

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD IN HYBRID FORMAT AT ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH, EDINBURGH AND ONLINE ON 9-11 JUNE 2022

Freshers' Meeting

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

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 9 June 2022.

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. He was delighted that it had been possible to welcome members and guests in person, as well as those joining the meeting online. The world had changed significantly since the most recent "in person" meeting of Synod, in 2019. It was good to be together again but there was a need to be patient and kind to one another. The Church could offer hope and a fresh way of being a good society. In the words of the Gospel reading of the day, the Church brought "good news" even in the face of fear and anxiety.

It was proving difficult to "go and make disciples of all nations... teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you". How could good news be offered to those struggling to find a safe place to live, to feed their families or to heat their homes – or to a world at the mercy of those unwilling to change how they treated the planet or who destroyed their neighbours. The Church offered hope by the way its members behaved, by the love they showed and by a determination to lead Christ-like lives.

Following lockdown, the Church was in a place where it needed to help the rebuilding of community. The Synod would continue its work towards being a more sustainable and environmentally friendly institution and would hear of work being undertaken to support the people of Ukraine. It was important for those stumbling or struggling to regain their feet, to remember that Jesus had said "I am with you always, to the end of the age".

Finally, the Primus commented on recent UK Government immigration policy that those arriving in the UK on boats would be sent to Rwanda. For many reasons, that was not an acceptable policy, and he would write to the Home Secretary. Those fleeing to the UK came not out of choice, but in an act of desperation. There had to be a better way of addressing the situation.

An online offering was taken to support the work of the Disasters Emergency Committee's Appeal for Ukraine. The offering amounted to £998.77 including Gift Aid.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Preliminary Business

1.1.1 Welcome

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

The Rev Ross Blackman (Church of Scotland)
The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church)
Major David Kavanagh (Salvation Army)
Mr Matt Driver (Focolare)
Ms Rita Docherty (Interfaith Scotland)
Mr Stephen Hagan (Baptist Union of Scotland)
Msgr Philip Kerr (Roman Catholic Church)
The Rev Mike Marsden (United Free Church of Scotland)
The Rev Mark Slaney (Methodist Church in Scotland)
Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends)
Dr Heather Payne (Church in Wales).

1.1.2 Appointment of Tellers

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Malcolm Bett and Miriam Weibye be appointed as tellers for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.1.3 Appointment of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Sarah Murray proposed, and the Very Rev Frances Burberry seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon David Richards be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed unanimously.

The Rev Canon Dave Richards proposed, and the Rev Canon Dr James Currall seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Very Rev Sarah Murray be appointed as Clerical Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed *nem con* as follows: 52 in favour, 1 abstention.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Ms Jenny Whelan seconded, the following Motion:

“That James Gibson be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed unanimously.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Ms Whelan seconded, the following Motion:

“That Maureen McKellar be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed unanimously.

1.1.4 Permission to Speak

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That invited representatives from other churches and faiths be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Dr Michael Hull, Patsy Thomson and the Rev William Shaw, be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* as follows: 105 in favour, 1 abstention.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Markus Dünzkofer be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That Sabine Chalmers of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That members of the Provincial Environment Group (Dr Val Cameron, Cathy Johnston and Robert Woodford), be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* as follows: 107 in favour, 1 abstention.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That Alan McLean QC be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That Claire Benton-Evans and members of the provincial Youth Network be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con* as follows: 108 in favour, 1 abstention.

1.1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2020

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 10-11 June 2021”.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 93 in favour, 1 against and 15 abstentions.

1.1.6 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken from the electronic records of the meeting. A total of 118 members attended.

SESSION TWO: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Standing Committee – Covid-19 Pandemic, Accounts, Budget and Quota Overview

2.1.1 Covid-19 Pandemic

The Rev Canon Dave Richards (Edinburgh) spoke as a member of the Standing Committee. Sir Winston Churchill had said "never waste a good crisis" and the Standing Committee had wanted to take some time in this first in-person Synod meeting for three years, to reflect on how members of Synod had coped, what might be learned and to recognise how people might be feeling.

He commended members by saying "thank you and well done" – for the ways in which people had served, led, prayed, cared, ministered, adapted and kept going. Prof Jason Leitch, the National Clinical Director for Scotland had said that during the Covid pandemic the Church in Scotland had "played a blinder".

Canon Richards thanked the SEC Advisory Group. He had not always agreed with its guidance, but it had been very helpful to have the advice of an external group on which to rely.

Canon Richards then shared his own personal experience of lockdown. On the first Easter Sunday over 5,000 people had watched St Paul's & St George's online services (they had nothing else to do!), the church had been featured on the BBC Scotland website three times, and a woman from south India had joined their first online Alpha Course and committed her life to Christ. But then the novelty had worn off and eventually he had hit a wall, physically, psychologically, emotionally and spiritually. He had struggled to lead himself, let alone a church. Rhythms of work, life, worship and prayer had been "blown out of the water". Through the help of family, friends, colleagues and a Jesuit Spiritual Director he had got better but it had remained a struggle. Speaking after lockdown, it was almost as if it had not happened at all.

Canon Richards invited Synod members to share their experience with one another.

Synod members, in table groups, then considered the following questions:

- *What has encouraged you in church life in the last two years?*
- *What have you found challenging in church life in the last two years?*
- *What have you learned and what will you take forward from the last two years?*

The Chair opened the meeting for comment from the discussion groups, noting that the points arising in those discussion groups would be collated after the meeting. Comments made in table groups are available at: <https://www.scotland.anglican.org/wp-content/uploads/General-Synod-2022-Full-Record-of-Table-Discussions-Session-2-SC.pdf>

Mrs Jan Whiteside (Glasgow and Galloway) reported that one positive aspect arising from the pandemic had been the increase in pastoral care. In some places, where there had not previously been a pastoral care team, but people had come together to provide such care.

Dr David Simmons (Glasgow and Galloway) observed that there had been a pulling together within congregations during the pandemic. Another encouragement had been developing online worship.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) noted that the pandemic had exposed divisions within society, particularly in relation to technology and the fact that there had been a "one size fits all" approach which took no account of distinctions such as age, poverty, etc. There had been a sense of anger from younger adults that the Church had not spoken out against the imposition of restrictions by Government. The Church had not been good at listening to such angry voices.

The Rev Canon Terry Taggart (Aberdeen and Orkney) reported that in some places the level of giving had improved – that had been an indication of how much people wanted to offer their support.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) suggested that the danger of "getting back to normal" was simply to reinstate things to the way they had been before. There was a need to come to terms with how to relate to those who had stopped coming to church.

The Rev Dr Ruth Green (Aberdeen and Orkney) reported on a comment in her group that there had been more change in the first three weeks of lockdown than there had been in years. It was encouraging that "change is possible".

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) noted that one of the challenges for the Church had been that everyone had been through a collective trauma without actually being physically together. The experience had been different for everyone and there had been no defined end to the trauma. There was still a need to work through such trauma, for example, in workplaces and for both young and older people.

Mrs Maureen McKellar (Argyll and The Isles) reported that the challenges had been different for different people. Some people had enjoyed online services, others had not. There had been real challenges around dying, funerals and people in care homes.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) suggested that the experience of not meeting together raised questions about what it meant to be church, to be Episcopalians and about the implications for sacramental theology.

The Rev Canon Neil Brice (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that there had been some learning that the Eucharist might not be the most central form of worship. Non-Eucharistic worship was still being appreciated online.

The Rev Libby Talbot (Edinburgh) suggested that church members had discovered how important personal discipleship was in their ability to sustain themselves during the pandemic. Another discovery had been how flexible the Church could be in worship, and it was important not to lose that for the future.

The Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that change was good but was hard. One had learned that what might seem catastrophic at the outset might prove not to be so. The pandemic had also highlighted injustices in society and underlined the need to act.

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that, contrary to an earlier speaker, the Church might have learned that the Eucharist in fact was the most central act of worship.

Mr Graham Nicholson (Brechin) noted that the sense of community had increased significantly.

The Chair thanked Canon Richards for leading the session.

2.1.2 Accounts

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) expressed thanks to the Advisory Group for its work during the pandemic. In her local church, she had found the guidance issued by the Group very helpful. She also thanked the Secretary General and the whole team at the General Synod Office for their work in supporting the Province in particularly difficult circumstances. She also expressed particular thanks to the Treasurer and his assistants for their excellent work on accounts and budgets.

Ms Campbell turned to the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021. She reminded Synod members that at the Synod meeting the previous year she had outlined an intention on the part of the Standing Committee to address issues of vision and strategy. The discussion at that meeting had provided rich feedback. Following the Synod, she had undertaken a series of discussions as a preliminary step but owing to the extra work arising from the ongoing pandemic and a need to deal with other matters, the Standing Committee had decided to pause the work for the time being. Nevertheless, it was making progress with drawing up an overall picture of the work of boards and committees which she hoped would be helpful to all.

Ms Campbell referred members to the audited Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021. The Standing Committee members were the charity trustees of the General Synod and were therefore responsible for preparing the Annual Report and Accounts. They were prepared on a going concern basis and the Committee had assessed the Synod's ability to continue as a going concern. In formal terms, the Committee had a reasonable expectation that the General Synod had adequate resources to continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future. That did not mean that the Committee was complacent.

Ms Campbell explained information projected on PowerPoint slides for the meeting. The total income for 2021 had been approximately £2.6 million. The largest component of income was investment income, followed by quota from dioceses. After deduction of expenditure, the overall result for the year had been a deficit of approximately £96,700. Page 19 of the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021 comprised the statement relating to the General Fund. That detailed all unrestricted and undesignated income and expenditure and provided a good picture of the overall financial position.

Ms Campbell reported that in 2021 there had continued to be considerable cost savings because many normal activities had had to be curtailed. In addition, income had been greater than expected. The Standing Committee was grateful for the good performance of the Unit Trust Pool which had allowed the Investment Committee to agree a larger than anticipated increase in the rate of distribution. That had added more than £113,000 to income. The unrealised value of investments had also increased, and the 2021 accounts showed a total gain of £7.4 million for which Ms Campbell expressed thanks to the Investment Committee and fund managers.

Ms Campbell reminded Synod that in order to provide dioceses with a degree of flexibility in responding to financial challenges arising from the pandemic, General Synod had previously set a level of quota for 2021 which was significantly lower than in previous years. The Committee had also been pleased to have been able to redistribute some of the financial "benefits" of the Covid-19 restrictions by inviting applications to a Recovery and Renewal Fund. She expressed gratitude to dioceses for their efforts in helping charges make worthwhile applications. The quality of applications had been such that the total amount to be distributed from the Fund had been increased to £300,000. It had been good to hear about the work on recovery and renewal taking place in different churches across the country.

She indicated that the Treasurer, Malcolm Bett, was available to answer any detailed questions regarding the Accounts.

The Chair invited questions and comments.

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to address the question of statistics arising from the Annual Report. The statistics showed an overall contraction in membership of 4.5%, excluding the charges which had left the denomination. They also showed a 6.7% contraction in communicant numbers. He suggested that that was the context for any strategic discussion and work undertaken by the Synod. If reduction in numbers continued at that rate it would be easy to achieve net zero carbon emissions because there would be net zero membership within the lifetime of some of those present at Synod. He suggested that more should be made of the numbers in the discussions at Synod. He asked that there should be more years of statistical comparison contained in the documentation for Synod. He suggested it should be a standing item on the synodical agenda to address the realities of such a statistical report. He believed that the Synod did not take such matters as seriously as it needed to.

Ms Campbell thanked Dr Grant for his comments. The specific figures for Aberdeen and Orkney did not compare like for like but she agreed that the need to understand context was important.

Dr David Simmons (Glasgow and Galloway) applauded the distribution of funds to the Pension Fund. In response, it was explained that that had taken place a number of years previously. Ms Campbell noted that the world was changing fast and it was important that the Church did not find itself stuck in a particular place.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (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 2021."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 101 in favour, 1 abstention.

2.1.3 Budgets

Ms Campbell then turned to consider future budgets. She explained that boards agreed budgets each autumn for the following year and indicative budgets for the two years after that. Standing Committee considered the budgets and associated requests for funding from the General Fund when it met in November. In the course of the previous few months there had been a number of decisions with implications for budgets arising since November 2021 and Standing Committee had carried out a further review of budgets in April 2022. That was an indication of the need to be able to be responsive to fast-changing circumstances.

The focus of the Committee in its oversight of the Synod's finances was on the General Fund the budget for which was contained on page 65 of the Synod papers. Accurate budgeting continued to be very challenging. It was still not clear how far patterns of working would be changed permanently following the pandemic and, more significantly, the economic situation had changed significantly since General Synod 2021. The impact of the Russian invasion of Ukraine and of the UK leaving the European Union continued to develop in ways which were difficult to predict. The rate of inflation was higher at the present time than had been predicted even a few months previously. Everyone needed to work together to come to terms with the reality of the changed and changing situation. This was a challenge for congregations, dioceses and Province. Working towards the net zero target on carbon emissions was also an issue requiring resource.

The Committee had considered how it could help. One of the responses to Covid-19 had been to reduce quota for 2021 to £600,000 with a view to a gradual phased increase to £750,000 by 2024. In the light of financial pressures being experienced by charges, including the impact of higher rates of inflation, the Committee was proposing to Synod that the quota increase for 2023 be limited to only £25,000 (giving a total figure for provincial quota of £685,000) and also that the period over which the increase to £750,000 would be phased be extended by a further year to 2025.

Ms Campbell reminded the meeting that Synod 2021 had taken a significant decision to adopt a new stipend policy, the result of which was that stipend increases for the following few years would be in excess of inflation. At the time the policy had been agreed it had not been anticipated that inflation would be at the current high levels. Standard Stipend for 2023 was yet to be agreed but it was expected that the increase was likely to be at least 7%. That would mean increases of around £2,500- £3,000 for charges with stipendiary clergy. Standing Committee had agreed to use £300,000 of reserves to help ease the transition to the increased stipend rates. Transitional Stipend Assistant Grants would be provided to dioceses to enable them to provide financial support to charges finding the greatest difficulty. Grants of £200,000 would be provided in 2023 and a further £100,000 in 2024. That assistance was not intended to cover the entirety of the increases but rather to provide a breathing space to enable charges to adapt to the new economic realities.

In setting the budgets for 2022-2024, the Standing Committee had agreed to deficit budgets to ensure that the ongoing work of various boards and committees was adequately funded. It had agreed to provide funding for an additional full-time Safeguarding Training Officer, proposed by the Provincial Safeguarding Committee, and to the development of a provincial training programme for curates at the stage of Initial Ministerial Training 4-6 and further funding for mixed mode ordinands, which had been proposed by the Institute Council.

As a result, it was likely that almost all of the existing revenue reserves of £809,000 would be used over the following two to three years and that it would be likely to be necessary to sell investments to fund deficits from 2024. The Committee would work with the Investment Committee to consider options.

Ms Campbell explained that the Synod would return later in the meeting to vote on the specific proposal regarding quota.

The Chair invited comment.

The Very Rev Frances Burberry (Edinburgh) thanked the Standing Committee for the prospective provision of Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants. She noted that pension contributions would also be affected and asked whether the grants were intended to include support for increased pension costs. Ms Campbell confirmed that the Standing Committee was aware of the point but that the detail of the grant provision was yet to be worked out.

The Chair thanked Ms Campbell, the Standing Committee and staff for their work.

2.2 Faith and Order Board

2.2.1 Introduction

The Most Rev Mark Strange (Primus and Convener, Faith and Order Board) explained that the material from the Faith and Order Board for Synod was spread over several sessions. The work of the Board continued to be full of challenge and change. The report of the Board contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2021 provided an indication of the work carried out by the Board and its committees. The Board had originally intended to present a first reading of the discipline Canons which had been the subject of work by the Canonical Review Group. Unfortunately, owing to the difficulties with which the College of Bishops had been wrestling in recent months the Review Group had rightly advised that Synod 2022 would not be the moment to bring such Canons forward. There were matters that still needed further consideration including the issue of suspension and matters affecting the College of Bishops and the Episcopal Synod. A particular task was to consider the work of the Episcopal Synod and that of the Primus. The Faith and Order Board had therefore agreed to set up a small working group to consider the extent to which decisions and actions on the part of

the Primus, the College of Bishops and the Episcopal Synod were currently subject to sufficient measures of transparency and accountability and to consider the extent to which such issues should be subject to accountability if they were not already. The Group would also be asked to make recommendations to the Board. He hoped that that piece of work would be concluded in time for the Faith and Order Board to discuss it in advance of General Synod 2023 in the context of the work of the Canonical Review Group.

At the current Synod, the Board was bringing forward proposed liturgical changes and a first reading of Canon Four and he thanked those who had been involved in preparing such material.

2.2.2 Liturgy Committee – Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021)

The Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor (Convener, Liturgy Committee) referred to the Committee's report in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021. Since then, the liturgy pages on the provincial website had been reconfigured and the material authorised for experimental use was now posted on a separate subpage with a link to a new online feedback platform. He encouraged members of the Church to use that platform and provide comment and reflection on their experience whether as officiants or members of congregations.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) then demonstrated the online feedback platform. He reminded Synod members that a number of years previously the process for adopting changes to liturgy had been altered so that the process was now similar to that for adopting a new Canon. The Committee had struggled to obtain feedback on experimental liturgies at an earlier stage, and so the platform would enable the gathering of feedback earlier than awaiting a formal second reading, when the possibility of making changes was more restricted.

Dr Taylor reported that the use of Zoom to introduce newly authorised material and provide opportunity for clergy and lay people to ask questions had proved worthwhile and would be continued.

Dr Taylor then turned to the revised text of the Scottish Liturgy 1982 which had received a first reading at General Synod 2021 and was now being proposed for second reading and the text of which was set out in the Synod papers. Comments from Diocesan Synods were also reproduced in the Synod papers, and he expressed thanks to members of all Diocesan Synods and the members of the Faith and Order Board for their suggestions. A number of the suggestions had been adopted by the Board and incorporated into the text which was now submitted to Synod. These included the insertion of an asterisk to indicate those parts of the Liturgy which could appropriately be spoken by the Deacon, the moving from the appendix to the main text of the alternative words for the offertory, variations to the opening address to God in the post-Communion prayers and the consecutive numbering of the Eucharistic Prayers. Not all suggestions from

Diocesan Synods had been adopted by the Board, the reasons for which were explained in the Synod papers.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021) be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time.”

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) noted the accidental omission of some of the asterisks for the participation of the Deacon, including that relating to the dismissal. He wondered what the other omissions were.

The Rev Canon Peter Moger (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the Liturgy Committee for its work. He wished to ask the question "how do we know what Episcopalians believe?" The answer was to be found in the Liturgy. When people were ordained, they were asked to agree the faith of the Church as expressed in the Scottish Prayer Book as a doctrinal norm. Liturgy mattered for both the Church's identity and theology. He commended many of the changes being made not least in the avoidance of gender exclusive language where that was appropriate. The Diocese of Argyll and The Isles had proposed an amendment which the Faith and Order Board had resisted. He believed the Board was probably right to have resisted the amendment for the reasons given in the Synod papers. However, it raised a broader question namely whether the Church wished to continue to retain the notion that God was a "God of power and might", as included in the Sanctus. In the opening Eucharist of Synod, the wording included in the Sanctus had been "Lord God of Hosts" which was the language the Roman Catholic Church had adopted in its most recent revision of the Mass. That wording was also included in the Scottish Prayer Book. He invited Synod to consider whether it wanted to express belief in terms of "power and might", given what was happening in the world at the present time. "Lord God of Hosts" expressed the angelic nature of joining Earth and Heaven in the Sanctus. He therefore wished Synod to consider whether it might wish to consider following the lead given by the Roman Catholic Church – and perhaps lead where other Anglican provinces might follow.

Dr Taylor responded to the points raised. Asterisks had been inadvertently omitted in paragraph 20 on page 111 of the Synod papers and in paragraph 26 on page 113. These would be corrected if the Synod agreed a second reading. He accepted that the power language of the Sanctus was problematic as was the question of how literally members of the Church understood references to angels. A further option might be to revert to the Hebrew. It was an issue which would need to be reflected upon in the future.

The Motion was put to the vote. As a result of a technical issue arising in relation to electronic voting, which resulted in inaccuracies, the voting was re-run in houses with following result:

House of Clergy: 44 in favour, 6 against, 2 abstentions
House of Laity: 46 in favour, 2 against, no abstentions
House of Bishops: 7 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Chair declared the motion passed.

SESSION THREE: THE RT REV BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Faith and Order Board

3.1.1 Liturgy Committee

The Rev Canon Nicholas Taylor (Convener, Liturgy Committee) explained that the three books of Pastoral Offices for Priests, Deacons and Readers and other Authorised Lay Ministers had been authorised for experimental use in 2017. Unusually for rites in their experimental use phase, they had been printed and distributed in hard copy. Much of the material was derived from rites already included in the schedule to Canon 22 and had therefore been tested, through synodical process, as well as through scrutiny by the Faith and Order Board and College of Bishops and could therefore be deemed to give true expression to the doctrine of the SEC. The decision to produce distinct collections of material for the different orders of ministry gave testimony to the value which the SEC placed on deacons and lay readers and other laity exercising authorised ministries, as well as upon priests.

It was intended to ensure that those using the booklets could be confident that they were authorised to use the material and did not need to consult rubrics in small print to ascertain that. Some material which had been omitted when the booklet had been authorised for experimental use had now been included: provision for baptism outside public worship with explicit provision for welcoming into the congregation those who had been so baptised; material for use with the bereaved at the time of death, currently published in the Funeral Rites 1987. The material for use with the dying included psalmody in both contemporary and traditional language and that in contemporary language was drawn from Daily Prayer which itself was undergoing revision. Negotiation was underway with the copyright holder regarding the adoption of a contemporary Psalter in which matters such as gendered language had been ameliorated. He expected that it would be possible to substitute the Psalms in the Pastoral Offices before submitting the booklets to General Synod for a second reading.

The adoption for first reading of the Pastoral Offices were the subject of three successive motions each of which he commended to Synod.

Pastoral Offices for Priests

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Priests be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.”

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) spoke in support of all three Pastoral Offices but with two reservations. He particularly appreciated the prefaces to the booklets and the variety of prayers for different pastoral situations. His first reservation was the size of the book which he considered to be unwieldy. He asked that it be reduced in size and also, if possible, that the rubrics be printed in red. His second reservation related to the reference to intinction of the wafer and allowing it to dry which he believed ought to be removed from all three Offices. He considered that the suggestion was an innovation and had not previously been done in the history of the Church. It was now clear that there was no reason why Communion could not be received in one kind and there might be pastoral reasons for doing that in some situations. Wine stains did not have any place in the Sacrament. It had no basis in theology, sacramental practice or the history of the Church.

The Rev Genevieve Evans (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the print was too small for use in dark hospital rooms. She asked the Committee to think about accessibility and, in particular, the print size.

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked about the rationale for the compression of the creed/confession of faith. It was not clear to him why question four in the Baptismal Liturgy was compressed.

Dr Taylor accepted the points regarding the size of the booklets and print size. The Rites were available on the website as well as in printed versions and so could be downloaded and adapted. The Committee would do its utmost to find a format which suited as many people as possible. As to the use of dried intincted wafers, that reflected pastoral practice in some parts of the world. The rubrics had been written prior to the pandemic and had been reflected upon afresh. It was possible that that provision ought to be reviewed before second reading. As to the use of the creed in the Baptismal Offices there was a wide variety of possible pastoral circumstances in which emergency baptism might be offered. The formulation had been developed to cater for as many pastoral situations as possible.

The motion was put to the vote in houses with the following result:

House of Clergy: 49 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions
House of Laity: 52 in favour, none against, 1 abstention
House of Bishops: 7 in favour, none against, no abstentions

The Chair declared the motion passed.

Pastoral Offices for Deacons

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Deacons be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.”

The Motion was put to the vote in houses with the following result:

House of Clergy: 48 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions
House of Laity: 51 in favour, none against, 1 abstention
House of Bishops: 7 in favour, none against, no abstentions

The Chair declared the motion passed.

Pastoral Offices for Readers and Authorised Lay Ministers

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Readers and Authorised Lay Ministers be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said he was not clear what "authorised lay ministers" meant. Those which the Province recognised were those mentioned in the schedule to Canon 66, namely Church Army officers. However, the preamble to the Rite suggested that it was for people who were authorised by Bishops "to do things" but those things were not specified. The way lay people were authorised differed from diocese to diocese and it was therefore difficult for him to support the material when it was unclear for whom it was intended.

Dr Taylor responded by explaining that the Rites had been drafted on the instruction of the Faith and Order Board. It was not intended to prescribe what Bishops might do in their own dioceses and the wording was therefore as comprehensive as possible to cover different usages across the Province.

The motion was then put to the vote in houses with the following result:

House of Clergy: 40 in favour, 9 against, 5 abstentions
House of Laity: 46 in favour, 2 against, 5 abstentions
House of Bishops: 7 in favour, none against, no abstentions

The Chair declared the motion passed.

Scottish Calendar - Commemoration of Figures of the Reformation Period until the Repeal of the Penal Laws

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended to include the Commemoration of Scottish Saints and Martyrs of the Reformation Period on 19 January.”

Dr Taylor explained that the Calendar had been cause for reflection, not only in Scotland but across the Anglican Communion, as had been reported to the previous meeting of General Synod. The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation had appointed a working group to consider a number of issues experienced across the Communion and also to reflect on ways in which the diversity of Christian experience and witness might appropriately be shared among member churches. In many parts of the Communion there were issues of historic injustice where the Church had been associated with colonialism, slavery and suppression of indigenous cultures. Such issues needed to be borne in mind in the formation of liturgical calendars. He commented on the process for making new commemorations in the Scottish Calendar. Canon 22.8 allowed the General Synod to alter the Calendar on a recommendation from the Faith and Order Board. When the Board received a proposal, it normally delegated to the Liturgy Committee the task of investigating the case and making a recommendation to the Board. It remained a decision for the Board as to whether a recommendation for change ought to be brought to General Synod. The process followed by the Liturgy Committee did not follow the process of any other denomination and certainly did not require evidence of miracles. Rather, the Committee considered the merits of the person and the Church's mission in the present time. The person who submitted a proposal to the Board was invited to give a more detailed presentation in writing to the Liturgy Committee and to meet the Committee to make a verbal presentation and respond to questions or comments from Committee members. The Committee might also consult any relevant publications by, or about, the person in question and seek advice from other experts. It was for the Committee to assess whether the Christian witness of the individual in question was of such enduring relevance in the life of the Church as to warrant inclusion in the Calendar and to submit a recommendation to the Board.

Dr Taylor explained that the unique history of Scotland raised particular issues of memory and commemoration, particularly during the Reformation period and the period thereafter during which the Church had been subject not merely to discriminatory and restrictive legislation with significant judicial sanctions, but also at times to extrajudicial violence. The Committee and the Board had given considerable attention to that issue in the previous few years and had been mindful not only of the complex history but also of the significant developments in ecumenical relations in recent decades. He emphasised that the work was ongoing and that the motions relating to the Calendar being brought to Synod were not expected to conclude reflection on such matters which were complex and for many still quite painful.

He explained that the motion to commemorate saints and martyrs of the Reformation period on 19 January was intentionally ecumenical in spirit, deliberately set within the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity and recognising that those who had suffered represented the diversity of

Christian expression in Scotland at the time and also that the SEC and its ecumenical partners remained committed to overcoming the bitterness of past divisions and to building ever closer working relationships.

Dr Taylor explained that the second motion proposed a commemoration of members of the Church who had suffered under the penal laws. The proposal was for a commemoration on 15 June, the date in 1792 when the repeal of those penal laws had taken effect. The names of those who had suffered were largely unknown, and unnumbered, but their fidelity in the face of adversity had made possible the emergence of the Church of which Synod members were privileged to be members and which had played a distinctive role in the formation of what had become the Anglican Communion.

Ms Helen Vincent (Edinburgh) supported the motion. She was a little concerned that the focus on the division of the Reformation period might obscure other religious developments during that period such as the search for truth and the desire to "get back to basics". It was good to acknowledge that the desire to find truth and advance liturgy happened on "both sides". However, it would also be good, she suggested, in the general commemoration to include some specific names whose stories could be shared with congregations. The Church had platforms on which to tell such stories. Matters which might be covered could include the pioneering liturgical work of the compilers of the Aberdeen Breviary of 1508, the concern for clergy education which had resulted in Archbishop Hamilton's catechism in the 1550s, and the liberation of the conception of oneself as a soul directly in relation to God which inspired the creativity of women like Elizabeth Melville and Esther Inglis. The human beings at the heart of the Reformation could be inspirational even in their imperfections. It was encouraging that the Church "on both sides" took the best part of the period of the Reformation into the new medium of print.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) explained that he had earlier that morning drawn to the attention of the Primus, the Convener of the Liturgy Committee and the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane that he had discovered the previous day that the Liturgical Commission of the Scottish Catholic Bishops' Conference had been discussing the possibility of a collective commemoration of the saints of Scotland. Those discussions were in their early stages, and he was thankful for the response of those to whom he had spoken. He expressed the hope that, in future, if the saints and martyrs of the Reformation were being commemorated that was done in conversation with the Roman Catholic Church and its Liturgical Commission and also with the Church of Scotland. The Churches had been involved in persecuting one another and it was important to move forward together and possibly have a common date for such commemorations. A common date had been agreed between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales.

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 97 in favour, 4 against, 9 abstentions.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended to include the Commemoration of Members of the Church who suffered under the Penal Laws on 15 June.”

Dr David Simmons (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the date of 1792 was before the abolition of slavery. He had been pleased to hear from Dr Taylor that issues of slavery and colonialism were already in consideration. An issue under consideration in the University of Glasgow, where he worked, was the financial legacy of slavery and he wondered whether the Faith and Order Board might wish to consider that.

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 97 in favour, 3 against, 11 abstentions.

In closing the session, the Chair thanked Dr Taylor, the Liturgy Committee and the Faith and Order Board.

SESSION FOUR: THE VERY REV SARAH MURRAY IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Faith and Order Board – Committee on Canons – Canon Four (Of the Calling and Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees)

The Most Rev Mark Strange (Primus and Convener, Faith and Order Board) opened the session by thanking all those who had worked on the review of Canon Four in order to bring a first reading to the current meeting.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh and Convener of the Canon Four Review Group) was pleased to be able to present a first reading of Canon Four on behalf of the Faith and Order Board. The topic would be familiar to those who had been members of General Synod in recent years. The Canon Four Review Group had consulted widely including many who had been electors or candidates in elections under the current Canon Four. Insights had been invited from General Synod and Diocesan Synod members and in 2021 the Review Group had presented two options for Synod’s consideration. The first had offered a more radical reinvention of the electoral process, the second, a gentler revision. Synod had preferred the second option and the text presented to the current meeting reflected that.

Bishop Armes wished to caution against unrealistic expectations of what a Canon could deliver. A Canon could not make those involved in the election process people of prayer. The election of a Bishop was a matter of vocation and spiritual discernment. The canonical process could provide a framework for that but was not a substitute for it. Those called to elect a Bishop were required to bring their whole selves to the process prayerfully, humbly and with open minds attentive to the Holy Spirit. Those called to be candidates were themselves in a process of discernment in which they offered themselves into the hands of the electoral Synod. At every stage there was a need to give primacy to God.

In itself, a Canon was impersonal and it was up to those involved to inject humanity into the process. In any process there was a need for those involved to treat one another with kindness and grace, as friends who loved one another, in obedience to Christ. That especially applied to the way candidates were treated in the process and was why the Board planned to provide not only a commentary explaining the Canon but also guidelines as to best practice on how an election ought to be run. Outlines of both commentary and guidelines were contained in the Synod papers and if the Synod gave the Canon a first reading, full versions of those supporting documents would be available the following year.

The process could not ensure that there would be sufficient numbers of candidates for the shortlists. The Church therefore needed to be intentional about identifying and nurturing clergy for senior leadership roles. Discernment needed to begin long before any episcopal vacancy was announced. Discerning the work that the Holy Spirit was already doing in no way contradicted belief that the Holy Spirit would enable the choosing and, through the sacrament of ordination, the further empowering of the person ultimately chosen to be Bishop. The members of the Review Group had listened to God in one another as well as within the wider traditions of the Church. As the Group had explored the details of the present Canon Four, the Group had come to understand the underlying reasoning. The Group was proposing a number of significant changes but also acknowledged that there were strong arguments leading to different conclusions, or even to retaining the status quo. However, it believed that the revisions proposed were necessary and important including, for example, the loosening of timescales, the size of the shortlist and the protection of confidentiality for candidates. The Group believed that fewer election processes would end with the Episcopal Synod as a result of the revisions and that, even when that did happen, the Canon required the Episcopal Synod to meet with the diocesan members of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr Graham Robertson (Convener, Committee on Canons) addressed the main changes incorporated in the Canon being proposed to Synod. The Committee had been instructed by the Faith and Order Board following the latter's meeting in August 2021 and the Canon being presented to the current meeting incorporated the recommendations of the Canon Four Review Group. It was not a complete rewriting of the Canon but rather a substantial revision. A different format for the text had been adopted including shorter sentences and paragraphs for ease of reference and comprehension. The Committee had tried to minimise obtuse legal language, but the regulatory nature of any Canon nevertheless required a degree of formal and precise wording. Mr Robertson outlined the main changes as follows:

- The heading of the Canon had been changed to read "Of the Calling and Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees", thereby emphasising the importance of discernment on the part of candidates and electors. The importance of suitable training for those involved would be more fully covered in the proposed guidelines and commentary. Section 4 included an obligation on the Diocesan Standing Committee to promote training on the electoral process, as well as in discernment.

- The list of candidates would no longer be made public, and all participants needed to maintain confidentiality until the Bishop-elect confirmed acceptance.
- It was important that delays be minimised, and section 4 provided for preparation of the diocesan description to be commenced as soon as the intention of the Bishop to resign had been intimated.
- The Canon underlined the importance of the Electoral Synod as the body responsible for directing the process. The Preliminary Meeting of that Synod would approve a provisional timetable for all possible meetings of the process and, if necessary, a meeting of the Episcopal Synod. The entire process was to be completed under a single mandate and included all three stages of the process. The first two were elections by the Electoral Synod and only if those stages were not successful would the election pass to the Episcopal Synod. The Canon envisaged the entire process being completed within one year of the date of the vacancy arising. The new Canon dispensed with the prescriptive timetable contained in the existing Canon in favour of greater flexibility.
- The membership of the Preparatory Committee of eleven remained as in the existing Canon with a ratio of six diocesan members to five provincial ones. For a first stage election, the shortlist of candidates was to be a minimum of three, maximum of five. At the second stage the minimum number was reduced to two, the maximum remaining at five.
- The possibility of a "none" vote was retained. For any vote to result in a valid election it was necessary that a candidate received a majority of votes in each of the House of Clergy and the House of Laity. Section 25 provided for two initial votes. If they were inconclusive and there were more than two candidates, a transferable vote took place under the proposed section 26. A successful election could arise at any stage during the transferable vote process but if that did not happen and there were two remaining candidates, a vote under the "first past the post" system would take place. If that was inconclusive, or if there were only two candidates under the earlier first past the post votes, a final vote would take place under section 27. If no candidate achieved a majority in both houses in the final vote, the right of election passed to the Episcopal Synod.
- There were two proposed resolutions under the Canon relating respectively to guidelines for implementation of the process and a commentary for all parties involved. These would be drafted by the Canon Four Review Group and would be presented to Synod 2023 for approval along with appendices to the Canon. One further change in the new Canon was that the members of the Electoral Synod were those in post at the time of the mandate, not, as at present, at the time of the previous Diocesan Synod.

Mr Robertson commended the Canon for first reading.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 4 be read for the first time.”

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to propose an amendment. He explained that whilst the Canon included many terms which were

specifically defined, the term "majority" was not defined. The Oxford English Dictionary gave alternative definitions for the word "majority" in that it might mean either the group or party whose votes amounted to more than half of the total or it might mean the group which had the largest share of the votes. When there were only two alternatives, those definitions coincided but when there was a list of three to five candidates the definitions diverged. In the absence of a definition, it was therefore necessary to infer that the first of those two definitions was intended. He considered it was important to make the matter explicit and, therefore, to introduce the word "absolute" at the relevant places in the Canon.

Dr Birch, therefore, proposed an amendment to the motion so that it would read as follows:

“That the amended text of Canon 4 be read for the first time subject to:

- (i) replacing the words “a majority” with the words “an absolute majority” where they appear in sections 25(f) and (g), 26(i) and (n), and 27(a), (f) and (g); and*
- (ii) replacing the words “the majority” with the words “an absolute majority” where they appear in section 26(a).”*

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded the proposed amendment.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) noted that section 26 (j) of the draft Canon indicated that when two candidates remained the final round of voting would take place using a first past the post system. He suggested that the amendment being proposed would conflict with that. He also emphasised that the process was not the exercise of a democratic right but rather to seek the mind of Christ and perhaps a degree of flexibility in interpreting words and phrases was a good thing.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed agreement with Bishop Riglin's point but also wished to point out that there was not a consistent definition of "absolute majority". In some situations, it might be defined to mean a majority of all of the electors, rather than of the electors present and voting and that would conflict with the rules about quorum.

Mr Robertson explained that the issue of majority needed to be understood in the context of "votes cast". Abstentions were not "votes cast". Majority was therefore not computed on the basis of the number of the electors. He had no great objection to the proposed amendment.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed as follows: 51 in favour, 45 against, 13 abstentions.

The motion, as amended, was then debated.

Dr Anne Martin (Edinburgh) said that one of the concerns which had led to the review of the Canon was the fact that the names on the shortlist were made public and the consequent effect of that on the candidates who were not elected. She was pleased to note that names would in future not be published but she also

noted from section 22 (d) that once the initial proceedings at the Electoral Synod had been completed all subsequent proceedings would be in private and would remain confidential. She asked how it would be possible to ensure that that happened in practice and how to ensure that electors understood that.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) thanked Mr Robertson for explaining the changes incorporated in the proposed new Canon. He also had reservations about the practicality of maintaining confidentiality. He would be interested to know what the perceived flaws in the current Canon were.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke as a member of the Canon Four Review Group and strongly endorsed Bishop Armes' comments about discernment. It was essential that discernment was at the heart of the electoral process. Prayerful engagement needed to underpin all involved in an electoral process. Synod members might be surprised to note that the revised Canon mentioned "discernment" only once. That was, however, appropriate because the issue would be explored more fully in the guidance document. The guidelines would also reflect feedback from the Review Group's wide-ranging consultation. A number of candidates who had not been elected had felt that feedback and pastoral support had been lacking and electors had often found the language of the Canon opaque and challenging to understand. He supported the motion.

The Rev Canon Dave Richards (Edinburgh) supported what Prof Werritty had just said. He welcomed the confidentiality clause. He noted that training was to be provided but the question was how candidates were to be trained and how their vocation was to be discerned. The final paragraph of the paper on the proposed commentary and guidelines, which appeared on page 143 of the Synod papers, was the most important, in talking of discernment of vocation. Where did the Church find the candidates from? Canon Richards referred to what Simon Simic, an expert in organisational change, referred to as "the golden circle". That identified the difference between great and good companies. Good companies talked about the "what/how"; great companies talked about the "why". His concern was that the Canon addressed the what and the how before the Church had addressed the why and the who. Because the SEC was a small church, one of the difficulties of the current debate was that any comment about the episcopacy could be taken as a criticism of current members of the College. He intended no such inference. However, what kind of bishops did the SEC want for the future? They might not be the bishops the Church wanted, but they might be those which the Church needed. What training was given to clergy for senior posts – he was not aware of any. He asked for an exploration of what training might be given to all participants.

Mr Robert Dickson (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that he had served in three different dioceses and, consequently, his comments ought not to be interpreted as referring to any particular diocese. In 1978, the SEC had gone through the humiliating procedure of electing a new Bishop in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. That experience had led to the rewriting of Canon Four. The procedure at that time had been the reverse of the procedure under the current Canon. The Diocese had chosen its Dean as the person to be its new Bishop. The matter had then passed to the College of Bishops to confirm the election, but the College had declined to do so. The Glasgow and Galloway Synod had met again and made the same choice. The College of Bishops was reported

as then having sought guidance from elsewhere and indicated that God had caused them to change their mind and so the election had been ratified. Canon Four had been fundamentally revised after that along the lines of section 17 of the proposed new Canon, which provided for opportunity for the College of Bishops to comment on candidates prior to the election taking place. Since 2016, five dioceses had fallen vacant and had followed the procedure under the existing Canon Four. Why then was it necessary to reconsider the Canon at the present time? He had been invited to act as assessor in one of the election processes. That process ensured confidentiality and he welcomed the provisions of the proposed new Canon in that regard. The same process, he believed, had allowed a warm welcome to be provided to all candidates but sadly it appeared that some other dioceses had not followed that process. There had been a widespread leaking of candidates' names and their views and, if rumours were to be believed, some candidates had been humiliated and embarrassed and poorly treated. It was essential that the future guidance document ensured the treating of all candidates with courtesy, generosity and kindness so that they felt their calling was treated with respect. It was also important to ensure that candidates felt they had been fairly treated. He supported the first reading of the new Canon.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) spoke with some reluctance but felt it important that the voice of a candidate was heard in the debate. He had been involved in Canon Four processes both as a candidate, as a member of a Preparatory Committee and as an elector. He was therefore not simply referring to one election. He invited Synod to reject the first reading of the proposed new Canon. His reason for opposing the first reading was that the draft Canon left in place the Primus, or the Primus' nominee, as the person chairing the process. Having witnessed several elections, he believed that was where the problem lay. He had witnessed utterly shambolic processes. As a candidate, he had been expected to attend a day of interviews without being fed or given drink. He had not been given the room which had been promised beforehand in which to wait. He had been given to believe that complaints which had gone to the Primus about members of the College had gone unresolved for years. The debate thus far had talked about training everyone involved, except the Conveners. There was a need to be more professional. He believed the Personnel Committee should be in charge of the process. The proposals gave more flexibility but for candidates that might not be a good thing since it might mean that the process would go on for longer. The choice was for the names of candidates to be officially published or for them to become known by gossip and the Canon would not improve that state of affairs. He did not believe that the proposals took into account why processes had been so difficult. Candidates went into the process because they loved the Church. It was not difficult not to become a bishop because of the love and care of the diocese. What was difficult was the way candidates were treated. For that reason, with regret, he asked members of Synod to reject the motion.

The Rev Canon Peter Moger (Argyll and The Isles) welcomed the revisions to the Canon and thanked Bishop Armes and Mr Robertson for their introductions. He also strongly endorsed Canon Richards' comments about discernment and vocation and hoped they would be clearly built into the commentary and guidelines. His concern was in relation to the training of those involved in the process. Section 4(c) was not clear about who would promote the training. He assumed from Mr Robertson's earlier comments that that role was for the Standing Committee of the diocese. However, he wondered whether this ought to be a

provincial role, perhaps the provincial Personnel Committee. Also, he suggested that that section ought to "require" not simply "promote" training. The training should be for members of the Electoral Synod and also for candidates. Guidelines in the proposed guidance document to be produced for the following year would be very helpful to clarify what the training might comprise and who would deliver it. It might be provided from within the SEC or from further afield.

The Very Rev Margi Campbell (Argyll and The Isles) did not wish to speak either for or against the motion but wished to support what Provost Holdsworth had said. She too spoke as a candidate. She suggested that, at least as far as she was concerned, she would not have stood in an election process unless she had determined to be content with the outcome, whatever the result was. She was not happy about the language of "failure" entering the process of discernment. She asked that the word "failure" not appear in the commentary or guidelines.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that she would vote against the motion with some reluctance because there were elements which she supported. She had served on the Electoral Synod in the most recent election process in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. She was pleased to see an improvement in the user-friendly nature of the text and layout. Having a clear process would help all involved in the process. She believed the current Canon was not fit for purpose, but she agreed with the comments made by others that the new draft did not address all the concerns. She accepted that it was not possible to introduce humanity into Canon law, but it was possible to introduce some professionalism and consistency. She struggled with the idea that those who were brave enough to put themselves forward for election had to depend on the mood of the College of Bishops and individual personalities. That could be improved by involving a body such as the Personnel Committee. She was concerned about the effect on the pastoral care of candidates of the introduction of the new confidentiality clause. She agreed with the comments of others that confidentiality could not be guaranteed. She also agreed that if the names were not published, they would become known through gossip. She was aware that candidates in the most recent election in her Diocese had found the greatest pastoral support from their local congregation. Not to allow a candidate, who had not been elected, to share their news might make the process worse.

The Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock (Aberdeen and Orkney) pointed out that the Rev Canon Ian Barcroft was a very able Provincial Director of Ordinands who would be able to train people in discernment.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Argyll and The Isles) hoped that the comments made by Provosts Holdsworth and Campbell about the pastoral effects of the process on candidates be taken on board. He himself was the most recent person to have been elected as a Bishop in the SEC. The proposed changes to the Canon were modest but nevertheless important and he particularly welcomed the new provisions on confidentiality. He had found it difficult when his former employer, King's College, London had assumed following publication of the shortlist that he was leaving his post. The concept of discernment had not been understood. There was a need to be realistic about leakage and exercise discipline. As to the involvement of Bishops in the process, the Canon included provision for them to be involved early on. Bishops might know things which they were unable to share with others which might make certain individuals unsuitable to be candidates. The

role of the Primus and the College in nominating conveners was also an important episcopal role. He supported the first reading. He believed the proposed Canon maintained good Anglican practice namely that it was episcopally led and synodically governed.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) explained that he was a member of both the College of Bishops and the Personnel Committee. He would vote in favour of a first reading because he believed that the comments about discernment and professionalism could be addressed in the existing structures. As would be explained in a session later in the meeting, processes were being adopted to enable the Church to handle matters in a competent and safe way. He reminded the Synod that the motion was for a first reading of the Canon and therefore represented the beginning of the process of discussion within the Church. If the motion was not passed there would be greater delay injected into any process of revision.

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the comments made by Canon Richards. If the motion were passed, he suggested that the accompanying text to go to Diocesan Synods and the manner in which it was handled at Diocesan Synods would be a place in which discussion about discernment could be introduced. These were matters which were, in effect, above the level of mere process, and the processes available to the Church for discussion tended to militate against addressing such matters.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) had listened with great interest to the debate and felt differently about the Canon from how she had felt when she had arrived at Synod. It seemed that there was not a settled view being expressed within the Synod. There appeared to be significant questions as to whether revisions to the Canon would be a good thing. It had been said that this was just a first reading and that there would be time to make further amendments. However, it had been implied during debate earlier in the Synod that first reading was the time to "get it right". If the Synod was not ready to accept the Canon as it stood, then it should decline to give it first reading and think about it further. It was a Canon that mattered significantly for the future of the SEC.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) suggested that the objections which he had heard during debate were not so much about the text of the Canon but about the way the process was handled. The handling of the process was not something which could be dealt with by the Canon itself. He did not believe there was a reason to vote against the motion. He thanked those who had spoken for sharing their experience.

Bishop Armes responded to points which had been raised in the discussion. He welcomed many of the points which had been made. In terms of process, he believed that weight should be given to points made in Diocesan Synods and that that should lead to amendments at second reading stage. He disagreed with the view that there was not opportunity to make amendments after first reading. On the question of training, he agreed that it was not for the Canon to address training but that it belonged in the guidelines. The Review Group had been working closely with the Provincial Director of Ordinands during the previous 12 months in order to consider how Electoral Synods might be trained in discernment. That was a provincial resource and if it was felt that the Province could back up what was

provided by a Diocesan Standing Committee, he would welcome that. Certain things could not be dealt with in a Canon and the issues which had been raised by Provost Holdsworth and the experience of candidates was not something which could be legislated for in a Canon. However, there was a need for consistency from one election to the next. Care of candidates would be included in the guidelines and would be available for Synod to consider the following year. As to those who might convene the Preparatory Committee, Bishop Armes indicated that the suggestion that it ought not to be convened by the Primus or his nominee was the first time that he had heard such a comment. He suggested it was a little unfair to put the blame for experiences which had not been what they ought to have been on the person convening the Preparatory Committee. It was the role of the diocese to make sure that the process was done in a courteous way. However, he agreed that failures had happened and that was a reason for having guidelines which would make sure that the diocese and the convener would know what was required of them.

On the question of confidentiality, Bishop Armes pointed out that the present Canon also required confidentiality, and, in previous election processes, members of the Electoral Synod had been relied upon to destroy their papers and to keep confidential what had gone on in the electoral process. It was impossible to ensure confidentiality – there was a need to trust people. He had not himself found that there was a tendency for people to talk about what went on in the electoral process. The difference with the proposed new Canon was that the shortlist would not be made public. There were strong arguments for making the shortlist public, but the Review Group had felt that the cost involved for the candidates was not a price worth paying. Candidates whom the Review Group had interviewed had, almost without exception, referred to the difficult experience of having their name made public. They had explained that their pain was in the fact that people assumed that they wanted to leave their charge. The pain was increased even further if a candidate had not been elected in more than one election process. The Review Group felt it was not fair on the candidates to expect them to have their names exposed in that way, even though there was no shame involved in not being elected. In effect, the proposed new Canon set the bar higher and assumed better of the electorate. There was a difference between a Canon which required names to be published and one that said that the names must not be published and relied upon the goodwill of people to maintain confidentiality.

Bishop Armes believed it was not time to draw back from passing the motion. The discussions had already been going on for a long time.

The amended motion was put to the vote with the following results:

House of Clergy: 35 in favour, 17 against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 40 in favour, 11 against, 1 abstention
House of Bishops: 7 in favour, none against, no abstentions

The Chair declared the motion passed.

SESSION FIVE: THE RT REV BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Presentation from the Church in Wales Representative

Dr Heather Payne, representing the Church in Wales, thanked the Synod for its welcome. She had gained much insight from the debates in the current meeting and would take that wisdom back to her own church. She presented to the Primus a book which had been produced to mark the centenary of the disestablishment of the Church in Wales in 2020.

5.2 Greetings from United Reformed Church Representative

The Rev John Bremner, spoke as representing the United Reformed Church, particularly the Synod of Scotland, and also the Scottish Congregational and United Reformed College. There had been a long history of collaboration between the training bodies in each denomination. The collaboration had been very close, and he brought very warm greetings from the College. He expressed thanks to the Scottish Episcopal Institute and the Institute Council which enriched the United Reformed Church not only within the Scottish Synod but also for students from other parts of the UK who had participated in activities of the SEI. Having known Bishop Riglin for many years, he also brought personal greetings to him and his Diocese.

5.3 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney and Convener, Institute Council) reported that the Institute had had an exceptionally busy year. Staff and students had been having to alternate between online and in-person meetings as a result of the changing circumstances of the Covid-19 pandemic. They had done so with great fortitude and were to be commended. Alongside that, all the necessary administrative work underpinning Common Awards had been undertaken and had been rooted in prayer and formational priorities. She thanked Synod members for their prayers. To deliver such an extensive programme, there were wide-ranging partnerships. Such partnerships were evident in churches where individuals began to sense a call and entered vocational processes. Many people were involved as vocational advisors, training incumbents, tutors, spiritual directors and good friends to those making a formational journey. This was a significant partnership and involved everyone.

Bishop Dyer drew attention to two stories from the previous fortnight which were good examples of how the SEI community could offer something to the wider Church. A new website for the SEI had been launched which included recent news. At the end of May 2022, SEI students had participated in a two-hour webinar on the environment with students in formation in the Episcopal Church in Brazil. In so doing, they offered a model of companion partnership moving beyond letters and prayers to actual contact and listening to one another's stories. The event had been very moving. Secondly, the SEI had received a Common Awards seedcorn grant to be spent on researching how best to "green the curriculum" for SEI, placing creation care at the heart of formation for ministry.

In the current session, the Council wished to ask Synod's wisdom on how the SEI could best resource the wider SEC community.

The Rev Dr Michael Hull (Director of Studies) explained that the principal role of SEI was to train people for the priesthood, the diaconate and for lay readership. It also had a responsibility to facilitate lay learning in the wider Church under the umbrella of "discipleship". The disciples of Jesus had seen him as a rabbi. As present-day disciples, members of the Church sought to learn more of him. Such discipleship was therefore learning for everyone.

Dr Hull explained what steps SEI had taken to support such discipleship. In 2019/2020 SEI had begun a pilot project with the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles and had brought together a group to study Christian doctrine. Ten sessions involving ten individuals had taken place on Skype. The feedback had been positive, and it had led to a discussion on Zoom over a book which again generated positive feedback.

In Lent 2021, Dr Hull had offered a series of discussions "Acting like a Christian". Twenty-seven people had participated. In Advent 2021, he had offered a series "Reading the Bible like an Episcopalian". He had intended a half-hour talk and 30 minutes discussion. In fact, 250 people attended, from across the world. With such numbers, online discussion had not been possible. Since then, there had been a further 400 views on YouTube. For the next series, it had been suggested that videos be prepared in advance and in Lent 2022 there had been a series of six videos on "Episcopalians and their Ethics". Approximately 575 people had viewed the videos. The point of these exercises had been to facilitate learning for the whole Church, and it was clear that people were very interested in learning theology. The SEI had been expanding the Church's devotion to discipleship, not only across the Province, but in some cases across the world.

Dr Hull suggested that there were three "take aways" from these experiences, namely:

- God's people wanted to know more about God.
- The pandemic had forced the SEI into sharpening its technical skills. YouTube, for example, could be a very good avenue for learning and discipleship.
- The SEI needed feedback from the current Synod and the whole Church to discern the voice of the Spirit to help it know what it might offer.

Dr Hull explained that the Rev Willie Shaw and Ms Patsy Thomson would explain how they had made use of SEI resources locally.

The Rev Willie Shaw (Edinburgh) explained that in his charges at Bo'ness and Grangemouth, and his wife's charge at Falkirk, Dr Hull's talk "Reading the Bible as an Episcopalian" had been advertised as their Advent reflection course. The fact that many others had joined the talks from across the Province demonstrated the thirst and need for lay learning as well as the power of online technologies to enable delivery. It had been an encouraging experience. On talking afterwards to those who had attended, it had become clear that there were questions and topics which people wanted to explore more fully. For the second talk, therefore, they had organised a Zoom session locally to allow a half-hour of discussion

following the talk. Approximately six had attended and that had given the opportunity to apply the learning and make the journey from gaining knowledge to discipleship. He suggested that for future events questions might be provided in order to facilitate group discussion. Follow-up conversations could be organised in breakout groups on Zoom which would enable a provincial level of fellowship which would be welcomed.

Patsy Thomson explained that she was a member of the Institute Council and was a lay reader at St Regulus, Cromarty. For her congregation, Zoom had proved a “game changer” and it had continued as a staple element of their mission and ministry. St Regulus was very grateful to the SEI staff for their accessibility and technical expertise in being able to reach out to the congregation. The house style had been affirming and encouraging and also patient. Dr Richard Tiplady's courses on pioneer ministry had allowed them to interact with other people as well as introducing them to current theory and practice. The course had provided energy and inspiration to think "out-of-the-box". It had led the congregation to try an all-age gathering and to enter ecumenical dialogue as the local Church of Scotland took steps to give up its building. Dr Hull had given strong doctrinal and scriptural meat in his Lent and Advent courses. Those in the congregation had felt stretched, affirmed and reinforced. Ms Thomson suggested they would have benefited even more from the additional elements described by Mr Shaw.

During the period of the pandemic the SEI had been consistently present for the laity, sharing attractive newsletters which widened people's perspectives. Access to the learning made everyone feel they were active disciples. In Cromarty they were planning a course based on a Grove booklet "Renewing the Life of the Earth". which had been brought to their attention by SEI. At the same time part of the Church grounds were being turned over to a youth group to develop a wildlife haven and shared garden. Locally, people tended to be more interested in the environment than church attendance and Dr Tiplady's course had enabled the congregation to engage with people outside its building. Dr Hull's course had concluded with a comment that Episcopalians and their ethics went out into all the world through their behaviour and this had encouraged the congregation to move forward.

Synod members, in table groups, then considered the following:

- *What enlivened you in what you heard?*
- *Name three ways – topics, courses or series – in which you think SEI could help support your discipleship and the missional future of the SEC.*

Comments made in table groups are available at: <https://www.scotland.anglican.org/wp-content/uploads/General-Synod-2022-Full-Record-of-Table-Discussions-Session-5-SEI.pdf>

5.4 Mission Board

5.4.1 Introduction

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Convener, Mission Board) explained that the work of the Mission Board in the previous year had produced many different stories. 2022 had been labelled the "Year of Stories" and she suggested

that storytelling was something which churches and Christians were well versed in doing. The Church had a story that was over 2,000 years old and it could still be told by diverse and distinctive voices across the Province.

The Board had been working to listen to the stories in order to share them more widely and explore how the Church could be more effective in telling good news stories. Diocesan representatives on the Board brought news and stories from dioceses. The Rev Audrey O'Brien Stewart had spearheaded Children's Chapel which had brought the story of Jesus to a younger audience in new and creative ways. Initially it had been a weekly offering and had then moved to a monthly one as churches reopened and were able to offer greater in-person provision. Provost Murray expressed the Board's thanks to Canon O'Brien Stewart and to those who had worked alongside her in offering administration support, video editing, etc. The workload of such key people was changing, and the Board was considering how, and whether, Children's Chapel could continue. She encouraged Synod members to consider whether that was something to which they could offer their time and talents.

Pioneer ministry also had a story to tell. The Rev Dr Richard Tiplady had been finding that that was becoming a normal part of the repertoire of ministry and mission in the SEC. He had run five "Introduction to Pioneer Ministry" courses during the first year of lockdown and a follow-on "Next Steps in Pioneer Ministry". Further introduction courses had been provided for the Dioceses of Edinburgh and Aberdeen and Orkney and Dr Tiplady had undertaken a pioneer ministry consultancy trip to Orkney. He had also run a monthly pioneer ministry learning set from September 2020 until December 2021. Dr Tiplady had indicated that he would be happy to run the course for any diocese or church or group of churches that were interested.

During the course of the previous year a new working group established by the Board, the Local Mission Development Committee, had been undertaking preliminary work on how such a group might best offer support and encouragement to dioceses and charges in their mission. It was operating with the principle of subsidiarity, seeking to understand what mission meant in concrete terms in local situations. There was in fact much good news – from worship to work parties; Facebook streaming to food banks; chaplaincy to charity shops; eco-church initiatives to engage all ages. Much took place quietly and went largely unseen, but it was no less significant for that. The Committee was reviewing information with a view to offering a summary and report. The task would then be to identify what would be of use to the College of Bishops, dioceses and charges.

It had been agreed that a "Season for Christian Life" would begin in January 2023 and offer a prolonged period of reflection on what it meant for church members to live out their baptismal promises. A small steering group had begun work and a conference for those from each diocese who might take a lead in the project was intended for late November 2022.

Provost Murray expressed thanks to those who served on the Board and its committees and to GSO staff.

5.4.2 Global Partnerships Committee

The Rev Dr Hamilton Inbadas (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) reported on the work of his Committee which was able to provide support to churches around the world, particularly in the Global South. There had been political instability in Myanmar and the Covid-19 crisis had been severe in India and several African countries. Small mission hospitals in rural parts of India and Malawi had struggled to obtain oxygen supplies and basic PPE for their staff. There were ongoing needs for churches in accessing sanitation and clean drinking water as well as capacity building in higher education and clergy training. A recent application to the Committee had been for post-trauma counselling in a seminary in India following the death of several students and staff during the pandemic.

Part of the business of the Committee was to encourage companion links between SEC churches and churches in the Global South. That was not just a question of grant provision but was rather an engagement in actual struggles and aspirations, in prayer and practical help and providing meaningful support in the context of partnership. Dr Inbadas was in the process of working out possibilities for supporting churches in Sri Lanka at a time of difficult economic crisis. He had also been in contact with the Priest-in-Charge of St Andrew's Church in Chandrapur which had been the hub of the missionary work of the SEC from 1870 to the mid-20th century. The church building could only accommodate a small percentage of those who gathered for worship on Sundays and the Christian community there continued the health care and educational mission activities which had been initiated by priests from the SEC many years previously.

Dr Inbadas suggested that in the previous two years the level of activity in companion links appeared to have decreased. He wished to invite churches and dioceses to initiate new links or to revive existing ones if they had not been particularly active. Details of the Committee's work and process for applying for support were available on the provincial website.

5.4.3 Situation in Ukraine

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer addressed Synod on his recent visit to Eastern Europe, introducing his address with the words: *"Viele kleine Leute, and vielen kleinen Orten, die viele kleine Schritte tun, können das Gesicht der Welt verändern"*. He described his visit to Poland where the Carpathian Mountains at the heart of Europe had seen everything which humanity could bring forth. Arriving there, he and his colleagues could almost have forgotten that there was a war unfolding only a few miles away, as a despot had decided to rain terror and death on his neighbours. The Polish authorities had handled matters well, shaming the dragging of feet by other European nations. Mr Dünzkofer had been profoundly changed by meeting one Ukrainian refugee, Sergei. Sergei had not been able to serve in the military because of a severe limp and had been allowed to leave his country. Nevertheless, he was a fighter and had carried his granddaughter and guided his daughter-in-law and grandson through the chaos which had exploded at the border. Mr Dünzkofer, together with his colleagues, had carried 24 people in three minibuses across Poland to Berlin, a safe place

to stay. Four million people had left their homes in Ukraine. He had transported 0.0006%. That might appear negligible, but it had not been for Sergei and his family.

The German words with which he had opened his address translated as "a lot of little people in a lot of little places who walk a lot of little steps will change the face of the earth". It was the case that no one had done "enough". Had people changed their behaviour, opened their doors or been more concerned about the financial impact of the situation? He had been challenged to do more by a member of a church in Edinburgh who had not been satisfied with "not enough". No humanitarian effort was adequate to the task – it needed a lot of little people in a lot of little places doing a lot of little steps. Everyone could take some little steps. At his own church, St John's, Princes Street, they had partnered with Edinburgh City Mission to host a regular meeting of Afghan women refugees. Small steps, but small steps really did change the face of the earth.

Ms Sabine Chalmers (Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees) addressed Synod, taking as her introduction "we are hard pressed on every side, but not crushed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not abandoned; struck down, but not destroyed" (2 Corinthians 4:8 and 9).

She spoke of the experience of Philomena, an asylum seeker from Glasgow, whose experience of living in an asylum hotel had been horrible and who had found that her black skin colour was seen as offensive, disgusting and annoying. However, when she had discovered her local church in Glasgow, some things had changed. She had been welcomed and made to feel at home and had been given a strong sense of belonging, irrespective of her colour. The support of her local church had helped her to believe that her future would be better and she was now studying to become a midwife.

Ms Chalmers said she was privileged to speak about the work of faith communities with refugees across Scotland, whilst wishing that that work did not have to happen. There was a long history of faith communities speaking out for refugees and asylum seekers and the scale of the humanitarian catastrophe across Europe in 2015 had led to the establishment of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees. The SEC had joined with other Christian denominations, Jewish, Muslim and interfaith groups to work together. By putting aside prejudices and agreeing to cross barriers of culture, language, religion and nationality, a real difference was possible. The work was not just about offering protection but also building a Scotland which welcomed and valued the contributions of people from across the world. She thanked the SEC for its support locally across Scotland.

Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees worked to raise awareness, offer advice and support, develop worship resources, create practical opportunities for faith communities to offer a welcome, and engage in political advocacy. The introduction of the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 threatened the very principle of refugee protection and the SEC had joined in campaigns to call for a more compassionate approach to refugees.

Asylum seekers had been welcomed to Scotland for more than two decades. With key partners the Scottish Government had developed the new Scottish Refugee Integration Strategy which described integration as a two-way process involving both host communities and refugees equally. Integration affected every area of life and churches had been exceptional in supporting that process, such as hosting community meals, offering English language practice or providing vouchers to enable people to buy clothes or food. One of the most exceptional contributions was the building of social connections. Churches and communities of faith were uniquely placed to offer personal, emotional and spiritual support and care and were physically present in every community where refugees had been resettled. Churches could also offer continuity over a long period of time. She urged churches to play their role in welcoming Ukrainians, Afghans, Syrians, Kurds, Iranians and indeed the world. She encouraged Synod members to link with the Faithful Welcome project which was being run in partnership with Faith in Community Scotland. The project team could deliver capacity building and awareness raising, walking alongside local churches and could provide support in the form of small grants.

For the first time, every household in Scotland had been given the opportunity to host Ukrainians in their homes. It was commendable that many had been considering hosting or were doing so already. Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees had prepared a guide for hosts in conjunction with the No Accommodation Network. Hosting was not for everyone but whether individuals were hosting or not they could be part of a community who could support those who were hosting and their guests.

In St Paul's & St George's dozens of refugee families had already found a welcome as a local church community had opened its doors. She encouraged other churches to do the same. She closed with the words of Sabir Zazai, CEO of the Scottish Refugee Council, himself an asylum seeker 20 years previously, "refugees may forget what they have lost but they will never forget the welcome received and the friendships built".

The Very Rev Sarah Murray then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

"That this Synod deplore Russian aggression in Ukraine and endorse the statement by the Primus offered to this Synod."

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke about the experience of members of his congregation offering help to refugees and finding themselves thwarted. Four members of the congregation had offered accommodation for refugee families, had registered their interest with the appropriate website of the Home Office and the result, over many months, had been a deafening silence. There had been no ability even to make contact with an official in order to advance the offer. Independently, a member of the congregation had made contact with a Ukrainian family in Romania and had offered accommodation. The offer had been approved by the UK authorities only to be held back by the lack of a visa for their baby. The family had been advised that they would need to make a 900-

mile journey to Poland in order to obtain a visa. The assurances of Home Office ministers that all was now well rang hollow. He endorsed the Primus' statement.

The Rev Bonnie Evans-Hill (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated she was the Convener of the Interfaith Relations Committee. She commended what Sabine Chalmers had said about the work of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees. There had been programmes from many years for the hosting of refugees from all over the world. She wished to make a plea on behalf of the Chair of Religions for Peace UK which was an international organisation. It had made a specific request in relation to 67 orphaned children who were currently stranded in Poland with their carers. They had permission to come to the UK but the proposed accommodation in England had been rejected by the local authority as inappropriate. They were therefore searching for a residential school, and she encouraged Synod members to come forward if they were aware of any suitable location.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

In closing the session, the Chair expressed thanks on behalf of the Synod to the Rev Dr Jenny Wright who had resigned as the Church in Society Committee Convener in the autumn of 2021 at the time of her move to England, and also to the Rev Canon Elaine Garman who had served as acting Convener of the Committee since then.

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

6.1 Administration Board

6.1.1 Introduction

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) introduced the session for the Board and its committees. In previous years, he had likened the SEC to a vehicle which required a competent driver, fuel and bodywork which was fit for purpose. On that analogy, the driver was the Church's clergy, the fuel was investment income and the bodywork were church buildings. He intended to comment on stipends, the UTP distribution and staff workload.

He reminded Synod members that a new stipend structure had been agreed the previous year and many of the other recommendations made by the Clergy Remuneration Package Interim Review Group were being worked through. The Standard Stipend for 2023 would be increased by the increase in the Church of England rate plus 1% or, if greater, by the increase in the Consumer Prices Index plus 1%. The expectation was that the rise would be CPI +1%.

The interim UTP distribution, which would be payable in August, had been agreed at 33.5p per unit, an increase of 11% on the previous year, with a

target of 70p in mind for the year as a whole (subject to any adverse effect of world events).

Increasing levels of bureaucracy and regulation governed much of present-day life and the SEC was not exempt. The reports in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2021 made reference to the legislation on smoke alarms and the regulatory environment affecting the retirement housing portfolio. In the previous two years, Synod had decided to grapple with issues concerning clergy well-being, climate change and ethical investment and the Church was also having to deal with the worldwide consequence of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, in particular its effect on fuel and food prices. All of those factors brought an increase in the workload placed on SEC office staff and committee members. The Church was blessed with the dedication and quality of staff but he encouraged Synod members to consider carefully the potential impact of any proposals which might be made.

Mr Gibson noted that the Investment Committee had been without a Convener for the previous three years and he was therefore delighted that Mark Harris had now been appointed as its Convener. He also expressed thanks to the Rev Lorna Mortis who was completing her term of office as Retirement Housing Committee Convener and he wished her successor, Peter Marsh, every success in taking up that post.

6.1.2 Personnel Committee

Mrs Jan Whiteside (Convener, Personnel Committee) explained that the role of the Committee was to create and oversee structures, HR policies and procedures for the Church. The Committee comprised both ordained and lay people and an external HR company, HR Department, assisted the Committee. Mrs Whiteside and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift, who was also a member of the Committee, gave a joint presentation on the work of the Committee, including the following:

- The clergy well-being survey of 2019 had indicated that 80% of clergy enjoyed their ministry but some areas needed work: lack of ministerial review, poor work-life balance for some and approximately 40% indicating they had felt bullied or harassed. Following that, the issue of bullying had been a major focus for the Committee and at General Synod 2021 a Bullying and Harassment Policy and Complaints Procedure had been adopted. The Synod papers for the current year provided a graphic to help any person who felt they had experienced such difficult behaviours. Guidance for Bishops to ensure consistent practice in handling complaints had also been developed and was included in the Synod papers for information.
- It had become clear that there needed to be a means of supporting clergy to engage with conflict in their charges. A training course "Living Well with Differences" was being run for the SEC by Place for Hope. Initially that was being provided for stipendiary clergy and feedback had on the whole been very positive.

- The Committee was assembling a list of external resources of support for clergy with a view to including it on the provincial website. The Committee was also starting up a confidential "listening ears" system to allow clergy access to an independent person who could listen and offer confidential support.
- A small number of clergy had indicated difficulties in behaviour on the part of vestry members. The Committee had drafted a paper to encourage discussion within vestries about appropriate support for their clergy and the setting of expectations for behaviour.
- Other "terms of service" issues which had been addressed were the increases to stipend, already referred to, and the creation of a "norm" that clergy should have two days off each week.
- As to current issues, there had been some uncertainty in the responses to the well-being survey about retirement housing provision. Stipendiary clergy who had served for 10 years in the Province could receive assistance, but consideration was also being given to other means of financial support to help clergy to enter the housing market before they retired.
- The Committee had been working on the Clergy Personnel Handbook which would be in web-based form and there was work to be done to refine the SEC's vacancy procedures.
- Together with the Committee on Canons, the Committee was working on an update to the Grievance Procedure which was currently part of Canon 53 as well as giving consideration to whistleblowing guidance to provide protection to anyone who reported a problem. A best practice note was also being developed for clergy sickness absence and consideration was also being given to how best to support clergy before and during their period of retirement.

Dr Anne Martin (Edinburgh) had been glad to read that the Committee would reconsider the question of appointing an individual to oversee complaints. She appreciated that many complaints could be dealt with at local level but there was a need for someone to ensure that all significant complaints were dealt with. Such a person could also provide expertise to pass on advice. Also, in the list of categories appearing on page 147 of the Synod papers (in the Guidance for Diocesan Bishops) there was no mention of complaints against vestries. If the incumbent was separately involved in the complaint there appeared to be very little support available to vestries as to how they proceeded and what they could do. That could result in a very distressing situation for both vestry members and their clergy.

Provost Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked the Committee for its work. He asked that the Committee continue its consideration of the diagram appearing on page 146 of the Synod papers. If the diagram was entitled "how to make a complaint in the Scottish Episcopal Church" he would have no difficulty. However, it referred specifically to an individual who alleged they had been bullied. He noted that part of the diagram appeared to lead to mediation and was concerned that within HR circles many would say that mediation was an inappropriate mechanism to offer

when someone had been bullied. It could imply that the person who had been bullied had brought the matter upon themselves. It was a recipe for institutional bullying. He suggested that needed further consideration.

Mrs Elizabeth Roads (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that the diagram contained an assumption that there had been bullying or harassment. She suggested that the issue might be a perceived problem rather than a real one. She suggested the negative tone of the flow chart could be made more positive.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) warmly welcomed the updated Complaints Procedure. Some of the stages involved were quite technical and detailed. They required, potentially, significant work on the part of the investigator. Prior to ordination she had spent 10 years in the work of investigating disputes. She wished to ask what training had or would be provided to those charged with conducting investigations to ensure that they were conducted appropriately and were properly documented.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Breachin) hoped that the rolling out of the "Living Well with Differences" training would in due course include house-for-duty priests and other active retired clergy. She herself had undertaken the course and it had been helpful.

Mrs Whiteside responded to points made. She confirmed that the "Living Well with Differences" course was being rolled out initially to stipendiary clergy and would then be rolled out further to others. She agreed that training was required for the carrying out of investigations – both in hearing and recording investigations. She took the point made by Provost Holdsworth but believed that mediation was appropriate for some lower-level matters. The Committee could revisit the question of appointing an independent person to oversee complaints. As to the question of complaints involving vestries, that was an ongoing issue. Whilst vestry members were charity trustees the Church had limited powers in relation to them.

Bishop Swift responded to Mrs Roads and explained that the diagram was created to be part of the bullying and harassment course. There was no assumption of guilt – the diagram was limited to process. The title to the diagram was in fact in response to a request which had been made at General Synod the previous year but Provost Holdsworth was correct that it was a summary of the overall Complaints Procedure.

6.1.3 Investment Committee

Mr Mark Harris (Convener, Investment Committee) noted that the previous few months had been economically challenging, creating significant headwinds across equity and bond markets around the world. That had had a negative impact on the price performance of the Unit Trust Pool. Since June 2021 the price had fallen by around 11%, approximately 2% of which was attributable to dividends which had been paid out. That drop largely reflected what had happened in markets in general. However, compared to February 2020, the unit price was nevertheless up by 25% and

approximately 5% of dividends would have been paid out over that period. The recent falls, therefore, amounted to a surrender of previously delivered gains. The main drivers to the falls were macro-economic and geopolitical factors, namely invasion, inflation and interest rates.

The UTP was invested across three different strategies two of which had fared pretty well, all things considered. Those two were down 5% and 3% respectively over the first quarter of the year, compared with market falls of approximately 6% or 7%. The third component, which had been hit hardest, was the long-term global growth strategy. That sought to invest in those companies which had the best prospects of earnings growth in the future. In conditions such as those applying at the current time, markets reduced their expectations as to future growth and also increased the rate at which they discounted the value of such future earnings. Over shorter periods of time it was to be expected that long-term global growth would be subject to greater volatility, but it needed to be remembered that there had been much greater volatility on the upside in 2019-2021. Over the long-term the Committee and Baillie Gifford were confident that the strategy was well placed to deliver the returns needed going forward. Markets tended to recover quite quickly from geopolitical developments and Baillie Gifford kept under review the resilience of the portfolio to the economic environment. It was a time for the Committee to hold its nerve.

Mr Harris reported that the Committee had been very pleased with the interaction it had had with the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and looked forward to that continuing. Also, Baillie Gifford had ethical investment and ESG (environmental, social and governance) issues fully embedded in their stock selection. No direct investments in Russia were held in the portfolio in either equities or bonds. Within the multi-asset income strategy, which was a pooled fund, there were three investments, two of which had been written down to zero in February and were suspended and the other was a gold mining company which operated in Kazakhstan. It represented less than 0.1% of the UTP's total funds and therefore fell within the permitted tolerance for excluded activities, if Russia were to become an excluded category.

Looking to the future, he would like to see the Committee starting a programme of communication with unit holders so that the Committee could fully understand the changing needs of such holders. It was also important that holders themselves understood how the Committee operated and the constraints of changing investment strategy. Also, the Committee was mindful of the need to preserve the real value of the dividend. Strides towards that had been made, the Committee having declared an interim dividend of 33.5p with the hope that the full-year dividend would be at least 70p which would represent an increase in excess of 20% over the previous two years.

The Chair thanked Mr Harris and also Daphne Audsley who had co-ordinated the work of the Committee during the period when no Convener had been in place.

6.1.4 Buildings Committee

Prof Peter Sharp (Convener, Buildings Committee) referred to a tragic accident which had taken place in 2021 in which two members of the congregation at St Peter's, Peterhead had died following an accident while painting the church windows. The Health and Safety Executive had carried out a full investigation and had taken evidence from a number of people at local, diocesan and provincial level, following which they had issued Improvement Notices to the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney and to the Province. These stated that the Church had failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that persons undertaking work to keep church buildings in repair were not exposed to risks to their health and safety. The HSE had given until the end of August 2022 for the Church to demonstrate that it was taking steps to address the problem, although an appeal against the notices had been lodged. The HSE had been particularly concerned that there had been no requirement for risk assessments to be carried out before any maintenance work had begun and that no training and little guidance had been provided.

Whatever the outcome of the legal case, the incident had highlighted concerns which needed to be addressed. The Buildings Committee had been asked to take that forward and had fortunately been able to call upon the expertise of Simon Pain, a member of the SEC, who had recently retired from running his own health and safety consultancy.

The current position was that the management of all charge properties was the responsibility of the vestry. That duty was normally delegated to the fabric/property subcommittee and the fabric/property convener had among their responsibilities a duty to be "aware of the statutory responsibilities placed upon charges in relation to buildings and health and safety matters". There was information relating to health and safety on the SEC website, but it was fragmented and did not clearly set out what a charge was expected to do. The Committee had recently produced a document entitled "Maintenance and Building Work for your Church – Some Practical Considerations" which pointed out the need to comply with regulations but provided no specific guidance on how to do that.

The Committee had been working on two projects. The first was to produce a risk assessment booklet which would be issued to each charge the aim of which was that, before any work task was carried out, the hazards associated with it were identified and an assessment made of the likelihood of injury resulting from such hazards. A risk matrix was then used to show the overall degree of risk which would then inform whether the task could progress, whether increased precautions were necessary or whether the task should not be proceeded with at all. The booklet would be accompanied by a training video on YouTube, including a short multichoice questionnaire which, if successfully completed, would provide a certificate confirming completion of the training.

The Committee recognised that there was a danger that vestries might find the process overwhelming and so the second project was to develop a health and safety toolkit which would be accessible via the provincial

website. That would explain what charges needed to do to comply with health and safety legislation and would provide guidance on where to find further information.

It was hoped that by the end of August it would be possible to demonstrate that significant progress was being made but the Committee recognised that there were longer term issues around the management of health and safety and the training of vestries. However, the work currently underway would be a significant step forward.

Questions and comment were invited but there were none.

The Chair thanked Prof Sharp for the Committee's ongoing work.

6.2 Standing Committee

6.2.1 Provincial Environment Group (PEG)

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Convener, Provincial Environment Group) was pleased to present the first report to General Synod of the work of the new Provincial Environment Group. However, it was no pleasure to consider why such a group was necessary. The most recent official figures showed that Scotland had achieved its greenhouse gas reduction target for 2020 but it had taken a pandemic to achieve that. The figures for 2021 were likely to tell a different story. The havoc of the pandemic would pale when compared to the crisis of climate change. That was a crisis not of the future but of the present. On a daily basis more species disappeared forever; more icecaps melted away; sea levels rose more; Earth moved towards more than 2° of global warming. For decades it had been assumed that it was "someone else's problem". He thanked the Synod from making it "our problem" and diocesan climate groups, congregations for making it "your problem". Referring to Markus Dünzkofer's text of earlier in the meeting, Bishop Paton thanked the "little people taking lots of little steps". A larger step had been the decision of General Synod 2020 to commit the Church to work towards net zero carbon emissions by 2030. The Standing Committee had set up the Provincial Environment Group in December 2021 to co-ordinate resources for the SEC at every level. The Group was accountable directly to the Standing Committee, not to just one single board, because the commitment to net zero concerned the whole Church, every person at every level. Members of the Group had been appointed because they had expertise in the field of environmental conservation: Cathy Johnston (Vice Convener), Valerie Cameron, William Shaw, Robert Woodford, assisted by Miriam Weibye and Fiona Campbell of the General Synod Office staff to whom he expressed thanks.

The first task set by Standing Committee for PEG had been to prepare the toolkit of resources for taking action, picking up the work already done by the Church in Society Committee and its technical group. He thanked the Rev Dr Jenny Wright, the Rev Canon Elaine Garman and Dr Donald Bruce for their work. PEG continued that work, leading to the Toolkit and Analyser which was available on the provincial website and had largely been

produced by Robert Woodford. Bishop Paton thanked those in local churches who had taken time to make their return using the Analyser.

Mr Robert Woodford (member, Provincial Environment Group) explained the difference between net zero and carbon neutral concepts. The carbon neutral concept did not imply any reduction of carbon emissions, only that carbon emissions would be offset. The net zero concept envisaged a reduction in carbon emissions to as close to zero as possible. Only once that was done would the process of offsetting begin. However, there was no generally accepted definition of either concept. Not all net zero plans had equal value for protecting the planet. The concept of net zero was in fact contested. It was important to ensure that the definition adopted by the SEC was credible and did not exacerbate social inequalities but was sufficiently robust to rebut any allegations of greenwashing.

There were unique challenges which the SEC faced. These comprised an ageing building stock, congregations (many of which were declining), tight constraints on finances, a specific organisational culture, the usage pattern of buildings (low during the week and high on Sundays), the Scottish climate, the 2030 target date (which was far more ambitious than the Scottish Government target of 2045), and limited resources. In the light of those challenges, there was a need to be realistic. A complex balancing act was needed between the prophetic and the practical, between the urgency of the climate emergency and the legitimacy of any net zero strategy whilst at the same time ensuring climate justice. There was, therefore, a need for a credible strategy.

The Group had come up with eight building blocks for a robust, legitimate and transparent net zero definition and pathway. These comprised:

- The kind of emissions being sought to be reduced (not just carbon but other greenhouse gases).
- The target date.
- The scope of activities to be included within the target.
- The boundary of what was included in the overall organisation.
- An established emissions baseline from which to track progress.
- The need for interim targets.
- The development of guardrails and principles including how offsets might be dealt with.
- A transparent reporting process.

Mr Woodford then considered in more detail the scope of activities. There were three areas relevant to that: direct consumption such as fuel used on site or work-related travel in transport; indirect emissions (for example purchased electricity); and all other indirect emissions such as the purchase of goods. The Group expected the 2030 target to include all of the first two scoped areas and part of the third area. The Group also defined the "SEC boundary" as all those entities which were within the sphere of the SEC and

that were under its control or significantly under its influence. The approach was in close alignment with the Church of England and Church in Wales.

Mr Woodford then shared information obtained via the Energy Footprint Analyser. The purpose of the Analyser was to empower churches to engage with a net zero process and calculate their consumption, and also to enable the Church to establish an overall baseline. The tool had been released on 15 March 2022 with a submission deadline of 25 May 2022. The completion rate had been 27%, of which 25% of the responses were usable. He thanked all those who had participated. The results showed that the heating infrastructure was approximately 67% gas, 29% electricity, 4% oil. 18% of those who returned results were on renewable tariffs and 1% had solar panels. 8% of churches were technically already at net zero. The results created a baseline in 2018 for those who had reported of around 1,404 tonnes. Extrapolating the data to 100% of churches across the whole SEC produced an overall baseline of 4,300-5,700 tonnes of CO₂. That equated to 13.9 tonnes of CO₂ per church. A consultation on net zero definition would be issued later in the year.

Going forward there was a need for a full-scale transformation of the infrastructure of the SEC from one based on fossil fuels to one powered by zero carbon energy. Whilst there was an ageing infrastructure, the solutions to address the issue existed. There was a need to increase the building utilisation of all churches so that the net zero strategy could support a broader mission within the Church. Net zero was not just environmental but was linked to climate, economic and social justice. It was also a moral issue. There was a need to embrace intergenerational thinking. The work required was comparable to the work of earlier generations who had bequeathed the Church's buildings to the current generation. There was a need to pass on to the next generation a church that was fit for purpose. Collectively achieving the goal would offer a beacon of hope to communities.

Ms Cathy Johnston (member, Provincial Environment Group) suggested that rather than thinking of the Church as a vehicle (which used fossil fuels) she wished to encourage people to think of the Church as an ecosystem with different species all of which would help each other to flourish. Everyone could be part of that. There was a need for a systemic approach. Synod had heard about the trauma faced by society, of which climate issues were part. Young people had been impacted by the pandemic but they were also those who wished to take up the hard work of how to change the world. There were some critical first steps to take and the Group would be asking for help from the Standing Committee on how the strategy could be developed for the whole Church. The biggest initial challenge was a lack of data. The Group had been in conversation with the Church of England about its energy footprint tool but it had not proved possible to move that forward which was why Robert Woodford had developed the Analyser. There was, however, a need to resource the task for the future. There were funding changes in the Scottish Government which made energy audits more difficult and it might be possible to partner with the Church of Scotland. There was also a need for knowledge about specific fundraising for the issue.

The Group would look at the resources which were already available within the SEC. For example, webinars could be shared across dioceses.

Ms Johnson hoped that Synod members would take part in the consultation referred to by Mr Woodford. There was also a need to be part of the wider ecosystem involving other bodies. She invited members to consider how they individually could influence how matters were taken forward.

The Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred to a BBC programme "Who Owns Scotland". There were large tracts of land in Scotland which were owned not by those who lived locally but who lived elsewhere. The largest owner of forests in Scotland did not live in Scotland and the forests had been planted for investment purposes. The largest owner of forests in Scotland was in fact the Church of England. If the SEC were to work collaboratively with the Church of England how could the SEC address that question of landownership because those who lived on the land did not have a say in its management?

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) thanked Mr Woodford for an inspirational presentation and for clarifying what net zero meant. It had also been helpful to clarify the scope of what the SEC was hoping to achieve. He emphasised the need for advice on what credible offsets were and also on how to assess what a truly renewable tariff was. He urged Standing Committee to allocate substantial resources to help congregations since many would need some financial assistance. He also asked that the presentation which had been given be made available for use in dioceses and vestries.

The Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock (Aberdeen and Orkney) commended the Provincial Environment Group for its work. She was a member of the Aberdeen and Orkney climate change group. She suggested that some of the recommendations which had been made were more suited to an urban environment. She lived in the Cairngorms and had a guilty conscience for driving an SUV. She did so because the area she covered meant that an electric vehicle would run out of battery and the terrain required a four wheeled drive, particularly in the winter. Despite other positive steps she and her church had taken, there remained a guilt factor and she was not sure how the Church could deal with that.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Bishop, Argyll and The Isles) expressed thanks for the clear presentation. He suggested that when recommendations were made it would be helpful if they were specific - for example, how were churches to be heated and who would pay. He had had to buy a car when he came to the Diocese. He had considered purchasing an electric vehicle but could not afford it. If the Diocese had bought one for him, he would have faced a significant tax bill. He wished to rise to the challenge but needed specific advice on how to do so. The challenge to the Church might be an increase in stipends if it expected clergy to purchase electric vehicles.

Bishop Paton thanked members for their comments. Those issues had already emerged within the Group and were the subject of discussion groups. That was the ecosystem to which Cathy Johnston had referred.

Growth would emerge from that. The Group was keen to keep engaging with the wider church on such particularities. The SEC was not on its own – there were other faith groups wrestling with the same rural issues which had been mentioned.

Bishop Paton reminded Synod that climate change was more than just a secular environmentalist issue. It was an urgent challenge which went to the core of Christian faith and spirituality. Whilst it was an issue of climate and biodiversity it was also an issue about people. Those hit first by climate change were those who had contributed least to its causes. Millions were already suffering as forests and farms turned into desert, resulting in real food shortages, rising sea levels and mass migration of peoples. As Archbishop Rowan Williams had said “for the Church of the 21st century, good ecology was not an optional extra but a matter of justice, and central to what it meant to be a Christian”. The heart of the crisis was a spiritual one. The top environmental problems were selfishness, greed and apathy, which needed a spiritual transformation. Scientists did not know how to do that but the Church did. The Christian faith taught Christians to be tenants not owners, stewards not exploiters, creatures not users of creation. Humans might have thought of themselves as co-creators, the summit of creation, but now there was a need for humans to think of themselves as co-creatures. God had called his creation "very good" and the Holy Spirit was present and active in the world. Through the Liturgy and Scriptures the Church could find the language to bring about life change and influence others also. That was why he believed that whilst acknowledging the dire urgency of the current moment one could face the future not with despair or confusion but with real hope and determination. He encouraged Synod members to take courage.

The Chair expressed thanks to those who had taken part in the session.

6.2.2 Ethical Investment

Mr Alan McLean QC (Chair, Ethical Investment Advisory Group) presented the work of the Group namely the report and proposed Ethical Investment Policy Statement for the Unit Trust Pool contained in the Synod papers. They were the result of the third and final chapter of the work entrusted to the Group by the Standing Committee after General Synod 2019.

Mr McLean reminded members that the SEC was an unusual UK church body in that its central activities were funded to the extent of approximately 60% by investment income so that much of what the Church did provincially was funded by earlier generations. The UTP was also utilised by dioceses and individual congregations. Its market value at the end of 2021 had been approximately £135 million which, in investment terms, was not a particularly large fund. It was managed by expert investment managers, currently Baillie Gifford reporting to the Investment Committee which was responsible through the Administration Board to the Standing Committee. In the absence of the income produced by the UTP, quota would have to be increased to fund current activity.

Investment was often not a value-neutral issue. Over the years, strongly held views in the Church had led to "restricted categories" in which the Church had agreed not to invest directly – such as companies deriving significant income from tobacco, armaments, gambling, pornography and extraction of thermal coal or tar sands. In addition, following the debate at Synod 2019 the Investment Committee had given an instruction to Baillie Gifford that there should be no further direct investment in companies which derived more than 10% of their income from extracting fossil fuels by any means. Issues continued to emerge to challenge the Church's thinking about the ethics of investment. Many investment funds included investments in sovereign debt of other countries and the ethics of holding such investments could change overnight – such as the holding of Russian sovereign debt following the invasion of Ukraine. Other issues included broader problems such as the use of child labour or modern slavery where it might not be appropriate to avoid investment but instead to identify companies within a sector which were working to end such problems in their own supply chains. In focusing on a transfer to green energy, one might wish to identify how best to invest in transformative industries such as wind, wave and solar power – perhaps sometimes through companies which had previously derived much of their income from fossil fuel exploitation.

In 2021, Synod had adopted the Group's recommended policy in relation to pooled funds. That pooled funds policy would continue to operate alongside the policy being put forward to Synod at the current meeting.

In the previous 12 months, the focus of the Group had turned to consideration of broader topics including how to define what "ethical" and "unethical" investment should mean for the UTP and how to put in place a procedural framework so that the Church could keep abreast of issues in a changing world and analyse and respond to new challenges. As in the wider Church, individual members of the Group would instinctively take very different approaches to such issues. Members of the Group had listened carefully to, and learnt from, one another and to hold in tension different considerations. The Group had also consulted the Investment Committee and the Church in Society Committee and had aimed to reach conclusions which were practicable and workable. The Group had recommended three high-level guidelines to inform future decision-making and which were set out in the report. The Group had concluded that the Church needed a permanent group focused on ethical investment, reporting to the Standing Committee. In addition, the policy document proposed the putting in place of a restricted category rule about companies earning more than 10% of their turnover from extracting fossil fuels, changing the trigger point for other restricted categories from 15% of turnover to 10% and mandating the Standing Committee to put in place arrangements to deal with such matters going forward. It would be for Standing Committee to consider the proposed terms of reference for the ongoing group. He commended the report and policy to Synod.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) then proposed the following Motion:

“That the Ethical Investment Policy Statement for the SEC Unit Trust Pool be adopted.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded the motion. He emphasised that ethical investment was not a simplistic or uncomplicated topic. The policy statement was well thought out in terms of principles of stewardship, of ethical investment and practical guidance for the Church's investment advisers. The Standing Committee itself supported the proposal.

The Very Rev John Conway (Edinburgh) thanked the Ethical Investment Advisory Group for its work. The work had begun with a motion that had asked General Synod to consider divestment as part of a wider campaign to help society move away from a carbon-based economy. That momentum was important. He knew from conversations with Operation Noah, whose Bright Now campaign had engaged with many churches around those issues, that in adopting the motion the SEC would be in a position to confirm that it was divested from fossil fuels. He hoped that if the motion were passed, the Primus or someone else appropriate would be able to sign some of the pledges which were available to commit the SEC to such divestment.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) also expressed thanks to the Group. He understood that the proposed policy would allow the Unit Trust Pool to hold up to 1% of investments in Shell or similar companies. He wished to be clear that that was the implication.

Mr Robert MacDonald (Argyll and The Isles) fully supported the stance of the Church in taking a lead on ethical issues. One of the problems was that the focus on sustainable investment gave a false hope that climate change could be tackled without significant cost to everyone and it also delayed long overdue Government reforms. If climate change was indeed a grave systemic risk the responsibility for protecting society lay with the Government. The Government had responded immediately to the Covid-19 crisis and it was necessary for the Government to bring in mandatory rules for everyone. That would mean emission controls and might also mean that the cost of energy would be permanently high. It was a very difficult problem. The private sector had a role to play but the primary responsibility was with Government.

Mr McLean responded to the comments which had been made. As to the signing of pledges, he was not familiar with the precise terms of such pledges, but they might certainly be looked at and if it was now possible for the SEC to meet the terms of such pledges then that might be a matter which would be worthwhile for Standing Committee to consider. On the question of the 1% issue, Mr McLean explained that the 1% figure appeared in the policy for pooled funds which had been agreed by Synod in 2021. It was correct that the policy put in place a 1% maximum limit in the context of the whole of the Unit Trust Pool. He understood from reports from Baillie Gifford that the Church was not in danger of breaching the 1% but it had been included in the policy for practical reasons. He agreed with the comment about the responsibility of Government. Divestment was not the only tool for pushing policy in the right direction.

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 102 in favour, 2 against, no abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr McLean and the Ethical Investment Advisory Group.

SESSION SEVEN: JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

7.1 College of Bishops

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, and the Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin, Bishop of Argyll and The Isles engaged in conversation over Bishop Riglin's first year as a Bishop, the assistance of Synod to the Bishops as they prepared for Lambeth and an update on other activities on the part of the Primus.

Bishop Riglin said it was a continuing pleasure to serve the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles. There was a real commitment to growth in the Diocese in terms of spirituality, mission and ministry. The Primus noted that the Electoral Synod for Bishop Riglin's election had been conducted on Zoom and that had been a first.

Bishop Riglin said he had been surprised by the size of the Diocese and the time spent travelling. No two charges in the Diocese were the same. The further west one travelled, the frequency of the Free Church of Scotland increased and that of the Church of Scotland decreased. That raised questions about who the principal ecumenical partner was in the region.

It had been very good to work with a deeply committed group of clergy and lay leaders. There was a strong sense of collegiality and he valued their advice. Bishop Pearson had taken the Diocese through a process "living the vision" and Bishop Riglin had the privilege of building upon that. He was blessed with a good PA and had also been able to establish good ecumenical relations with the Church of Scotland and be involved in that church's discussion about buildings closure.

Responding to a question as to what had been difficult, Bishop Riglin said that the distances in the Diocese had been challenging, including the distance from his spouse in London. Also, the St Andrew Declaration with the Church of Scotland had caused some misunderstandings in that he had encountered views that the Declaration represented a common understanding on the Sacraments and Holy Orders, when in fact that was not the case.

On the question of what Bishop Riglin would change, he indicated that he believed that the Province needed to address how the episcopacy and quota was funded. It cost far more to be an Episcopalian in Argyll and The Isles than it did in Edinburgh or Glasgow. Quota per member in his Diocese, comparing churches of like size, was three times as much than in Glasgow and Galloway. There was a need for a sense of fairness and equity.

Speaking about the forthcoming Lambeth Conference, the Primus indicated that the Conference would be considerably shorter than previous conferences, the gender balance would be significantly different and some bishops had also declared that they would not be present. Most of the bishops present would be

different from those who had attended in 2008. Bishop Riglin noted that the Conference had decided that if a bishop's spouse was of the same gender then they could not attend the Conference. That was an injustice. Commenting on relationships within the Communion, the Primus suggested that relations were considerably improved over the position of a few years previously. At a Primates' Meeting earlier in the year, he had detected no particular tension towards himself or the Scottish Episcopal Church. He had found it remarkable that he had been asked to represent the European region at the Anglican Communion Standing Committee and he had been asked to help shape the communique from that Primates' Meeting. He considered that the SEC was regarded as an honoured member of the Communion and there was no longer any sense of being excluded. The context had changed since the number of provinces which had made decisions about same-sex relationships was greater than had been the case when the SEC had made its own decision in relation to same-sex marriage.

Synod members in table groups then discussed the following questions:

- *What topics do you think Anglican/Episcopalian Bishops should be discussing at the Lambeth Conference?*
- *What matters do you think the Scottish Bishops should take to the Lambeth Conference for discussion?*

Comments made in table groups are available at: <https://www.scotland.anglican.org/wp-content/uploads/General-Synod-2022-Full-Record-of-Table-Discussions-Session-7-COB.pdf>

Bishop Riglin invited questions but there were none.

The Primus then spoke about his recent activities. Since the previous meeting of Synod, the Anglican Primates had met in person. He has attended the COP21 Conference a powerful experience at which had been sharing a service with a lady from the Amazon. He had a number of invitations pending. He was due to attend the USPG National Conference in 2023 and had been to the Church in Wales twice, once to attend an enthronement and then a Four Nations Faith and Order meeting. He had been invited to Cyprus and the Gulf. Gradually, his travelling time was increasing. As that happened there was a need to reduce meeting times. He had been at St Paul's Cathedral in London for the Queen's Jubilee service. He had received a significant number of requests for partnerships including some from the newer provinces of the Anglican Communion. It was a joy to represent the SEC at such events but as the number of invitations increased, it was also tiring. He had also participated in the provincial pilgrimage to the Holy Land earlier in the year which had been a wonderful experience.

The Chair thanked the Primus and Bishop Riglin.

SESSION EIGHT: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Faith and Order Board – Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon Prof Charlotte Methuen (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reported on the work of her Committee. Her "day job" as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Glasgow was in fact an ecumenical role

and she emphasised that the work of ecumenism was not just managing relationships between different church bodies but also about the practical interpersonal relationships.

The major development in the previous 12 months had been the signing of the St Andrew Declaration with the Church of Scotland. The Church of Scotland had also entered into a deed of friendship with the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland. Such declarations were about how ecumenical relationships were managed. The Saint Andrew Declaration in effect said that the Church of Scotland and SEC wanted to think about their relationship in a different way. It was not the end of a story but was a step on the way. She had become aware that there was some confusion about the implications of the Declaration. The Committee, drawing on work which had already been done, would draw up protocols explaining what the effect of the Declaration was. It was possible that the Committee might return to General Synod 2023 with a suggested canonical change relating to the SEC's relationships with other bodies which did not amount to "full communion". She was pleased that the Declaration was already bringing people into conversation who might not otherwise have been in conversation. She hoped that it would be possible to find ways for Anglicans and reformed churches in Scotland (not just the Church of Scotland) to look at the report of the Anglican Reformed Dialogue "Koinonia - God's gift and calling".

In the wider ecumenical context in Scotland, work continued on defining the successor body to ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland). In the previous two years the work of the new Scottish Christian Forum had already begun to take shape through the work of the Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office, the regular meetings of Scottish ecumenical officers and through the Scottish Church Leaders Forum which brought together churches across Scotland including churches which had never been members of ACTS.

Later in the summer the World Council of Churches Assembly would meet in Karlsruhe with the theme *Christ's love moves the world to reconciliation and unity*. That theme was even more relevant than it had been at the time it had been set. There could be no true peace or reconciliation without justice.

Prof Methuen thanked Miriam Weibye for her support for the ecumenical work of the Church – she was herself a living embodiment of ecumenical relationships.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Chair expressed thanks to Prof Methuen.

8.2 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee)

Mr Richard Baker (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) explained that the motion contained on the agenda asked Synod to agree a change to the membership of the Committee. The proposal flowed from the work of the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group and Mr Baker thanked Mr David Strang who had chaired that Group. It was clear that work remained to be done within the Province to ensure that in every congregation there was a consistent and highly robust approach to safeguarding. That was an

issue of huge importance for churches across Scotland and the UK. The independent enquiry into child sexual abuse had published its findings in relation to the Church of England in the previous year and the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency had also been established. Since the Committee had carried out the safeguarding audit a number of years previously diocesan safeguarding reports and annual returns showed that there remained a need to improve auditing and reporting. For that reason the Committee had been pleased to endorse the findings of a short life working group established in partnership with the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group which had made a number of key recommendations including establishing a process for independent oversight of safeguarding procedure, increasing capacity in the provincial safeguarding team, ensuring effective working between the provincial team and diocesan protection officers and including external expertise in the membership of the Committee. Work was still required to implement all of the proposals of the short life working group but Mr Baker was pleased that the recommendations had been received positively by the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee. That had enabled the Committee to begin the process of recruiting a Safeguarding Training Officer. The ambition of the Committee was that in due course the capacity of the provincial team should be three full-time officers. It had also been agreed that the Province would commission independent oversight and, where appropriate, advice on SEC safeguarding processes from *thirtyone:eight*, previously known as the Churches Child Protection Advisory Service which was an independent Christian charity. The proposal being brought to Synod at the current meeting was to include two additional members of the Committee from outwith the SEC who had professional safeguarding management experience at senior level.

The Committee had consistently said that it believed reform of Canons 65 and 54 were important and it hoped that the ongoing consideration of the Canonical Review Group could be concluded soon.

He expressed thanks for the support of the Provincial Officers, Donald Urquhart and Daphne Audsley, and Vicki Anderson, their administrative assistant.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) then proposed, and Ms Bridget Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That section 2.2.7 (b) of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted and replaced with the following:

(b) the Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee), consisting of a Convener, up to six other members drawn from within the Church and up to two additional members drawn from outwith the Church and who have professional safeguarding management experience at a senior level.”

In speaking to the motion Bishop Swift emphasised how well he felt the Church was supported by the existing safeguarding structures and by the provincial team. The change proposed by the motion would bring a degree of independence and

the budgets to be considered later in the meeting would include provision for a Safeguarding Training Officer.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Primus asked Mr Baker to take the thanks of the Synod back to the Committee and the provincial team.

8.3 Standing Committee

8.3.1 Budgets and Quota

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) reminded the meeting of the budgets set by Standing Committee for 2022-2024. The Committee was budgeting for deficits which it intended to fund from surpluses generated in recent previous years. Illustrating the budget with PowerPoint slides, Ms Campbell reminded Synod that the deficit included provision for one-off Stipend Assistance Grants for 2023 and 2024 which were planned to provide breathing space as charges and dioceses worked out how to respond to rapidly changing economic circumstances, including the impact of the significant changes to the policy on stipend which had been agreed by Synod 2021.

One of the Committee's responses to the Covid-19 pandemic had been to reduce quota for 2021 to £600,000 with the expectation of a gradual phased increase to £750,000 by 2024. In the light of the financial pressures being experienced by charges, including the impact of higher than expected rates of inflation, the Committee had revised its plans and proposed that the quota increase for 2023 be limited to £25,000, with quota being set at £685,000 rather than the £710,000 originally planned. The Committee also proposed to extend the period over which the increase to £750,000 would be phased by a further year to 2025. The allocation of the total quota between dioceses was based on assessable income.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2023, agree to a quota figure of £685,000 for that year.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 97 in favour, 1 against, no abstentions.

8.3.2 Synod Rules of Order

Ms Campbell explained that in the light of experience in previous years, the Standing Committee had been looking at the Rules of Order for the Synod and wished to propose some changes. It was seeking to strike the right balance between open debate and ensuring that those participating in debate and voting could do so on an informed basis. Emergency motions were sometimes appropriate but, generally speaking, it was important that

members had adequate notice of issues to be discussed and access to information on which to make a judgement. There were three main issues. The first was to ensure the giving of longer notice of Rule 10 Motions. There were different routes through which material could come to the General Synod. It was the responsibility of Standing Committee to agree the agenda for Synod. Boards, committees and Diocesan Synods all had the opportunity to include material on the agenda and Synod members also had the opportunity to propose motions. In the letter sent out in March each year, a deadline was given for members to propose motions so that they could be considered by the Standing Committee for possible inclusion on the agenda. If the Committee decided not to include such a motion it had to notify members of that and give reasons for such non-inclusion. A further route for members to bring motions to Synod was the "private motion" procedure under Rule 10.

She had been impressed by the level of commitment on the part of volunteers who served on provincial boards and committees. Those boards and committees devoted considerable time in developing proposals for Synod. Ultimately it was for Synod to accept, amend or reject proposals. However, where Synod decided to reject proposals in favour of a different approach, the Committee believed that members should have adequate opportunity to consider any proposed alternative and that the board or committee in question should have enough time to consider that and respond.

The proposal for longer notice in relation to Rule 10 Motions stemmed from the experience in 2019 when a motion had been received on the morning of the Synod. The Convener of a committee, which had been working on the issue for several years, had had very little time to consider or respond to the proposal. The Committee proposed that notice of a Rule 10 Motion in future should be given at least seven days before the Synod meeting was due to start. It recognised that there might be some circumstances where it was not practical to give seven days' notice, such as a motion relating to an immediate event. Rule 15 already allowed temporary suspension of the Rules so there existed a mechanism to waive the requirement for seven days' if Synod decided that was appropriate.

The second element to the proposed amendments related to countermotions. The Rules of Order already included a process for making amendments to motions. Notice of amendments was not required in advance of the meeting and no change to that was being proposed (although advance notice was in fact very helpful). The proposal would allow for the possibility of countermotions to be put forward. Such a procedure might be of use where the counter proposal was substantially different from the original proposal. Again, seven days' notice was being proposed for countermotions. Members of the Committee considered that it would be helpful to expand the Rules to provide for such an option. The question of whether an amendment was competent was decided by the Chair, advised by the Assessor. An amendment which altered the terms of

a motion to render it the opposite of the original motion would not be competent. The countermotion procedure would enable that.

The third change being proposed was a new Rule 16. The Rules of Order could already be temporarily suspended or amended by a two thirds vote. In the past, where amendments to the Rules had been made they had required only a simple majority. In order to improve consistency, it was being proposed that changes to the Rules ought in general to be decided upon by a two thirds majority.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the revised Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as new Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rules.”

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) proposed, and the Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) seconded, the following amendment:

“That Rule 10(a) of the revised Rules of Order for the General Synod, as set out in the Synod Papers, be amended by the deletion of the word “shall” and the reinstatement in its place of the words “should normally”.”

Dr Routledge explained that the amendment related to the question of how much notice needed to be given for a Rule 10 Motion. The current Rules of Order provided that they "should normally" be submitted before the start of General Synod. In practice, that meant that the Secretary General was occasionally handed a motion on the morning of Synod of which he had had no prior notice. The change proposed by Standing Committee suggested a change to requiring a seven-day notice period. She was broadly supportive of that because Synod worked well when it was well briefed on the issues and people were prepared to engage. The proposed change, however, made the provision of prior notice a requirement rather than just a convention. She considered that it was more in the spirit of what was being proposed that rather than requiring Synod members to suspend the Rules of Order, the fact that emergency situations might arise should be recognised. She considered that requiring a suspension of the Rules of Order would make the overall process too complicated given that, assuming they were so suspended, the Synod would still have to vote on a two thirds basis to decide whether it wished to debate the motion, as well as then debating the substance of the motion. She therefore proposed that the "should normally" wording which was contained in the current Rules of Order should be retained.

Ms Campbell understood why the amendment was being proposed but she preferred to remain with her original proposal. Whilst she had not been personally present, she considered it was important to address the kind of issue which had arisen in 2019.

Dr Routledge wished to push back against the criticism of what had happened in 2019, because she considered it was exactly the sort of circumstance of which she was speaking. She believed that attempts had been made to bring the business in another way and it had only been discovered at the start of Synod that those attempts had not been possible because of difficulties regarding protocol. She believed that what had happened in 2019 was in the spirit of an emergency motion.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) supported what Dr Routledge had said. He believed it was always a bad practice to encourage the idea that in order to discuss a topic it was necessary to suspend standing orders.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) strongly opposed Dr Routledge's amendment. She had been present in 2019 and had served on the Investment Committee subsequently. She had been disappointed in the way the business had been conducted in 2019. Retaining the "should normally" wording would become the norm and result in officials being pressured to permit debate which probably ought not to be permitted.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Argyll and The Isles) had mixed feelings about the amendment. He slightly resisted the notion that a longer notice period was awkward for board or committee conveners. He was concerned about what would be awkward for members of the Synod. In the course of his ministry he had attended assemblies and synods where the mood of the meeting moved from seeking the mind of Christ to a gathering which received reports and decided whether to accept or reject them. He was also concerned because whilst in his own Diocese there had been a pre-Synod meeting, the members had not known what other dioceses thought on issues until they arrived at General Synod. A seven-day requirement might restrict scope for action. He, therefore, supported the "should normally" wording.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) supported the amendment. She had fronted the motion in 2019. She thanked Bishop Riglin for his comments because that was in fact what had happened in 2019. There had been no concerted effort to undermine the proper workings of Synod or subvert process. There had been a meeting of minds between three clergy from different dioceses which had not happened until the eve of Synod and a meeting following the Freshers' meeting at the beginning of Synod to consider whether fossil fuels could be addressed in a different way. The initial attempt had been to table an amendment which had been ruled incompetent because it had been too far removed from the terms of the original motion. Therefore, a Rule 10 Motion had been tabled at extremely short notice. She accepted that that had been undesirable. However, there was a need to strike a careful balance in framing the procedural rules. The Rules were there to help the Synod hold in balance doing business well and enabling the flexibility to allow the Holy Spirit to speak in and through members. In 2019, the motion had gained a two thirds majority to enable its debate and then had received overwhelming support from the floor. She supported Dr Routledge's motion.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed as follows: 65 in favour, 25 against, 9 nine abstentions.

Dr Routledge then explained that she was proposing a further amendment to the motion to allow Synod to vote separately on the component parts of the various changes being suggested to the Rules of Order. She then proposed the following amendment:

“That Motion 26 shall be divided into five Motions as follows:

- ***Motion 26A:*** *That the revised Rule 9 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as the new Rule 9 of the Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rule 9.*
- ***Motion 26B:*** *That the revised Rules 10(a) [as amended] and 10(b) of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as the new Rules 10(a) and 10(b) of the Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rules 10(a) and 10(b).*
- ***Motion 26C:*** *That a process for introducing countermotions be introduced by adopting the new Rules 10(e) and 10(f) of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers.*
- ***Motion 26D:*** *That the new Rule 16 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted.*
- ***Motion 26E:*** *That minor clarificatory revisions to Rules 2, 8, 12 and 14 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted.”*

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) seconded the amendment, confirming that it was intended to enable Synod to vote separately on the proposed changes to the Rules. Ms Campbell indicated that she supported the proposed amendment. The Rt Rev Dr Keith Righin (Argyll and The Isles) asked whether the amendment needed to be put to the Synod if Ms Campbell had accepted it. She indicated she wished the meeting to consider it.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed as follows: 89 in favour, 7 against, 4 abstentions.

Following the division of the original amended motion into separate motions, the Synod proceeded to consider each separate motion.

Initially it considered motion 26A as follows:

“Motion 26A: *That the revised Rule 9 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as the new Rule 9 of the Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rule 9.”*

Ms Helen Vincent (Edinburgh) said that as a lay member of Synod all that she saw of the work of committees and conveners was in the reports presented to Synod. She urged that if significant work was being undertaken to bring proposals to Synod that greater use be made of the provincial website as a means of informing the wider church of their

thinking. That would allow members to feed back at an earlier stage. It would also minimise the possibility of last-minute amendments.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) agreed that adequate notice for boards and committees was a good idea. Generally, he congratulated the General Synod Office for the advance notice given in providing papers for Synod. There was nevertheless significant homework for Synod members to undertake before arriving at Synod. With the change to the Rules of Order, the timeliness of the issuing of the Synod papers became more important. If longer notice were to be given of Rule 10 Motions, then earlier provision of the initial proposals would be necessary to allow Synod members time to do that.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether now that the amendment in relation to Rule 10 had been accepted that there would still be a requirement for seven days' notice of a countermotion. He thought it would be unrealistic to expect people to propose countermotions if they had not actually heard the debate. If a countermotion were to be proposed it needed to be in the context of the Synod's business and not that of the Standing Committee. The Secretary General confirmed that the "should normally" wording which had been adopted by the first amendment in the current session applied both to Rule 10 Motions and to countermotions.

Dr Routledge raised a point of order that the current debate related to motion 26A, Rule 9, and not Rule 10. The Chair accepted that that was correct.

Motion 26A was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 89 in favour, 2 against, 6 abstentions.

Synod then considered motion 26B:

***"Motion 26B:** That the revised Rules 10(a) [as amended] and 10(b) of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as the new Rules 10(a) and 10(b) of the Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rules 10(a) and 10(b)."*

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) supported the amendment and believed it to be a good response to what had happened in 2019. He noted the irony in that in 2021 and 2022 the Synod had passed policies, without much debate, which had been practically identical to the policy which had attracted heat in 2019. The problem which the motion did not quite address was that of communication among members of Synod prior to Synod. He believed that Standing Committee should give consideration to how to facilitate communication among members of Synod prior to Synod meetings. In practice, it was difficult for members to contact one another.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) supported the motion but queried whether it went far enough. The current debate illustrated that it was relatively easy to change Rules of Order as compared to changing Canons.

She considered she was not good at the cut and thrust of parliamentary debate. Often at Synod there was no time to reflect and pray after a debate. She asked that in the coming years it should become standard practice that at the end of a debate there be opportunity for pause. Also, if during a debate a particular matter had become contentious, Synod should have the ability to set the matter aside and return to it later during the meeting.

The Assessor indicated that following the first Amendment to the original motion earlier in the meeting, there would now be an inconsistency in the proposed Rule 10(b) in that that referred to notice being given to the Secretary General at least seven days prior to the start of Synod. He suggested that a way to resolve the inconsistency would be for the words "at least seven days" to be deleted in both places where they appeared in the proposed Rule 10(b). A member of Synod would need to propose such an amendment. Dr Routledge confirmed that she was content to propose such an amendment, Dr Holmes seconded that amendment. Synod agreed to pause consideration of motion 26B until later in the meeting and proceed instead to consider the remaining motions.

Synod then considered motion 26C:

***"Motion 26C:** That a process for introducing countermotions be introduced by adopting the new Rules 10(e) and 10(f) of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers."*

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 88 in favour, 1 against, 6 abstentions.

Synod then considered motion 26D:

***"Motion 26D:** That the new Rule 16 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted."*

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 89 in favour, 2 against, 6 abstentions.

Synod then considered motion 26E:

***"Motion 26E:** That minor clarificatory revisions to Rules 2, 8, 12 and 14 of the Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted."*

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) drew attention to the proposed changes to Rule 12. He considered electronic voting was a good thing but the manner in which the current Synod meeting had been conducted was some way away from what was envisaged in the Rules of Order. He wondered whether the current motion was competent particularly in that in the past Synod had been invited to indicate whether it wished to conduct its business by secret ballot. When voting was not by secret ballot it was clear where opinion lay within the Synod because people raised their hands. The move to electronic voting changed that substantially. He believed it would be helpful if the Standing Committee were to reflect on that and perhaps withdraw the motion for the current year and return in

future. He also pointed out that tellers had been appointed at the beginning of the meeting. Tellers did not just count votes but scrutinised them as well. In fact, the voting numbers had been dealt with by Sanctus Media during the current meeting and not by the tellers. He had no difficulty with the integrity of Sanctus Media but it did not make sense to appoint tellers and have the votes counted by others. He also thought there were issues to consider about how electronic votes were scrutinised. He suggested that the proposal in relation to Rule 12 be withdrawn and reflected upon in the light of the Synod.

Ms Campbell agreed with the idea of reflecting upon how voting was approached. She was not proposing to withdraw the proposal but that did not mean that the Standing Committee would not reflect on what had been said. Provost Holdsworth then spoke against the motion. He believed it was a fundamental change because it took away from Synod members the ability to decide how they voted and passed it to the Chair. The Synod members needed to be able to control their business and it ought not to fall to the Chair to decide whether votes were taken in private or in public. The Synod itself should decide that.

The motion was then put to the vote with the following result: 55 in favour, 33 against, 11 abstentions.

Whilst the motion had achieved a simple majority because, as a result of motion 26D, a two thirds majority of those present and voting was required to alter the Rules of Order, motion 26E fell.

It was confirmed that the motion could not be put to the vote for a second time.

Synod then returned to consideration of motion 26B. Following discussions with the Assessor in the light of his comment earlier in the debate, Dr Routledge proposed that motion 26B be amended to read:

***“Motion 26B (amended): That Rule 10(b) of the revised Rules of Order for the General Synod, as set out in the Synod Papers, be amended by the deletion of the words “shall be evidenced” and the insertion in their place of the words “should normally be evidenced.”*”**

Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) seconded the amendment.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) asked whether the amendment required to be passed by a two thirds majority. She opposed the amendment. Following advice from the Assessor the Chair explained that since this was an amendment it only required a simple majority.

Dr Routledge explained that the sole purpose of the amendment was to avoid creating an inconsistency in the Rules.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed as follows: 72 in favour, 10 against, 9 abstentions.

The Chair then put to the Synod motion 26B as amended as follows:

“Motion 26B (final form): That Rule 10(b) of the revised Rules of Order for the General Synod, as set out in the Synod Papers, be amended by the deletion of the words “shall be evidenced” and the insertion in their place of the words “should normally be evidenced”.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 78 in favour, 10 against, 8 abstentions.

Ms Campbell thanked all Synod members for their contributions.

She also thanked the Primus and the other chairpeople for their chairing of the Synod sessions. She paid tribute to the standard of the presentations which had been made during Synod which had been inspiring.

8.4 Contribution from Ecumenical Delegate

Mary Woodward brought greetings from the Religious Society of Friends. She always found it a joy to be present at General Synod. Speaking personally, she was delighted that the Synod appeared to be moving towards the Quakers in valuing silence. She offered a reading from a work by Gordon Matthews.

SESSION NINE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

9.1 Elections

9.1.1 Standing Committee Membership

No nominations for the vacancy for a lay person on the Standing Committee had been received by the deadline for submissions.

9.1.2 Institute Council Membership

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon Elaine Garman be re-appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 93 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Bishop Dyer then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev David Paton-Williams be re-appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 92 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention.

Bishop Dyer then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That Cathy Johnston be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 94 in favour, none against, 2 abstentions.

9.1.3 Preliminary Proceedings Committee Membership

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

“That Jeanette Whiteside be appointed as alternate lay member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 92 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

9.1.4 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Hon Lady Wolffe be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 91 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Hon Lady Poole be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 91 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

9.1.5 Administration Board Membership

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Amanda Fairclough be re-appointed for an additional term on the Administration Board.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 81 in favour, 8 against, 5 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Richard Kilgour be appointed as a member of the Administration Board.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 86 in favour, 4 against, 4 abstentions.

9.1.6 Pension Fund Chair

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the appointment by Standing Committee of Sarah Whitley as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees be ratified and that her term of office continue until the conclusion of General Synod 2027.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 92 in favour, none against, 1 abstention.

9.1.7 General Synod Trustees

Synod was reminded that notice of additional motions regarding the appointment of additional General Synod Trustees had been provided to Synod members in advance of the meeting.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) wished to draw attention to the gender balance of the Trustee body and noted that all three proposals for the current meeting were male.

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following motion:

“That the Rt Rev David Chillingworth be appointed as a General Synod Trustee with effect from 31 August 2022.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 75 in favour, 11 against, 9 abstentions.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following motion:

“That Dr John Ferguson-Smith be appointed as a General Synod Trustee with effect from 31 August 2022.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 82 in favour, 4 against, 9 abstentions.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following motion:

“That Mr Gavin Gemmell be appointed as a General Synod Trustee with effect from 31 August 2022.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 83 in favour, 2 against, 10 abstentions.

9.2 Mission Board - Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Provincial Youth Committee (PYC)) explained that it had always been his intention during the youth session at Synod to enable Synod to hear as much as possible directly from the youth representatives. At the current Synod, the age profile was somewhat higher than previously because none of the youth representatives had been able to attend for reasons of exams, jobs and other commitments. As a result, rather than pretending that everything had returned to normal after the pandemic, it was necessary to acknowledge the changes. The Church's young people had been through the same and different challenges as everyone else. During the height of the pandemic it had been possible to keep in contact with young people, supporting them online and occasionally in person. How could the Church continue to support and nurture its young people in a changing world and what could be said to those churches who had not yet found their young people returning? He encouraged churches not to give up but to keep the door open and not to blame young people. The Youth Committee, like churches, was rebuilding after the pandemic.

Mrs Claire Benton-Evans (Provincial Youth Co-ordinator and Youth and Children Officer for the Diocese of Edinburgh) reported that the PYC, like many churches, was wondering where the young people had gone. There was no key to a magic cupboard bursting with young people eager to fill pews. Rather, the work of ministry to and with young people was about building relationships and helping young people to belong. An inspiring example was the Hot Chocolate Trust in Dundee which operated out of a city centre church and was open to all young people "without prejudice or distinction of religion, race, culture, health, disability, gender, hair colour, sexuality or politics". Teenagers needed "communities of practical love". Churches could be such communities. Building a relationship with teenagers had been a challenge during the pandemic. Many young people were struggling with mental health and were hungry to reconnect in person. She encouraged churches to encourage their young people to book for the Provincial Youth Week at Glenalmond College, the theme of which in 2022 was *God's year: out of the ordinary*.

James Gardner (Youth Officer for the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that building relationships with young people sometimes led to trying new things. In his Diocese, after Glen 2019 the voices of young people had been heard, and the Diocese had looked at cluster models of youth fellowships. The Diocese had formed its own Young People's Committee which had organised a "church of the future" competition looking at what a carbon neutral church might comprise. The Committee had a direct link to Glenalmond College through the school Chaplain who was involved in the Committee. The Diocese

had also created a youth forum in September 2021 which had planned a youth gathering at the Cathedral in November of that year. It had created a diocesan youth hymn. The forum had also had a residential planning weekend hosted at St Mary's, Burnham. That church did not have any teenagers of its own but had seen the value of young people joining in its outreach.

Ley-Anne Forsyth (joining by video link) gave a personal reflection on her experience years previously as a young person during the youth week at Glenalmond. At the time, she had been experiencing very difficult circumstances. It had been an encounter at the youth week with the current Primus which had made a significant difference to her and had helped her to see God in the difficult situation in which she had found herself.

The Rev Becki Cansdale (Argyll and The Isles) was curate at St John's Cathedral, Oban and Youth Officer for her Diocese. She noted that she had been amongst the youngest people present within the Synod membership and that was often the case in her day-to-day ministry. One could lament the lack of younger people or one could see the situation as an opportunity to build community that was welcoming and inclusive and also multigenerational. All that had been presented at the current meeting had had, at its core, orientation around community. The gift of being called into community was a gift to share. The current time was a unique opportunity, after the pandemic, for churches to get to know their young people and children by name and provide space for them to learn, grow, be encouraged and be heard.

The Primus thanked all those who had contributed.

9.3 Thanks from the Primus

The Primus expressed thanks to Synod members, ecumenical and interfaith guests whether they had been present in person or online, to those who had acted as facilitators and to the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated them, and to those who had acted as Chair. He also thanked the Assessor, those who had arranged the Eucharist and had led morning and evening prayer as well as those Conveners who were stepping down at the end of the current Synod, the Rev Canon Elaine Garman and the Rev Lorna Mortis.

Thanks were also expressed to Bridget Campbell in her role as Convener of the Standing Committee, to Sanctus Media who had supported the technical aspects of the meeting, to the staff at St Paul's & St George's and to General Synod Office staff.

9.4 Closing Worship and Acts of Synod

The Synod closed with an act of worship at the end of which the Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and gave the Blessing.