

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 7-9 JUNE 2018

Freshers' Meeting

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

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 7 June 2018.

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. He referred to his knowledge of the effects of poverty, particularly upon children, from his experience of Bishop Eden's Primary School in Inverness and the area of the city surrounding the Cathedral. He urged Synod to reflect on what it meant to "love your neighbour as yourself". The Good Samaritan had actually "got his hands dirty". People responded to Jesus because he was interested in them. The mission of the Church had to be about revealing God's love and making life better for all, not just for those within the Church. In the context of Synod, loving one's neighbour was also about expressing differences of view but in the spirit of reconciliation. Neighbours outside the Church were watching and too often only saw those within the Church displaying division. Members of Synod should consider how the Synod's decisions could make their neighbours rejoice. Synod members had their marching orders to "love God and love your neighbour as yourself".

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of the Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland. The offering amounted to £1,415.48.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS AND 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 Francis Bloomfield (Baptist Union of Scotland), Mr Matthew Driver (Focolare Movement), the Rev Ralph Dunn (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Dr Liam Fraser (Church of Scotland), Mr Alan Kay (Interfaith Scotland), Msgr Philip Kerr (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Very Rev Steven Mulholland (Roman Catholic Church), Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends) and the Rev Canon Steven Kirk (Church in Wales).

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland) and Major Steven Turner (Salvation Army) were welcomed to Synod on their arrival later during the meeting.

The Ven Alan Perry (Anglican Church of Canada) was welcomed as a visitor.

Synod members introduced themselves in table groups.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Andrew Swift and the Rev Samantha Ferguson were elected as Clergy Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

Ms Jenny Whelan and Professor Alan Werritty 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 Richard Tiplady, 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 Professor 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 record slip to record the votes on their table. 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: the Rev Philip Blackledge, Mr Richard McIndoe, the Rt Rev William Nolan, the Rev Richard Tiplady, Ms Charlotte White, all ecumenical and interfaith guests and members of the Provincial Youth Committee who would make a presentation later in the meeting.

1.7 Minutes of General Synod 2017

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 8-10 June 2017.”

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

1.8 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.9 Elections

The Secretary General explained the procedure in relation to elections. The vacancies on the Administration Board which were outlined in the Synod papers, would be dealt with at the end of the meeting once Synod had had an opportunity to consider and vote on Motion 16 on the agenda which, if passed, would make some alterations to eligibility for election to that Board.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Mr James Gibson for a second term as lay member on the Standing Committee, the Rev Elaine Garman and the Rev David Paton-Williams as members of the Institute Council and the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband and the Rev Margaret McTernan as members of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

1.10 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 126 members attended.

SESSION 2: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Standing Committee – Strategic Direction; Budgets and Quota Overview

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) welcomed the opportunity early in the Synod deliberations to give a broad overview of the financial context to inform discussion on a range of issues in the following couple of days. He wished to encourage debate and feedback either in the current session or later in the meeting.

By way of correction, he pointed out that references on page 54 of the Synod papers to the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 ought of course to have been 2018, 2019 and 2020. He expressed his thanks to the Secretary General, Treasurer and other members of the General Synod Office staff for their support and paid tribute to the significant contribution in the finance area over a number of years of Carol Duncan who, very sadly, had had to step down from her post in December 2017.

He emphasised that prior to the Motions to approve the Accounts and quota at the end of the current meeting, the Treasurer and he would be very happy to discuss any points which Synod members wished to raise.

He was also delighted that Mr Jim Gibson had been reappointed to the Standing Committee earlier in the meeting since Mr Gibson was another source of financial wisdom.

2017 had been another satisfactory year. Budgeted surplus on the General Fund of around £50,000 had resulted in an actual outturn of a surplus of £77,000 largely due to an increase in income because the Investment Committee had been able to increase the Unit Trust Pool distribution from 51p to 52.5p per unit. In terms of expenditure, building grant spend had been increased to £185,000 in line with budget and the Institute Council spend had been almost £400,000 as the Church invested in the leaders of the future. Mission Board spend on support for mission and ministry had risen to £304,000. Also, a number of minor underspends had been offset by an overspend of over £50,000 by the Standing Committee on professional services. This had included legal advice required in a protracted dispute with HM Revenue and Customs on eligibility for the Employment Allowance which had happily, and eventually, been resolved in favour of the Church. Precautionary advice had also been obtained from the Church's pensions advisers in the autumn of 2017 when indications suggested that the outcome of the then imminent triennial review of the Pension Fund looked as though it might prove very challenging. That advice had given Standing Committee an understanding of the possible options available. Thirdly, substantial legal and other advisory costs had been incurred in relation to a range of unbudgeted clergy personnel cases.

Looking to the future, whilst it was possible to budget with relative certainty in a number of areas, there was considerable uncertainty in a number of others, most notably training for ministry, providing and funding suitable curacies and securing appropriate first incumbencies. Standing Committee rejoiced in the numbers coming forward and was excited by the opportunities presented by the mixed mode stream. As explained on pages 51 and 52 of the Synod papers, calculating with accuracy how many ordinands and curates there might be and what the level of required provincial support would be was difficult. By 2020, the sums required would be of the order of £300,000-£400,000 per annum on the basis of a 50% provincial contribution to curate costs but with additional costs of the order of £80,000 per annum for every 10% over the 50% provincial contribution.

The Mission and Ministry Support Grants allocation was currently about £315,000. The scheme was due for review in 2019 with a view to changes being introduced in 2020. It was clear from the first two years of operation of the scheme that a significant proportion of the monies went on sustaining ministries and there was a growing sense that to make a real difference in terms of launching new initiatives there would be a need for additional resources from local churches, diocesan funds and provincial resources.

In the light of those pressures and opportunities, Standing Committee was budgeting for deficits in the General Fund by 2019 (marginal deficit) and by 2020 (deficit of around £150,000). Looking further ahead, it was expected that those deficits would increase. In the short to medium term, additional spending could be covered by surpluses built up over recent years but it was because of those pressures and opportunities that Standing Committee had decided against proposing a freeze in quota for 2019 and would instead seek Synod's agreement

to a rise of 3%. Beyond the medium term, the challenge would be to see increased and disciplined giving of time, energy, imagination and money across the board and the emergence of even more self-sustaining, confident charges reaching out in their communities in a culturally relevant way ready to engage with people in need, calling out injustices, promoting socially transformative initiatives, and engaging locally with issues of the kind highlighted in the Church in Society Committee paper for Synod - in short, providing opportunities for people to encounter the living God.

In the year ahead, Standing Committee's aim was to continue to work closely with a full College of Bishops, supporting the work of the Scottish Episcopal Institute and supporting initiatives of the Mission Board to make a more sustained provincial contribution to mission (whatever form it took) including how provincial funding might be brought to bear. It would also support the work of the College of Bishops as they sought to determine how ministries could be sustained in fragile areas, how opportunities for development and growth could be identified, taking account of likely retirements. The Committee would continue to worry away at the issue of the suitability of the Church's governance, deliberative machinery and administrative arrangements for the contemporary needs of a church the size of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Church had very considerable deliberative machinery and that brought costs not just financial but also in the time and energy required to service it. Work described in the Annual Report on links between Province and dioceses would continue but it was already very clear that dioceses varied considerably in the scale of resource available to sustain existing, and to grow new, ministries. The allocation of provincial resources already involved an element of redistribution but there was a question as to whether this needed to go further. Was there a role for a more determined and focused provincial support, not only in cash, but perhaps also in kind for those dioceses which were less well able to operate sustainably?

The Standing Committee went forward with hope, well aware of the challenges to be faced, but confident in the knowledge that the Church did not rely on its own strength.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) congratulated the Standing Committee on an excellent report. Referring to the Annual Report of the Committee contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017, he asked how Standing Committee was addressing the expected clergy retirement bulge. Mr Gordon responded that it was not always clear when clergy would retire nor when new situations for deployment might arise. It was an inexact science. There was a need to look at models of ministry which were sustainable. In some cases God might be saying that there would be growth "but not yet". The question was whether more could be done with provincial resources to enable things to happen since sometimes cash could make the difference.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Diocese of Brechin) thanked the Standing Committee for its sterling work. He was surprised that the Annual Report did not contain information on the number of clergy currently at work in the Church, their age distribution or a projection of the number of vacancies. Such information would be needed for "workforce planning". The availability of clergy positions depended

not only on retirement but also on the ability of charges to provide a stipend. However, there was no mention in the papers of the additional budgetary pressures on dioceses and congregations caused by the raising of quota. On the question of quota he did not question that every diocese and congregation needed to make a contribution, nor did he doubt that the system used to calculate quota was fair in intent. However, it might require tweaking, for example, by capping quota for a congregation at 10% of its quota assessable income, because even a fair system might eventually reach a point where its outcomes were no longer perceived as fair. In his opinion, that point had now been reached in the Diocese of Brechin. The proposed increase in quota would exacerbate the financial problems of the Diocese and the situation both at diocesan and congregational level was dire. Positions had been cut in the preceding months. It was therefore going to be difficult for him to vote in favour of an increase in quota (which would involve a rise of 6.15% for Brechin). According to his calculations, quota for Brechin had gone up by more than 22% since 2015, almost 3 times the rate of inflation.

Dr Jacobs wished clarity on the effect of a Motion to increase the level of quota. He asked which entity actually had the legal authority to decide upon budget and quota – Standing Committee or General Synod? Were transfers between General Synod, dioceses and congregations "grants" as he had heard them described. If so, the trustees of dioceses and congregations would be within their rights to deal with such requests as they saw fit in accordance with the financial situation of the charity entrusted to their care. Was quota requested simply on the basis of a moral authority?

Mr Gordon responded and indicated that he could not comment at that point on the points regarding the increase in the quota requested from the Diocese of Brechin since 2015 but he would invite the Treasurer to engage with Dr Jacobs before the debate on quota later in the Synod meeting. The average increase was 3% but it varied as between dioceses depending on their respective income. He suggested that there was a recognition of the difficulties. Generally speaking, the larger dioceses were sufficiently substantial to sustain their ongoing life but some of the dioceses were at the margins of viability both in terms of human and financial resources. It was in relation to such situations that he had been opening up, in what he had said previously, the question of a possible greater redistribution in the Province or whether more could be done to support the fragile dioceses, given that 60% of the Province's income came from the Unit Trust Pool and 30% from quota. The fundamental question for the Church was whether it wished to see the continuation of episcopal ministry in all parts of Scotland where it had traditionally had a presence. The question of whether quota ought to be capped at a certain level was one which would need to be taken away to be considered since it might have unintended consequences. That issue would be taken away for further consideration.

2.2 Faith and Order Board

2.2.1 Committee on Canons: Communicants' Rolls

The Most Rev Mark Strange (Primus and Convener of the Faith and Order Board) explained that the proposed alteration to Resolution 1 under Canon

41 arose from changes to legislation regarding data protection. The current requirement of the resolution to display the Communicants' Roll could not be fulfilled in accordance with the legislation if consent had not been obtained. The intention behind the proposed alteration to the resolution was to allow compliance both with the Canon and the data protection regulations.

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the most straightforward way of addressing the matter was to amend the Resolution rather than the Canon itself. A minimum of words had been used to effect the necessary change. There was no direct reference to the General Data Protection Regulation. That had been done deliberately to allow flexibility in case there were in future to be further changes. The Resolution also cross-referred to exhibition of the Communicants' Roll to the Bishop or to the Dean under Canon 42. This could be done only once the cleric was satisfied that there would be no breach of the data protection rules.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) said that the wording appeared to place a lot of responsibility on the cleric to know data protection regulations in depth. Would there be any advice issued on this point from the Province?

Mr Romano responded that advice had already been provided in the form of an excellent template which he commended. Mr Fraser indicated that his overriding impression of the advice from the Province was of its lateness but he felt that a cleric would still have huge questions as to what they were responsible for doing. He considered there was a need for more specific advice. Mr Romano suggested that the effect of what Mr Fraser was requesting would need the relevant data protection rules to be set out at great length. Mr Romano did not think there was an obligation on the Province to provide that. Mr Fraser countered that the matter was a specific question regarding the display of data. Mr Romano responded by explaining that was why the templates had been provided in the provincial guidance.

The Secretary General apologised that the issue of the guidance had been later than he had wished. This had been as a result of factors outwith his control. The advice which had been received by the Province was to the effect that entry on a Communicants' Roll constituted sensitive personal data. There was a general exemption which applied in relation to the processing of such data in a charitable body provided the information was not disclosed outwith the body in question. The obligation to exhibit the Communicants' Roll went beyond the scope of the exemption unless consent was obtained. That was why the guidance which had been issued by the Province asked for consent to be obtained and was clear on that point. If it was helpful, some "frequently asked questions" could be drafted for placing on the provincial website. The intention underlying the proposed Motion was as a protection for clergy so that clergy were not canonically obliged to do something which would be at odds with data protection legislation.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said that GDPR was not about protecting clergy but about protecting people's data and he believed the matter was being approached from entirely the wrong angle. He believed it would be impossible for any cleric be satisfied that they could advertise the names and addresses of the members of their congregation to all of the other members. If someone had dementia they might still be a communicant but might not be in a position to consent to their personal data being shared. Did such a person cease to be an Episcopalian? Of course, they did not. He did not think a cleric would ever be in a position where they could exhibit their roll. He considered, therefore, that the question which should be addressed was whether such rolls should be exhibited and whether the Church should even be trying to obtain consent from its members in this way? He could not support the Motion.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that the wording would place the responsibility on the cleric. He suggested it might be better to word the resolution so that exhibition of the rolls would take place only if consent had been given. He did not understand why the cleric was being asked to make the necessary judgement.

Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) indicated that she would be seconding the Motion. She agreed with Provost Holdsworth but the process of changing the Canon (which already required the public display of the names on the roll) could still be started. Changing the Canon would take some time but if the Motion was accepted, it would bring the Church into line with GDPR at the current time.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Aberdeen and Orkney) suggested that inclusion of the reference to the cleric "being satisfied" was in fact redundant. He suggested that the wording might better read "only if to do so would not infringe any applicable laws relating to data protection...". That would take the responsibility off the cleric.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reported that the vestry of his congregation had already commenced the process of using the template provided by the Province. He considered that some further guidance would be helpful.

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Breachin) asked why the Canon required the Communicants' Roll to be exhibited.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked how the Resolution would alter the Church's understanding of the Canon as a whole. If a Church member declined to opt in did that person cease to be entitled to be on the Communicants' Roll? She herself would not be happy to have her address published at large. If she were not on the Communicants' Roll she would not be entitled to be a member of Synod.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) suggested that matters were becoming overcomplicated in discussion. The basic purpose of the

proposal was to allow clergy not to exhibit the Communicants' Roll. The question of a broader review of the Canon was a separate issue.

The Primus responded by reminding the Synod that the alteration of a Canon was a lengthy process. The purpose of the Motion was to alter the Resolution under Canon 41 at the present time to avoid clergy being put in a position where they were in breach of the Canon owing to data protection legislation. He suggested that the Faith and Order Board would understand the need to look at the Canon itself and invite the Committee on Canons to consider it. He invited the Secretary General to explain the rationale behind the obligation to exhibit the Communicants' Roll and the latter suggested that it was probably so that there was transparency as to who was entitled to vote at a Congregational Annual General Meeting.

The Primus then proposed, and Canon Hood seconded, the following Motion:

“That Resolution 1 under Canon 41 be deleted in its entirety and substituted by the following:-

“The cleric shall keep privately the Communicants' Roll and may exhibit it to the members of the congregation at large or to individual members thereof only after the cleric is satisfied that to do so would not infringe any applicable laws relating to data protection. Subject to compliance with such laws, the Roll shall be exhibited to the Bishop upon request or to the Dean as provided by Resolution under Canon 42.””

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 2 against, 5 abstentions.

2.2.2 Review of Canon 4

The Primus explained that the Diocesan Synod of Aberdeen and Orkney meeting in March 2018 had agreed that a Motion, in the form which appeared as Motion 3 on the agenda for the current Synod, should be passed to the Provincial Standing Committee for consideration for inclusion on the agenda for General Synod. The Faith and Order Board which had met shortly after that Diocesan Synod meeting had agreed to adopt the Motion as its own and the Standing Committee had agreed that the Motion be brought to Synod in that form. The Faith and Order Board had been supportive of the idea of undertaking a review but had not made any decisions on exactly how it would undertake such a review. Any alterations to the Canon arising from such a review would require the usual two-year canonical process. He reminded Synod that the Faith and Order Board included all members of the College of Bishops as well as diocesan representatives from every diocese and that would make a thorough conversation possible. However, this would only be effective if members of the Church made comments in Synod or passed them to members of the Faith and Order Board.

The Primus proposed the following Motion:

“That Canon 4 “Of the Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees” be revised and amended as necessary.”

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded the Motion which she explained had begun in her Diocese. The Synod had called for the Canon to be reviewed in all its parts and revised as necessary. Canons were limited in what they could do. They could not anticipate every circumstance or human behaviour. Nevertheless, she hoped firstly that a revised Canon might encourage an understanding that the process for electing a Bishop was one that should be led by the Holy Spirit and was about discernment. Secondly, it was to be noted that, for candidates, the current process was very public and could be bruising for them and their families. That could be a discouragement to others who might refuse to be nominated. Potentially, therefore, the Church lost individuals who might be very good candidates.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke from the perspective of having been an elector and having served on five preparatory or vacancy committees and he had also been involved in the appointments of senior academic staff. He observed that the See of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane would have been vacant for 15 months by the time that the Rev Canon Ian Paton were consecrated later in the year. He suggested that no comparable organisation would contemplate a vacancy of such senior personnel of more than six months since it led to damaging paralysis. He urged the Faith and Order Board to consider the election timetable. He could see no good reason why the preparation of the diocesan profile and the issue of the mandate could not be done while the retiring Bishop was still in post. That would enable the preliminary meeting of electors to take place very soon after the See had become vacant. The period between the preliminary meeting and the meeting with the candidates ought also to be reduced. In the recent St Andrews election, this period had been 14 weeks long with 31 days elapsing between the announcement of the shortlist and the meeting with the candidates. He also considered that the requirement for the shortlist to comprise a minimum of three and maximum of five candidates was unnecessarily restrictive. He had sat on many senior appointment committees which had been fortunate only to have two candidates. He urged changing the Canon to reduce the minimum number of candidates required to just two. The meeting of candidates with the electors was a vital stage in the process. At the recent St Andrews meeting, the electors had been invited to discuss and submit questions for submission to the candidates. The Bishop of Edinburgh had done an excellent job in sifting and consolidating the questions which had been posed to each candidate in turn. In so doing, the Church was adopting the wider practice of asking all candidates the same questions. However, a number of the electors had observed after the meeting that there had been a desire to pose candidate-specific questions in order to probe an aspect of the candidate’s written submission or oral presentation. The homogenisation of questions was a further issue which ought to be reviewed.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) supported the idea of a review of the Canon. However, he considered the wording of the Motion somewhat unfortunate in that it appeared to give the answer to the proposed review. He suggested that the Motion rather than referring to the Canon being "revised" should simply refer to the Canon being "reviewed".

The Rev Samantha Ferguson (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed delight at the recent elections of the individuals to the Sees of Brechin and St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, but explained that she felt short-changed. She had moved from the Brechin Diocese to the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane in August 2017 and had found herself ineligible to vote in either election. She suggested that this ought to be addressed in any review.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that he had served on the Preparatory Committee for the election in Aberdeen and Orkney. One of the problems with the existing Canon was the fact that it was very tightly defined. He suggested that a clause ought to be included to allow greater flexibility so that changes could be made with the consent of both the College of Bishops and the Electoral Synod. Also, if in principle, the Church wished to elect its Bishops (a principle which he supported), the Canon should ensure that that happened in all circumstances, namely that the Electoral Synod of the diocese should always have the opportunity to elect its Bishop. When that did not happen, it did no service either to the new Bishop or to the diocese. The current Canon also allowed Bishops to exercise power of veto in relation to candidates. He personally had been unhappy with the way that power had been used. The explanation of that element of the process which had been given at the outset of the process appeared not to have been consistent with what had happened subsequently. He suggested that such a power ought either to be removed or to be more specifically defined. In his view, the Preparatory Committee in the Electoral Synod of the diocese should have the freedom to choose and the Bishops ought not to have a wide power of veto. Finally, he had discovered that there had been no way of calling a meeting of the Electoral Synod except for the Acting Bishop to do so. In congregations, an extraordinary general meeting could be called by sufficient numbers of individuals on the congregational roll. There appeared to be no equivalent power at either diocesan or provincial level. The process in his Diocese might have benefited from an open meeting with sensible discussion but there had been no means of calling such a meeting. He suggested that any revision to the Canon ought to include power for such a meeting to be called even if the Acting Bishop did not support it.

The Rev Dean Norby (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that two election processes had run simultaneously. That could have disadvantages and he invited the Faith and Order Board to consider how that might be overcome.

The Rev Canon Steven Kirk (Church in Wales) referred to experience in the Diocese of Llandaff where the non-election of an individual as Bishop

had caused controversy. He encouraged the Synod to go forward and indicated that the Church in Wales would watch carefully. He had been nominated as the chair of a commission to consider the Welsh procedures. The problems encountered in Wales were not ones of openness but rather the reverse in that the confidentiality of the process had been widely broken.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) supported the suggestion that the Motion refer to "review" rather than "revision".

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) said he was in favour of reviewing the Canon but pointed out that no Canon would work if there were no candidates. There was, therefore, a question of nurturing candidates and the Church needed to do that properly in order to form people for episcopal ministry.

Dr Peter Kemp (Argyll and The Isles) explained that he had served on the Preparatory Committee in the election in St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and had previously served as Diocesan Secretary servicing the Preparatory Committee in Argyll and The Isles when the Bishops had elected a very successful Bishop for the Diocese in the form of Bishop Pearson. In the St Andrews election, the Committee had had to consider the possibility of applications from outside the European Union. The effect of immigration law on the requirement for a shortlist meant that either no candidate could come from outside the EU or that all candidates had to. He suggested this needed to be taken account of.

The Primus responded by indicating that he noted the points which had been made.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 1 against with no abstentions.

SESSION 3: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Administration Board - Resettlements Grants

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) explained that the business of the Administration Board was spread over a number of sessions for the current meeting. The Convener of the Personnel Committee, Mrs Maureen McKellar, was unwell and the Rev Sarah Shaw, a member of the Committee, had kindly agreed to stand in for her.

Dr Ferguson-Smith explained that the proposal in relation to Resettlement Grants arose originally from the workings of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group. In a period of 15 years, Resettlement Grants had only been allocated on 17 occasions. Also, they were not in fact Resettlement Grants but related to the reimbursement of relocation expenses. They averaged out at approximately £1,000 each. The Review Group had recommended to the Administration Board

that, along with the Personnel Committee, it should review the existence of the grants. If the grant were only being used for relocation expenses then such matters ought to be considered by a vestry as it moved to appointing a new incumbent. He recognised that it was possible that some clergy might have been planning to make an application under the existing system and the proposal was, therefore, that any applications received by the end of December 2018 would be honoured. The proposal required alterations to the Digest of Resolutions. Later in the meeting, it was intended that the Synod would consider the Clergy Expenses Guidance which would cover issues of relocation.

Dr Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

“That:-

- in paragraph 4.1.1 of the Digest of Resolutions the words “Resettlement Grants” be deleted and the words “Administration Board” appearing opposite the words “Resettlement Grants” similarly be deleted;*
- in paragraph 4.3.2 of the Digest of Resolutions the words “Grants shall be paid to individual clergy for the undernoted purposes:” be deleted, the designation “(a)” be deleted and the entirety of paragraph (b) be deleted;*
- notwithstanding the foregoing resettlement grants continue to be payable in respect of applications received prior to 31 December 2018 on the same basis as pertained immediately prior to changes effected by this Motion.”*

Mrs Emma Barrie (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether Resettlement Grants ought to be retained for cases where the individual was coming from abroad.

Dr Ferguson-Smith responded that if an individual was coming from abroad there would need to be discussion as between the charge and the diocese, having regard to the viability of the charge.

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

3.2 Administration Board: Personnel Committee

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) expressed thanks to Mrs Maureen McKellar for her hard work over the preceding year. She explained that the Personnel Committee had been working to update the Personnel Handbook for stipendiary clergy which had first been issued in 2004. The plan was to do so not in printed booklet form but as a series of policy documents which could be available online and updated as necessary. The papers for consideration in the current meeting represented a first tranche of such policies. Synod had agreed the previous year that the process for adoption of policies was that the Personnel Committee would

recommend policies to the Administration Board and after adoption by the Board they would come to Synod for ratification. Both the Personnel Committee and the Administration Board included members of clergy, as did the current Synod.

Ms Shaw explained that the policies being brought to Synod had been discussed in detail by the Personnel Committee, discussed further at the Administration Board with changes having been made prior to final adoption by the Board. The purpose of the policies was to bring the Scottish Episcopal Church into line with current employment legislation and/or good practice and to protect both the clergy and the Church. They were not intended to alter the overall ministerial framework within which clergy exercised their ministries and in which cleric, Bishop and vestry all had their respective roles. However, they were intended to give greater clarity, transparency and certainty as to the appropriate rights, responsibilities and procedures which should apply. Clergy were not employees but in any cases of dispute the Church would be expected to adhere to good employment practice, regardless of the employment status of clergy. As far as payment of stipend and expenses were concerned, HM Revenue and Customs had deemed clergy to be employees under PAYE and there was, therefore, a need to follow appropriate HMRC rules.

The Leave Policy was intended to set down standard practice but there would always be a need for flexibility between clergy and their vestries and generally clergy worked far more hours than they ought to. The policy set out standards to maintain and uphold the welfare of clergy and charges. The Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Parental and Shared Parental Leave Policy covered the new legislation and set the procedure down clearly. It was intended that the Personnel Committee would produce a pack of standard letters for use by diocesan offices in order to guide people through the policies. The Clergy Housing Policy was an update of the previous policy in the Clergy Handbook as was the Retirement Policy. The Clergy Expenses Guidelines had been produced at the request of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group and was based on a similar document produced by the Church of England.

The role of the Synod was one of ratification. Comments were welcome on the policies. It was her hope and recommendation that Synod should ratify them but if Synod felt further changes required to be made then the policy in question would be taken away and worked on to be brought back the following year.

She intended to take each of the policies and Motions one by one and therefore commenced by proposing the following Motion:

“That the following policy, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Leave.”

Dr Ferguson-Smith seconded the Motion.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) appreciated that the policies were intended principally to protect clergy and she was grateful for the time which had been spent in putting them together. In relation to the Leave Policy, it was worth reiterating that clergy were not employees or workers but office holders. There was nothing wrong with following good employment practice but clergy

exercised ministry in response to a calling from God and there was no way that they could be paid enough to do what they did. Like most clergy, she worked many more hours than she probably ought to. She did not begrudge any of it but it was important to have guidelines in place so that vestries could encourage clergy to take time off. It was also important for Bishops and Deans to manage their clergy in a pastoral way to ensure an appropriate work-life balance and also so that if expectations were not being met, any underlying causes for that could be addressed. The policy needed to be much less prescriptive. It suggested that clergy might wish to take a week off after Christmas or Easter but that would not necessarily be practical. The policy also envisaged that the Bishop had discretion in cases of bereavement to allow six days off but could exercise their discretion again without limit. Ideally, the policy should be taken back to a bare minimum articulating that clergy should be entitled to time off for refreshment and recreation as needed to fulfil the obligations of their office and that that would usually be "of the order of X days per year".

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) welcomed the production of the policies. The Church was called to seek the well-being of all of creation and that included those who worked for the Church in either a paid or unpaid capacity. It was important to encourage clergy to look after themselves and their significant others. However, he would wish to see revision to the policy before ratification. In relation to language, he considered that clarification was needed of the slight confusion in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 where the former referred to minimum provision of annual leave and the latter referred to maximum. Also, he was concerned about the language of "entitlement". Where that was required by law or human rights its use was essential but he was concerned about a cultural shift arising from the overuse of the language of entitlement in the Church which was a community of grace and mutual responsibility. He would prefer the policy to refer to "recommended" amounts of leave, whilst maintaining the stress on encouraging both vestries and clergy to ensure the taking of leave. As far as procedures were concerned, it was appropriate that clergy were accountable for the ministry they exercised and that freedom as office holders was not misused. However, a procedure of reporting annual leave to the Bishop was perhaps a burden too far for Bishops and their PAs and appeared to treat clergy as employees and possibly irresponsible ones. He did not think the procedure was workable. In relation to appeals, Section 6 appropriately stated that the Bishop was the person clergy should go to to arrange special leave. He did not think that, in the final sentence, it was appropriate that any appeal should go to the same Bishop.

The Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) was concerned that the policy potentially undermined the reality of ministry. Clergy were not employees and the policy imposed burdens on Bishops and their staff which were not credible. In effect it treated clergy as employees and Bishops as managers. He would not wish a Bishop to operate in such a way. Clergy offered themselves in ministry in response to divine grace and that reality needed to underpin any policies. He supported the desire for clarity but felt the policy did not reflect the spiritual reality. In relation to Section 2, he queried who in the diocese was to be notified and speculated that the procedure would involve a very large number of phone calls for the diocesan office.

Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) said it was a privilege to be in a room with so many gifted and talented clerics. He noted that clergy well-being only received a mention in the Retirement Policy. In the Leave Policy, there was no mention of in-service training, retreats or spiritual direction (although these matters were mentioned in the Clergy Expenses Policy). He accepted that the policy in question was limited to leave and was the first of a raft of policies. However, earlier debates in Synod had already highlighted how varied the work of an incumbent was. It was becoming more and more difficult. The *Living Ministry* report from the Church of England the previous year had noted that only 50% of eligible people had responded to a questionnaire but had not identified why that might have been the case. That report had also mentioned in passing that chaplains had a higher level of well-being than clergy. He speculated that the reason for that might be that chaplains worked 37.5 hours per week. The effect of the Leave Policy being prescriptive, in envisaging that clergy would work six days per week and two out of three sessions each day, was that, if a session were 3.5 hours, clergy would work a minimum of 42 hours per week and, if a session were four hours long, they would work 48 hours. Peter Fleming, in his book *Death of Homo Economicus: Work, Debt and the Myth of Endless Accumulation*, indicated that long-term stress and overwork were potential killers and could no longer be overlooked. Researchers at University College London had studied 85,000 workers and discovered there was a correlation between overwork and cardiovascular problems, in some cases resulting in a fivefold increase in the risk of a stroke as well as myocardial infarctions. The Australian National University had found that working over 39 hours per week was a risk to well-being and that would support the findings of the report from the Church of England the previous year. They had experimented by reducing the hours of health workers from 8 to 6 hours and discovered that this resulted in less stress and less sickness absence as well as higher productivity. He suggested that the Committee devise ways of safeguarding working. If the Church were serious about new models of being church it would not be possible to be prescriptive about the number of Sundays to be worked by Fresh Expressions ministers in the way envisaged in the policies. If a Fresh Expressions minister was working on Saturdays, how could the policy be prescriptive as to the number of Sundays they were required to work? There was nothing in the policies that indicated that such individuals were valued and welcome within the Scottish Episcopal Church as a pioneer or expert in Fresh Expressions. He asked the Committee to go away and think again and return the following year with proposals on leave and the other policies.

The Rev Stephen Hazlett (Glasgow and Galloway) said he was in accord with the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway. He explained that Monday was his day off and he queried whether the Bishop really wanted a telephone call to ask for permission to go to the dentist the following Thursday. Previously, he had worked for a well-known Christian charity which had foolishly gone down the employee route with awful results. The policy was a commendable idea but it simply would not work. Trust already existed and the policy should operate to underline that trust not undermine it. He would have to vote against the Motion.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said he had found it difficult to receive the Synod papers this year. The previous year, he had led the charge because the Committee had wanted to introduce such policies without

consulting the Synod. It was clear that what was proposed as a Leave Policy was not yet fit for purpose. It frightened him that had the Synod not acted as it had the previous year, the policy might have been implemented. In the course of the previous year's Synod, he had been approached by various Conveners in order to avoid blocking the proposals. He had been assured publicly and privately that the clergy would be consulted on any matters affecting them. The clergy had not been consulted on the policies now before Synod. Why had matters proceeded as they had – had legal advice been received or was it simply a discourtesy to the clergy? All of the points which had been made in the debate could easily have been made in an earlier consultation and in a less contentious environment. He agreed with the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway that the policy would fundamentally alter the relationship between bishops and clergy. In the absence of consultation with clergy, vestries, bishops and diocesan offices, the Synod needed to say "no".

The Rev Professor Annalu Waller (Breachin) explained that she was a worker priest employed by a university. She had taken the opportunity to look at the university policies. She agreed with all that had been said and agreed that the policies were not fit for purpose. She accepted the need for clarity but considered that policies needed to be affirmative and respect the human being. The wording of the policy was very negative, far too prescriptive, punitive and mean and gave the impression that clergy had to come with their begging bowl. She quoted from the university policy on bereavement leave which affirmed that the university would grant a period of leave in the event of death of closest dependants, the duration of which would take account of the individual's relationship and the necessary travel arrangements but would not normally extend beyond five days. She suggested that the Committee should take the matter back to the drawing board, consult clergy and look at other comparable policies (and which need not refer to jury service, Territorial Army service, etc which were simply matters of common sense).

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) explained that she was an NHS employee and had had to request two days of leave in order to attend Synod. The policies in place at work were to protect her. She was not suggesting that being an employee was comparable to being an office holder but policies allowed everyone to be treated fairly. Sometimes the Church did not act fairly but, if they were well written, and adopted following consultation, policies had a place for everybody, whatever their role.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and The Isles) wished to reiterate what had already been said and recognised that much work had been put in to the preparation of the policies. He believed it was important to have policies but was disappointed that what was being presented was incomplete. The clergy constituted several hundred potential free consultees, but had been missed out. If the Synod did not agree to ratify the policies the Committee should endeavour to find a way of consulting with those who wished to be consulted. He hoped the policies could be ratified the following year because he recognised that they were needed.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested that the document appeared to be aimed at clergy who could not be trusted. She was sure that that

was not the intention but the policy forced a drawing of strict and prescriptive lines. It did not give much guidance in terms of what clergy might expect by way of protection for their own working hours. If the policy were going to lay down negative prescriptions then surely it also had to address the positive. It might not be realistic to prescribe what clergy were or were not entitled to. If clergy were to be treated as employees then it would be necessary to adhere to wider employment legislation. Were there any clergy at the Synod who could guarantee that they would have 11 hours of uninterrupted rest between their days at work and were there any who never worked more than 48 hours per week – probably not. The Church could not afford to do that both for financial and other reasons. She agreed that robust policies were necessary to protect clergy but the policy currently being considered was not the way to do it. Churches in general treated clergy badly – the Church expected the world of them but did not give very much back. She was also an NHS employee who had recently watched her sector have policies imposed on it without any consultation, from which ill feeling resulted. That led to job dissatisfaction and the sense that the employing organisation was, in some way, against its employees. She did not believe that that was the intention of the Personnel Committee but top-down policies adopted without consultation would lead to that perception whether intended or not. She urged Synod to vote against the Motion and for new policies to be brought forward the following year.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) speaking as a lay person did not wish to comment on the relationship between clergy and bishop. However, he wished an explanation of the logic behind Section 7.2 which on the one hand referred to reasonable time off being "less than one day" or "one or two days at the most".

The Rev Samantha Ferguson (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) pointed out that there was nothing in the policy documents about part-time roles. There was a need for the policies to be clear about how part-time clergy should be treated.

The Rev Sarah Shaw began to address some of the points raised and explained that the Committee had spent some time talking about the language used.

Dr Ferguson-Smith thanked the Synod for its feedback on the policies and affirmed that the motives behind bringing forward the policies were of the best and intended to protect clergy. However, it was clear that the policies needed to be taken back to the drawing board and that the objections being raised were not simply about the detail of the content. He therefore withdrew the Motion and also Motions 6-9 on the Synod agenda.

SESSION 4: THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Administration Board: Buildings Committee

Ms Rebecca Cadie (Convener, Buildings Committee) spoke to the paper contained in the Synod papers and explained that there had been confusion over the years about where responsibility lay for the making of decisions about changes to the outside of churches and their surrounding grounds. In the case of a listed building, the local planning authorities would make decisions regarding

planning and listed building consent. Also, in conservation areas, there were applicable planning controls. Interiors of church buildings were part of what was known as the "ecclesiastical exemption". Decisions regarding the interior of listed church buildings were left to the internal decision-making body within the relevant denomination. The Canon 35 process covered that. The Canon also covered the building fabric. However, there remained uncertainty about other exterior aspects. In some dioceses there was a good dialogue with the Dean and Diocesan Property Committee. There had, however, been cases in some dioceses where problems had arisen, for example, the tarmacking of church grounds without prior consent. Such actions could completely change the setting of a building. The proposal to bring curtilages within Canon 35 would allow for appropriate dialogue and discussion. It was important that the Church addressed such matters properly because nationally there was significant pressure to abolish the ecclesiastical exemption. The Canon was therefore a means of protecting the image of the Church but also of allowing appropriate change. Minor works were already exempted from the Canon and the draft new appendix set out in the Synod papers expanded the list to include certain additional items. She drew attention to the fact that the planting of trees was not excepted since significant damage could be done to buildings as a result of trees. Also, the creation of new memorial gardens were not excepted. The important thing was to ensure that everyone knew where such a garden was and that a record of this was kept. The absence of records could give rise to difficulties in circumstances where a church was closed. In addition to including curtilages, the proposed canonical amendment altered the reference from "painted glass" to "stained glass", the latter being more all-encompassing. The change of the Canon would make no difference to the fact that, where necessary, appropriate planning consents and building warrants would be needed.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that the minor works list referred to new memorial gardens. It was also the case that some churches might wish to create other kinds of new gardens. He suggested that the word "memorial" was unnecessary and that the making of any new garden should be a matter of discussion.

The Rev Michael Last (Moray, Ross and Caithness) asked whether in addition to planting trees, major surgery or removal of trees ought also to be subject to the Canon. Ms Cadie agreed that such actions could have implications but explained that the removal of a tree particularly in a conservation area or in the grounds of a listed building would need consent because such trees were protected.

The Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and The Isles) said that when the matter had been discussed at the Faith and Order Board it had been explained that "curtilage" did not have a legal definition. Ms Cadie explained that within planning legislation there was a very clear definition of "curtilage". It was the known boundaries which encompassed a building. It might not be demarcated physically but any application for listed building or similar consents required to show a boundary and this was referred to as the "curtilage" within the planning legislation. Whilst that might differ from a legal interpretation, it was nevertheless clear from a planning point of view.

The Very Rev Ian Barcroft (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked the Committee for addressing the issue. He wished to support the reference to memorial gardens because of the issue of internment of ashes. In his diocese, there had been cases recently where ashes might require to be exhumed and reinterred because of church closures and so dioceses needed to be made aware of the existence of memorial gardens so that proper provision could be made. The Diocese had also had cause to remind charges to reflect on insurance in relation to storage sheds in situations where other organisations used the building. On the question of signage, he asked whether there was planning regulation relating to the height of signs.

Ms Cadie responded by affirming that the exemption of minor works in Canon 35 did not remove the need for obtaining planning consent where that was necessary. Such legislation did apply to matters such as storage sheds and signage.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 35, Sections 1 and 3 be read for the first time.”

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

House of Bishops: passed *nem con*

House of Clergy: passed by majority, 3 against, 1 abstention

House of Laity: passed by majority, 1 against, no abstentions.

4.2 Administration Board: Retirement Housing

The Rev Lorna Mortis (Convener, Retirement Housing Committee) was present to answer questions but there were none.

SESSION 5: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

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

Mr Christopher Townsend (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) reported that the Committee had had another busy year in advising the Church on the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults. Guidance issued by the Committee was, however, effective only to the extent of its implementation at congregational level and a proper understanding by vestries of their role. The Provincial Officer for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults and he had met with the Standing Committee earlier in the year and had emphasised such matters. Safeguarding was not to be seen as an "extra" but needed to be embedded in everything which the Church did since prevention was better than cure. The effect of abuse on victims could not be underestimated. The Committee was of the view that there was a need for greater awareness of

safeguarding issues within the Church. A lack of awareness and of understanding as to how to respond to concerns was potentially one of the most serious risks facing the Church and its reputation. The Church could not afford to be complacent.

As part of the Committee's work to ensure that the Church remained as safe as possible, a safeguarding audit, endorsed by the Standing Committee, had been carried out to identify where there might be a need for action to be taken. Full analysis was yet to be undertaken and he would report further in 2019. At the present moment, approximately 12% of charges had not completed a response. Since many of those non-respondents were small churches, the Committee would need to consider how best to embed safeguarding in such places. The level of knowledge of safeguarding would be enhanced by better attendance of both clergy and vestry members at training events run by the Provincial Officers. Since General Synod 2017, training had taken place three times in the Diocese of Edinburgh, twice in Argyll and The Isles, twice in St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and once in each of Aberdeen and Orkney and Moray, Ross and Caithness. Attendance at such events could sometimes be problematic and work was ongoing to make training more accessible, including the development of an online resource. Whilst the common perception was that safeguarding related to children, the Committee was of the view that working with adults was in fact the more pertinent current issue.

The review of Canons 54 and 65 had begun but was unlikely to be concluded for approximately three years and there remained a real concern that this left the Church vulnerable in terms of its ability to respond to allegations during that time. The overlap between clergy conduct and safeguarding was not yet fully recognised. There had been discussion with the Standing Committee about the possibility of introducing protocols and guidelines outwith the canonical framework.

Mr Townsend closed by thanking the Provincial Officers and General Synod Office staff for their support during previous year. He also thanked the members of his Committee, two of whom were retiring after eight years of service. He encouraged all to take on board his report to work together to make the Church as safe as possible.

Mr Chris Brown (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) had no wish to criticise the report but observed that the General Synod structure chart appearing on page 2 of the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017 placed the Committee at the opposite side of the structure from the Mission Board and Church in Society Committee. This was a dramatic visual aid to people such as himself who had experience of being abused. He also knew many survivors of abuse. It was a cause of personal concern to him that the Committee had a 10 minute slot on the agenda and that its place on the structure chart appeared to be minimal rather than missional. He suggested a rearrangement of the chart to stress the missional importance of the matter.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) reported that at his Diocesan Synod it had been reported that, at that time, 38 out of 62 charges in the Diocese had not returned a safeguarding report to the Diocese. He considered this posed an

extreme risk in terms of reputational exposure. He asked how charges could be better supported because the matter had to be taken seriously.

Mr Townsend responded by saying that welcomed the idea of safeguarding appearing higher up the agenda. He agreed with comments made by Mr Kennedy which reiterated his own comments about reputational risk. The Committee continued to talk about the best way to provide support and he hoped that the statistics which he had quoted in relation to the safeguarding audit would have resulted in an increase in the diocesan reporting rate. He would report the following year.

The Rev Alexander Guinness (Argyll and The Isles) spoke as one of the non-responders to the audit. He emphasised that it was because his congregation took the matter so seriously that it had wanted to take time in order to complete the response.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that there was no lack of will or intention in congregations but she considered that it was essential for training to be based upon real evidence.

5.2 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) brought greetings on behalf of the ecumenical guests to Synod. This was his second visit to General Synod. Since his previous visit, he had represented the United Reformed Church Synod of Scotland at the General Assembly of the United Free Church and at a meeting of the Society of Friends. All of those experiences had been very different and deeply moving because he had been allowed to participate in key moments in the life of other Christian bodies. The Synod's hospitality, therefore, offered the guests the possibility to enter into the experience of another community of believers in the worldwide church. The report from the Inter-Church Relations Committee showed how varied the Scottish Episcopal Church's participation in the worldwide oikoumene was. As well as relations with churches in Scotland, he had noted participation in the Anglican Communion, relations with the Old Catholic Church and Lutheran and Reformed Churches in continental Europe. He asked whether it was perhaps easier to come to agreement with those who lived far away rather than with close neighbours. Might not what the Scottish Episcopal Church had agreed with Reformed Churches in Europe be equally applicable to relations with Reformed Churches nearer to hand? On behalf of all of the ecumenical guests, he offered thanks not only for hospitality but also for the challenge to see the world through different eyes and thanks for the ongoing collaboration of telling the world of the great works of God.

5.3 Faith and Order Board

5.3.1 Canonical Review Group

The Primus reported that the Faith and Order Board had established a Review Group to consider Canons 53, 54, 64 and 65. The Group had met three times and a significant amount of work had been undertaken by officers and others to support the review. He indicated that it represented

some of the hardest work which he had undertaken in a committee setting for many years. The outcomes would in due course come through the usual canonical process.

5.3.2 Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) said that at the recent General Assembly of the Conference of European Churches (CEC), when walking along the banks of the Danube, he had been reminded of St Paul's words that when one part of the body suffered, all parts suffered with it. Nineteen years previously, the bridges under which he and others at the Assembly had found themselves walking had been "crumpled and crushed" – a local description of the NATO bombings of the bridges of Novi Sad. At that time, the Conference of European Churches had refused to expel the Serbian Orthodox Church because it remained committed to standing alongside the suffering of all those involved. The Conference had, the previous week, used the image of the rebuilt bridges to speak of the vocation of the European churches in the present day – a vocation to build bridges between those separated by conflict (such as refugees and those displaced by conflict, particularly Christians in the Middle East) and to build bridges in societies divided by poverty and exclusion. One recent piece of work had brought together ten young Serbs living in Croatia and ten young Croatians living in Serbia to learn from each other and to learn to support human rights. Since Synod had in 2017 agreed to re-join CEC, the Scottish Episcopal Church now shared in that work throughout the continent of Europe notwithstanding the United Kingdom leaving the European Union. No part of the body could say "I have no need of you".

Canon McLuckie reported that Action of Churches Together in Scotland was undergoing a major review. Whatever came out of it, it would focus on the mutual need of the churches to support one another in local communities. There were many opportunities to work together and if congregations wished support in their ecumenical work they should contact the Committee. In pursuing the ecumenical journey, new ways were being encountered of expressing mutuality. Friends in the Focolare Movement were providing an example of an ecumenism of life, founded on community. Common life was so much more than structures and committees. He was delighted that the Focolare Movement was represented at the current Synod by Mr Matt Driver.

Ecumenism was changing and was increasingly focusing on the mission of the Church to witness to the God who bridged all separations. All Christians belonged together.

The Rev Dr Liam Fraser (Church of Scotland) wished to add his greetings to those of the Rev John Bremner and commended the work of the Committee in particular in the *Our Common Calling Group* in which the Church of Scotland and Scottish Episcopal Church came together. The particular reason for commending this work was that times had changed. The forces of secularity had emptied churches and coffers and robbed

people of the opportunity of serving and knowing Christ. Those forces did not care about denominational differences. As Canon McLuckie had said, when one part of the body hurt, all parts hurt. All the churches were hurting in different ways. In that changed context, there was a choice either to go it alone or to stand together. He hoped that people would choose the latter since, in the words of the Creed, Christians believed in "one church". The Primus had reminded the Synod of the Church's calling to serve the least in society. That calling could be addressed better when the churches worked together to bring the good news of Christ.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) also wished to commend the Committee. He wished to remind it of the need to update the schedule to Canon 15 to include the Philippine Independent Church and also the Malabar Independent Syrian Church. He explained that he was the Secretary of the Society of St Willibrord and wished to remind the Synod not to lose sight of the connection with the European churches. The Old Catholic Churches in Europe were doing amazing work in serving refugees from Syria. He suggested that a bridge could be built by inviting a representative of the Old Catholic Churches to the Synod in future.

Canon McLuckie responded by indicating that when in Novi Sad the previous week he had spent time talking with the Archbishop of Utrecht and they had agreed there was much more which could be done to work together not just because of a shared spirituality but also because both were small churches living in a context of larger churches.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to emphasise the importance of CEC. He had represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at a working group of CEC on the subject of genome editing. One theme had been the clash between secular values and Scripture. One delegate had suggested that this was one of the greatest challenges that the Church had faced in the previous 100 years. Such issues needed to be approached ecumenically and on a European basis and it was very good that the Scottish Episcopal Church was now back in membership of CEC.

5.3.3 Liturgy Committee

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) hoped that many would have celebrated Lent, Holy Week and Easter according to the new Rites which had been approved by the College of Bishops for experimental use. New forms of permitted changes to the Scottish Liturgy 1982 had been approved by the Faith and Order Board and the College of Bishops in late 2017 and would be available on the provincial website. The most notable changes concerned gender-specific language about the Holy Spirit in the epiclesis and gender exclusive language in the Nicene Creed. A new Rite of Holy Baptism Outside Public Worship would be sent to the College of Bishops for approval in the near future. It was intended for those who could not attend public worship on account of physical incapacity and would be accompanied by a new rite for welcoming into the congregation

those who had been so baptised. That rite had its precedent in the Prayer Book patterns for Holy Baptism.

The experimental period for the new Collects would come to an end in 2019 and the Committee encouraged feedback on these. A formal consultation would be undertaken shortly. He wished to stress that the Committee was happy to receive written comments and considered criticism at any time by surface or email. These could be addressed to him personally or to the Committee through its Secretary, Miriam Weibye. He understood that on occasion people wished to let off steam through social media but it was more helpful for the Committee to receive thoughtful questions, comments and informed criticism.

With that in mind he wished to offer some comment on the principles of liturgical revision. The starting point was that all worship was grounded in the self-revelation of God and that, through worship, God brought humankind back from exile to a place where God could truly be known. The task was therefore more about understanding the whole liturgical tradition, seeing it as a repository of truth, rather than about using the liturgy as a vehicle to develop a particular theological view or vision. The task was to discern the tradition and adopt it in such a way that it would speak in the current day. At all times it was necessary to focus on how worshippers recognised Christ in the liturgy. The believer did not just believe but "saw". In other words, the believer perceived spiritually, intellectually and physically. Liturgical rites therefore needed to allow for a liturgically engaged human body. How then was it possible to avoid the largely unconscious tendency to dualism as if worship were only something that happened inwardly? The fundamental principle of the liturgical reforms which had taken hold in the 1960s had been that of full, active and conscious participation in the liturgy by all the people of God. A shared understanding of the liturgy was therefore important in order to be able to participate fully and consciously. For that reason, he urged the whole Province to take very seriously the issue of liturgical formation. As a step in that direction, the Liturgy Committee, in collaboration with the Doctrine Committee, had produced a commentary on the Rites for Lent, Holy Week and Easter and intended to produce further commentaries in due course.

It could be said that external actions expressed an internal understanding. Such external actions had a further significance, either for those whose intellectual capacities were not mature or highly developed, or for those whose sensory perception was impaired. There was no "inner person" as such. A person's body participated in the image of God whether people had physical disabilities or were temporarily able-bodied. Worship took place within special coordinates and that space, and the action performed within it, was not an expression of an "inner reality". Rather, the external was just as real as the internal. In the location of the liturgical action that which was supernatural was encountered through sight, touch, taste and smell. The whole fabric was required for that sensory perception to be effected. For that reason, the human body had to be liturgically engaged and it was in the context of human bodies, of word, song, movement and

other physical aspects, and above all in bread and water and wine, that the Liturgy was the way Christ came to be known and continued to be revealed in the natural world. It was essential that the liturgies allowed all to be actively participating in that ongoing work of God's saving purpose for the world.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) noted that Canon 31 now included the words "in the light of the fact that there are differing understandings" and that comment had been made the previous year that liturgy embodied the Church's theology. He wished to call for a new eucharistic prayer to be considered for those who might consider themselves to be from a more low church background. The emphasis might principally be as an act of remembrance and would not require the inclusion of the epiclesis.

Dr Davies responded that any instruction to the Liturgy Committee would first need to come through the Faith and Order Board. Work on revising the 1982 Liturgy was in progress and formal representations were encouraged.

The Rev Professor Annalu Waller (Breachin) said she was delighted that the Committee in its day-to-day thinking was considering the entire body of the Church whether members were non-disabled, disabled, sensorially disabled or otherwise. It was exciting in terms of opportunities to explore more ways to include sensory experience of faith, looking at the work done with people having profound learning disabilities and what could be learned from work done in relation to sensory stories and the tangible link with the Eucharist as an experience of God. She suggested that clergy and lay people learn more about what such people were doing and how it could be incorporated for the benefit of the whole Church. Dr Davies thanked Professor Waller for her comment. In future meetings, the Committee was intending to take account of issues of inclusion in the liturgy.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) indicated that one of the joys of coming north of the border had been the discovery of the Scottish Episcopal Church's eucharistic prayers. Compared to the Church of England's liturgies, he had been pleased to find creation reflected time and again. He had also been pleased to see the development of seasonal resources and asked whether there were any plans to consider the increasingly observed ecumenical season of creation which was unofficial but was nevertheless being adopted by more and more churches. Such a season gave the Church the opportunity to engage with issues of environmental justice, responsibility and care, poverty, migration and scientific understandings of the world. He wondered whether the Committee might look at the development of liturgical resources and even a specific lectionary for the season of creation. Dr Davies suggested in response that Mr Paton-Williams write to the Faith and Order Board with his suggestions.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) expressed thanks for what had been said. She did not wish to detract from what had been said about the

role of the body in liturgy but she felt not much had been said about how all of that might be reflected in local contexts. One of the joys of liturgy was that it was very different in each local context. The internet provided an inordinate amount of liturgical resources and she was probably not the only priest who made some use of that in her own services. It was therefore a little frustrating when she noted that liturgies provided for Lent, Holy Week and Easter were approximately three to four years behind material she had discovered elsewhere. She understood that one of the difficulties was needing to manage new liturgies through committee processes. In the light of that, she wondered whether there was a different way of working that would reflect better how available resources could be used, sensitive to local context, but without making those who stepped outside the authorised liturgies feel guilty.

Dr Davies responded that Dr Marriage's comments would be borne in mind as the process continued since the Lent, Holy Week and Easter Liturgies were at the current time in their experimental phase.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked about liturgy for use with children. In some churches there was no space for a Sunday School and so Communion was "all age". Some wording to enable the children to access what was going on in the service would be very helpful. At a recent service, thought had been given to the meaning of Corpus Christi and children had enacted a non-consecrated Communion with bread and berry juice. This had been profoundly moving.

Dr Davies responded that the issue of children and worship was under active consideration within the Committee. The Committee could not do everything at once. It was an area where some training either via other provincial bodies or at diocesan level might be helpful.

The Chair thanked Dr Davies and the Liturgy Committee.

5.3.4 Doctrine Committee

The Rev Professor David Jasper (Convener, Doctrine Committee) explained he had become Convener just prior to General Synod 2017 and expressed thanks to his predecessor the Rev Dr Harriet Harris.

He reported that the Committee had been asked to formulate a response to a letter received by the Faith and Order Board from the Church of Scotland regarding same-sex marriage. The Committee had responded noting that the Scottish Episcopal Church was in broad agreement with the paper of the Theological Forum of the Church of Scotland *An Approach to the Theology of Same-sex Marriage*. The Committee had also formulated a rapid response to the Faith and Order Board on a consultation paper from the Scottish Government in December 2017 regarding the proposed revision of the Gender Recognition Act 2004. This had generated discussion on the part of Faith and Order Board members and he emphasised that the Committee's role was merely advisory and to assist

the theological thinking of the Church. It was not the role of the Committee to represent the defined theological thinking of the Church.

Currently, the Committee was engaged in four main areas of work. A book had been commissioned by SCM Press on the subject of truth and post-truth which would comprise a number of essays by members of the Committee and others. It would not represent the position of the Scottish Episcopal Church but would be a contribution to thinking on that subject. In conjunction with the Liturgy Committee, work was almost complete on a short commentary on the experimental liturgies for Lent, Holy Week and Easter. A request had also been received from the Liturgy Committee that the Doctrine Committee consider the question of a catechism and whether that was appropriate and, if so, what form it might take. The Committee was already in discussion with ordinands and others in the Church as to how the Committee might provide some form of assistance and material to help those engaged in the initial stages of Christian teaching or confirmation training. What precise form that might take, whether on the website or in printed form, was as yet unclear. The Committee would welcome any contributions from the broader church as to what kind of teaching was already going on at present. The Committee had also provided a short paper on episcopacy to the Faith and Order Board in 2017 and was now hoping to develop that into a broader work on the theology of ministry which might become a Grosvenor Essay. It would be a way of reflecting on the theology of ministry particularly in the Scottish Episcopal Church and in its context. Finally, he reported that consideration had been given to whether the membership of the Committee should be extended to include ecumenical and interfaith representation. It had been agreed that that was not in fact appropriate but that, from time to time as appropriate, representatives from other churches and faiths might be invited to attend meetings, but not on a regular basis.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) asked whether it would be possible for the Synod and the whole Church to have access to the response which had been given to the Church of Scotland on their approach to the subject of same-gender marriage. He asked whether it might be appropriate for the Doctrine Committee itself to work on the theology of same-sex marriage rather than simply referring to such theology as being contained in the liturgy. He also noted that a rapid response had been given to the Scottish Government regarding the Gender Recognition Act 2004. He asked where he might be able to access it.

Professor Jasper explained that responses formulated by the Doctrine Committee went to the Faith and Order Board on whose behalf the Committee acted. The response to the Church of Scotland had been a very brief letter thanking the Church of Scotland for its document and noting the comments which had been made. It was available in the papers for the Faith and Order Board. In relation to the Gender Recognition Act consultation, the Committee had received a very lengthy document and had had approximately two weeks to consider it. For most on the Doctrine Committee this was an entirely new subject. The Committee had

formulated its own particular thoughts about which there had been much discussion within the Doctrine Committee itself and a variety of views but all had agreed that it was nevertheless important for the Church to have a voice in the debate.

The Primus explained that within the Faith and Order Board it had become clear that, in the light of the timescale, it was not going to be possible to formulate substantive response to the consultation and therefore the response which had ultimately been sent had indicated simply that the Church wanted to continue to be involved as the consultation developed.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said that notwithstanding the responses which had been given, it would be helpful for the Church to see what advice had been given by the Doctrine Committee. The question of what had been put into that paper had not been answered and she was unaware that such a response had been given. Historically, responses from the Faith and Order Board to Government had been regarded as a whole-church response whereas others in the Church had been unaware that such positions were being adopted. It would be useful to know, for discussions going forward, where such discussions were starting from.

Professor Jasper indicated that the discussions of the Committee were recorded in the minutes of the Committee and of the Faith and Order Board. Within the confines of the Faith and Order Board, he was happy to make the Committee's discussions public within the Church and he apologised if it sounded as if meetings of the Committee were somewhat clandestine or closed. That was not the intention.

The Chair thanked Professor Jasper and the Doctrine Committee for its work.

The Primus encouraged those who had asked questions during the debate to speak to him so that such matters could become part of the Faith and Order Board discussion. He also expressed his thanks to members of the Faith and Order Board.

5.4 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Philip Blackledge (Acting Convener, Information and Communication Board) explained that he intended to focus on the proposed canonical change to dissolve the Information and Communication Board. This was not a proposal which the Board had arrived at lightly. Communications with the wider world were handled well but there were some areas in which the Church could do better. The Church was not so good at talking with one another or at consultation or at sharing good practice. That failure tended to result in people feeling they did not have a voice. The Board had come to the view that it did not particularly help the good things which the Church was doing and, in some ways, by preserving a board, it gave rise to the perception that communication was dealt with by a separate group. In fact, communication belonged to every board, network and group.

The world had changed significantly since the days when the Board had been set up and internal communication had been via the written word. The work of the Board was essentially producing written material but things were now very different. Communication with the wider world was primarily digital and there was a need to be flexible in order to be heard in a new era when news stories changed very rapidly. The fact that many people were now online gave new opportunities for internal communication and consultation. Those opportunities were not being taken full advantage of. He noted that Synod members had been politely invited not to add to the social media "noise" when discussing liturgy. However, if that was where the conversation was being had, then why not join in the conversation there? It was important to make good use of the good materials that were available to communicate. The advent of the printing press had changed the world forever and online communications was changing things again. It was important for the Church to be part of that. In the new media, the Church needed a combination of professionals and volunteers who were experts in their fields. The professionals employed by the Church, namely the Director of Communications and the Digital Communications Co-ordinator, had successfully increased the profile of the Church, shared good news stories online and promoted those who were good media representatives of the Church. This also, on occasion, involved the hidden, but very necessary, firefighting in relation to stories which required an instant response as they arose. More volunteers who could devote themselves to particular projects and who knew the communications field well were also needed. Those requirements were not a good fit with the Board which was a group of diocesan representatives who were not necessarily those who undertook communications work in their own dioceses. He himself was a good example of that. In terms of internal communication, the existence of the Board sent the wrong message. Good communication could not operate when it was seen as the responsibility of one section of the Church. It needed to be intrinsic to every group. The existence of the Board discouraged, rather than promoted, communication.

The communicative medium determined the content. He referred to the Oregon experiment where paths on a university campus had been laid only after people had been allowed to start making their own routes across the campus. The paths had then been laid to follow those routes. The proposals for Synod were in the same spirit. Instead of trying to keep the Board where it had always been, the proposals sought to work out what was needed for today. Dissolving the Board would be at least a one year process and it would be important that Synods and boards would all be part of that conversation. If the Motion were passed at Synod, it would allow the dioceses to have what he hoped would be a very good conversation about what was actually needed in terms of communication. The good work already underway would carry on but would be done more effectively without an extra layer of administration. He also hoped that the budget which currently covered the costs of the Board's meetings might go to those involved in communications in the dioceses so that there could be better coordination with the Province and among dioceses, allowing sharing of good practice. Crucially, it would mean that responsibility for communications would be in the hands of the boards and committees and groups which required good communications. Dissolving the Board was a structural change and that tended to be the way which made things happen. Dissolving the Board was only the beginning of the process

but it was vital that that step be taken since otherwise nothing would change for the better.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and The Isles) proposed the following Motion:

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

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded the Motion. He expressed the thanks of the Standing Committee to the Board and the Director of Communications for all the work they had undertaken. In the preceding months, the Committee had found it very helpful to have the Director of Communications present at meetings to try to achieve some of the objectives embodied in the proposal and to ensure effective communication. The proposition was that the Director of Communications could bring a forward plan of the Church’s external communications to each meeting of the Standing Committee so that the Committee could sign off the actions proposed to be taken proactively. It would also take stock of the work undertaken by the communications function reactively to deal with issues as they arose. The machinery as proposed would serve the Church well and Standing Committee would give strategic oversight. Consideration was also being given to how *ad hoc* groups might take forward specific tasks requiring different sets of expertise. He cited the whole area of digital transformation and indicated that it might be appropriate to hire external expertise to help the Church as well as engaging with those within the Church who knew about that area. There was also a need to do more to promote conversation between Province and dioceses to encourage communication of "good stories". He invited Synod to back the Motion.

Dean Swift (Argyll and The Isles) speaking as the proposer of the Motion, explained that he was a member of the Information and Communication Board. The way forward to ensure good governance at all levels meant that institutional bureaucratic ways of working had to change. Change was difficult but something flexible would help the mission of the Church.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) congratulated the Board on its work. It was important for boards to consider from time to time whether they continued to be necessary. He noted from the Synod papers that both the Board and the Mission Board had done that but they had come to rather different conclusions. The Mission Board saw the need to continue but to focus on the sharing of good news stories and pull together matters from across the Province. He appreciated that digital communications had changed things enormously. The Province was blessed by having an energetic Director of Communications but nevertheless he believed that it was important to have a body which brought together the different dioceses and which was able to share both the good news stories and also experience of what had not worked. A board did not have to be bureaucratic. The Mission Board worked well as a discussion forum on many issues and the Information and Communication Board, of which he himself had previously been a member, could do likewise. Otherwise, there was a danger of a centralising tendency. He believed the question needed much more consideration and he intended to vote against the Motion.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) fully recognised the issues being faced by the Board but she was not convinced that abolishing the Board was necessarily in the interests of the Church. It was a good idea to involve professionals but it was important to have the bigger picture of how the Church communicated about God. There was a need for constancy and stability, using people with the right skills. There was a need to review how the Board worked rather than abolishing it and to ensure support so that it did not fall just on one person.

The Rev Canon Cliff Piper (Moray, Ross and Caithness) had a number of concerns about the governance and structure and about the communications strategy. He agreed that there was a need to retain an identifiable and accountable body representative of the dioceses. One of the concerns about the strategy was the wording of the fourth aim about minimising the risk of reputational damage in situations which required crisis management. Wording such as that came in for great criticism when something went wrong and an organisation was accused of having policies which sought to cover things up. There was a need for a better form of wording. He was not averse to change and recognised that matters had moved on since his days as Convener of the Board. There might not be a need for a board but there was a need for an identifiable group of people, perhaps a sub-committee but, he suggested, not of the Standing Committee, on which he had also served. He considered that if the Church were raising its profile then communications could become a committee of the Mission Board. He would vote against the Motion and encouraged others to do the same.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) explained that she was in a quandary. She was in favour of structural change but the problem was that canonical change took two years and she was, therefore, loath to vote against the Motion. She believed there were wonderful skills for communication in the Province. She would be concerned that there would not be a consultative body surrounding and supporting the professionals. The paper was somewhat vague as to how that might happen. She was concerned about the definition of Christianity on the Provincial website. She was concerned that busy people were having to formulate an expression of fundamental matters of faith. In short, she urged the passing of the structural change but called on the Standing Committee to put around the Director of Communications some support in the shape of people who could write text for the website which reflected the Church's faith and so that this could be communicated both internally and externally.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) explained he also had formerly convened the Board. He too wished to resist the Motion and urged others to do likewise. He recognised that change probably was necessary. There were a number of ways in which a group could be extremely useful to the Province possibly as a sub-committee of the Mission Board or Administration Board or possibly even merging the Mission and the Information and Communication Boards together. All of those would be worth considering but simply abolishing the Board did not make sense to him. It had to be the case that there was a way of utilising the significant skills of people in the Church for the Province. It did not make sense to abolish the Board and yet talk of ways of bringing the dioceses and Province together. That was what the Board actually did. He also emphasised what Canon Piper had said about reputational damage since that

was a safeguarding issue. Mentioning the reputation of the Church, but not of its members, was a matter of concern to them.

Miss Mary McKinnell (Aberdeen and Orkney) welcomed the need to talk about the need for change but there was a difference between the necessary practical decisions which were necessary and the broader strategic discussions. She believed the latter required a group of people to give attention to that both for the benefit of the Province as a whole but also for the seven dioceses. She was uncomfortable with the Motion because she struggled to see how the needs of the Province and each different diocese could be met. She considered there would be a loss of diocesan representation. She queried whether the College of Bishops or Standing Committee would best be able to meet the desire for expertise. She also had a concern as to whether there would be sufficient time, amongst other business, for the College of Bishops and Standing Committee to address communications matters.

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) wished to respond to the comment made by Mr Blackledge about a comment which Dr Davies had himself made earlier in Synod. He was very much in favour of discussing liturgical matters on social media platforms. In his remarks, he had been endeavouring to prick conscience about letting off steam. In the context of reputational damage, he suggested that those with large followings on social media needed to be careful about enabling snide and contentious comments about the work of provincial committees.

Ms Cassandra Smith (Aberdeen and Orkney) agreed with comments made by previous speakers. She did not feel that the suggestion made sense since it would result in the loss of a forum for regional voices and the Standing Committee might not have time to engage in a communications focus. She did not think that the abolition of the Board would in fact enable the addressing of the issues which had been raised in the paper. She agreed that communication was the responsibility of the entire Church. She worked in the oil and gas industry in which health and safety was the responsibility of every individual but that did not mean that the health and safety department ought to be abolished. Such a body existed to give guidance and governance and to encourage everyone to be responsible. The Board could do likewise.

Mr Blackledge then responded to comments which had been made. He agreed that it would be good to have a body to share good practice but that was not the Board which currently existed. The Board had no remit to encourage all the other boards to share good practice. Similarly the sharing of good practice as between dioceses did not happen on the Board. He himself had been on the Board for the previous two years and his experience was that dioceses did not submit issues to the Board. The pathways in existence were not in fact the ones set up by the Board. The purpose of the Board had been to look after the Provincial website, run *inspires* and oversee the Red Book (annual directory). The Board now only addressed the website and there was no need for non-professional help for that. Dr Marriage had been right to say that the paper was vague but that was because it represented the beginning of a conversation. He hoped that it would start some good conversations in the dioceses. The conversation would need to keep happening because changes would keep occurring. He agreed with

Provost Holdsworth that there had to be a way of using the considerable skills within the Church but the Board was not the means of so doing. The existence of the Board was an encumbrance to good communication. The internal communication in the Church was not a matter over which the Board had a remit and whilst the external communication of the Church was pretty good it could always be improved. Finally, he accepted the point made by Canon Piper regarding the communications strategy and its reference to reputational damage. He was sure that the wording of that could be reconsidered.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed as follows:

House of Bishops: 4 in favour, 1 abstention

House of Laity: 34 in favour, 22 against, 1 abstention

House of Clergy: 30 in favour, 25 against, 4 abstentions.

The Chair declared the Motion passed.

SESSION 6: THE RT REV DR GREGOR DUNCAN, BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY, IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Mission Board

The Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) reported that the Mission Board had continued to work hard to facilitate mission across the Province. It had consulted widely to see what it could do as a board to resource, support and encourage mission whilst retaining strategic oversight. One source which had informed the thinking of the Board had been the report of the latest Scottish Church Census entitled *Growth Amidst Decline*. She invited the Rev Alastair MacDonald, a member of the Board, to convey the main points arising from the report.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that the Mission Board had spent some time reviewing the 2016 Scottish Church Census Report, *Growth Amidst Decline*, a summary of which had been given to Synod the previous year. 61% of Scottish Episcopal Church churches had responded on the basis of which the Census Report had extrapolated that around 13,380 people had attended a Scottish Episcopal church on the Census Sunday, a figure which was fairly close to the Church's own statistics figure of 12,511 for 2016. The total estimated church attendance in Scotland in 2016 was 390,000 people, 7.2% of the Scottish population, which represented a decline of 32% over the previous 14 years since the previous survey. A greater number of women were leaving the Church than men. On average, 13,000 people had stopped going to church each year during that period albeit the actual figure would be higher because some people had started going to church. The primary area of growth in Scotland since the previous Census had been in Pentecostal churches, particularly amongst the immigrant churches. The Scottish Episcopal Church was the third largest denomination in terms of numbers of congregations and the fifth largest in terms of people attending. It accounted for 3.4% of church attendance in Scotland. Since 2002, the Scottish Episcopal Church had declined by 29%, less than the Scottish average of 32%, but this still meant a net loss of around 390 people

every year. If the current rate of decline continued, by 2025, the attendance rate in the Scottish Episcopal Church would be less than 10,000.

Mr MacDonald highlighted certain significant challenges for the Scottish Episcopal Church. In Scotland as a whole there had been an 11% decline in the number of congregations but no significant decline within the Scottish Episcopal Church. Whilst that might sound positive, this meant that the average size of a Scottish Episcopal Church congregation had reduced. 56% of Scottish Episcopal Church congregations had an attendance of 50 or less with nearly half of all Scottish Episcopal Church churches having an attendance of 25 or less. That was the highest percentage of any of the separately measured denominations. A related fact was that the statistics showed that the larger the congregation, the greater percentage of younger people attended, and the smaller the Church, the older the average age was. In churches with less than 50 people, only 13% were aged between 12 and 44, compared with 39% in churches of over 500. In a church of 25 or fewer, the average age was 61 but in a congregation of over 500 it was 43. The number of small Scottish Episcopal churches therefore made the age profile problem an even greater challenge. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a large number of small, ageing and shrinking congregations which would find it very difficult to attract the next generation and he was aware of that from his own personal experience in Aberdeenshire. It was imperative that diocesan strategies took that issue very seriously.

Finally, the other key challenges which the survey highlighted for the Scottish Episcopal Church included: the fact that the average age of a Scottish Episcopal Church priest was 59 years; that 58% of Scottish Episcopal Church clergy had been in post for fewer than five years whereas studies showed that churches were most like to grow when leaders had been in place for between seven and nine years; that 54% of Scottish Episcopal Church clergy were responsible for more than one church; that the Scottish Episcopal Church had the highest percentage of churches (67%) which had not run an evangelistic course of some sort; that only 5% of Scottish Episcopal churches had a youth worker (only 2% a full-time youth worker) and this was the lowest percentage of any denomination.

Ms Ross then addressed the paper from the Board contained in the Synod papers. There were a number of positives, not least that the influx of younger ordinands would shift the average age of clergy in the right direction as well as bringing hope and joy. The Census report also showed that the Scottish Episcopal Church had strengths in midweek services. There were many varied courses on evangelism available and it ought to be straightforward for the Mission Board to circulate information and advice so that every church embracing the first mark of mission (to tell the good news of God's love) could find something to suit them in their context. Mission might need to be done very differently in different places. Going deeper in faith and facing the challenges honestly would mean that mission by small churches became different and might still be difficult but not necessarily impossible. The Church worshipped the God who had shown that the impossible was not a barrier.

A variety of approaches in the Province, in diocesan strategies and in individual churches, was needed in the light of the statistics including church growth, church

planting, pioneering and Fresh Expressions and a new emphasis on growing disciples.

Where discipleship was strong, mission happened and so there needed to be a move to explore and facilitate discipleship, whether discipleship was seen, as expressed in a recent World Council of Churches paper on the Diakonia as "the vocation to be Christ-bearer incarnated in the world as Christ was incarnated" or (as the Anglican Consultative Council document *Intentional Discipleship and Disciple Making* referred to it) as "the total God-ward transformation which takes place when individuals and communities intentionally, sacrificially and consistently live every aspect of their daily life and commitment to following Jesus Christ".

In order to take all of that forward, the Board needed to adapt and had formulated the approach outlined in its paper for Synod. In essence, the Board wished to change the culture of the Scottish Episcopal Church to be more intentionally focused on mission and discipleship by standing down structures which did not work and instigating a new one – the local mission resourcing group - for a trial period of three years; by encouraging continuing ministerial development to offer the fine resources available via the Scottish Episcopal Institute; by funding one or two bids annually for imaginative missional projects outwith the existing Block Grant system, provided Standing Committee agreed to make funds available; by organising provincial events starting with a missional strategies day for those in senior leadership within dioceses to help them develop the diocesan strategy appropriate to their setting.

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

“That this Synod welcome the paper from the Mission Board setting out plans for future action.”

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church) noted in what had been said many parallels with a report in the Methodist Church. The Methodist Conference had the previous year received statistical returns. Many mainline churches had in the past lost confidence in proclaiming the Gospel but now felt driven to do it. In response to comments made about reaching the next generation and encouraging young people, he noted that many churches comprised older people. Sometimes the churches beat themselves up with an obsession about younger people. It was not realistic to assume that young people would flock to the churches. However, he cited an example of a Methodist Church in Derbyshire where the average age of the congregation was 75. The congregation had recognised that whilst they might be unable to attract people in their 20s, they might be able to do so for those who were 70 and so they had adopted a trickle-down idea. There was no quick fix but he commended the Scottish Episcopal Church for what it was doing.

The Very Rev Ian Barcroft (Glasgow and Galloway) was concerned about the references to changing the culture. He considered that what was being explored was theological literacy or illiteracy and the difficulties of using language when speaking about faith in a proactive way. There was a need to be careful when

using words like "culture". Where culture was changed, subcultures were created and he was concerned at the reference in the paper to the way that such subcultures might be represented in terms of pioneer ministry, entrepreneurship, Fresh Expressions, etc. There needed to be good work done on the theological literacy of describing discipleship so that it could be expressed in an appropriate manner. St Mary's, Hamilton had worked very hard at such issues. It had created three charities and a cafe and he had been blessed by the people whom he had served. He did not wish to apply for money under those kind of headings. St Mary's was undertaking pioneer ministry and was acting as an entrepreneur but it was very important how such matters were labelled. He referred to the Statement of Financial Activities for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017 and noted that in the previous two years the gain in revaluation in investments had been £11 million and the fund balance had moved from £42 million to £54 million. He was disappointed in some respects with the paper since he would have liked to have seen how money was going to be used. There was huge potential and there were huge assets in the Church but the greatest asset was the people who had not yet come into church. He urged the good use of money and hoped that when the Synod came to consider the Motion from the Church in Society Committee later in the meeting it would ask Standing Committee to give a good amount to the many projects across the Scottish Episcopal Church which needed proper funding.

The Rev Dean Norby (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) recalled that ten years previously he had heard a Bishop referring to the fact that the Church was elderly and ought to focus on the elderly. He was in a group of three churches which had been quite elderly but in the previous four years they had seen 40 people come onto a course to explore the Christian faith. In the previous three months he had seen two people in their 20s come to faith and in the previous year six people had been confirmed. The culture had been changed and new approaches, such as the Pilgrim Course, had been used and also the Alpha Course. He encouraged Synod members to support the Motion and to encourage the accessibility of the Church so that people could experience God's love.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) welcomed the paper. Within his Diocese he was the Diocesan Children and Youth Officer and he was involved on the Provincial Youth Committee. He suggested that the Mission Board needed to look at how it supported those undertaking diocesan officer roles since at the present time only one diocese had a paid worker. It would be helpful to have support for continuing professional development.

The Rev Canon Kerry Dixon (Breachin) spoke also as the National Officer for Scotland for the Church Army. He noted that the Church Army was mentioned in the report. The Church Army was not a new organisation to Scotland and in fact the Primus was a Vice President. The Church Army was an evangelistic, but not an evangelical, organisation and had been born out of the Oxford Movement. Wilson Carlile, the founder, had been an Anglo-Catholic and the current Chair of the Board was also an Anglo-Catholic (the Rt Rev Stephen Cottrell). On behalf of the Church Army, he thoroughly endorsed the report. The Brechin Diocese had also been looking at statistics and they were grim. Whether one termed it a cultural shift or a theological understanding, the task before the Church was not to rescue churches which were failing but rather to re-evangelise the nation of

Scotland. That was a more exciting vision. His experience was not that people were not interested in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Wilson Carlile had likened Anglicans to rivers which were frozen at the mouth. When Anglicans were able to share what they believed it came alive. He commended the report.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Aberdeen and Orkney) said he was the lay representative of a church which had bucked the trends to which Mr MacDonald had referred. He had no man-made solutions but the statistics should cause the Church to grieve and prioritise in a way which had never been done before. From his experience at Westhill, he said that the congregation had recognised that Jesus Christ was the head of the Church and so the church's prayer had been to ask God to do what God wanted to do. He was reminded of the account in the Acts of the Apostles that God "added to their number, daily". Westhill proclaimed the truth of the Gospel even though it appeared to many as a ridiculous thing. However it brought people into church because they saw a reality. Also, old people could pray and if anything had caused growth at Westhill, it was because people had prayed for those whom they longed to come to know Christ. His plea was for the Church to take this seriously and prioritise it over all else.

The Rev Canon Fay Lamont (Brechtin) agreed with all that had been said. Some months previously, she had stood up in church and said "welcome to our youth church" because there had been more young people under the age of 18 than there had been adults that morning. That was because she was very blessed to have a lay person who intentionally worked with young people. Twenty five years previously, Canon Lamont had done a review with a congregation which was desperate for young people but in a parish which had no young people. Her congregation was blessed because it had a Girls Brigade company. She agreed that pioneer and other new forms of ministry were excellent but there were other needs. There were 150 young people in Broughty Ferry who wanted to join the Scouts but there were no leaders available. She encouraged Synod members and those in congregations to go out and take on such roles. It was the case that young people wanted to engage with real issues.

Ms Ross responded to the comment from Dean Barcroft by explaining that the current system for grant allocations was via the Block Grant system. Reports of the application of those funds suggested that the grant was mainly being used for purposes of maintenance and so the Board was trying to consider other ways of encouraging innovative ways of doing mission. The Block Grant system was in any event coming up for review. She took on board the other suggestions which had been made.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, two abstentions.

A video produced on behalf of the Board in which Board members and others talked about their personal discipleship was shown.

The Synod then undertook discussion in table groups around the following questions:

- What does following Jesus mean to you?

- How has being part of the Scottish Episcopal Church helped you to flourish?
- What opportunities have you had to be involved in growing other disciples and how did that feel?

In closing the session, Ms Ross thanked the Synod members for their contribution. The Chair thanked Ms Ross and the Mission Board for their work.

6.2 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council) reported on behalf of the Council. He said that mission was the heartbeat of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Episcopal Institute was its pacemaker. Referring to the report of the Council which appeared in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017, he indicated that he was happy to take any questions but that the main focus of the Council session during the Synod would be to introduce the Rev Richard Tiplady, the new Director of Mixed Mode Training at the Institute. Before that, however, he wished to remind the Synod that any vocation needed to be "realistic, informed and obedient" – the "RIO" formula. In terms of personal vocation, "realistic" meant "who am I when I stand before God?". "Informed" meant "what have I to offer God?". "Obedient" meant "where is the Church most needing me?" – the very essence of vocation. He intended to translate those principles into the governance and structure of the Institute Council for the purposes of his presentation. When the review of theological education had taken place a number of years previously, the review group had looked at the Province as a whole, the fact of limited resources and what it wanted to achieve. It had been realistic. In terms of being informed, the group had been able to see what the Church could offer those set alight by discipleship and finally there had been obedience to the call of God by setting up the Institute Council. People were appointed to the Council because of the specific experience which they could bring. In its operations, the Council itself was realistic, informed and obedient. He emphasised how the Council, he believed, was attentive to the Holy Spirit. Similarly, the Holy Spirit had guided the validation meeting with Durham University at the point the Institute had entered the Common Awards scheme. Also, in relation to the setting up of mixed mode training, after several years of gruelling discussion, the Institute had put together a programme which was the envy of many because the programme was now geared specifically to the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church. In appointing Richard Tiplady, the Church had found someone whose own vocation was realistic, informed and obedient.

The Rev Richard Tiplady (Director of Mixed Mode Training) then addressed Synod. He expressed thanks for the welcome and friendliness which he had received within the Church. A paper setting out a summary of the mixed mode programme had been included in the envelope of material provided to Synod members on their arrival at Synod. The paper was designed to be shared widely. He explained that the mixed mode training programme was an iterative process of learning and formation, integrating placement experience, private study and cohort learning and discussion. The difference between that and other forms of theological formation was that the placement formed a central focus. In effect, the local church was being given primary focus as a place for formation for

mission and ministry. In short, "placement was king". Significant demands would be made of the placement congregations but equally it was hoped that the support needed would be provided. There would be a significant focus on mission and that would need to be embodied in the life of the placement. The placement would last two to three years. A meeting would take place the following week of some who had expressed interest in taking a mixed mode student in order to talk together about how matters might be structured. He was keen that this would not be something that was seen to be "imposed". He was committed to working with others so that things could be constructed together. For placements receiving the students, it was an investment with a fairly rapid return. Placements would receive a committed individual who was keen to serve but he emphasised that they were not interns. They were not "full fat" curates but rather "semi-skimmed" ones. Based on his previous experience, students added real value within the first three to six months of placement. All of this was the main focus of his job (the other part was to work with the Mission Board). The programme was therefore being designed for individuals who had some form of vocation to mission and to a degree of risk taking. The budget had been set for approximately three students per year. He would act as diocesan adviser to the students and, in terms of his personal capacity to do that, there was a limit on the number of students who could be accepted.

Mr Tiplady referred to some of the distinctive modules which were being incorporated in the programme. Such modules were mandatory for the mixed mode students and could be audited by other students. Common Awards was a remarkable pot of course descriptors and was a very useful resource. The Mission and Ministry in Context module was about mission in the context of western culture and would be taught at the residential weekends and so all SEI students would participate. The Evangelism in Practice module equipped students to be able to lead some form of evangelistic course such as an Alpha Course, a Lent Course, etc. This could be tailored to address different church traditions and he was keen to serve the diversity of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Evangelism was not a solo activity but one in which the whole Church needed to be involved. The Institute already taught a course called Mission Entrepreneurship Practice which came from the Church Missionary Society's Pioneer Ministry Course. There was a follow-up practice course which would be undertaken by mixed mode students and which would require students to set up some kind of pioneer ministry expression or social enterprise. He was keen for students to be risk-takers and to do so in a context where they were supported when they made mistakes. Looking to the future, there was a possibility that where some form of social enterprise might be started as a means of mission it might also generate an income which could contribute towards the costs of their ministry. This was speculative but was a possibility. Mr Tiplady explained that some of the courses would be available for existing clergy for CMD purposes in the following academic session and beyond.

Three students were currently lined up for September 2018 albeit not all of them had yet been to Bishops' Advisory Panels. Three potential placements had been arranged in the Dioceses of Moray, Ross and Caithness, Glasgow and Galloway and Edinburgh. He was keen that not everything should happen in the Central Belt or in cities. He was interested in hearing from charges that might wish to explore the possibility of becoming placements.

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) noted that Mr Tiplady had referred to the ordinands as being seen as a resource to local congregations. In Manchester he had been involved in working with five small congregations and it had been very beneficial to them to feel that they were involved in some way in training for the wider church. He wondered to what extent the training might include ecumenical thinking.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to ask about lay readers. He was disappointed by the statistics contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017 which showed there had been three people entering and completing training in 2014/15, none in 2015/16 and only one in 2016/17. He wished to link this to the Motion which had been passed by the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney, and which had been referred to in the letter issuing the Synod papers, about lay ministries, namely that there should be provincial consideration of the forms of lay ministry authorised across the Province. It had been explained that that Motion did not require to come to Synod because the Institute Council was already considering the matter. He asked for more information about what the Council was doing in relation to such lay ministries. In the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway, there were a number of lay ministries including Eucharistic Assistants, Pastoral Assistants and Worship Leaders. Whilst he could understand the need for such posts, one of the unintended consequences of them was that people tended to opt for them instead of considering lay readership. He suggested that the main reason for that might be the level of training commitment required. To become a worship leader, for example, involved five to eight evening sessions over two months whereas lay readers trained for 20 hours per week for three years. He appreciated that there were differences between the roles, not least the depth of theological understanding required, but he noted that certain aspects of the role description were not materially different in that a lay reader could "preach" whereas a worship leader could give an "exposition of the Word".

The Rev Neil Brice (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that he lived in Shetland. In relation to placements for both readers and ordinands he wished to flag up the need to address the difficulty of providing placements in Shetland and, in all likelihood, in Orkney also.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that the SEI was about relationships. Making a general point, he said that when someone put their name forward for the process of discernment, it was a big step for the individual to take. It raised within such people a hope and an expectation that the sacrifices which they had made in terms of time, finance and family would result in them being ordained. If an individual was informed that ordination would not be possible, for whatever reason, what pastoral care was given to them, bearing in mind the sense of rejection which they, their families and churches might feel? He recognised that the pastoral care of the local church would be paramount in such circumstances, but he wished to highlight that the Church was dealing with people it loved and cared for and that ought not to be forgotten. It was important that, whilst the Church might say "no" or "not yet" in relation to ordination, it be made clear that God had not said "no" to the individual and their ministry. He expressed these thoughts because he had had conversations with those who had

been very hurt by the process. He accepted that the entire process was difficult and stressful but he was concerned about the pastoral response.

Bishop Pearson explained that the reason he had emphasised the criteria in his presentation was that every day those who were called to ordained ministry, including Bishops, had to ask whether their ministry was realistic, informed and obedient. With larger numbers of younger candidates, the question of a delay in ordination or what people perceived as rejection would become a bigger issue than it had in the past. However, it had always been the case when a candidate was recommended by an advisory panel they were recommended for training and that did not guarantee ordination. In his own experience, having been involved over many years in discernment processes, he had had to explain to candidates that the Church was a human institution and that whilst it was possible that mistakes could be made, the process could involve saying "no" as well as "yes". The question of care was paramount and there were different facets of care relevant at different points in the discernment process. There was an analogy with bereavement in that there were identifiable phases involved. When vocation was not recognised similarly there were different phases. The Bishops were adamant that resources would be found to ensure that professional help was available. Bishops were expected to be omniscient when in fact they were not. The skills of a counsellor or psychotherapist could be identified and paid for. He was very aware of how disappointed people could be.

In relation to the comment regarding Shetland, Bishop Pearson noted that other parts of the Province also might seem far away but the Province had already trained people in places such as Raasay and Rothesay. The Institute was working on keeping people in touch via Skype and Big Blue Button. One of the answers to the question was financial. Placements in some areas would be more costly than in others and he was aware of that. In relation to lay readership, two lay readers would be coming into training in the coming year. In terms of standardising lay ministries across the Province, most dioceses were following, to an extent, the material put together by the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway in relation to recognised lay ministries. However, owing to local practice and sensitivities, there was a wide variety of different titles being used and the Council was trying to address that. In relation to lay readership, he had met with the lay reader wardens. It had been a good meeting and he had communicated to the wardens the need in the Province for lay theologians. Preaching was a hugely important role and lay readers were canonically recognised in that role. The reference to an exposition of the word was merely a permissive direction for those who were not authorised as lay readers. These matters were all under active consideration and a further meeting with the lay reader wardens was also scheduled. Finally, he thanked Mr Bremner for the comments from the latter's experience in the United Reformed Church. Bishop Pearson entirely agreed that small congregations had something to offer the wider church. Work was ongoing with ecumenical partners. The SEI Principal had been invited to be part of the Church of Scotland's review of training and there were also good connections with the United Reformed Church.

Bishop Pearson then closed by thanking all members of the SEI staff including the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson in her role as Principal, the Rev Dr Michael Hull as Director of Studies who also did significant work in relation to the

SEI Journal, the Rev Canon Alison Peden as Provincial Director of Ordinands and Mr Tiplady for his presentation. He also noted special thanks to Mrs Denise Brunton, the SEI Administrator, who was due to retire later in the year.

SESSION 7: Ms JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Church in Society Committee

7.1.1 Child Poverty

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the material set out in the Synod papers. The Committee dealt with a vast variety of issues during the year and part of the intention of producing a comprehensive report for the Synod was to encourage people across the Church to engage. For the current year's Synod, the focus would be on child poverty. He noted that in earlier debates during the current Synod the importance of working ecumenically had already been noted. Child poverty was an issue around which all Christians could unite and he was looking for direction from Synod as to how the Church might respond to child poverty. He then introduced the Rt Rev William Nolan, Roman Catholic Bishop of Galloway, who addressed Synod.

Bishop Nolan thanked the Synod for the opportunity to speak about child poverty in the light of the Give me 5 Campaign. Whilst he was not qualified to talk about poverty because he was not himself poor, the poor in society tended to be voiceless and so he was happy to be their voice in the current meeting. He suggested it was easier to consider poverty elsewhere in the world than consider it at home and for Christians to see their responsibility. It was tempting to blame the poor for being poor but the poverty of those sleeping rough or who were dependent on food banks, represented a poverty of society itself. The Pope had referred in *Evangelii Gaudium* to God's heart having a special place for the poor and Jesus had challenged those who had to be concerned about those who did not have. Concern for the poor went beyond handouts and works of charity. Archbishop Oscar Romero had taught of the church being a defender of the rights of the poor in order to achieve a more just society which prepared the way for the true reign of God in history. Similarly Dietrich Bonhoeffer had spoken of not simply bandaging the wounds of victims beneath the wheels of injustice but of the need to drive a spoke into the wheel itself.

It was a primary function of the State to protect and promote the well-being of its citizens and the Church needed to challenge the State if it did not fulfil those responsibilities. The causes and drivers of poverty were complex but the reduction in benefits and changes to the benefit system were part of the reason for worsening poverty. The rollout of Universal Credit, for example, had had devastating consequences. Food banks were as much a symbol of poverty as the bread lines of the Great Depression of the 20th century.

The Give me 5 Campaign had been launched in August 2017 and was a coalition led by the Child Poverty Action Group with backing from various faith and third sector groups. One in four children now lived in poverty, the largest proportion of any European country. The research underpinning the Give me 5 Campaign modelled that an extra £5 per child per week on child benefit would lift 30,000 young people out of poverty immediately. This would make a practical difference to people's lives and well-being. At the launch of the campaign, one mother had indicated it would allow her to say "yes" to her children instead of having constantly to say "no". The money would also go to families allowing them to decide how best to spend it and nor would it be means tested, thereby avoiding well-documented problems around means tested benefits tied to sanctions and constant scrutiny.

There was a tendency to look down on those who received benefits as if they were a burden on society. However, people who used other State services such as the health care system or education were not looked down on. The attitude of seeing the poor as spongers ought to be complete anathema to Christian consciousness.

Child poverty in Scotland was too big an issue to leave to the politicians and there was a need to persuade them to act quickly. If children did not get a good start in life because of poverty they suffered the consequences for the rest of their lives and society also suffered. As Pope Francis had said, the future of humankind was not exclusively in the hands of politicians, great leaders and big companies but was most of all in the hands of those people who recognised that "we all need each other".

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Moray, Ross and Caithness) then gave a presentation regarding child poverty in Inverness and work being undertaken through St Andrew's Cathedral. She spoke of the relative affluence of Inverness and of the significant number of visitors coming to the city, with in excess of 170,000 being expected in the current year from the cruise liners which docked at Invergordon. However, there were other aspects to the life of the city. Inverness had been the subject of a pilot for the rolling out of Universal Credit and she cited local headlines of those who had not eaten for several days or had been brought into debt because of the rollout of the new benefit. In Central Ward in Inverness, where the Cathedral was located, 31.2% of children were living in poverty (approximately 820 children). Rent arrears had also increased threefold since the introduction of Universal Credit. The Cathedral had responded by setting up its *Inspire at Inverness Cathedral* initiative. In summer of 2017, the Cathedral had started a holiday hunger club. A number of local schools had over 50% of their pupils who were entitled to a free school lunch but that was not available during the summer holidays. The Cathedral was able to provide lunches on three days each week and lunchboxes on the other two days. The uptake had been slow initially but had risen to the feeding of 45 families per week. This had been possible through the help of volunteers and donations and teaming up with the *Fair Share at Tesco's* initiative. The Cathedral had also established a school

uniform bank, a toiletries bank and a winter jacket bank. That last bank had been established in co-operation with Moray Firth Cash for Kids. The establishment of a breakfast club, after it had become apparent that children were arriving at school without any breakfast, had subsequently led to the preparation of breakfast boxes which were delivered to local schools and approximately 450 such boxes were being distributed each week. The Cathedral was considering how it could continue to secure future funding and was hoping to recruit staff to co-ordinate that. All of this had been done to meet a perceived need and in response to the call of the Gospel. It was possible through the generosity of donations, grants, prayer and discernment, partnerships and local media. The experience enabled the Church to listen to the actual experience of those in poverty and to walk alongside them.

The Synod then engaged in table discussion groups on the following questions:

- What is your experience of child poverty?
- What would you like to do about child poverty?
- How can I engage?

Professor Atkinson then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, remembering Jesus’ saying that he came that we may have life in all its fullness and remembering his concern for children, support the ‘Give me 5’ campaign and call on the Scottish Government to pay a £5 a week top up on child benefit.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that whilst he supported the Motion, the issue was more than just a question of giving an extra £5 per week. It was also about helping families to budget and to learn cooking and other skills. He hoped that what the churches could do would help people in those other ways.

In answer to a question from the Rev Willie Shaw (Edinburgh) as to the level of child benefit, it was explained that it was currently £20.70 per week for the first child and £13.70 for every subsequent child.

The Rev David Mackenzie Mills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reported that his local authority had been told by central government that it needed to reduce its budget by some £7 million which made the situation of those in poverty even worse. For example, music lessons were no longer to be available through schools. This represented a poverty of experience. He asked whether more could be done to speak to local and central governments since it was not just about money but also other aspects of life of which people were being deprived.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) cautioned against judging parents who were doing their best in a difficult world. Charity was

not just about handing out money but about love. The Motion was a step in the right direction but there was so much more to be done.

The Rev Professor Annalu Waller (Brechin) said that one had to start somewhere. All churches and faiths ought to be going to Government to say that the current situation was not acceptable. There ought to be no child poverty in Scotland in the 21st century. There was a need for people of faith to stand up together and say "enough is enough". As a person on a good salary, she was perplexed that Government policy now meant she did not pay for her prescriptions. Children were being denied the opportunity to reach their potential.

Mr Colin Gregory (Moray, Ross and Caithness) said that often people were unable to receive the money to which they were entitled. He suggested the Synod might also ask for a review of Universal Credit to be carried out both in rural, but especially in city, areas.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) applauded the work being carried out in Inverness by the Cathedral. He recalled that Oxfam had previously said "give a man a fish and you feed him for today but teach him how to fish and you will feed him for life". He suggested that an additional £5 on child benefit was equivalent to providing a fish. The underlying issues were poverty of education, training, love and confidence. If a family had not been taught how to cook, £5 would be spent simply on one more takeaway. It was essential to address the root causes.

Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) declared an interest in the debate since she was a Trustee of Church Action on Poverty where those in poverty were referred to as "experts by experience". She urged the Synod not to think that because someone bought a carryout meant that they could not cook. Some people did not cook because they could not pay the energy bills to provide gas or electricity. Some food bank recipients were only able to receive food which did not require cooking. She agreed with Professor Waller that the Government needed to be told that it was unacceptable for poverty to be on the increase.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 2 abstentions.

7.1.2 Church in Society Committee – Other Matters

Professor Atkinson spoke to the report contained in the Synod papers regarding other matters on which the Church in Society Committee was active. He explained that in 2019 the major item of business from the Committee for General Synod would be genome editing on which the Committee was actively working at present. It was an issue which raised important theological, practical and societal issues. He also drew attention to the Conference on Pilgrimage which the Committee would run in Aberdeen on 21 September 2018. Mention had been made earlier in the meeting of the decline in statistics being experienced by the churches. One real area of growth was that of pilgrimage. The day conference would consider the history of pilgrimage and then move on to considering a range

of current approaches to pilgrimage. The speakers would include Wendy Young of Christian Aid who would speak about how pilgrimage related to refugee issues. A theological paper from her was available from the website of the Scottish Faiths Action on Refugees which also included links to pilgrimage. Booking for the conference was available via Eventbrite and there would be an attendance fee of £5 pounds per person. Professor Atkinson indicated that he had received an amendment to the Motion which appeared on the Synod agenda, and which he was happy to accept. He then proposed the amended Motion as follows:

"That this Synod receive the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod papers, and ask the Standing Committee to consider an allocation to the Church in Society Committee budget, so that church projects seeking to alleviate poverty can be funded."

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded the Motion and confirmed he also was happy to accept the amendment. In seconding the Motion, he wished to refer to the lengthy resolution contained in the report from the Church in Society Committee in the Synod papers regarding the subject of Brexit. He was increasingly being asked for opinions on the subject but it was difficult to know what the Church as a whole thought about the issue. He indicated that he would welcome opinions on the floor of Synod or privately on that subject. He thought church members would share the apparent confusion emanating from the Westminster Government on the situation because momentous decisions would be made in the coming months about the future of the United Kingdom. They would have a significant impact on society. In addition to the concerns raised in the Committee's paper, he was concerned about progress on issues such as social justice and environmental action. Much could be achieved through co-operation rather than competition.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) cited the question of youth justice which was affected by child poverty. The origins of problems in youth justice often came from the fact that many families found themselves in difficulties in a number of areas arising from Universal Credit. Support for those who had fallen through the justice system was particularly difficult and the churches ought to recommend that consideration was given to problems in local communities. As Jesus had taught, people needed to be forgiven, rehabilitated and supported.

Mrs Pamela Gordon (Edinburgh) thanked the Committee for its work. Some of the issues had the potential to be divisive when discussed in a wider forum. They were crucial because they touched on ethical concerns but also because they affected the perception of the Scottish Episcopal Church externally which was particularly important in a time of "fake news". Things were changing rapidly and she noted that some of the matters which featured in the paper would not even have been thought of as relevant issues at the time when she had become a Synod member only eight years previously. The issues, however, were not all possible to reach agreement on easily because sometimes there was a balance of both

positives and negatives. She noted that there had been a theme in Synod about consultation and communication and she urged that thought be given to appropriate and early consultation on such issues before proposals were brought to Synod. The Scottish Episcopal Church had had a recent process for dealing with a very controversial issue and she considered there was a relevance of such a process to issues the Committee was dealing with. She asked the Committee to consider widening the process to bring in different views before Synod was asked to make a decision.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) reported that at the pre-Synod meeting in her diocese there had been considerable discussion about Brexit. People had felt that the Cascade discussions had provided a model and that it would be good to recognise the diversity in the Church on other issues. She suggested it would be helpful to have support from the Province or diocese to encourage discussions of such divisive issues. It would be a means of enabling members of the Church, as disciples, to link faith with political and public life. She suggested it would also be helpful to have resources in some form to enable congregations to have Bible studies or workshops to talk about such matters.

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) agreed that to be able to have conversations at all levels of the Church would be wonderful. She noted from the resolution which had been passed by the Church in Society Committee, as set out in the Synod papers, that there appeared to be a narrowing of the issues to a limited Scottish focus and she wondered why that was the case.

The Most Rev Mark Strange (Primus) wished to take up the comments made by the Bishop of Edinburgh. His role was to interface with Parliament, other churches and society on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church. He said it was becoming impossible to enter into conversation about Brexit because the Scottish Episcopal Church had not debated it in detail. He wondered if there was some way for him to be informed as to what the views of the Church were. He needed to know what the Scottish Episcopal Church thought.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that the Motion which had been passed by the Church in Society Committee on Brexit had a number of headings. Whilst he personally agreed with all that had been said he had reservations as to whether it was sensible for the Committee to have listed them all. He encouraged the Primus to consider the headings and identify those which were fundamentally secular, political statements and which were, therefore, not particularly the business or focus of the Church. It was possible, for example, to say that it was wrong that those living in the UK did not know whether they would be able to stay here and it was wrong to say to people that their working conditions would change. However, the Church ought to take a step back from such matters since they were secular, political ones.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) commended the Committee for much of what it had done. It was right for Christians to become involved in political activities but it was not the job of the Church as a body to do that, namely to have an opinion on politics. A number of matters concerning Brexit expressed by the Committee were overtly political and he found them unacceptable and would therefore vote against the Motion. It was unfortunate that the Motion combined a number of different elements.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) commended the Committee for the breadth and commitment of its work. However, she did not see any mention of the Committee's work on poverty in the paper which had been produced. She, therefore, questioned the content of the amendment to the Motion which returned the Synod to a previous subject. She was not convinced that the Motion was competent to sit as a single Motion.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to raise two points of order. He noted that the Give me 5 Campaign had already advertised that it was supported by the Scottish Episcopal Church and he wondered what the point of a debate was if the organisation already believed that the initiative was supported. Secondly, whilst he believed in alleviating poverty, he did not agree that the best way of doing that was to give further funds to the Church in Society Committee. Consequently, he did not know how to vote. He was unclear what a vote either in favour, or against, would mean.

The Assessor explained that the proposed amendment related to the consideration by the Standing Committee of a budget allocation to the Church in Society Committee rather than a specific financial allocation as such. He considered that there was material in the report from the Church in Society Committee about poverty sufficient to justify an amendment to the Motion on that topic. He confirmed that the amendment had been accepted.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) considered that the report was excellent, parts of which needed serious consideration. She considered that the Church had sat on the fence on a number of issues over the years and had not stuck its head above the parapet on a number of political issues. She wished to take the Primus' plea seriously. However, consideration of such issues could not be done in 10 minutes on the floor of Synod. She did not know how matters could best be addressed but there was a need to do so.

The Rev Willie Shaw (Edinburgh) said he too wished more time to consider everything in the paper. He welcomed the material regarding the RSPB and creation and was concerned that he might not have heard about it had the report not been given in the Synod papers. He was embarrassed to belong to a church which seemed to be content with the idea of nuclear weapons. As to pilgrimage, there had been a number of conferences on that subject and perhaps the Committee could actually organise a pilgrimage.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) asked for confirmation that the Assessor had ruled that the amendment was relevant to the Motion. The Assessor confirmed that he had.

The Rev Jane Ross (Glasgow and Galloway) speaking as the Convener of the Mission Board had been aware of the Motions coming from the Committee since the Church in Society Committee was a pendent committee of the Mission Board but the Board had not been made aware of any change to the Motion and she considered it was odd for it to be changed on the floor of Synod. She was not convinced that the amendment would have been supported by the Board.

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) noted that earlier in the meeting, the Synod had heard reports on liturgy, doctrine and mission. If the Church were to continue to shrink there would in fact not be many people in the world who would care what the Scottish Episcopal Church thought about some of the issues. The Church in Society Committee paper presented a huge range of issues and voting on them as a whole was difficult. He considered that a vote would not take the Synod anywhere on such matters. He suggested the focus should be on growing the Church so that when the Church wanted to speak, people would listen.

The Rev Professor Annalu Waller (Brechin) wished to comment on the link between the issues of genome editing and Brexit. The previous year there had been a report from Scandinavia which had commended the fact that children were no longer being born with Down's Syndrome. In fact, that amounted to eugenics. She was concerned that in the context of the Brexit discussions, society was being told who had a place and who did not. She believed matters were going down a slippery slope.

Professor Atkinson said that the issues which had been raised by Professor Waller were part of the work of the genome group. Such issues had been raised loudly and clearly at the CEC conference which he had mentioned earlier in Synod. In relation to pilgrimage, he pointed out that the Scottish Pilgrim Routes Forum regularly ran pilgrimage walks and was engaged in creating walking pilgrimage routes across Scotland. More generally, he made no apologies for the breadth of material contained in the report but he felt that it was important for the General Synod to be aware of the matters which the Committee was addressing. That was why the Motion in question sought simply for Synod to note the paper. He made no apology for the inclusion of political matters. Later in the month at the Royal Highland Show he would launch a report prepared by the Scottish Churches Rural Group dealing with the changes needed if the rural church was to be successful. That document would contain a significant section on Brexit, which the United Reformed Church had particularly encouraged, because it was seen as very important in relation to the sustainability of the life of the churches in rural Scotland. Whilst the effect of Brexit might seem to relate to agricultural changes in Scotland it could in fact have a significant impact on the rural church in Scotland. The way to encourage people into Church was for the Church to be relevant.

He commended the Motion and noted that the amendment to it would simply encourage a conversation with Standing Committee about budget.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway), citing rule 9 (c) of the Rules of Order, asked whether the Synod was to vote on whether it wished to accept the amendment prior to voting on an amended motion. The Assessor suggested that the amendment be put to the Synod for a vote.

Synod was then asked to consider whether it wished to amend the original Motion so that it would read:

“That this Synod receive the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod papers, and ask the Standing Committee to consider an allocation to the Church in Society Committee budget, so that church projects seeking to alleviate poverty can be funded.”

The amendment was put to the vote but not accepted.

The original Motion was then put to the vote, namely:

“That this Synod receive the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod Papers.”

The Motion was passed by majority.

Following the end of the session, the Assessor indicated that whilst he had no wish to reopen previous discussion, rule 9 (c) made it clear that where a motion emanated from a board or committee of the General Synod the mover of that motion had power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the Motion had emanated, to accept an amendment.

7.2 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

The Primus explained that there had been a misunderstanding on his part as to whether the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths was to have a slot on the agenda for the current Synod and apologised for that.

The Rev Canon Cedric Blakey (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) expressed gratitude for restoring the Committee to the agenda of the current Synod. He reminded Synod that the Committee was the most long-standing interfaith committee among the Scottish churches. There was much ongoing in the world of interreligious relations in Scotland and there was much more to do.

He introduced Pastor Simon Wiegand, an ordinand of the Evangelical Uniert Church in Germany who had spent his final year prior to ordination working with Interfaith Scotland. He conducted a brief interview with Pastor Wiegand regarding the latter's experience in Scotland.

In answer to a question about what the Scottish Episcopal Church could do to support interfaith work in Scotland, Pastor Wiegand noted that many members of

the Church were already involved in interfaith matters. He encouraged congregations to make contact with other faith communities present in their localities.

Canon Blakey indicated that the Committee was looking forward to meeting with the Primus later in the summer to explore ways in which interfaith work could become increasingly mainstreamed in the life of the Province, dioceses, charges and chaplaincies and he looked forward to being in touch with many people as that process continued.

7.3 College of Bishops

7.3.1 Report from Primus

The Primus outlined some of what he had been involved in during his first year as Primus. He had kept on discovering new roles of which he had previously been unaware such as the fact that the Primus was a Vice President of the Church Army. His role, however, included representing the Scottish Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion and to other churches and he therefore thought it was important that Synod should hear how he had spent his first year. He expressed thanks to the Rt Rev David Chillingworth as his predecessor as Primus.

One of his early tasks had involved attendance at Primate's Meeting in Canterbury in 2017. He expressed thanks to those who had prayed with him before leaving. He had returned to Scotland for a two-day visit to Iona and had then left Scotland again to attend the Porvoo Primate's Meeting in Copenhagen. He had attended a service in Westminster Abbey to mark the anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation and in all places he had discovered those who were interested to hear what the Scottish Episcopal Church had done at its Synod in 2017. In November, the Scottish Episcopal Church had hosted the visit of Presiding Bishop Michael Curry of The Episcopal Church and at the end of that month he had represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at the enthronement of the new Archbishop of Wales. In January, a meeting of the Celtic Bishops had taken place in Rome, hosted by the Church in Wales and which he had attended with the Bishop of Edinburgh on behalf of the Scottish Bishops. The consecration of the new Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney in March had been followed by the consecration in Uppsala of the new Bishop of Gothenburg where the Archbishop of Sweden had engaged in a discussion about Brexit. In April 2018, he had visited the headquarters of the Church Army in Sheffield and immediately before General Synod had attended the Provincial Synod of the Episcopal Church of Brazil where he had been invited to talk about the process which had been adopted in Scotland regarding the change to the marriage canon. More generally, he tended to spend one week in Edinburgh every month and used the opportunity to arrange a number of meetings. He had also had the opportunity to preach in the cathedrals in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen as well as Inverness. In Edinburgh, he frequently found himself engaged in meetings at the Scottish Parliament. In one period of three months he had spent no more than three consecutive nights at home. He found he had every opportunity to

talk about the love of God. He expressed thanks to his Dean and Diocese for their support. In July 2018 he would travel to the General Convention of The Episcopal Church and then go on to meet the Archbishop of Anglican Church of Canada and then a further meeting in Sweden. In addition, there were arrangements to be made for the forthcoming consecrations of the two new Bishops recently elected. He invited the prayers of the Church both for him and his wife and assured the Church that he was enjoying the role.

7.3.2 Curacies

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) wished to bring the Synod up-to-date on discussions within the College regarding curacies. To an extent, this complemented what he had said on behalf of the Institute Council earlier in the meeting. He wished to frame his remarks in the context of the discernment of vocation which was realistic, informed and obedient. His remarks would relate to the role of the College in its own vocation. The College had to be realistic. It was aware of the membership statistics for the Church but was equally aware that the Church was moving from membership to discipleship and, despite the statistics, very aware that there were all sorts of developments across the Province which could not be statistically measured. There was a need for disciples to be nurtured and the College was realistic in recognising that the Holy Spirit was raising up ordained ministers in different ways to nurture discipleship in a variety of contexts from Messy Church to Choral Evensong. That was one reason why the idea of mixed mode training had been embraced so warmly. The vocation was to make God's love real.

One of the marks of the Holy Spirit's confidence in the Scottish Episcopal Church was the number of people, including younger people, seeking ordination. It brought new challenges in training, in identifying curacies and in how the College of Bishops engaged with those challenges. Ordination remained the prerogative of the Bishop but there was a tension between individual Bishops and the needs of the diocese on the one hand and the needs of the Province and of the whole Church on the other. The challenge was to be informed and to make that tension work positively. The College was working towards a collaboration between ordination and curacies. The College was ever aware of the needs of the whole Province for ordained leadership and the need to identify congregations which could offer opportunities for placements and curacies. He had been cheered by the comments made by the Rev John Bremner earlier in the meeting about the fact that small congregations could have much to offer. Small congregations loved those who made mistakes and that was a very valuable lesson to learn for the ordained person, namely that one had to learn to live with one's mistakes. Individual Bishops discussed with their individual candidates emerging ministry and those fed into the discussions of the College of Bishops. The SEI Principal and the Provincial Director of Ordinands took part in the College's discussions regarding the discernment of placing curates in congregations and so the exercise was collaborative. This did not undermine the autonomy of the individual Bishop.

Bishops were called to oversight within the body of Christ and needed to be obedient to that calling. As new Bishops were welcomed into the College, they were welcomed in to build that collaborative approach to serving the body in which dioceses both had much to offer and also to gain from the body as a whole. In all of the training pathways offered by the SEI much greater emphasis was now placed on fieldwork placements and the reflection of the individual in such a placement. Practically, the training programmes were preparing candidates to hit the ground running and to keep running. In some contexts, individual rectors would need to exercise a ministry of episcopate over larger areas and this would enable the making of new disciples. It was an exciting time in the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church as the Church responded to God's call to make disciples.

The Chair thanked all those who had taken part in the session.

SESSION 8: THE REV JANE ROSS IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Pension Fund

Mr Richard McIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) referred to the report of the Pension Fund contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017. It had been a good year and investments had increased in value during the year but the main aspect had been leading towards the triennial valuation as at 31 December 2017. The purpose of the valuation was to assess the past service funding level of the Fund and also to address the cost of benefits arising in relation to future service. In relation to past service, the Fund had been in surplus both at the 2014 valuation and also again in 2017. At the end of 2017, the surplus had increased to £3.7 million. The percentage, expressed as assets divided by liabilities, had increased from 103% to 107%. The main drivers of the increase in the surplus had been investment returns earned during the previous three years (which had added £7.7 million to the funding level) but the Fund had also been affected by changes in market conditions, namely future expectations of investments. The market indicated low growth looking forward for a long time. The relevant indicator was the market yields on Government bonds. This had more than offset the investment returns made during the three-year period. A number of other smaller factors had contributed positively to the Fund including the fact that the Church had paid a little more than the cost of future service and that had been important. Also, the pace of increase in longevity was reducing.

The cost of future service had increased from 30.2% in 2014 to 35.9% in 2017. That was a significant increase and the drivers for such change were broadly similar to those affecting the past service level. Arising from this was the question of what rate ought to be payable to the Fund for that future service. That issue was not automatically answered by the Actuary and was a decision largely for the Trustees. Since there was a surplus, that could be used to offset the cost of future service but that was not the only option since the surplus could simply be retained as a buffer to deal with future adverse experience in the Fund. The Trustees had considered all those options but on balance the Trustees were

comfortable to use the surplus. However, there was also a subsidiary question as to how quickly the surplus ought to be used. The Trustees had asked the Actuary how long the surplus would last if the contribution rate was maintained at 32.2% of stipend/salary and had been advised that it would cover 12 years and nine months. There was a balancing act to be carried out in considering such issues including prudence by the Trustees on behalf of members of the scheme, affordability to the employer and stability and equality of treatment. Since the Church had been overpaying for the previous three years, it seemed equitable to the Trustees that the Church should underpay for the forthcoming period. The Trustees' proposal that the current contribution rate be maintained was the proposal being put to Synod in the Motion contained in the Synod agenda. The risk involved in that was that the surplus could disappear.

Finally, Mr McIndoe referred to the investment strategy of the Fund and how it had changed since 2014. A new strategy had been adopted in 2017 and comprised one third of assets matching the liabilities of the Fund, one third generating income and the remaining third seeking growth, in this case in a diversified growth fund. Only that last third was very exposed to investment markets. Since the previous valuation, the Trustees had reduced exposure to growth seeking assets in order to ensure that the funding level held up going forward. That provided a measure of reassurance in relation to the surplus.

Mr McIndoe explained that the Synod papers also included a paper regarding the Pension Fund Trustees' response to the question of investment in fossil fuels. The Trustees had considered the matter carefully and had adopted the Church's ethical investment policy but it could not actually be put into practice at the current time because the growth assets of the Fund were held entirely in a single pooled vehicle and the Pension Fund Trustees had no underlying ownership in the companies represented in that pooled fund. It was possible that matters might change in the future since the Trustees would be looking again at investment strategy in the coming year in the light of the valuation.

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) thanked Mr McIndoe and the other Pension Fund Trustees for their work, particularly in relation to the valuation. During part of 2017, it had been thought that the valuation might have been less positive and advice had been taken by the Standing Committee to look at possible options going forward. Fortunately, at the current time, it was not necessary to do anything radical. Standing Committee was happy to endorse the proposition regarding the contribution rate going forward.

Mr McIndoe then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:

“That the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be maintained with effect from 1 January 2019 at 32.2% of standard stipend and salary respectively.”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) declared an interest as a member of the Pension Fund and hoped to receive a pension one day. He had served on the Standing Committee at the time the Committee had had to deal with the difficulties arising from the 2011 valuation. Standing Committee had

dealt with that by requiring congregations to pay more and by reducing benefits. It concerned him that churches struggling financially could be given assistance but the individuals affected by the changes to the benefits would continue to be affected for the rest of their lives. He believed that this involved a question of equity which troubled him. Also, he suggested that the Standing Committee and the Administration Board should be invited to reflect on the effect of the decline of the real value of the stipend both for those currently in receipt of a stipend but also in relation to the effect of that on future pensions because the value of pension was related to stipend. At a pre-Synod meeting in his Diocese, people had been shocked to learn that the value of the stipend had fallen by about 8% over the previous 10 years. He recognised that there was a question about affordability for congregations but he asked that consideration be given to the affordability level for individuals both for stipendiary clergy and for those who would become pensioners one day.

The Rev Willie Shaw (Edinburgh) was concerned about the response to the climate change issue since it had been 11 years previously that the ethical policy had originally been adopted. He would prefer even a small part of the Fund to be ethically invested because he did not want to be paid from unethical money.

Mr McIndoe responded said that it was possible that in a further 11 years the position regarding ethical investment might not have changed. The Trustees were committed to exploring whether there was a means of putting the policy into effect whilst maintaining the investment strategy, the fundamental objective of which was to ensure that the Fund could continue to pay pensions which had accrued and were continuing to accrue. Prior to implementation of the current structure the Trustees had explored the matter and had found that there was no current means within the market to put the policy into effect. This was because central to the strategy was the diversified growth fund which balanced the growth exposure. There had been no diversified growth funds in the market which adopted an ethical screening approach. The Trustees were aware that there were one or possibly two such funds now in existence, but the Trustees had not thus far done a full review of those options. There would be a cost involved in moving to such an option. It was not that the Trustees were doing nothing. As explained in the report, the Trustees engaged regularly with the investment manager, Schroeder, and that included discussion as to what they were doing in relation to responsible investment. The manager's approach mainly took the form of engaging with companies rather than disinvestment. The primary objective had to be the payment of pensions and the secondary objective would be implemented as and when the Trustees were so able.

Mr Gordon thanked Provost Holdsworth for his remarks and hoped to say something about the matters which the latter had raised later in Synod.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 1 abstention.

The Chair thanked all who had participated in the session.

SESSION 9: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

9.1 Administration Board: Composition of the Board

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) spoke to the proposal set out in the Synod papers to alter the manner in which some posts were filled on the Board. He explained that the proposal came out of the experience of recent years and after General Synod 2017 it had been necessary to co-opt additional members to the Board. In co-opting individuals it had been possible to improve the gender and clerical/lay balance on the Board. Whereas the Digest of Resolutions currently required the posts of General Synod representatives to be filled only by individuals who were General Synod members, the proposal would widen scope so that those elected to the Board did not require to be General Synod members.

Ms Cassandra Smith (Aberdeen and Orkney) agreed with the proposal but noted that in future nominations would be brought to General Synod by the Standing Committee. She wondered what would happen if Standing Committee itself chose not to nominate an individual – in those circumstances the General Synod itself would not be in a position to make the choice.

The Primus from the chair suggested that the intention was that Standing Committee would invite nominations.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) suggested that the wording of the Digest of Resolutions could be altered to suggest that nominations might be made from the Synod.

Professor Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked why the words "on the nomination of the Standing Committee" were included at all. Dr Ferguson-Smith responded that the purpose was to ensure that nominations were in fact brought to Synod.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) asked whether members had a fixed term. Dr Ferguson-Smith responded that they were appointed for a period of four years.

Dr Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:

"That paragraph 2.3.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-

"The Administration Board shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of the Standing Committee, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

9.2 Administration Board: Investment Committee

Mr Adrian Tupper (Convener, Investment Committee) reported on the work of the Committee. He explained that the Unit Trust Pool (UTP) was a specially created investment vehicle. It was a unitised fund allowing not just Synod but also congregations to invest funds and liquidate them as needs required. Its purpose was to pay a twice annual distribution rising so as to maintain its real value. The UTP was managed by external investment managers, currently Baillie Gifford, with assets allocated across three portfolios: two pooled funds (a corporate bond fund and a long-term growth fund) and a directly managed portfolio of international equities. Allocation was decided by the Investment Committee with a 5% discretion given to the investment managers.

In the year to March 2018, the UTP unit price had risen in value by 10.9% after fees and was worth £72.8 million. The 2017 distribution had been 52.5p per unit, equivalent to around 3% of the Fund's value. In 2018, the distribution was likely to be higher. Annual management fees were highly competitive but would rise shortly and the new fees would still be attractive by industry standards but would depend on how the Committee chose to invest funds. An unusual aspect of the UTP was that the distribution was paid not only from income but also from capital. The reason for that was that income generating investments had become very pricey while the performance of growth stocks, which paid little or no income, had been superior. That strategy had enabled the payment of an increasing, yet sustainable, distribution.

Looking forward, the Committee had been unanimous that corporate bonds no longer represented an attractive asset class and that a multi-asset income fund, about to be offered by Baillie Gifford, provided not only a comparable income yield but also sourced it from a variety of asset classes hitherto unavailable to the UTP such as infrastructure and property. The diversification offered by that fund would help to keep volatility low and the sustainability of the distribution more certain. The Committee was also considering whether to move investments from the managed portfolio into the multi-asset income fund as well, thereby increasing it to as much as 70% of the UTP. A final decision was yet to be made and had wider implications. On the one hand, the benefits would include lower management fees and increased diversification. On the other, moving away from a managed portfolio into a pooled fund meant that there would no longer be any direct equity investments and no longer scope to assert the Church's ethical investment policy on direct investments. Whichever direction was taken, continued involvement with the Church Investors Group remained in place which would mean that the Church would continue to support engagement with corporations around the world on a number of environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues identified by the Church Investors Group. The Committee would also continue to engage with its investment managers in relation to their own ESG policies.

Mr Tupper thanked the members of the Investment Committee as well as support from General Synod Office staff.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to welcome what Mr Tupper had indicated about consulting on proposed changes the effect

of which might mean an inability to apply the ethical policy since there might no longer be any direct equity investments held by the UTP. In the light of the debate which had taken place at General Synod the previous year, he did not wish to say that such a move would be a bad idea but he wished to support the ongoing work with the Church Investors Group which represented very significant funds under management. He wanted to see how much greater use could be made of the Church Investors Group and reported that the Church in Society Committee was also involved in the discussions with Baillie Gifford.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) endorsed what Professor Atkinson had said. Many charges had investments in the UTP and it was important to be able to report back to vestries on the workings of the Church Investors Group particularly if the Church in practice was no longer able to draw its own red lines.

Mr Tupper responded by confirming that he would be delighted to work on these matters with those who had commented.

SESSION 10: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

10.1 Mission Board

10.1.1 Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Provincial Youth Committee) introduced a presentation by members of the Committee.

The Youth Chair of the Committee, Rebecca Cromwell, spoke of her experience over the previous year including serving on the Preparatory Committee in the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane for the election of a new Bishop. She had also been involved in a Christian Aid event at the Scottish Parliament on gender justice and had had the opportunity to meet the First Minister. She reported that some members of the Committee were also involved in their church vestries and able to make a positive contribution.

A number of other members of the Committee contributed on the roles being taken up by them in their local churches. Young people were not the future of the Church but were part of the Church of the present day. In addition to the annual Glen Youth Camp, the Committee hosted youth weekend and sleepovers at various places in the Province and these provided taster sessions for Glen and allowed for continuing sharing and contact between Committee members. Such events in the previous year had taken place at St John's, Dumfries, St Columba's by the Castle, Edinburgh, St Peter's, Edinburgh and St John's, Perth. An event had also been planned in Dunoon but had, owing to the timing of exams, been limited just to local delegates.

A report was given on attendance at the Scottish Parliament where there had been opportunity to speak about the role of young people in the

Church. It was pleasing that the Year of Young People had been honoured in that way by both the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Parliament. Becky Northover encouraged members of the Church to engage with young people and gave a teaching on current youth slang.

Mr Rongong promoted Glen 2018 which would take place in July and the theme of which would be "24.7/365, Yesterday, Today, Forever". A certificate for the "pisky bingo" card winner was presented to Eleanor Tofield.

The Primus thanked all members of the Committee for their involvement.

10.1.2 Global Partnerships Committee

Mr David Kenvyn (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) explained that the Committee had responsibility for making grants to partner organisations within the Anglican Communion and for some liaison with other provinces of the Communion. Approximately £110,000 each year was available to spend on grants for work overseas and represented income derived from legacies which could not be spent on any other purpose.

In 2017, the Committee had worked closely with the *Side-by-Side Campaign* and *Thursdays in Black* to make sure that gender justice issues remained at the centre of its work. In that respect it had funded the publication of a booklet called *Loving One Another* which was a resource for congregations and other groups to use. It had also agreed to provide some funding for the Ecumenical Forum of European Christian Women for a conference held in Serbia. Reports had also been received from the Anglican Consultative Council, the Anglican Alliance and International Justice Mission. In particular, the Committee had been involved in a visit to Scotland by Paulo Ueti, the Regional Facilitator of the Anglican Alliance in Latin America and the Caribbean. It had also been working in collaboration with that region on supporting a safe house for battered women in São Paulo, Brazil.

In Scotland, the Committee had worked with the Just Festival providing funding to bring a dance group from Soweto to Edinburgh and it had also been making plans with the Just Festival for the celebration of the Nelson Mandela Centenary in 2018. It provided a travel grant for a member of the Diocese of Edinburgh to attend the Soul Edge Christian Leadership Training Programme amongst the First Nations of Canada.

In Africa grants for clergy training in Angola, Guinea and South Sudan had been provided along with money to support the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa. Funding for projects in three dioceses in South Sudan had been small-scale and of a very practical nature but the Committee had been assured by the relevant bishops that they constituted a significant contribution to the peace making process in that country. A grant had also been provided to support pensioners in the East London Diocese in South Africa. In India, two projects had been supported in the Diocese of Nagpur.

Mr Kenvyn closed by reminding the Synod that if dioceses wished to collaborate on projects with overseas dioceses within the Anglican Communion, grant funding was available from the Committee. He thanked Miriam Weibye for her work as Secretary to the Committee.

10.1.3 UN Commission on the Status of Women

Ms Lottie White reported that she had represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at the 62nd session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women held in New York earlier in 2018. She had found it an occasion of meeting the most kind and inspiring women whom she had ever encountered. Every year, the Anglican Communion sent a delegation of approximately 20 people to UNCSW and the group had remained in touch after the current year's meeting.

The primary theme of the 2018 session was "Empowering Rural Women and Girls". When that theme had previously been a focus of the meeting there had been no agreed conclusions. Emotions had run high again in 2018 and she was sad to report that the UK had played a major part in frustrating the official negotiations and many seasoned delegates had thought that, once again, no conclusions would be arrived at. In fact, some conclusions had been reached albeit they had not been as extensive as she had hoped.

The empowerment of rural women and girls was of the utmost importance to Scotland and to the Scottish Episcopal Church. 51% of the Scottish population was female, 54% of the population in the most recent Census identified as Christian and 94% of the Scottish landmass was rural. Rural women in Scotland were among the demographic most likely to be subject to poverty. Such women were less likely to be able to access healthcare, hold a driving licence or access childcare. Scottish rural women also were less likely to be able to seek support in the event of domestic violence. Female genital mutilation was also on the rise in Scotland and previous legislation had just been overhauled because no prosecutions had been brought under the previous law. Sadly, in relation to human trafficking, Scotland had progressed from having been a transit country to being a destination country. Women were more likely to become modern slaves and both the police and the public were likely to treat such individuals as immigrants rather than as victims.

UNCSW was not just a platform to raise issues but was a platform to discuss how to improve matters. She had learnt three things from the experience. Empowerment was not something that could be done to other people. The essential thing was to create room to allow women to empower themselves. Secondly, for a faith-based community to take its responsibility to create such room, she had learned that the Church should continue to do what it was already doing but to do it better. One event at UNCSW entitled "Women in Faith: Engaging Faith Leaders" had included testimony from women of faith explaining how they had effected change. Sadly it was the case that a number of issues facing women were in

practice justified on the basis of religion. When overseas religious leaders were challenged from outside their faith communities, or from a western mindset, the message fell on deaf ears. However, when the message came from other faith leaders, the harmful practices reduced. It was about leading by example in showing what was possible. Removing references to blame and shame from language was also key. Thirdly, whilst there could be a perception that certain issues (for example domestic violence) were not relevant in congregations, experience suggested that where those in leadership preached about such a subject, it actually resulted in people coming forward from within their congregations to talk of their experience of such matters. It was, therefore, important to talk openly about such issues.

She thanked the Global Partnership Committee for enabling her to attend. Her experience suggested that it was worthwhile for the Scottish Episcopal Church to send a delegate to the meeting. References in some of the draft documentation at the beginning of the session had been disparaging about religion but she had managed to convince some that religion could in fact be a tool for change. She brought back with her the congratulations from the Ecumenical United Church Centre in New York to the Rt Rev Anne Dyer on her consecration.

Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends) expressed thanks to the Synod for the welcome which she had received and she brought the loving greetings from the Religious Society of Friends. She offered the gift of silence to the Synod so that it could reflect on what it had just heard.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) asked for more information regarding the objections raised by the UK Government at UNCSW.

Ms White responded that at the outset of the meeting a "zero draft" had been released and had then been subject to negotiation. At the outset, the UK had not raised any objections and in fact Russia and the USA had been fighting against progress. However, the UK had indicated that any matter which infringed sovereignty must be regarded as a no-go area for example if it imposed obligations on individuals. This appeared to be a policy stance by the UK Government.

The Primus expressed thanks to Ms White and to the Global Partnerships Committee for its work.

10.2 Standing Committee

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) said the Synod had covered much ground during the current meeting and there would be much on which the Standing Committee would debrief. He was grateful for the positive comments which people had made to him during the course of the meeting.

10.2.1 Accounts to 31 December 2017

Mr Gordon turned to the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2017. He noted that earlier in the meeting, the Very Rev Ian Barcroft had sought to introduce an amendment in relation to the budget available to the Church in Society Committee for grant making. That Committee already had a grants budget of approximately £45,000. The Church in Society Committee submitted its budget proposals annually to the Standing Committee in the same way that other Committees did and so there would be an opportunity for the Standing Committee to reflect further on that. The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth had also raised the question of stipends and increases to stipends during the Pension Fund discussions. Those matters had been considered by the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group in 2016 and the report of that Group was available on the Provincial website. One of the points made in that report was that any historic comparison in relation to stipend levels depended on the specific period over which it was measured. Over the longer term growth in Standard Stipend compared favourably against inflationary indices - for example, if measured from 1993. For the period since 2006, stipends had fallen behind inflation but had kept pace with average earnings. In short, all those earning had taken something of a cut.

A question had also been asked as to why money was being accumulated in investments. He expressed his thanks to Mr Adrian Tupper for the way in which the Church's investments were being managed. It was the case that values could go down as well as up and there had been some dramatic reductions in the previous 10 years. Yields also varied. The Province received approximately £28,000 of income for every £1 million of investments. Approximately £1.4 million of the £2 million of annual income came from investments. The Standing Committee had recognised that it would need to draw down from surpluses in order to fund ordinands and curates in future and the possibility of additional grants from the Mission Board going forward. He suggested that thought would also need to be given perhaps over the forthcoming 10 years to the balance of provincial income as between investments and quota. If the aspiration was to become a more dynamic and growing Church, with new congregations, then the quota assessable income would increase but that was an aspiration.

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

“That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2017.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

10.2.2 Budgets and Quota

Mr Gordon explained that Standing Committee had considered whether to put a proposal to Synod to increase the amount of quota by 3% or to maintain it at its 2018 level. He was aware that an amendment would shortly be proposed the effect of which would be to set the 2019 provincial quota at the same level as in 2018. He explained that if there were to be a 3% increase, it would involve an increase of approximately £22,000 and he explained how that would be divided amongst the seven dioceses. The allocation as between dioceses was calculated by reference to their respective quota assessable income. If there were no increase in the level of provincial quota whilst the overall amount would remain the same, the respective shares born between dioceses would alter from the 2018 level because of the differences in quota assessable income. Standing Committee had taken the view that an increase in quota of 3% would maintain approximately the same balance of income as between investments and quota but it acknowledged that 2017 had been a good year with additional investment income and it was, therefore, a matter for Synod to decide. If Synod were to decide not to increase provincial quota, that did not mean that increases would not be necessary at some point in the future.

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

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2019, agree to a quota figure of £763,773 for that year.”

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechtin) indicated that he had questions regarding the nature of quota and he recognised that the Convener of the Standing Committee might wish to respond to the questions in writing at a later date. His questions were as follows:

- Clarification on which entity actually had the legal authority to decide upon quota. Was it the Standing Committee, as charity trustees, or was it the General Synod as currently convened?
- Were the transfers of funds between congregations, dioceses and Province grants?
- Were the trustees of dioceses and congregations able to deal with quota requests as they saw fit in accordance with the financial situation of the respective charity entrusted to their care?
- Did the authority upon which quota was requested represent a moral authority resting upon a mutual understanding of Province, dioceses and congregations of their respective financial responsibilities?

Mr Gordon thanked Dr Jacobs for his questions and indicated that he would arrange for a reply to be given in writing. Synod had the authority to determine the level of quota which is why Synod was about to vote on

the Motion. Dr Jacobs wondered whether, within a diocese, it was the Diocesan Synod which decided how quota should be raised among congregations or whether it was the Diocesan Council or the Bishop.

The Primus suggested that a reply be provided in writing to the questions which Dr Jacobs had asked and a copy of that response could be supplied to other Synod members.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that balance was important in all things. For any congregation, there was a balance between money to be spent on work which the congregation wished to undertake and its contribution to the diocesan and provincial synods. Synod had heard earlier in the meeting of the future provincial plans including the fact that hope had been expressed that some curates would go to small charges. Inflation had exceeded income for most people and there was very real pressure on small congregations. Whilst the Scottish Episcopal Church had managed to sustain a large number of small congregations, it had been less good at sustaining the number of people within such congregations. Looking at the accounts and the surpluses which had been built up, he suggested that it might be useful for Synod to have the opportunity to put down a marker and to freeze quota in 2019 at the 2018 level.

Professor Atkinson then proposed an amendment to the Motion so that it would read as follows:

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2019, agree to a quota figure of £741,527 for that year.”

Dr Jacobs (Brechin) seconded the amendment.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to add a different perspective on the proposed increase in quota. He accepted that what he was about to say was not entirely accurate but he wished to consider the increase in quota on the basis of the number of church members. The communicant members in 2017 had been 22,073. The proposed quota for 2019 of £763,773 gave a figure of £34.60 per head. In the previous year quota per head had been £32.47 giving a percentage increase of 6.56%. In the previous two years the increase had been 12% and so the increase in respect of each individual member of the Church would be far in excess of the rate of inflation if the increase were to be accepted.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) felt conflicted about the issue. He heard the need of small congregations but also recognised the need to invest in curacies, ordinands and other exciting forward plans. He wondered whether there might be some rebalancing of the amounts of quota coming to the Province and dioceses respectively. He suggested that it might be possible to accept the wording of the original Motion but with a recommendation to the Standing Committee to invite dioceses and their treasurers to consider some

rebalancing as between congregations since there would be some more able to bear an increase than others.

The Very Rev Jeremy Auld (Brechin) noting the call to be realistic, informed and obedient, said that there was an obligation of obedience to pay quota. However, there was also a need to be realistic about what could be afforded - *nemo dat quod non habet* – no one could give what they did not have. He wondered whether the issue was being looked at the wrong way round. Normally people cut their cloth depending on what they had. It seemed as though the Province was indicating what it needed and was seeking to receive that. Where that would come from, however, was a real question, particularly in a diocese like Brechin where huge numbers of churches were on a knife edge. A member of clergy in that diocese had recently been told that there was no money to pay her. He supported the idea of the kind of conversation proposed by Professor Werritty but he suggested that in the meantime quota be frozen. That conversation could take place prior to further debate at General Synod 2019.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked about the division of quota between the dioceses. She noted that, in terms of the proposed increase, her own Diocese was being paid for by other dioceses. She was uncomfortable about that because her Diocese was the only one which had had an increase in numbers in the previous year.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) said the matter was difficult because there had been a surplus budget in 2017 of £50,000 but the surplus actually realised had been £77,000. There had been exceptional payments of £55,000 and so the surplus might have been £132,000. He compared that to the proposed increase in quota of approximately £22,000. Much had been heard in Synod about the costs in the pipeline, including training costs and the Synod had also heard about shameful amounts of poverty in the nation. Synod had encouraged the Government to increase child benefit by £5 per week. Education was crucial to the alleviation of poverty and the Scottish Episcopal Church, having three Episcopalian schools, needed to put its money where its mouth was and increase funding to schools. The Primus in his charge to Synod had reminded the Synod to "love our neighbours as ourselves". He had not yet been at Arbroath for three years and he recognised that the burden within the Diocese of Brechin fell largely on the Cathedral, but at Arbroath they had seen a 6% increase in giving in his first year and 11% in 2017. However, that was still not enough. If Synod were to "love ourselves", the levels put aside for clergy retirement housing was woefully low. Those in training in the 1980s/90s might well have been encouraged to sell their house and that cohort had not yet reached retirement. There would be a big increase in that area as a result. In relation to stipend levels, he said that there had been an interesting report in England in 2001 which had suggested that clergy were professionals and that the level of stipends (including housing) ought to be equivalent to 80% of a primary school head teacher. In 2001, that would have given rise to a differential of £4,000 but at the current time, that differential exceeded £15,000. The Scottish Episcopal Church

stipends were approximately 5%-8% lower than those paid in the Church of Scotland. He also noted the £3.7 million surplus in the Pension Fund but there had been reductions in benefits. Was there an opportunity to "love ourselves"? He loved what he did but he was not convinced that he should do so for nothing. The Church was run on the goodwill of Church members and there was a need to love people and not see them as cash registers.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) said that she had benefited in unusually generous ways from the coffers of the Church. She was a newly trained cleric and received stipend support from the Province and the Diocese of Edinburgh which had made her appointment in Dunbar possible. On a Sunday there were no more than 40 people in worship of whom she estimated only eight were salaried. She was therefore in a quandary. On the one hand, she had no desire to ask her congregation, already in the red, and fighting tooth and nail to grow mission, to give more money. On the other hand, unless members of the Church were the generous givers which God called them to be, there would be no growth. That, therefore, meant change so that people might give in a way which culturally, they had not been accustomed to previously. She did not think it was a big ask for quota per head to be increased from £32.47 to £34.60. How many members were in fact giving generously? That was a difficult message which perhaps everyone needed to hear. She believed quota needed to go up.

The Very Rev Frances Burberry (Edinburgh) noted from the budget report in the Synod papers that surpluses had been generated in previous years and also that the Standing Committee intended that budgets should be set with a view to achieving a broadly break-even position on the General Fund. She noted that there were significant financial challenges ahead. However, the fact was that substantial surpluses had been collected in recent years and she believed there was an acknowledgement that the budget process was not sufficiently robust. In all budgeting, there was a need to connect budgetary decisions in relation to matters such as future curacies, mixed mode training, etc with the budget at the time that such financial commitments would fall due rather than in advance with a woolly proposal that money might be needed in the future.

The Rev Professor Annalu Waller (Brechtin) explained that she did not receive a stipend from the Church and so she could say things which stipendiary clergy might not be able to. Every year at Diocesan Synod, she said that the way the Church worked had to change. She spent time with congregations in which there were perhaps four or five elderly people who had sleepless nights because they felt responsible for keeping their churches going. There was a moral responsibility to make difficult decisions about retiring some charges in order to build from the bottom up. Bishops in the past had come in and indicated that they would not close churches during their term. Difficult decisions had to be made if the Church as a whole was going to be supported and equip the Church and its young people to grow and be prepared to share the word of God with society at large.

The Very Rev Ian Barcroft (Glasgow and Galloway) said this was an important subject and he recognised he had been somewhat cheeky earlier in Synod to endeavour to achieve more money for the Church in Society Committee. He had been a Convener of that Committee when it had had a budget double its current size. The Social Responsibility Committee (the precursor to the Church in Society Committee) had even enabled people to be employed in its service. In the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway, there were a number of projects where considerable effort was put into raising project funding from external funders. The Church had to think about bringing money into the heart of synodical business, not just on Saturday morning. It was the case that there had been substantial gains made in the previous two years (£11 million) and yet the Church was dealing with people who had very little and there was a duty to raise a voice on their behalf. He felt a duty to do that. He supported Professor Werritty. The issue was not so much about the actual figure of quota but rather having time to review the matter properly so that the Mission Board could think how it might use the money. At present, less than 5% of the funding balance was for external purposes and that was not good enough. He agreed with the comment made earlier in the Synod by the Rev Canon Fay Lamont about having to be "real". There was a need to think about service rather than work and the Church's vocation to a better humanity. He urged that money be brought into the centre of the Synod.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that the idea of freezing quota had come not from Professor Atkinson originally but from the Standing Committee who had indicated that they had considered it. He was disappointed that they had decided to turn it down. He wished to adopt a pastoral view. He believed the local church was the hope of the Scottish Episcopal Church and it was God's primary means to re-evangelise the nation. The Synod had been encouraged to go and proclaim the Gospel but the Synod had also heard of the shocking statistics which projected decline. That had not been taken on as seriously as was needed. He was disappointed that the Standing Committee had decided not to freeze quota when it could have done so in the light of the surplus. Most churches did not run on surpluses and were indeed running on empty and it would be a great encouragement to such churches to be told that quota was being frozen. The Synod had a pastoral responsibility to the whole church and a freeze on quota might encourage local churches to put more into outreach or to help alleviate child poverty locally. The current economic climate would hit local churches harder in the current year and the Synod had the opportunity to bless churches financially. Surpluses might be built up for a rainy day but for many churches it was already raining and the roof was leaking.

Mr Gordon thanked everyone for their contributions which would be considered by Standing Committee. He agreed that making financial considerations central to the decision-making process was a point well made.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) asked, on a point of order, whether, if the original Motion were not to be passed, it would achieve the same result as the amendment. The Primus responded that the process for considering the amendment was under way and needed to be followed through.

The amendment was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 58 in favour, 45 against, 3 abstentions.

The Rev Willie Shaw (Edinburgh) asked what the effect of Synod voting against the amended Motion would be. The Secretary General explained that the practice of Synod was to fix the amount of provincial quota on an annual basis. If Synod choose not to pass the Motion he suggested that the matter would in effect have to be remitted to the Standing Committee acting on behalf of the Synod. There would be no other way of dealing with it.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) disagreed and said that if the Motion were not to be passed, the Province would close down. Quota could not be collected from a church which voted against collecting quota. He believed Synod needed to say that it would cough up.

The amended Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, 5 against.

10.3 Elections – Administration Board

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the Rev Amanda Fairclough, the Rev Christine Fraser and the Rev David Gifford as General Synod representatives to the Administration Board.

10.4 Scottish Episcopal Institute Valedictory Service and Close of Synod

The Synod closed with the Scottish Episcopal Institute Valedictory Service at the end of which the Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and gave the blessing on Saturday 9 June 2018.