the amendment then people could continue together in their journey with integrity recognising that each person was only partly seeing the mystery of God. She believed in a church which admitted its failures and which admitted that it could not fully know and therefore did not close the door on people of integrity and faith who held different views. The proposed Canon recognised, as a fact, that there were differing views. She urged Synod to accept the Motion to help build a church which was not closed to those who held differing views.

Mrs Anne Jones (Glasgow and Galloway) said that she firmly believed that the issue was one of equality in law and in the eyes of God. Same-sex marriage was now legal in the law of the land but not in Canon law. Synod had an opportunity to put that right. Did the Church believe in some kind of Orwellian definition of equality – all are equal but some more equal than others? She herself had been married for 48 years and her relationship with her husband was based on love, friendship, mutual care, respect and

equality. She viewed her relationship as normal and boring and wonderful and equal, like those relationships which she saw between her LGBT friends. If the Church believed that all were equal in God's sight and equal in his love, Synod should take the opportunity to change the Canon and make the members of the LGBT community equal with all the other members of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) was conscious that two of the things which defined the Scottish Episcopal Church were its emphases on hospitality and mission. It was important to look at the Canon with a missional focus. He asked whether adopting, or rejecting, the Canon would help the Church in its approach to mission and hospitality. In recent discussions regarding mission, there had been a focus on encouraging people to become disciples. Many of those who had spoken in the debate had referred to St Matthew's Gospel. In that Gospel there were two themes one of which was continuity but the other was change, growing out of continuity. Such change allowed the Church to relate to people and circumstances around it. Those people and circumstances changed over time. The final thing which Jesus had said at the end of St Matthew's Gospel was the command to go and make disciples – that included hospitality and fellowship. The question was whether passing the Canon would help the Church in its task of making disciples of all nations.

Mrs Pamela Gordon (Edinburgh) said that, with the greatest of respect to those who took a different view, she believed that there was ample evidence over 2,000 years of Christianity of moments of illumination and enlightenment. How could that be denied in the 500th anniversary year of the Reformation? She believed that during her lifetime it had been given to people both in secular society and in the Church to take a different view of things. The Church was privileged to have a moment to reassess matters, not simply because society had moved on (which it had) in terms of scientific knowledge and commitment to justice and equality. The great immutable truth was that God was love and that Christians were enjoined to love one another. Other things, she believed, were transitory and transitional. In that context, most of the western world had learned to embrace diversity and the Church was rightly part of that movement. There was a responsibility to put words into action and alter practices. The Church was learning to value the diversity of God's creation in a way which had not been so readily discerned in the past. There was a recognition of diversity in terms of people's sexual orientation, gender, natural talents and potential and she would like to see the Church proclaim this to the world by embracing the revised Canon which moved towards equality for all God's people in their diversity. In urging support for the Canon, however, it was necessary to continue to respect the diversity within the Scottish Episcopal Church. Whatever the outcome of the vote, there would be people in Synod and elsewhere who would be bitterly hurt who might question whether the Church was one in which they could see their future. Tolerance and the broadness of the Church had been its strength and she urged respect for those who disagreed.

Mrs Emma Barrie (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the proposed change aimed at inclusiveness but would in fact be divisive on every level. She spoke about the implications of change. She suggested that it was not a minor consideration that the Scottish Episcopal Church would lose not only the interdependency of relationship within the Anglican Communion but also the strength and feeling of being part of a worldwide church. The aim of the Canon was inclusiveness but for someone who did not agree with same-sex marriage could such a person in conscience accept an invitation to become a Bishop? A Bishop would require to sign the necessary nomination form to allow clergy in their diocese to perform same-sex marriages and some might feel, in conscience, that they could not do that. How then would the College of Bishops represent the broad Church? On future, unconnected matters, the College would not be trusted to balance the weight of Scripture and tradition against the liberal view. The authority of a Bishop on a Board or Committee would not be seen to reflect the broad church of the bishopric. People might consider this to be a matter of perception, rather than reality, but perception was often more influential to lay people who felt that the Church was changing too far in its beliefs and practices. "Broad church" was not the same thing as "liberal church". A broad church needed to reflect the variance of belief amongst the bishoprics. How would it feel to be part of a vestry where there was disagreement on the marriage question? Labels would stick and it would be the key question when choosing a new cleric and would keep coming up for decades. There would be no scope for compromise and each vestry member would become judge and jury and would come out of meetings feeling like the accused. Would vestry members continue to be chosen for the talents, energy and commitment which they offered or would this be overshadowed by whether their convictions on marriage aligned with those of others? She urged Synod members to spare a thought for volunteer organists and flower arrangers who would have the option to make a choice but the making of that choice would require a public display of their views. How would the changes affect members of a congregation which was divided on the issue? Would such members attend less frequently or decline to help out or join a different church? Individuals who might, or might not, have an interest in reading the Doctrine Committee paper would have to come to a view on same-sex marriage and articulate that view which would become known in their community. If the cleric wished to perform such rites or if a gay couple in the community asked if they could be married in the Church, their friends would ask their opinion. Views would be sought and known in the local community and, indeed, possibly put onto social media and commented on by those who thought differently. She asked whether, if a same-sex couple could not marry in their local church and were offered an alternative 40 miles away, that was likely to feel inclusive. It would be preferable to be told that Scottish Episcopal Church clergy did not officiate at such ceremonies but that people were welcome in churches. That had been the teaching of the Church from the beginning. The law of unintended consequences was such that whilst the Scottish Episcopal Church might find gay and liberal clerics queuing up to fill vacancies, many of the most committed members of the Church would be so concerned at these

developments that they would choose to mow their lawns on Sunday morning or worship elsewhere. It was important that Synod understood it would affect everyone, not just the occasional cleric. Could disagreements within a vestry be managed without bitter words and departures? Could those with a deeply held traditional view of marriage continue to feel welcome? Many felt that the family and the holy estate of matrimony was being undermined.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred to comments he had made at General Synod 2016 about the Scottish Episcopal Church being a leading cog to effect change. He wished to reinforce that message to the current Synod. As someone who worked directly with young people in the Church, he asked Synod to bear in mind the personal effect of the proposed change. For some young people, and adults, who were deeply committed Christians and members of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the question was a big issue because they identified as LGBTI and the Church was a safe place for them. He suggested Synod should extend that safe place to allow same gender marriages. For some young people, the question was a big stumbling block in their faith because they did not feel they could bring before God the person with whom they had fallen in love. The decision would affect how people saw their future and how welcomed and included they felt in church life. In the liturgy, the Church acknowledged that God was love and that "we are his children". If God was love that same love was evident in same gender partnerships. God's love was for everyone irrespective of sexual orientation or gender identity. Some young people and adults were being physically hurt and hunted because the religion in the country where they lived did not accept them. He urged Synod not just to be a leading cog which effected change, including wider change in the Anglican Communion, but also to be a sign of hope and light in the darkness to young people in the Scottish Episcopal Church and around the world by indicating that the Scottish Episcopal Church was ready to welcome and marry them. He asked Synod to support the Motion.

The Rev William Shaw (Edinburgh) said that he had come on a journey on the matter. Originally, he had taken a simple Biblical interpretation that same-sex marriage was wrong but he had changed. He believed the matter was an Acts 10 moment. He considered that the law, the rules under which the Church lived, had been changed by the Spirit. Acts 10 spoke of Peter welcoming Gentile believers and not just Jewish ones. Peter had recognised that God had poured out the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles. He considered that God had poured out His Spirit on all those who had spoken in the debate. God was holding everyone's hands. He did not believe that the Church should divide. The proposed new Canon was similar to the letter to the Churches in Acts 15. The new Canon would create a safe place for all. The Church lived under grace and he encouraged the Synod to continue to do so.

The chair invited Bishop Armes to respond to the debate.

Bishop Armes thanked all those who had participated. It was not for him to further argue or debate the points which had been raised but some questions had been raised which he would attempt to address. On the question of whether those who held a traditional view were protected by the Canon, and whether the College of Bishops guidelines would be legally binding, he accepted that the guidelines were not legally binding but, equally, the guidance was based on the Canon which did clearly protect different viewpoints. He also wished to question the suggestion that a vote in favour of the Canon was a vote in favour of sexual anarchy. That was not the case and, indeed, the opposite was true. The Canon sought to raise the bar of the quality of same-sex relationships. It assumed that people in a same-sex relationship were just as capable of a lifelong committed relationship as those of the opposite gender. For too long there had been double standards within the Church, not just in Scotland, particularly in relation to clergy where there had been a degree of pretence. It was time to get beyond that and to raise the bar. At the current time, the Church offered neither blessing nor teaching on how a committed, faithful and lifelong relationship could fulfil the will of God when it was between two people of the same gender. The canonical amendment offered the opportunity to turn that round and for the Church to say to people it wanted them to aspire to something very special, in marriage. It would provide the opportunity to bless those relationships which had already achieved something special. Nothing in the proposal would undermine those who had chosen to live a celibate life. There had always been many reasons why some Christians had chosen to live that way and it had been honoured and celebrated over many centuries and came from a particular gifting of God's grace. Much had been said about the Anglican Communion. Bishop Armes suggested that the Anglican Communion would want to know that the Synod had reached its decision on the basis of a sincerely believed and carefully prayed through understanding of God and of God's will for humanity. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not alone in having a diversity of different views within it. A similar diversity existed in many parts of the Anglican Communion. Whatever view one took in the debate, one was constrained by Christ. Unity in Christ transcended disagreement. That was a position he would wish the whole of the Anglican community to acknowledge. If the Anglican Communion was to survive, it needed to find a way of embracing its diversity. The solution constituted by the proposed canonical change modelled a hopeful possibility for the whole of the Communion, if not for the whole of the Church. The amendment to the Canon was intended to acknowledge the differences within the Church, to honour those who disagreed and to affirm in the generosity of God that it was possible to differ but remain God's beloved children, part of the family of God and of the body of Christ.

Following a moment of quiet, the Chair led the Synod in prayer.

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

House of Bishops: 4 in favour, one against, one abstention

House of Clergy: 42 in favour, 20 against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 50 in favour, 12 against, no abstentions.

The result was received in silence.

The chair invited the Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, to address Synod.

The Primus said that the decision represented the end of a long journey. There had been the Cascade Process which had involved people across the Church and the Doctrine Committee paper which had explored whether a Christian understanding of marriage could extend to same-sex couples. The Church had studied, thought and prayed.

In the life of the Church, endpoints were often also starting points. The step taken by the Synod had been momentous. By removing gender from the marriage Canon, the Scottish Episcopal Church now affirmed that a same-sex couple were not just married but were married in the sight of God. They could "leave and cleave" and express in marriage a commitment to lifelong faithfulness and to the belief that a calling to marriage was for them also a calling to love, forgiveness, sacrifice, truth. A new chapter had opened up and inclusion had taken a particular form. However, the decision was also difficult and hurtful for those whose integrity in faith told them that the decision was unscriptural and profoundly wrong. For them, the new chapter would feel like an exclusion, as if their church had moved away from them. Consequently, the journey now beginning also had to be a journey of reconciliation.

It was the case that every faith community had to face the issues bound up with human sexuality, in their own way and in their own time. Others would arrive at answers different from the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion, which was embedded in the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church and to which the Scottish Episcopal Church was passionately committed, would have to explore whether its historic commitment to unity in diversity could embrace the change.

The Primus referred to the fact that he had on many previous occasions indicated that a vote in General Synod changed the canonical position of the Church. However, it could not lay to rest the deep differences which the question exposed in the Scottish Episcopal Church, and every other faith community. The new Canon affirmed that there were differing views of marriage in the Church. No one would be compelled to do anything against their conscience. The Synod affirmed that the Scottish Episcopal Church was one of diversity and difference, bound together by oneness in Christ. The Church would carry forward in its life two honourable and historic understandings of marriage: one which saw marriage of same-sex couples as an expression of Christ-like acceptance and welcome; another which said that the traditional view of marriage was God-ordained and scripturally defined. That was the journey ahead and was now the calling

of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Those in the Church had to, and would, address it with truth, graciousness and acceptance of one another.

3.2.3 Appendix 26 to the Code of Canons

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) spoke to the text of the proposed amendments to Appendix 26 to the Code of Canons. He explained that when a cleric solemnised a marriage, they were acting as an arm of the State. One of the necessary preliminaries to any marriage was that the Registrar was satisfied that the parties to the marriage were not excluded by the terms of Schedule 1 of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014. It was, therefore, absolutely vital that Appendix 26 reflected the marriage legislation. There was no prohibition on adding to the list, as the Church saw fit, but it could not subtract any of the categories mentioned in the proposed Appendix. He commended the new Appendix 26 to Synod.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh), seconded the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Appendix 26 be adopted.”

The Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and The Isles) said that there was a startling omission in the list of relationships, namely former spouse of child and former spouse of grandchild. Under the list as proposed, it was not possible to marry one's father's wife but one could marry one's son's former wife or daughter's former husband. In the letter to the Corinthians, St Paul had upbraided the Corinthians in relation to the man who had married, or was living with, his deceased father's wife. Paul had observed that such behaviour was not practised even amongst the pagans. The Scottish Government list did prevent such marriage but did not prevent marriage of one's daughter-in-law or son-in-law. Genetics were one matter to be taken into account. However, there was another issue to be considered which he believed was vital, namely the marriage bed of parent and child. It was a matter of pollution if one considered questions of sexuality and abuse. The bond between parent and child was surely sacred and, in that sense, sacrosanct. It was not a bond in which sexuality, in terms of genital expression was appropriate or legally allowed. To marry one's son's or daughter's former spouse would be to bring genital sexuality deeply into the relationship between parent and child where it did not belong and where it was surely very damaging. It would be a case of abuse. He could not believe that such relationships had been deliberately omitted. He wished to propose that additional categories of former spouse of child and grandchild be added to the list.

Mr Romano confirmed that those categories were not included in the marriage legislation, albeit he did not know why. It would be a matter for the Faith and Order Board to deliberate and to propose a further alteration to the Canon in due course if the Board were so minded.

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

3.2.4 Resolution Under Canon 31

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) spoke to the text of the proposed Resolution 1 under Canon 31. He explained that the Motion was one with practical intent. The expectation of the legislation was that individuals would be nominated to the Registrar General to solemnise marriages of same-sex couples by the institution concerned. The Faith and Order Board believed that that was a pastoral, as well as an administrative, task and that it was best undertaken by the cleric's Diocesan Bishop.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the following be adopted as Resolution 1 under Canon 31:-

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

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) noted that, during the earlier debate, reference had been made to the fact that a Bishop who did not approve of same-sex marriage might turn down a request for nomination. He wondered whether that eventuality had been considered.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that the College of Bishops had anticipated such circumstances and had reminded itself that the Diocesan Bishop would, in such circumstances, be acting administratively regardless of their personal view. He was sure that members of the College of Bishops would adhere to that. The Bishop would have to take into account all pastoral implications but he assured Synod that the Diocesan Bishop would be acting administratively.

Bishop Armes confirmed that it was possible that there would be Bishops who personally disagreed with same-sex marriage but they would also sign their consent to the Code of Canons and one of the principles articulated in the paper from the College of Bishops was that everyone acknowledged the Church's new canonical position. The Diocesan Bishop would not seek to veto a nomination but nevertheless needed to be in a position to take account of the pastoral context. He expected that the following week Bishops would be writing to their clergy indicating that the process would take some time and he encouraged members of Synod not to rush matters. The Canon would take effect 40 days from the end of the Synod meeting. Some consultations with vestries might take place during the 40 day period but there was no need to rush matters. Nominations did

not have to be submitted to the Registrar General in a single batch and he advised clergy to be wary of making promises about dates for marriages which they could not keep.

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

SESSION 4: THE REV CANON ANNE DYER IN THE CHAIR

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

Mr Chris Townsend (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) reported that it had been a busy year for the Committee continuing in the work of advising the Church on safeguarding matters. However, any guidance given by the Committee was only as effective as its implementation at congregational level and that relied heavily on both communication and a proper understanding by vestries of their role in safeguarding. Protection of the most vulnerable people in church had to be seen as part of the Church's mission and the Committee felt strongly that there was a need for a greater awareness of safeguarding issues from the clergy, vestry members, volunteers and individual members of congregations who were often best placed to alert the PVG Co-ordinator to any concerns. There were potential serious financial and personal consequences of not giving safeguarding the priority it required. Safeguarding was much more than PVG scheme membership and safeguarding was not the responsibility of the PVG Co-ordinator but of the vestry. There was scope for improvement in the level of familiarity on the part of vestry members and the level of knowledge would be enhanced by a greater level of attendance at training events run by the Provincial Officer and the Assistant Officer. Mr Townsend strongly encouraged attendance. The Committee was also reviewing its training resources and had begun work on putting together some additional web-based resources to keep those who had genuinely been unable to attend training events up-to-date with their knowledge. Some of those resources, it was hoped, might be used for a training session at a vestry meeting.

Mr Townsend said that it would never be possible to eliminate the risk of harm and abuse in the Church; one could only strive to minimise the risk and develop a safer church but for that to happen the whole Church needed to be vigilant and involved. The key message was that if anyone were in doubt about a safeguarding matter they should report it either to the PVG Co-ordinator or rector or to the Provincial or Assistant Provincial Officers immediately.

A second area of concern had been the level of response of annual congregational safeguarding returns submitted by congregations to dioceses. In some cases, the response level had been very good and was to be commended but there was scope for improvement and the Provincial Officers were working with Diocesan Protection Officers to support them in that exercise. Incomplete returns meant that it was extremely difficult for the Church to obtain a true sense of the extent of implementation of policies and procedures. The Committee

intended to instigate a safeguarding audit and would thereafter issue recommendations for improvements.

Mr Townsend encouraged Synod and vestry members to commit to attending training if they had not done so in the previous two years and to work together to build a safe church. He thanked the previous Committee Convener, Mr Hugh Donald, for the leadership he had given to the Committee, and thanked Donald Urquhart and Daphne Audsley, the Provincial Officers, and the other members of the Committee for their work in the previous 12 months.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked how many training sessions had taken place during the previous year.

Mr Townsend responded that five sessions had been delivered. Mr Harris suggested that the feeling locally was that there needed to be more training. Mr Townsend agreed to take that matter back to the Committee.

The Chair thanked Mr Townsend and the Committee for their work.

4.2 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland) thanked the Synod on behalf of all of the ecumenical delegates for the Synod's welcome and hospitality. He commended the provision of "buddies" for the ecumenical delegates and thanked the Rev Sarah Shaw for acting as his buddy. He thanked the Synod for allowing the ecumenical delegates to be present for the debate the previous day regarding same-sex marriage. All churches were wrestling with similar questions and were at different stages on the journey and he welcomed the opportunity to have been part of the Scottish Episcopal Church's discussions. He referred to the Scottish Episcopal Church motto "Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order". In his charge, the Primus had used the words "radical orthodoxy". Such statements encapsulated something which the Church felt was important and how the Church wanted to be part of the bigger picture. The previous day's debate had been part of that as the Synod had wrestled with the changing times and how people in the Church related to one another and how the Church related to the wider world – a world of which the Church was a part, not one from which the Church was set apart. Following the General Election results announced earlier in the morning, it was clear that within the UK there would be uncertain times ahead and in Scotland there was a changed, and changing, political landscape. How would the Church engage with that? What had taken place the previous day in the Synod had been a part of how the Church was working out its engagement with the world. On a personal note, he wished the Primus well for his approaching retirement and expressed appreciation for working with him in the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership. On behalf of all the ecumenical delegates, he wished the Synod the wisdom, graciousness and vision of the Holy Spirit.

The Chair thanked Dr Easton for his greetings.

4.3 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) said that ecumenism was changing. Within months of the beginning of his papacy, Pope Francis had caught the mood of that change in *Evangelii Gaudium*. Ecumenism had been set in the wider context of the unity of the human family and was seen as a significant contribution to that unity. The Church, in its desire for unity, served the wider mission of God. In striking that tone, Pope Francis had been speaking in similar vein to the World Council of Churches' report *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*. The purpose of the Church was as part of Christ's work in reconciling all things to himself. As the focus of ecumenism changed, the churches and ecumenical bodies needed to find a new way of working. That new way of working was relational, was concerned with shared work for the common good, was committed to the proclamation of the Gospel and was rooted in a profound spirituality of unity and dialogue. Partnerships with sister churches were also undergoing major reviews. Relationships with the Methodist and United Reformed churches were strong enough for all three churches to review and reflect on their common working. The Scottish Episcopal Church's commitment to ACTS was strong enough for it to play a full part in a major review of its life and structures which would begin in the following months. Similarly, the new conversations being undertaken with the Church of Scotland sought to model that new ecumenism in practical and imaginative ways, building grassroots co-operation as well as reflecting theologically. Europe was also changing not least because of the UK's political place within it. The Scottish Episcopal Church had withdrawn from the Conference of European Churches eight years previously because there had been a concern that it had not been meeting needs effectively at that time. However, that organisation had now reset its priorities and had sharpened its focus on the issues which faced the Continent. It was therefore being proposed that the Scottish Episcopal Church should recommit to that organisation.

Canon McLuckie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded, the following Motion:

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

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that he had been involved in the decision to withdraw from the Conference of European Churches and he felt that it had been the right decision at the time. He endorsed the Motion since it did now seem appropriate to re-join that body. However, he would not wish the fact that it had been the right decision at the time to be lost. He invited the Committee Convener to ponder whether there might be other ecumenical groupings for which a similar strategy might be effective.

Canon McLuckie responded that, because a period of review was about to commence, particularly in relation to ACTS, he did not consider that the current time was the point at which to make any change to other commitments.

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

Canon McLuckie then addressed the proposal contained in the Synod papers regarding the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership and explained that it was an opportunity to reform the focus of that Partnership. The Partnership had reached the stage where it was appropriate to take a couple of years to consider how to focus energy in the period which followed. He then proposed, and Bishop Strange seconded, the following Motion:

*“That this Synod approve the **Proposal for Synods of Spring 2017** regarding the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed (EMU) Partnership set out in the Synod Papers.”*

Mrs Margaret Hanley (Glasgow and Galloway) was delighted to see the Motion on the agenda. She was part of an EMU group in her local churches which had organised many events in the previous year.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church) spoke in support of the Motion. He explained that the Motion had been approved at the United Reformed Synod in March 2017 and also by the Methodist Synod in April 2017. The conversations which had led to the proposal had not been easy. When he had returned to Scotland he had originally been somewhat sceptical about the value of EMU meetings but as time had passed he had increasingly valued the conversation since all of the churches were grappling with similar issues. However, his experience within the Methodist Church and also the Scottish Episcopal Church was that people did not know about EMU. He thought the United Reformed Church had been better at communicating the existence of the Partnership. There was a need to nurture the relationships better at local level and the Partnership needed to become more than just a paper declaration. He was happy to support the proposal but it needed to be more than just words. He encouraged Synod members to look for local opportunities to work together with the other churches.

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church) explained that the Partnership had been a major part of his life during the 10 years he had been the Ecumenical Officer for the United Reformed Church. He was delighted, as he finished his role and moved into pastoral ministry, that the two congregations he would serve on the west coast were both linked in local partnerships with the Episcopal Church and in one case also with the Methodist Church. The recent assembly of the Congregational Federation in Scotland had agreed to look at ways in which it could engage with the Partnership. That meant that in future the Partnership might become EMUC or even ECUM.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, one against, no abstentions.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) referred to the question which he had asked the previous year about the apparent discrepancy between the introduction to the Code of Canons and the schedule to Canon 15 regarding the Philippine Independent Church. He wondered whether there had been any progress on that matter.

Canon McLuckie confirmed that there had been no progress but thanked Mr Duenzkofer for the reminder.

The Chair thanked Canon McLuckie and his Committee for their work.

4.4 Committee on Canons: Second Reading of Canon 63 – Of the Office of Lay Representative

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) explained that the reason for the proposed change to Canon 63, section 3 was because, as the Canons stood at the present time, the alternate lay representative was in many churches not a member of the vestry. Since vestries were trustees, it seemed important that if the alternate lay representative was to step into the role of the lay representative then they also needed to be part of the vestry structure. Also, if the alternate lay representative became involved in episcopal election processes but had not been involved in attendance at any vestry meeting, it would be difficult for that person to have a proper sense of the opinions of the congregation.

Bishop Strange then proposed, and the Rev Canon Cedric Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

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

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) explained that he was generally in favour of the proposal but considered that it needed to go considerably further. The Canon did not give an indication of the rights and responsibilities of the lay representative. He himself had undertaken the role for six years but when he had started he had had little idea of what was expected at Area Council, Diocesan Synod or General Synod. At most Synods, there were no controversial issues but when a contentious issue arose lay representatives could find themselves on the spot. If the congregation or vestry attempted to influence the lay representative there was no explicit provision in the rules to make it clear that the lay representative had to make up their own minds. It could be difficult to resist pressure. He wished to suggest that the Canon be considered with a view to a clearer indication of the role of the lay representative. Also, the Canon was not clear on whether, if an individual ceased to be the lay representative, they continued for the full term of their General Synod membership.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that he had no objection to the proposal but noted that alternate lay representatives were simply one instance of a number of categories of alternate members. He suggested that any alternate ought to be involved similarly to the principal whom they might replace.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) agreed with Mr Howard Thompson and asked for guidance about lay representatives and alternates. He was aware of a recent case where the individual in question had felt unable to report to their vestry because they had voted differently from the views held by the vestry.

Bishop Strange thanked those who had contributed for their comments. On the broader question of other categories of alternate he suggested that there was a distinction between those situations where trusteeship was involved and those where it was not. If better instruction was needed on the role of the lay representative, he suggested that people should send their comments to the Convener of the Faith and Order Board so that the matter could be considered and passed to the Committee on Canons.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked for clarification as to whether the Canon related only to lay representatives and alternate lay representatives on Diocesan Synods, and not on General Synod. Bishop Strange confirmed that the Canon did not apply to General Synod membership.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted the reference in Canon 63.5 to linked charges. He could understand that if there was a single vestry for a number of charges the lay representatives would represent all of those charges but he could not understand how, if there were separate vestries, one person could function for all such charges.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) said that there would be a single vestry in the case of a "joint charge" but "linked charges" implied there would be separate vestries.

The Rev Paul Romano responded that "linked" could mean one or more vestries. He suggested that the comments made be sent to the Convener of the Faith and Order Board and the Board could consider whether there were corrections which needed to be made.

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

House of Clergy: passed *nem con*, one abstention
House of Laity: passed *nem con*, one abstention
College of Bishops: passed by majority, one against.

4.5 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Chris Mayo (Convener, Information and Communication Board) thanked all Synod members for their work the previous day when the Synod had been subject to intense media interest.

For the Board, it had been a year of endings and beginnings and the coming to fruition of the results of an approach which the Board believed would make the Church's communications missional in approach, more engaged with third sector partners and the Scottish people and would result in stronger ties with media channels throughout the UK. It was an approach which recognised the recent Government observation that communications now needed to be regarded as the fourth major utility. It also recognised that the current era was one of both highly professionalised communications and democratised access. It was necessary, therefore, to have the right skill sets and experienced communicators.

There had been a retargeting of what had been the role of the Communications Officer to one of Director of Communications. Previously, the Board had set strategy and the Communications Officer had put that strategy into action, along with the Board Convener. In a paradigm of 24/7 news, the time for interested amateurs to make strategic decisions in such areas had passed. The Board therefore turned to the person with the skills set and experience necessary to lead it in development. The Board retained a role for ideas generation and linkage with other boards and committees but now emphasised its oversight and auditing capacity.

The Board had been aware that a major gap in the Church's activity was in the area of digital and social media. That had not been through lack of intent but rather lack of capacity. Having only one person to keep up with social media, put together a printed magazine, liaise with media partners and deal with a wide range of other demands and requests, all urgent, was simply insufficient. Consequently, the previous month Aidan Strange had been appointed as the new Digital Communications Co-ordinator (part-time). Part of his remit was to encourage the Church community to tell its stories and he would be contacting people in the coming year.

It had been with regret that the Board had had to say goodbye to *inspires* as a printed magazine. Mr Mayo's predecessor as Convener had raised the question a number of years previously and the Board had decided two years earlier to relaunch and then review the magazine with a view to deciding its ultimate future in the spring of 2017. The Board had, justly, been proud of each edition and had received wonderful feedback not just from within the SEC but from journalists, other churches and editors. It had been informative, challenging, inviting and consoling and Mr Mayo expressed thanks to the Rev Pip Blackledge for his Final Word. Despite the positive feedback, however, people had simply not subscribed and the magazine had continued to make a loss financially. The time taken to put the magazine together and consistently meet the print deadline had been key factors in bringing it to a close. The decision had been hard and painful and the Board had recognised that there were those who did not have access to fast broadband and those for whom that world was not where they wished to be. It was necessary, therefore, to create a vehicle by which articles could continue and comment be encouraged. The Board had, therefore, created *pisky.scot* which had been designed to be a forum for information, articles, the proactive curating of blog posts from across the SEC and beyond and the telling of stories through word, image, sound and video. It was separate from the main provincial website so that the latter could be the vehicle for the Scottish Episcopal Church's "official" presence. *pisky.scot* would allow for more latitude, comment and, hopefully, provide a challenging but safe space to encourage dialogue and debate. One of Aidan Strange's responsibilities would be to proactively curate content but it was open to all to offer articles and other material and shortly the Board would seek a more democratised method of posting content, moderating it with a light touch. Its success would rest upon contributors being ready and willing to use it. Items could be offered via the "submit a post" page where it would be held in draft form until the content had been checked to ensure that it met fair usage guidelines. This was not censorship but simply to ensure fair play.

Much of the content might be an opportunity for clergy and others to disseminate electronically or in printed format

The Board had commissioned a "corporate video" for the Scottish Episcopal Church which would act as a new welcome mat on the provincial website, YouTube channel and Facebook page. It had been created and produced professionally by John Duncan, videographer, whom Mr Mayo recommended to any wishing to produce similar material. Mr Mayo's own appearance in the video was simply coincidence and he confirmed that he was not on commission.

At that point, the new corporate video was shown.

Mr Mayo closed his presentation with a period of silence.

The Rev Lesley-ann Craddock (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed sadness about the cessation of *inspires* magazine. Members of her congregation would miss the printed material. Some did not have the technology for online use or did not know how to access material online. She was considering installing a computer in her church to enable access. She wondered if there was another way of providing material, other than her having to print copious amounts of paper. It was important not to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

The Rev Dom Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) appreciated the comments which had just been made but he recognised the need to be pragmatic (the magazine had not sold well in his own church, a location where it might have been expected to sell well). He thought the video was superb and caught well the essence of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked Mr Mayo and wished the members of the Board success in taking matters forward. She wished to acknowledge that the future work would be built on a very strong foundation and wished to thank former conveners and members who had served on the Board who had worked to bring the Board to its current point.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to support the comments made by the Rev Lesley-ann Craddock about the difficulty of disseminating the work of the Church to the disadvantaged. Much of her work had been with those who suffered from disorders such as dementia or those wrestling with poverty. *inspires* magazine had been able to reach them and she regretted its passing. She wished to find some other way to bring such people into the life of the Church which was not dependent on a knowledge and availability of technology.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) asked whether the principle of closing matters down where they were not economically viable would continue in other areas of the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Mr Mayo responded that the closing of *inspires* had not just been a question of economics but the question of capacity in human resources had also been a factor. Each edition had largely been put together by a very small editorial team

but the bulk of the work had fallen upon Lorna Finley and this had taken a disproportionately large amount of her time. Other urgent media demands meant that the publication was often being put together late at night or at weekends. He recognised the pastoral implications of the ending of *inspires*. Whether there was a future for a printed publication was for the Scottish Episcopal Church to determine but it would need to provide sufficient resources for that to happen.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) said that he had the technology and the ability to use it but did not have the inclination. He wanted to express thanks for *inspires online*.

In closing the session, the Chair thanked Mr Mayo and other members of the Board.

SESSION 5: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Mission Board: Stories and Statistics

The Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) indicated that intentional discipleship would be a focus area for the Mission Board in the following year. The Board endorsed the Anglican Communion's document *Intentional Discipleship and Disciple-Making - An Anglican Guide for Christian Life and Formation*, a summary of which appeared in the Synod papers. However, the publication of the initial findings of the Scottish Church Census had been felt to be a more pressing matter to acknowledge at Synod in the current year, as well as sharing inspiring stories of mission. She explained that there was also a desire within the Mission Board to review the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and as a first step to that, a brief summary of the policy had been included in the Synod papers.

The Board had oversight of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant system and had appointed a Block Grants Review Panel to review the ways in which the seven dioceses had spent the Block Grants in the previous year. The Panel had noted that the accountability process was an evolving one, focused on sharing of experience (both good and bad) with a view to helping dioceses review and reflect on their mission. The Panel had had no concerns regarding the use of the funds and the Board wished to thank all dioceses for engaging with the process and compiling their submissions. It was hoped to circulate information in some form to the dioceses to assist them and their Bishops in developing further diocesan mission strategies. The Panel had noted that some decisions appeared to have been driven by lack of money rather than necessarily a clear sense of vision and that giving levels needed to be increased to sustain ministry and engage in mission. The Mission Board was seeking ways to address the issue of giving which it saw as a natural part of intentional discipleship. Also, the Board had noted that clergy provided strong leadership for effective mission and so the continued use of Block Grants to support the missional leadership of stipendiary clergy had been welcomed. The annual review process was an important means

of sharing mission stories and the Board was already working with the Information and Communication Board to identify effective ways of doing that.

Mrs Ross then shared specific examples from each diocese arising from the Block Grant review information which she had found encouraging. These included: the Carpenters Arms Fellowship for Everyone (Caf4e) in Aberdeen; the embarking upon the "Living our Vision" five-year programme for which the funded congregational development officer/mission enabler post had been extremely effective in training and developing congregations (Argyll and The Isles); the weekly Soup and Soul in Dundee Cathedral, described as "loving care for the whole person" (Brechin); cookery classes for young adults and "pay as you can" meals on Saturday evening in Dunbar meeting a community need (Edinburgh); the Clydemmen initiative of St Mary's, Port Glasgow providing a quality meal and stylish place to meet and talk now attended by up to 90 men (Glasgow and Galloway); the new church at the Crask Inn, Lairg (Moray, Ross and Caithness); child friendly church, the Filling Station project and the stall at Crieff market (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane).

A video about the Crask Inn was then shown to Synod.

Mrs Ross referred to the summary of the Scottish Church Census results which had been provided to Synod members. Detailed denomination-specific information was yet to be released but the Mission Board would consider those findings carefully. The Board hoped to encourage imaginative and creative ways of mission and hoped that the Church could dare to fund them. The report, entitled "Growth Amidst Decline" recognised that there was no place for complacency but growth which had been experienced in Scotland had nevertheless caused the previously expected decline to moderate.

Mrs Ross then spoke to a number of slides, produced by Mr Malcolm Bett, Provincial Treasurer, indicating the changing pattern of church attendance and membership in Scotland in general and in the Scottish Episcopal Church, in particular. She noted that total church attendance in Scotland had almost halved in the previous 35 years and the rise of independent churches was masking decline in many of the traditional denominations. In the Scottish Episcopal Church there had been a reduction of approximately 39% in communicant numbers between 1983 and 2015, an average annual reduction of approximately 450. In the period 2006-2015 communicant numbers had reduced by 18%, an annual total reduction of approximately 520, suggesting an increase in the rate of decline. The average size of Scottish Episcopal Church congregations had reduced by 17% from 96 communicants in 2006 to 80 in 2015 and the number of charges with 200 or more communicants had halved from 33 to 17 in the previous 10 years. There was an increasing number of smaller charges (approximately 28% of charges had 20-40 communicants).

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed thanks for the statistics, a field in which he had previous experience. He had noted that, over the longer period, it seemed to be the case that the Scottish Episcopal Church had only experienced significant growth when it planted new congregations. He was aware that within Synod there were a number of people

who had experience in doing that and he wondered how the Scottish Episcopal Church could own that truth and work with it creatively so as to encourage church planting across all the traditions. He encouraged the development of resources for that. The Canons allowed for the creation of new charges. Could there be some form of promotion of that online to support the creation of new Episcopal churches? He asked whether the Canon allowed people to start such a church beyond of Scotland. He had in fact received an enquiry about that recently. This was a missional, ecumenical, and faith and order question.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) asked whether there was a particular reason for focusing on communicant numbers rather than the alternative attendance figures. He appreciated that a snapshot taken on a single date had its limitations but nevertheless it perhaps provided a more realistic picture of the state of the Church than communicant figures might suggest.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that the statistics did not show the age profile of congregations. He suggested that perhaps congregations were not dying out as quickly as the age profile of church members might suggest. He wondered whether that was a hidden good news story.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether consideration had been given to the new housing being developed in Scotland much of which was geographically located far away from Scottish Episcopal, or other, churches. If the Church was serious about mission, it needed to look at where people were living.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) asked how much collaboration there was between the Information and Communication Board and the Mission Board.

Mrs Ross responded to points raised. A member of the Mission Board attended meetings of the Information and Communication Board and Mrs Ross and the Rev Chris Mayo also talked together. The question of new housing was a good point. There was a tension between what the provincial Board and dioceses did. On the question of statistics, those taken on a particular day could be weather dependent. It had been recognised that the statistics currently collected did not measure the breadth of church life and the Board was endeavouring to develop a way of measuring such other aspects of the Church's life.

At this point, the Synod engaged in table group discussion on the following questions:

1. Share mission stories from your own experience. Do they resonate with any of the stories from the presentation?
2. How do you feel about the statistics?
3. How can the Mission Board help? What would you like to happen at diocesan level and as a province?

Responses from the table groups were recorded on flipcharts.

5.2 Church in Society Committee/Investment Committee

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the report of the Church in Society Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. He expressed thanks to the former Secretary of the Committee, Elspeth Davey, who had retired at the end of 2016. The Committee had agreed that it wished to focus on work to prevent and alleviate poverty. It interpreted that in a wide sense which was the reason why the Motion about to be considered by Synod focused on environmental issues. Those most affected internationally by climate change tended to be the poor. The Motion about to be considered dealt with how the Scottish Episcopal Church could respond to climate change. This had been joint work undertaken by the Church in Society and Investment Committees. It was important that individuals, congregations and dioceses thought about what each could do in relation to the problems associated with the man-made aspects of global climate change. Investment policy involved everyone in the Church because everyone was involved in making some contribution to climate change. Many churches had been debating what to do about their investments and the Synod had charged the Church in Society and Investment Committees to look at this. The report being presented, he believed, provided something which would be effective, made a clear statement, and was also practical.

Mr Adrian Tupper (Convener, Investment Committee) explained that the Investment Committee provided oversight to the management of the Unit Trust Pool. That was the part of the Church's balance sheet which was invested in financial markets. It provided a twice-yearly distribution and had contributed £1.4 million to the General Fund in 2016, approximately double the amount raised by quota. All dioceses and approximately 180 congregations were invested in the UTP which had a total value of approximately £66.5 million. He emphasised that the Pension Fund was not part of the UTP and was managed separately by the Pension Fund Trustees. The investments of the UTP were handled by professional investment managers, Baillie Gifford, whose appointment was reviewed periodically. Investing in financial markets carried risks but those could be managed and the objective was to achieve sustainable growth. Costs were kept down by a keenly negotiated agreement with Baillie Gifford who were set a benchmark for performance. At the end of May 2017, the value of the units had reached an all-time high. Part of the Unit Trust Pool was invested in pooled funds which meant that control of what was held within such funds was ceded. Approximately 35% of the Unit Trust Pool was managed directly on behalf of the Church and was the only part of the Fund where the Church's ethical policy could be directly applied. It would be possible for the entire Fund to be managed on a segregated basis but there would be additional cost amounting to multiples of £100,000. The Investment Committee met with the investment managers twice annually and held them to account. This included the question of how shares had been voted. The managers invested in a broad range of assets in order to keep down volatility. As things stood at the present time, businesses deriving revenues in excess of 15% in the sectors of weapons, gambling, pornography and tobacco were excluded in that part of the UTP which was managed directly. Baillie Gifford had its own ethical policy also, much of which related to the area of corporate governance. Mr Tupper emphasised that companies did not benefit

when shares were bought, nor did they suffer when they were sold. The right of a shareholder to participate in annual meetings allowed the potential for engagement by way of shareholder activism.

Dr Donald Bruce explained that he had been the Director of the Church of Scotland's Science, Religion and Technology Project for many years and was now a member of the Church in Society Committee. He reiterated the seriousness of climate change which was altering the chemical and physical balance of the world and was having very far-reaching effects. Sea levels were rising and affecting South Sea Islands which were becoming uninhabitable. It also had immense effects on people, particularly the poorest, especially in the Global South. Everyone needed to make a significant change to their lives in order radically to reduce the burning of fossil fuels. The Paris Agreement of December 2015 had committed most countries to take action but it was the case that nothing much would happen unless everyone acted together. Therefore everyone should become eco-congregations, eco-dioceses, eco-families, eco-communities. Unless individuals took action, dealing with investment was meaningless. On the question of investment, when the initial discussions had started with the Investment Committee, the issue had been whether there should be disinvestment from fossil fuels. However, it had become apparent that that was not the best way to approach the issue. The picture was more complicated than a simple question of investment/disinvestment. Given the need to move to a low carbon economy, the question had become how the Scottish Episcopal Church could best act to encourage that. In relation to tobacco, an investor could easily divest from such a company because tobacco constituted the main business of the company. Fossil fuels, however, were integral to every level of lifestyle in industrialised countries. Fossil fuels were also the raw materials for many products, such as plastics. The issue was not the use of fossil fuels as raw materials but rather the burning of fossil fuels. A consensus had emerged amongst a number of other churches and there were two areas where a distinction could be made: the extraction of thermal coal and the tar sands oil production. Those were distinct areas from which disinvestment was possible. In other areas, however, the view which had been arrived at was one of shareholder engagement. In 2016, the Scottish Episcopal Church had joined the Church Investors Group (CIG), the members of which had combined assets of approximately £17 billion. He had attended their annual conference in 2016. The Church Investors Group had been working on a carbon disclosure project to encourage companies to declare their greenhouse gas emissions and the resilience of their corporate plans, which were assessed on a scale from A (best) to E (worst). Approximately 50 UK companies had been identified as no better than rating C. CIG had engaged with them and 23 had improved their score and the CIG intervention had been a major cause for that change. This had led to the "Aiming for A" initiative which had targeted the 10 largest extraction and energy utility companies in the UK most of which were now at A or B level. A number of CIG members had been effective in using their shareholder power. Within the previous weeks, Exxon Mobil had been forced to consider a motion from the Church of England to compel them to make disclosures. The approach being suggested to Synod was one of engagement through CIG but also to encourage Baillie Gifford to produce data on companies in which the UTP invested. That was an area of ongoing development in conversations with Baillie Gifford. This

approach also set a marker for a change in ethics in investment policy. The Church Investors Group had a number of other issues waiting to be raised such as labour conditions in clothing manufacturers in parts of Asia.

In presenting the paper, Professor Atkinson thanked Daphne Audsley for the significant help on her part in completing paper.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed the following Motion:

“That this Synod, conscious of its responsibilities as a Christian Church

- (a) Calls on all members, congregations and Dioceses to develop approaches consistent with a low carbon economy;*
- (b) Encourages the Church in Society and Investment Committees to work with and as part of the Church Investors Group as a means of informing and setting the Scottish Episcopal Church’s policy on investment in an era of climate change and helping small investors to implement such policies;*
- (c) Seeks to follow the example of other churches by restricting its direct investments in companies deriving over 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands;*
- (d) Asks for an annual meeting with the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Investment Managers, currently Baillie Gifford, at which the means of agreeing any limits to investments in companies with a poor environmental profile and encouraging the use of targets and processes suggested by the Church Investors Group might be discussed;*
- (e) Seeks to put in place a mechanism, which would allow the policy of the Church Investors Group on voting at company meetings, to be put into effect;*
- (f) Encourages the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund Trustees to follow similar approaches.”*

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded the Motion and emphasised that the work was a collaborative effort between the Church in Society and Investment Committees, having been commissioned by the General Synod.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) congratulated the Committees on their paper with its realistic proposals. Many would have liked the proposals to have applied to pooled funds but he had been persuaded by the strong case which had been made by the Committees. He also welcomed the Church's membership of the Church Investors Group. He wished to offer two suggestions for the future. Christian Aid was currently running a campaign entitled "The Big Shift" encouraging people to write to five of the UK major banks reminding them of commitments which they had entered into following the Paris Agreement. All had agreed to report on their patterns of investment in fossil fuel companies but none had in fact reported to date. He encouraged all members of Synod to check out the campaign and participate. Also, Professor Werritty noted that the final section of the proposed Motion referred to the Pension Fund Trustees. It was often said that fiduciary duties inhibited trustees in their scope

for action. Christian Aid had also drawn attention to a Law Commission report published in 2014. That review had concluded that where trustees considered that ethical, environmental or similar issues were material, trustees ought to take such matters into account. He was not an expert in that field but he wondered whether some pressure could be brought to bear on the Pension Fund in terms of how it invested. He had discovered that the Trustees of his own Pension Fund, the Universities Superannuation Scheme, were members of the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change. That Group included the Church Commissioners, Church in Wales, Church of Ireland and other churches. He invited the Administration Board to consider joining that Group.

The Rev William Shaw (Edinburgh) explained that he was the rector at Grangemouth and Bo'ness, where fossil fuels were very important. Another element of the fossil fuels debate which he would like to see addressed, particularly in the context of Bo'ness, was that of fracking. The charge at Bo'ness was invested in the Unit Trust Pool and would be horrified if their money was going into fracking. He considered it would be helpful if some of the information which had been provided to Synod could be provided in an abbreviated form for congregations. He also asked whether, in terms of the gradings which Dr Bruce had referred to, this led to a lowering of emissions by the companies in question. The report to Synod indicated that the UTP held very little investment in fossil fuels but he wished to emphasise that widows' mites were very important.

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) considered that the paper which had been presented was outstanding both in its analysis and its practical approach. He asked whether there were other issues for which a similar approach could be taken such as deforestation, desertification, damage to the oceans, dispersal of species of sea life, destruction of coral reefs. He noted too that Church roofs were very large and were an ideal place for solar panels but it could be difficult to obtain planning permission.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) emphasised the need to take fracking seriously. Some of her congregational members came from an area where land had subsided as a result of former mine workings. Fracking could have future implications as well as present ones. She also referred to the injunction in the report that everyone should take action to achieve low carbon lifestyles across the entire reach of the Church's activities. That sounded wonderful but it was difficult for congregations because of the cost and congregations were unable to borrow from outside sources. She considered there was a need for structures to allow action to be taken. Perhaps a start would be for provincial offices to become carbon neutral.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) found the report excellent. If the Motion were passed, whilst he did not wish to burden people with unnecessary statistics, he wondered whether there should be an annual report on progress made in the matters referred to in the report.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) asked whether it was the case that none of the pooled funds were already ethically screened. He spoke with personal experience of the Eden Tree suite of investment funds operated under

the umbrella of Ecclesiastical Insurance. Such funds produced very good returns and gave the possibility of a virtuous circle comprising ethical investment, insurance cover and the possibility of a grant from Allchurches Trust Ltd.

Mr Adrian Tupper responded that, in theory, the pooled funds of the UTP could invest an unlimited amount in fossil fuels but in fact almost nothing was held.

Professor Atkinson indicated that he had taken note of points made in the debate. He suggested that those who had contributed and wanted action could contact him direct. He agreed that, in terms of follow-up, it would be good to keep a record of action that was being taken and report to Synod. The issue was one which was ongoing and the intention was to make things transparent and, to take the stance of working with people rather than antagonising them.

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

5.3 Church in Society Committee: Other Matters

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod papers which referred to matters the Committee had been working on since the compilation of its report contained in the Annual Report for the General Synod of the year ended 31 December 2016. The purpose in bringing the paper was not to ask for Synod's approval but simply to make people aware of the issues. It was also an invitation to those interested to become involved and he invited contact accordingly.

Professor Atkinson said that the Church agreed that organ donation was a good thing. The Committee had been involved in Scottish Government consultations because the Government was considering moving to an "opt out" system rather than the current "opt in" one. The Committee had concerns about that both practically and theologically. If someone choose to opt in, they were making a gift. Gifting was an important part of the Church's theology and traditions. An opt out system, however, would move matters from gift to expectation. That was a major change. It would also involve moving to a system of presumed consent which did not exist in other areas of society. The Committee was concerned about that. A further issue was whether the Government and the NHS were capable of putting together the necessary IT system. A further concern was what moving to an opt out system said about people as individuals. It would be serious if people came to be valued, towards the end of their lives, for the transplant potential of their organs rather than as people. The Committee believed that this was an area in which the Church should provide guidance.

Dr Donald Bruce explained that in the 1990s he had chaired the first UK committee on the ethics of genetic modification. Such modification had only partially delivered what had been promised at that time. To an extent it had stagnated and led to global controversy. New technologies had emerged and the question was whether, and if so how, such technologies should be used. It was a particularly Scottish issue because it was easier to make such changes in animals than in plants and the Roslin Institute had perfected certain techniques. For example, a modification found in warthogs but not, generally speaking, in the

UK pig population, could potentially be introduced to pigs to counter swine fever. It was an area where regulation could be hugely important. If there were overregulation, the field became restricted to multinational companies which had different motivations from simply addressing human need. An area which raised many issues was that of altering the human germline. This potentially raised serious issues such as producing experimental babies. Another area was that of mitochondrial DNA change. Faulty mitochondrial DNA was normally completely untreatable but authorisation had recently been given to permit such cell replacement. The Committee would continue to look at these issues and keep Synod apprised.

The Rev Canon Kathy Collins (Moray, Ross and Caithness) was disappointed to see a "take note" Motion from the Committee. She had been a senior hospital chaplaincy manager in North Wales when Wales had revised its organ donation laws. She had been a member of the Health Board's Organ Donation Committee. She was very disappointed to see the same old arguments being rehearsed again which had been gone through with the Church in Wales. Whether a system was opt in or opt out, everyone still had a choice. If the proposed change went through, as it had done in Wales, individuals still had the choice to opt out. The person receiving the donation of an organ would not mind whether it came to them via an opt in or opt out system. It took time to change people's hearts and minds about the value of organ donation. Her experience in Wales suggested that the conversation about the matter was far more important than the legislation and she believed the same lesson needed to be taken on board in Scotland. Conversations about organ donation should never start in intensive care waiting rooms or in accident and emergency departments. They should start in schools, churches and families. She had worked in situations where organ donation was only possible because such conversations had taken place beforehand. Synod could by all means support the Motion but she urged that the important thing was to start the conversations.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that her background was in biomedical sciences. It was important to carry out ethical research and to challenge unethical practices. However, if she had read the paper without any prior knowledge of the subject of genome editing, she might have wondered why the Church was addressing this in the first place. She illustrated some of the practical applications of that technique so that Synod could understand why this matter was being discussed. The CRISPR-Cas9 technique enabled lots of genes to be looked at at once and that was important in a multiplicity of diseases which involved many genes at the same time such as heart disease, diabetes, schizophrenia, many of which placed a significant burden on individuals and society. There were also investigations as to how this might allow new treatment techniques so that treatments for certain kinds of cancer and cholesterol-related diseases and HIV could be addressed. She welcomed the fact that the Committee was continuing to engage with those issues. She invited the Committee to consider the advantages of such technologies as well as the disadvantages and risks.

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

“That this Synod take note of the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod Papers.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

In closing the Mission Board session, the Rev Jane Ross thanked the Synod for its table discussions, the flipchart reports from which would be written up. The Board was grateful to the Church in Society Committee, its pendant Committee of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths and the Youth Committee and Global Partnerships Committee. The Church did mission not to fill churches but because it was what God did in reaching out to reconcile the world to Godself. It was hard when the workers appeared to be few but the Church must hold to its conviction that God was faithful and embrace the new things which God was doing, grounding everything in prayer. The stories which she had told earlier in the session gave hope, showed that strategic approaches were evolving and that vision and direction could be developed if one was courageous and listened to God. The time was right to move towards intentional discipleship which fuelled the journey in mission. The Mission Board wanted to encourage and facilitate the Scottish Episcopal Church in that task.

SESSION 6: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council) referred to the Council's report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. He suggested that the Scottish Episcopal Church motto was *"evangelical truth and apostolic zeal"*, that mission was the heartbeat of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Episcopal Institute was the pacemaker.

The Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson (Principal, Scottish Episcopal Institute) reported that the Institute had just come to the end of its first year of running the Common Awards curriculum. The Institute had moved to that way of validating and delivering courses for ordinands and lay reader candidates in order to be responsive to what the Church was asking of its training agency. The Church had asked for a training pathway focused upon formation – the shaping not only of knowledge but also of character, skills and virtues. The Durham course had offered such an integrated curricular pathway.

The Institute was trying to be responsive in many other ways. The previous year's intake had included by far the largest number of younger candidates for many years and at the start of the forthcoming academic year, there would be more candidates below the age of 45 than above. Both ends of the age spectrum were needed and valued but the increasing preponderance of younger candidates brought new challenges, excitements and demands to which the Institute was learning to adapt. Other demographic changes included the large number of candidates from the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness probably in direct response to the ways in which that Diocese had been seeking to find new ways

of being church in a changing context. In being responsive to that, the SEI summer school would take place in that Diocese learning from clergy and lay people in eight locations across the Diocese. A further demographic shift was the increasing number of candidates discerning a call to the vocational diaconate. Dr Tomlinson suggested that it would be good to see a corresponding increase in the number of people candidating for licensed lay ministry (as evangelists and catechetical workers). The lay reader pathway offered training for that.

Whilst many younger candidates arrived at SEI with existing theology degrees, several others were seeking to gain that through full-time study. In the autumn of 2017 four candidates would be studying full-time at New College, supported by SEI bursaries and the Vice Principal there had recently affirmed the value to the New College ministerial candidate body of the Scottish Episcopal Church ordinands. It had also been good to see links with the four ancient Scottish universities deepening over the previous two years.

The Durham University palette of courses, as well as laying down a foundation in Biblical and doctrinal modules, was also geared towards the Church of the present. The previous week, the Rev Annie Naish, the Bishop's Enabler of Mission in the Edinburgh Diocese, had begun to teach a course on "entrepreneurial mission". Also, for the first time, students in the central belt had spent their first year's placement with chaplains from Workplace Chaplaincy Scotland in places such as shopping centres, ports, council offices, etc. In responding to the need for students to understand the wider Communion of which the Scottish Episcopal Church was a part, one student had spent time in Malawi learning about the provision of religious education in a mixed faith setting and later in the year another would spend time as a guest of the Anglican Communion Centre in Virginia Theological Seminary and a third would work in a church in Gothenburg which had a ministry to refugees.

The Rev Dr Michael Hull (Director of Studies, Scottish Episcopal Institute) spoke of how the Institute had sought to be responsive to the learning needs of the wider Church. These included a number of ongoing learning opportunities available to anyone who was interested. A module was being offered in New Testament Greek, taught by Professor John Starr. The group met at Emmaus House in Edinburgh to introduce people to the rigours of the study of Biblical languages. Professor Starr was able to offer a grounding not only in the text but also in the principles of translation. A module in Christian ethics was being offered by the Rev David Robinson. This module was offered at the General Synod Office and provided an introduction to critical Christian moral thinking. These modules were not limited to Edinburgh and were available live on Skype.

A further development had been the launch of the new Scottish Episcopal Journal which was available online. It was an outreach to the whole of the Scottish Episcopal Church and beyond. It had been launched in March 2017. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a real depth of theological acumen, a great history of liturgy, a vibrant pastoral life and ministerial experience to share. The journal aimed to highlight the thinking of the clergy and laity, to encourage debate on current issues in the Anglican Communion and to engage in dialogue on what it meant to live a life of holiness and service as Episcopalians in Scotland. The

journal was free to all and hopefully would serve as a catalyst for prayer and reflection. The second issue would be available by the end of the month. The SEI hoped to continue to be a resource to the wider Church.

Dr Tomlinson then spoke about the SEI's response to need in setting up a context-based training pathway from September 2018. SEI was keen to equip candidates with the skills for missional leadership and create new forms of church community and therefore placed great emphasis on field education modules. However, it was aware that increasingly many potential candidates desired to train with an even greater "on the job" emphasis. The new pathway would seek to enable candidates to spend part of each week working in churches or mission contexts with a local supervisor and spend the other working days on academic study. The placement would be financially supported.

Dr Tomlinson then engaged in conversation with the Rev Canon David Richards (Edinburgh) who had been closely involved in the discussions about the new pathway. Canon Richards referred to the change of context and the fact that training models which had been used in the past would not necessarily adequately equip people for the future. Whilst many might value a 17th-century liturgy, the fact was that the world had changed. Those being trained needed to be adapted, and adaptable, to the world around them. The concept of pulling people out of their local situation for training was a relatively recent one. Previously, people had been trained in their own locality. He referred to the conversations which had taken place with St Mellitus College in London which had over the previous 10 years developed into the largest training institution within the Church of England. It was aimed at part-time students in a church situation so that their theological, spiritual and ministerial formation took place hand-in-hand. It had proved particularly popular with those aged under 35. When it had become apparent that a partnership between the Scottish Episcopal Institute and St Mellitus would not be possible (because St Mellitus was concentrating on establishing a third centre in England), the Institute Council had decided that it would develop such a pathway itself. Canon Richards found that proposal appealing and confirmed that St Mellitus would be available for consultation. He pointed out that some congregations who might not be able to afford a curate might nevertheless be able to support an ordinand on such a pathway. It would be important, nevertheless, to ensure that such a person was not simply seen as a "cheap pair of hands" and it would be important to establish appropriate boundaries. It was hoped that advertisements for an individual to oversee the context-based training pathway would go out later in the year and it would also be important to identify charges potentially across all geographical contexts and church traditions. Canon Richards indicated that St Paul's & St George's hoped to be able to provide some finance to support the initiative.

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) asked whether ordinands on the context-based training pathway would still undertake a three-year curacy.

The Rev Canon Dom Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), speaking as a Diocesan Director of Ordinands, thanked all those involved in the SEI. He could see that the bar had been raised and that the quality of candidates was first rate. In his Diocese, which he suspected was not alone, there was a need for more

priests, particularly self-supporting clergy to serve some of the smaller charges. In the light of the raising of the bar, there perhaps needed to be some degree of leniency. For those to become rectors, the training might be different from that appropriate for a person serving in an assistant priest capacity. Likewise, there might be scope for variation in relation to lay readers.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) noted with some disappointment that there were no statistics for the numbers of lay readers coming through the discernment process. He asked why the SEI thought there had not been the same increase in the number of lay readers coming forward as it was experiencing in relation to ordinands. Was the bar being set at too high a level or was it that there were other routes available to people such as that of worship leader? In his own Diocese, it was sometimes difficult to see the difference between the roles of worship leader and lay reader.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) expressed disappointment at the text on the reverse of the SEI bookmarks which had been distributed which suggested means of raising funds for the Institute. He suggested funding was not being taken sufficiently seriously and that the "war chest" ought to be raided to fund the SEI.

The Rev Kenneth Webb (Edinburgh) was very encouraged by the proposed context-based training pathway. He emphasised that the key to its success would be in the quality of training incumbents and he wondered what was being done to address that.

The Rev Diana Hall (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed thanks, as someone who was in her final year of curacy. Much hard work had been put in and she was excited to see how matters were developing. The future was bright.

Dr Tomlinson responded by explaining that the two types of formation were quite different. For someone undertaking the context-based pathway, there would still be the three-year IME (Initial Ministerial Education) 4-6 curacy, which would be a different kind of formation from IME 1-3. Experience from England, where some candidates had remained in the same context for six years, suggested that there were pros and cons about that.

Bishop Pearson responded to the issues of raising the bar in terms of training requirements. The thrust of the previous few years had been in response to experience that suggested that inadequate academic training in the context of formation meant that people were not sufficiently resilient. That question was, however, about to be looked at again as experience developed. The Council was aware of the need of the Church but it was also aware of the need of the individuals. Temporary expediences very rarely took things forward helpfully. On the question of lay readership, he suggested that lay readers themselves needed to be proactive in recruiting and letting people in congregations know that lay readership existed and that it was a very valuable ministry in the Church. Lay readers were a theological and catechetical resource within the Church and needed the training which was provided. In terms of statistics, only one lay reader had been recruited in the previous year. Historically, the Scottish Episcopal

Church had ignored lay readership for a long time and it was only now being rediscovered. The Institute Council was looking at the issue. On the question of training incumbents, the Council was aware that curates had traditionally been placed in locations where finance and housing resources were available. Funds were needed to move to a position where training could be offered in locations where the local resources did not necessarily exist.

Bishop Pearson expressed thanks to Dr Tomlinson, Dr Hull and Canon Richards.

Bishop Pearson was heartened by the Synod's indication that funding for the Institute should be a priority but there was also a need to produce some new money. A theme of the current Synod had been moving from membership to discipleship and a characteristic of disciples was that their experience of the living God led them to make new disciples. That meant that the Institute needed friends who would pray and give money. He was not asking for money to prop up a failing institution or pay off its deficit but to help everyone move from membership to discipleship. A possible scheme for the Friends of the Scottish Episcopal Institute would be considered by the Institute Council in detail at its meeting at the end of June 2017. The provision of bookmarks was to flag up that the issue was money. The need was for an extra 50p per member per week. That would enable the funding of training programmes and future curacies and deal with the bulge of curates for the following years. People in each diocese would act as "ambassadors", not fundraisers, but would put church members in touch with relevant information. He commended the work to people's prayers and pockets.

The Chair thanked Bishop Pearson and all those who had contributed.

6.2 College of Bishops

The Primus paid tribute to the Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton, Bishop of Brechin, who was due to retire during the summer. He expressed thanks for Bishop Peyton's leadership of the Cascade process which had assisted the Church in being able to debate the marriage Canon the previous day. Bishop Peyton had also been instrumental in developing the Church Army Centre of Mission in Dundee. He wished him and Mrs Peyton a happy retirement.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) then paid tribute to the Primus who was also due to retire during the summer. Bishop Strange reflected on the Primus' many achievements. He had from the start asked all of the right questions and had had a great ability to network across the Province, the nation and the Anglican Communion. At all times, the Primus had worked for his vision for the Scottish Episcopal Church. On behalf of the College of Bishops, Bishop Strange thanked him for his unstinting work and wished him and Mrs Chillingworth a happy retirement.

The Primus thanked Bishop Strange and reflected on his time in Scotland. The fact that there would shortly be a number of episcopal vacancies was a consequence of the fact that there had been a period of remarkable stability within the College of Bishops. That had enabled much to be achieved such as the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy, the launch of the SEI and the process

of discussion which had culminated the previous day in the alteration of the marriage Canon. He expressed thanks to General Synod Office staff and his wife and wished the Church every blessing for the future.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) noted that the Synod had not had the opportunity the previous year to thank the Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies who had retired later in the year as Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney. Thanks were expressed to him.

The Chair thanked all of the Bishops for their leadership and offered the Synod's prayers to the Primus and Bishop Peyton as they retired and to Bishop Duncan for his continuing recovery.

6.3 Faith and Order Board

6.3.1 Liturgy Committee

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) reported that the new Pastoral Offices had been given approval by the College of Bishops for an experimental period of three years and all clergy and lay readers had been sent copies. Further copies were available from the General Synod Office. The cost of production had been borne from the Liturgy Committee budget hence the deficit in the figures shown in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2016. Members of the Committee had facilitated a workshop the previous month in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway to introduce those new Pastoral Offices. Committee members were happy to offer a similar workshop in other dioceses, if desired. During the course of the year, the main business of the Committee had been the drafting of new rites for Lent, Holy Week and Easter and this work was now ready to be presented to the Faith and Order Board in August 2017. Dr Davies indicated that feedback on any of the rites currently in experimental use would be welcomed, namely the new set of Collects, the Pastoral Offices and the new Eucharistic Prayers for Christmas and Epiphany. He reported that the Faith and Order Board had decided not to proceed with the Eucharistic Prayer in contemporary language based on the 1929 Prayer Book which had previously been authorised for experimental use.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Chair thanked Dr Davies and the Liturgy Committee.

6.3.2 Doctrine Committee

The Rev Professor David Jasper (Convener, Doctrine Committee) explained that he had been appointed Convener of the Committee following the resignation earlier in the year of the Rev Dr Harriet Harris. The Committee was in the course of being reformed since only two of the Committee's previous members remained at the current time. The

Committee had had a provisional meeting a few weeks earlier and would have its first formal meeting over the summer.

Dr Jasper wished to introduce the Grosvenor Essay "*Clothe Yourselves with Compassion*" which had not thus far been completed but it was hoped that it would be available online before too long. Quoting Dr Harris, he indicated that there was a body of work on the science of compassion, and a growing awareness within and beyond Christianity (most strongly associated with Buddhist influences) of how prayer, worship, meditation, contemplation and the rhythm of life could help to cultivate compassion. It was hoped to develop that awareness for Christianity. Dr Harris had suggested that the context for such work was because compassion was much needed in a world in which there was a pandemic of loneliness in society, social resentment and distrust affecting attitudes such as immigration, a growth in fear-mongering, hate crime and violence and a climate in institutions which corroded compassion and a sense of community. The Essay would be both a theological and practical resource.

Looking to the future, the Doctrine Committee intended to prepare Grosvenor Essay number 14 on the role and theology of Bishops in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Looking more externally, it would also give consideration to the nature of truth, particularly relevant in the so-called post-truth world. The Committee also wished to work more closely with other pendant committees and initially intended to work jointly with the Liturgy Committee by providing a commentary on the Liturgy Committee's liturgies for Holy Week and Easter. Professor Jasper also hoped that the Committee could act as a faithful servant and commentator to the whole Church and the College of Bishops on matters of theological concern where a quick response was necessary. He hoped to be able to work more closely with other churches and other faiths in Scotland on matters of common interest.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Chair thanked Professor Jasper and also expressed the thanks of Synod to the Rev Dr Harriet Harris, the former Convener.

SESSION 7: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Pension Fund Trustees

Mr Richard McIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) reported on the work of the Pension Fund Trustees. During the year, the Fund had received £1.5 million by way of employer contributions and had paid out £2.2 million in pensions and the difference had been made up by investment income. That was a normal dynamic for a mature pension fund. On the investment side, there had been a market value increase of approximately £6.8 million which had been quite extraordinary. The investment manager, Schroder, had achieved an investment return of 15% in the year and over five years had achieved an average annual return of 8.9%.

The year had, therefore, been exceptionally good. Ironically, most of the return had been driven by Brexit. At the time of the Brexit referendum, the entire investment world had expected the vote to result in an investment disaster. It was possible that Brexit might yet prove to be such a disaster but the year-to-date had been good particularly for Sterling investors. That was because there had been a fall in Sterling and, therefore, any overseas investments were worth more in Sterling terms. UK equity investments had also done well because much of the UK equity market was relatively concentrated in a group of multinational companies. Returns had also been good for bond investors because of the uncertainty created by Brexit. As a result, the price of bonds had increased.

Mr McIndoe explained that the Pension Fund held growth investments, intended to provide the growth needed to fund pensions in the longer term, and also low risk investments (represented by bonds). The growth investments had generated a return of approximately 7.1% but the bonds had returned 15-20%. Unfortunately, the increase in price had reduced the yield and that resulted in an increase in the Fund's liabilities. That state of affairs was not evident from the Accounts. The liabilities were reported in the actuarial valuation which would happen at the end of the current year. The Trustees received regular updates from the Actuary and the estimate was that at the end of the year the liabilities were expected to have increased by approximately £6 million. The investment strategy was largely a matching one and, thus far, that investment strategy meant that the Fund was not exposed to the kind of deficit volatility to which it had been exposed in the past. The Trustees had in fact increased the bond part of the Fund and reduced the growth part by 10%. As he had stated in the Annual Report, expectations were that future growth might be more limited. The Fund was currently well invested but the problem arose in relation to future benefits earned by scheme members. If the return from investments reduced, such benefits then had to be paid from another source, namely employer contributions. He was, therefore, giving a word of warning about the valuation due at the end of the current year.

During the year, the Trustees had dealt with a number of technical matters. The scheme administration was carried out by Daphne Audsley but the Trustees had become involved in the case of a couple of death grants which had become payable during the year. Such lump sum benefits were payable "at the direction of the Trustees" according to the scheme rules. Generally, the Trustees would, in such circumstances, follow the wishes of the deceased person provided they had previously been notified. He wished to remind all scheme members to ensure that their expression of wishes was up-to-date and had been communicated to Daphne Audsley.

Finally, Mr McIndoe expressed thanks to the Mr Bob Burgon who had stood down as a Trustee during the year and to Mr Andrew Hunter who had joined the Trustee Board.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) referred to the discussion which had taken place earlier in Synod regarding ethical investment. He asked whether the Trustees had had an opportunity to consider the paper debated by Synod.

Mr McIndoe responded that the broad position had been discussed at every meeting. The broad policy of the Trustees was to share the view of the Church but in fact it was unable to do so at the present time in any meaningful way because the entirety of Pension Fund investments was held in pooled funds. The Trustees were not in a position to impose stock constraints. The Trustees met the investment managers, Schroder, annually and responsible investment formed part of that discussion and would do again at a meeting later in the year. The Trustees would press them to engage with companies. The Pension Fund was somewhat different from other church investments and the question of funding the liabilities was a differentiator. The Fund existed only to pay those liabilities and the investment strategy had to be directed to that end.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether the Pension Fund Trustees could adopt a position similar to that discussed earlier in the day in terms of joining with others in a collective group. For example, could the Pension Fund Trustees join the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change? Mr McIndoe responded that he was well aware of the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change. He confirmed that the Pension Fund Trustees would consider the Motion which had been passed earlier in Synod and he did not wish to pre-empt that discussion. The Strathclyde Pension Fund, which he ran, was a big supporter of the Institutional Investors Group and the Church Investors Group was also a member of that Institutional Investors Group. The Pension Fund Trustees did not themselves have a separate membership of it. The main impact of separate membership would probably be a second membership fee but he would take the matter to the Trustees.

The Chair thanked Mr McIndoe and the other Pension Fund Trustees.

SESSION 8: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Administration Board

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) referred to the reports of the Board and its pendant committees contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. The Board was contributing to the review of impact of the Mission and Ministry Support Grants which had been referred to earlier in Synod by the Convener of the Mission Board. The Board had also received the recommendations of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group and had accepted all the recommendations. The new Buildings Grants system had also been introduced. The process for setting up the panel which would award the grants had taken longer than anticipated as a result of ensuring that the correct parameters were in place. The first round of grant applications had taken place earlier in the year amounting to a total of £45,100. There would be a series of publicised dates for future application rounds. The Buildings Committee had also developed a new church property inventory, based on a pilot project undertaken in the Diocese of Edinburgh. Maintaining an up-to-date inventory was increasingly important in relation to insurance. It was also intended that there would be a glossary of terms

used in the pro forma. He expressed thanks to the Buildings Committee and its Convener, Rebecca Cadie.

Dr Ferguson-Smith reminded Synod that the Convener of the Investment Committee had contributed earlier in the meeting to the debate on climate change and fossil fuel investment. Much work had been involved on the part of the Committee as well as its continuing oversight of the management of the Unit Trust Pool.

The Retirement Housing Committee continued its work in providing suitable housing for retired clergy and Dr Ferguson-Smith expressed thanks to Mr Elliott Glen-esk who completed his term of office as Convener of that Committee at the current Synod.

8.2 Personnel Committee

Mrs Maureen McKellar (Convener, Personnel Committee) indicated that she had told General Synod 2016 about the new policies which the Personnel Committee had been working on and the revised Clergy Handbook it had planned to issue. Those had not yet been made available as the Committee had been discussing with the Administration Board how best the policies and procedures could be issued. The Committee was aware that clergy operated as office holders and not employees but in order to protect both clergy and the Church it was important that there were good and up-to-date procedures in place. In its discussions, the Committee had differentiated between those matters which were of a procedural or guideline nature and those which were fundamental terms and conditions and which might result in termination of office. Those latter processes were rightly covered by the Canons. The Committee had been aware that the Faith and Order Board had been discussing the disciplinary Canon, Canon 54, and she invited the Bishop of Brechin to comment since he served both on the Board and on the Committee.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that at its most recent meeting the Faith and Order Board had received a Motion from the Brechin Diocesan Synod inviting the Board to carry out a comprehensive review of Canon 54. Experience in Brechin had raised four key concerns, namely that the canonical procedure needed to be just and timely for the accused, just and timely for the complainant, and that the process ought to demonstrate the highest standard of practice within the life of the Church as well as transparency and credibility in the public view. The Board had agreed in principle to establish a review group but it was also recognised, and this had been reinforced by subsequent discussions in the Personnel Committee, that Canon 54 ought not to be reviewed in isolation. It stood alongside Canons 53 and 64 and was also connected with Canon 65. In practice, issues surfacing under one or other of those Canons frequently tended to have aspects which bore on one or more of the other Canons. The critical point was that clergy might suffer loss of office as a result of proceedings under those Canons. The Board had considered a draft remit for such review but it was intended that, in the light of the further advice of the Personnel Committee, an expanded remit be drawn up for the Board's approval to include those other Canons in the review. The membership of the

group would need to include those with experience as a Diocesan Bishop, those with experience in current HR practice, those with knowledge of the Church's Canons and, of course, the voice of stipendiary clergy. It was hoped that the review group would be able to report to the Faith and Order Board by the spring of 2018. Any changes which might be recommended would need to come to General Synod and follow the usual canonical procedure.

Mrs McKellar continued by explaining that the Personnel Committee used ACAS procedures as the basis for new policies for the Church but altered them to suit the specific circumstances of the Church. They did not alter the employment status of clergy but were about spelling out good practice to assist clergy in their ministry and would cover subjects like shared parental leave, annual leave, time away from duties, a guideline for fees for weddings and funerals, abuse of drugs and alcohol and how to deal with bullying and harassment. The Committee considered that the best way of introducing such policies was for the Administration Board to consider the policies in detail and that was reflected in the Motion about to be proposed. That would enable a speedier response to external factors such as changes required by new legislation or HM Revenue and Customs. There would be consultation with clergy representatives on the Board and the Committee and any procedures that were to be considered contentious in any way would be consulted on more widely with clergy before being put to the Administration Board.

Mrs McKellar then proposed, and Dr Ferguson-Smith, seconded the following Motion:

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

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

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

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) warmly welcomed what the Committee was trying to do. He noted that the proposal was to broaden the scope of paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions but further noted that reference to maternity pay, etc would no longer appear. Mrs McKellar responded that issues such as maternity would be covered by the generality of the new wording.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) proposed an amendment such that the words "provided that they shall be ratified by the General Synod before implementation" be added to the end of the proposed new paragraph 6.8.

Provost Holdsworth explained that he was trying to be helpful by proposing the amendment. The potential of the wording of the Motion was that it changed the relationship of stipendiary clergy to the Church. He accepted that the intention

was entirely benign and he thanked those who worked on the Personnel Committee but he considered that matters could be fundamentally changed for clergy by the wording being originally proposed. He asked Synod to accept the amendment so that the wider church was automatically consulted.

The Rev Canon Cliff Piper (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment. He welcomed the amendment and appreciated what the Committee was trying to do. The amendment would enable him, as proposer, and other clergy to vote in favour of the Motion.

Discussion proceeded on the amendment.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) suggested that even with the amendment as stated, he considered the issue to be one of tinkering around the edges. Earlier in the meeting, the Synod had demonstrated that it was not averse to changing its Canons in the light of present-day context. In the appeal judgement in the case of Sharp v Worcester the tribunal had stated that it had sympathy with the employment status of Mr Sharp but that it was bound by 800-year-old documents to determine his status as an office holder. It was surely necessary to look at such matters again and to consider changing the employment status of clergy (and not just full-time clergy) to that of employees. In his own Diocese, there would soon only be two full-time stipendiary clergy north of Dundee. Because there were only two full-time stipendiary clergy, that put considerable pressure on part-time clergy and they needed to be protected, in his view, by full employment contracts. He invited the Administration Board and Personnel Committee to look again at employment status. In the meantime, he invited Synod to vote against even an amended Motion.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) said that the proposed amendment changed the meaning because it left the power of ratification in the power of the Synod. He suggested that the power to adopt ought therefore to be rephrased as a power to propose.

Mrs McKellar responded to the proposed amendment by indicating that it was not the Committee's intention to propose controversial material for adoption by the Administration Board. Her difficulty with the proposal was that if matters, such as shared parental leave, needed to be adopted to reflect legislation and the Synod then rejected the proposal, it would need a revised proposal to come to the following year's Synod before anything could be adopted. She had suggested previously to Provost Holdsworth that if the Administration Board were content with proposals being brought forward by the Personnel Committee then such material could be issued to clergy and only if there was an indication of unhappiness amongst clergy would it then come to Synod for a fuller discussion. She would be content if matters proceeded on such a basis.

Dr Ferguson-Smith appreciated the anxieties being expressed. On the Administration Board, there were diocesan representatives and there was therefore an opportunity for dioceses to have input to the discussions within the Board. As had been indicated earlier in Synod, there were vacancies on the Board for General Synod representatives, and a plea had been made,

particularly, for clergy representatives. A number of expressions of interest had already been received during the course of the meeting in those vacancies. The current discussion was about keeping policies and processes up-to-date and relevant in order that matters could be addressed consistently across the Church by introducing guidance and pathways which had not previously existed. Their lack of existence was itself a threat in the longer term. Such matters could change quickly from year to year and there was a constant process of catch up. Aspects of tenure remained covered by Canons and matters affecting the position of individuals would remain covered by Canons. The Administration Board would take seriously the scrutinising of any material brought forward from the Personnel Committee.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) felt strongly that the Personnel Committee needed to be given space. In the previous 12 years she had had three children and had fortunately had a supportive rector, bishop, dean and vestry but she was aware that around the Province there were those who were not so accommodating. To wait two years for maternity benefits, or even to know what the benefits might be, was too long. She urged that the amendment not be accepted.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) observed that the Personnel Committee was saying that it heard the concerns being voiced but was not reacting to those concerns. He heard the remarks of Dr Marriage but was concerned that power was being handed over to the Personnel Committee. He favoured ratification by the General Synod.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) was unsure what the amendment intended by the use of the word "ratified". Did it mean a single vote by Synod or did it imply a two-year process? He hoped that Synod had sufficient trust in the Standing Committee to oversee what happened in the Administration Board and make sensible comment. He opposed the amendment.

Mr Robert Gordon (Standing Committee) said that, if it gave comfort, Standing Committee, which included four clergy and a number of Bishops, could be asked to sign off on any changes. Requiring matters to be ratified by Synod would hold things up. A subsequent Synod could then hold Standing Committee to account if necessary.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) supported the amendment. She appreciated the work being done by the Personnel Committee but considered there was a need for checks and balances. This was not because she did not have trust in the people on the Committee and Administration Board, but there was a question of "legacy" in that different people would serve in decades to come.

Provost Holdsworth responded to points made. He suggested that for matters to be signed off by the Standing Committee would be worse because, having served on the Standing Committee previously, he was aware of how much work the Standing Committee already had to do. He was not proposing a two-year delay – his proposal was for the material to come for ratification to the very next Synod

and therefore there would not be a two-year delay. On the question of consultation, he pointed out that matters had been discussed at a pre-Synod meeting in the diocese and had attracted very considerable discussion. The proposal was controversial and he noted that there had been no prior consultation about the proposal.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried 57 in favour, 41 against, 4 abstentions.

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) then proposed a further amendment to the Motion such that the words "and having regard to employment legislation and good practice" be inserted into paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions after the words "the Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee,".

Mrs Shaw explained that she considered the original wording was too general in scope and made no reference to protections available to working people. Her amendment was therefore to introduce reference to employment legislation and good practice applicable to the world of work and also the practice in other churches.

The Rev James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment.

Mrs McKellar indicated that she was willing to accept the amendment.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether, if the Motion failed, what was the practice to which the situation would revert.

Dr Ferguson-Smith responded that the issue was not one of reversion but rather of progressing in order to put consistent practices in place across the Church which were not already there.

Mrs Shaw explained that she had not anticipated the amendment from Provost Holdsworth. The Chair clarified that Mrs McKellar had accepted Mrs Shaw's amendment. On a point of order, it was confirmed that the Committee Convener had power to accept an amendment in such circumstances and that the Synod's consent was not required.

On the question of the two-year period which had been mentioned in discussion, Mrs McKellar explained that if material came to Synod for ratification and was rejected it would then have to return to Synod the following year and in that sense Synods in two successive years would be involved.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) said her understanding was that ratification would require only a single majority vote at General Synod and not a two-year process.

Dr Ferguson-Smith clarified that the reference to two years had not been a reference to a two-year process. Mrs McKellar had simply been emphasising

that if the Synod declined to ratify material at one Synod, it would then take a further year for material to be re-presented the following year.

The amended Motion was then put to the vote as follows:

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

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

The Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, and having regard to employment legislation and good practice, have power to adopt policies, procedures, rules, and guidance in relation to personnel matters in respect of clergy, not otherwise covered by the Code of Canons provided that they shall be ratified by the General Synod before implementation.”

It was passed by majority, with four abstentions.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke as a previous Convener of the Medical Review Panel under Canon 64. He explained that Canon 64 had been very difficult to operate and he urged that when any review of the Canons was carried out, there ought to be consultation with members of the Panel. He suggested that the current Canon had been drafted without input from the medical profession and that that was evident.

Dr Ferguson-Smith thanked members of the Administration Board and its Committees and also the General Synod Office staff.

The Chair expressed thanks to Dr Ferguson-Smith as the Board Convener.

SESSION 9: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

9.1 Mission Board

9.1.1 Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Provincial Youth Committee) explained that the Provincial Youth Committee had run camps at Glenalmond and Strathallan for the previous two decades. At such camps, the seven diocesan crosses came together to form one single cross. In the current year, activities had been expanded beyond the single youth camp to events in each diocese. In April 2017, a celebration event had been held to mark the 20th anniversary of the annual camp. A video of that event was then shown.

Rebecca Cromwell was introduced as the new Chair of the Youth Committee. She spoke of her spiritual journey and how the Provincial Youth Committee and the Glenalmond camp had been part of that. In

particular, the experience of Glenalmond had given her greater confidence to take a more active part in the local church. She now represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at the Church of Scotland National Youth Assembly and had attended the Heart and Soul event in Edinburgh at the time of the General Assembly. She referred to the fact that mental health was an increasing issue for young people. Young and old needed to work together to ensure the Church was a place where people could come together to talk and experience healing. Church needed to be a place where people were not judged or made to feel that they were not good enough. Young people in congregations needed not only the support of the Church but also had a job to explain to the Church the support which they needed. The Provincial Youth Committee helped to give young people a voice. The annual camp was an opportunity for young people to come together to develop their faith and develop lifelong friendships. Many previous delegates had subsequently become youth leaders in congregations. She thanked Tembu Rongong and the other Glen leaders for their unflinching support and also the Primus for all he had done to support youth work in his Diocese and the wider Scottish Episcopal Church.

Aidan Poon, another member of the Provincial Youth Committee, spoke of his faith journey and how Glenalmond had helped him in that. In particular, he had grown up in a church where the youth group numbered only two or three. Presence at Glenalmond where there were much larger numbers, had helped him to realise how much bigger the family of which he was a part was.

Rebecca Fleming, another member, similarly spoke about what Glenalmond meant for her. Initially her faith had been shaky but she had been encouraged by being able to explore her faith and beliefs. This had led to her becoming a member of the Provincial Youth Committee and she was also involved in youth activities in her local church.

Mr Rongong thanked the Synod for its attention and announced that the deadline for submission of applications for Glen 2017 had been extended. He encouraged applications.

From the Chair, the Primus thanked Mr Rongong and members of the Youth Committee who had participated. As he visited congregations, he was aware of more children and young people in church. On the growing number of Facebook pages for congregations in the dioceses, there was an awareness that there needed to be more images of young people. That changed the image which the Church projected. He invited Mr Rongong to comment on whether there was a growing understanding that Glenalmond needed to be able to change the face of the Church rather than simply being an event which young people attended – a move from being a parachurch group to one which changed the everyday life of the Church.

Mr Rongong said that only a small proportion of young people involved in everyday church life had come through Glenalmond. He suggested there was a need for people to listen to one another and that that was the best way to involve young people in every part of the Church's daily life, listening being more important than talking.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether financial support was available to help young people attend Glenalmond. He was aware from discussions in his own Diocese that, when money was tight, vestries were tempted to think that the money which they might use to pay the one third share of the Glenalmond fees might better be spent elsewhere. He suggested that central funds might be used to assist.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that she was possibly the oldest member present at Synod and said how much she appreciated having young people present. They represented the future and the hope of the Church. She suggested the young people could bring the Church to a further hope that it could grow and have an influence in the community. She hoped the Church would offer its support and financial help.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) emphasised the importance of congregational support. Even if some financial assistance was available from elsewhere, it was important for the congregation to be involved in providing some finance.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) said that she would not be at Synod if it were not for supportive youth work when she had been younger. She expressed gratitude for what the Provincial Youth Committee did.

Mr Rongong responded by saying that it was important to celebrate the young people for who they were now. It was indeed important to grow and develop but young people were present in the midst of the Church already.

9.1.2 Global Partnerships Committee

Mr David Kenvyn (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) explained he had become the Convener of the Committee in July 2016. He expressed thanks to Elspeth Davey and the former Convener, the Rev Val Nellist, who had worked hard to ensure that that the convenership transition was efficient and easy. He wished Elspeth Davey a happy retirement.

Mr Kenvyn explained that the Committee was responsible for the distribution of approximately £100,000 of grants per annum to projects run by sister churches in the Anglican Communion or, in co-operation with other denominations in Scotland, to suitable projects and organisations. In 2016, the Committee had funded projects in Gaza, Africa, South America and China and had been involved in projects supporting the empowerment of women in India, Brazil and various parts of Africa. One

initiative had been the publication of a resource called *Loving One Another* which had been produced in co-operation with partners in India to assist them in their work on gender equality. With the papers for the current meeting, members had been provided with information about the Thursdays in Black campaign which sought to eliminate violence against women and it had been good to see many responding to that initiative on the first day of Synod. All projects were required to have the support of their Diocesan Bishop so as to ensure that the projects supported were ones which sister provinces wanted to deliver and also to ensure that any grants were properly spent and accounted for.

The Committee also ensured that the voice of the Scottish Episcopal Church was heard in relevant international organisations and, shortly, Synod would hear from Rachael Fraser who had been involved in UN activities regarding women's rights.

The previous year, the Committee had tried to organise a companion partnerships day but it had been cancelled because the only people registered to attend were Committee members. The vast majority of members of congregations did not know about the work of the Global Partnerships Committee. He encouraged Synod members that, if their church was supporting a project overseas, it would be worth remembering that the Committee had some money for small grants of up to £5,000 which could help to change lives.

Ms Rachael Fraser reported on her attendance at the 61st Session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in March 2017. She reminded Synod that she had attended the 60th Session the previous year and had therefore been excited and honoured to return. The Commission 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. Each year the Anglican Consultative Council sent a delegation of about 20 women from across the Communion. The delegation in the current year had come from different walks of life but shared a commitment to ensuring that the voices of the silenced could and would be heard.

She pointed out that every person was born into a particular set of circumstances, over which they had no control such as race, sex, nationality. Those attributes, however, often gave individuals advantages over others. Examples of privilege included white privilege, male privilege, straight privilege. It could mean having access to clean running water or where a man known to have sexually assaulted women was elected President of the United States. She encouraged Synod members to think about their own privileges. The problem was that for those accustomed to privileges, equality felt like oppression, as had been evident from some of the rhetoric in the recent general election.

The Commission had been one of the first wide-scale events in the US to have felt the effects of President Trump's travel ban and it had been a

privilege to have a seat at the table at the Commission meeting. The financial support of the Scottish Episcopal Church had been crucial in enabling her to attend the meeting and she thanked the Global Partnerships Committee and hoped that funding to ensure future attendance would be protected.

The focus in 2017 of the Commission had been women's economic empowerment in the changing world of work. The Global Equal Pay Coalition had been launched during the meeting. In every country, women had fewer economic choices, less income and less control of assets than men did and were more likely to work in low paying, insecure jobs, often in the informal economy and without legal protection. Women also made a substantial, but invisible, contribution to the global economy through unpaid care work which in turn reduced their access to income. Economic empowerment of women and girls did not always look like an equal pay cheque. It could also be achieved by ensuring access to things like affordable health care and education.

She would shortly graduate from the University of St Andrews with a degree in international relations. Her tuition had been entirely paid for by the Scottish Government because of the privilege she enjoyed of being resident in Scotland. There were girls in many parts of the world with no access to education simply because men in positions of power did not think they were worthy of that education. When would such men understand that femaleness was not a design flaw?

The Commission had also discussed the UN's sustainable development goals, intended to be achieved by 2030. These were important in the Church context because the goals reflected deep Biblical themes of mutual responsibility for living well together, seeking the equality of all people created in the image of God and God's concern for the vulnerable and marginalised. She urged Synod members to familiarise themselves with those goals and consider how they could be discussed and worked towards locally. The Anglican delegation had again looked forward to the day when ACC resolution 13.31, which affirmed the goal of equal representation of women in decision-making at all levels of the Church, became a reality.

She reiterated the comments she had made to Synod the previous year that young people were not the future of the Church but were the present. She urged Synod members to talk to young people in congregations to find out what they cared about and to make hopes a reality.

It was not often acknowledged that the Church was a vital partner in civil society. The Church was often uniquely placed to reach the most vulnerable and had the networks, resources and capacity for social mobilisation. She could not emphasise enough the importance of working together. There was a need to be building bridges, not walls and it was especially important to engage men and boys in the fight for gender equality.

Attendance at the Commission had been an inspiring, faith affirming and transformational experience. She closed her presentation by referring to Galatians, chapter 3 "there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female for you are all one in Christ Jesus".

The Primus thanked Ms Fraser and congratulated her on the completion of her degree.

Mrs Ravinder Kaur Nijjar (Interfaith Scotland) said it was an honour and privilege to join the Synod meeting. She had noted the presentation earlier from young people and the importance of camps. In the Sikh community local Gurdwaras came together and held camps throughout the year and she suggested that might be a way forward for local churches. She had been interested in Rachael Fraser's presentation because she chaired the UK Women of Faith Network, Religions for Peace and she was also on the Global Women of Faith Network and violence against women was one of the issues handled there. 45% of women in the UK experienced violence at some point. The Religions for Peace Network had created a toolkit to help faith communities address the issue of violence against women which was available from the Religions for Peace website. The UK Women of Faith Network had also produced a document looking at what the nine world Scriptures said on the subject of the status of women. There was a need for male ambassadors to take that forward. There was both an exhibition and a booklet and she was happy to receive expressions of interest about that. She urged Synod to continue with its work. If all women downed tools for a week, the world would come to a standstill.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that she was aware of the work of the Global Partnerships Committee but only because she knew certain people who had served on it. She had heard nothing about the promotion of the Loving One Another resource nor the Thursdays in Black initiative. She made a plea for provision of more information. She had been inspired by Rachael Fraser.

The Rev James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) said that one privilege which had not been mentioned by Ms Fraser was the fact that Synod members had been able to hear her presentation. He hoped her text could be made available to those who had not been present to hear it.

9.2 Standing Committee

9.2.1 Accounts

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) 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 2016."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

9.2.2 Budget and Quota

Mr Gordon acknowledged that there had been underspends for many years but it was also the case that there were also predictions of overspends going forward. There was ongoing business to be dealt with for the future. Significant areas of expenditure for the future were grants to support mission and all of the work of the SEI. Indeed, the previous day Synod had actively encouraged additional spending in the area of training. He saw a great opportunity to do more and it was encouraging that more people were coming forward for ordination. He had been pleased to hear Provost Holdsworth talking of church planting and others raising the question of what could be done where churches were not located close to where people lived. Energy needed to be devoted to such areas and that was a joint enterprise between congregations and dioceses, with a provincial contribution. Provincial money was being provided via the Mission and Ministry Support Grants. There was a question as to whether there were some projects which would consume too large a share of such grants and need separate provision.

Illustrating his presentation with PowerPoint slides, Mr Gordon demonstrated how expenditure would exceed income depending on the assumptions adopted. It was possible that the need for expenditure might be even greater, for example, if additional funds were needed in relation to the Pension Fund or there were increases in relation to curate grants. At present, the pension contribution level was approximately 32% of stipend but the actuarial indications were that contributions might need to increase significantly, albeit that that was subject to the valuation due at the end of 2017. That would raise the issue as to whether there might be a provincial contribution so that the burden on congregations would not be so severe. In the short term, the expectation was for a small surplus in 2017 and a small surplus in 2018 but a deficit by 2019.

Standing Committee had considered whether to propose no increase in the level of quota for 2018 or to stick with the usual annual increase of 3%, given that inflation on stipends and salaries and general inflation levels were expected to be around 2%-3%. The Committee had decided to recommend to Synod an increase in 3%.

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 2018, agree to a quota figure of £741,527 for that year.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that people had asked why much more could not be spent on mission. The underlying need, he emphasised, was for giving to be at a realistic level within congregations.

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

9.3 Vote of Thanks

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

He expressed particular thanks to the following: Mr David Todd and the Rev Rosie Addis who had arranged the Eucharist and morning and evening prayer and all of the musicians; the retiring Conveners, namely the Rev Dr Harriet Harris and Mr Elliott Glen-esk; Hattie Williams of the Church Times; those with whom he had shared the Chair of Synod; those who had acted as facilitators and the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles and the Rev Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated them; Dr Nicholas Grier as Assessor; Alison Dines and Paul Deponio for operating the IT and audio-visual facilities and the other staff of St Paul's & St George's; General Synod Office staff.

9.4 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing on Saturday 10 June 2017.