

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD ONLINE VIA ZOOM FROM ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH EDINBURGH ON 10-11 JUNE 2021

Welcome and Induction

A training video was shown before the beginning of the meeting.

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh via Zoom at 9.30am on Thursday 10 June 2021.

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist, taking as his text "let your light shine before others so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in heaven. Do not place your light under a bushel basket. A city built on a hill cannot be hidden." He reflected on the difficulties of the Covid 19 pandemic - people had been denied the things they were accustomed to do to make their light shine and, at times, the bushel basket had felt very close. However, he drew comfort from the words of the psalmist "Yea though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." There had been moments in the previous year and a half when he had been afraid – fear of losing the things that were precious. However, that was not a fear about evil. Evil was about assault on godliness, an assault on one's relationship with God and a desire to turn people from God. The Shepherd carried the rod of defence and the staff of guidance to protect the sheep. To reach the prepared table referred to in the psalm required a need to be anointed and to dwell in God's house. The evil that made him afraid and pushed him to take shelter with the Shepherd was the degradation of those who were different, the laying of blame at the feet of those who had no voice, child poverty, the plight of refugees and the level of public criticism of people. In the midst of all that, the green pastures of love and care could be glimpsed. He encouraged Synod members to uncover the place of quiet waters in the forthcoming meeting and discover those things which brought hope and joy, acknowledging that members might disagree on detail but needed always to agree the message the Church was asked to proclaim: the message of love.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Stop Climate Chaos Scotland. The offering amounted to £848.62.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Preliminary Business

1.1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members and guests to Synod.

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 Alison Simpson proposed, and the Very Rev Sarah Murray seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed *nem con*: 58 in favour, 2 abstentions.

The Very Rev Alison Simpson proposed, and the Very Rev Sarah Murray seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon David Richards 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*: 57 in favour, 2 abstentions.

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

“That Hugh Morison be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed *nem con*: 46 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 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 the Rev Alexander Horsburgh be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

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

“That Donald Bruce be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 107 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) 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 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.

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 5 December 2020”.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 91 in favour, 16 abstentions.

1.1.6 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken from the electronic records of the meeting. A total of 128 members attended.

1.2 Standing Committee – Accounts, Quota and Strategic Direction

1.2.1 Accounts

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) introduced herself as the new Convener of the Standing Committee and thanked the Synod for the honour of having been elected. She expressed gratitude to those who had welcomed her and helped her to understand the role. She expressed thanks to her predecessor, Robert Gordon, and was glad that, whilst he had stood down from the role of Convener, he had become a Trustee of the General Synod. He had also kindly continued in the role of chairing the Advisory Group to help the Church through the pandemic. She expressed thanks to all members of the Advisory Group who had worked very hard throughout the pandemic to provide advice to dioceses and congregations on Government regulations and guidance on church gatherings. The Communications Team had also supported much additional digital communication and broadcasting and whilst nothing could wholly replace meeting in person, access to online worship had been a huge solace and support to many. She suggested that the way in which the Advisory Group had operated as a small, dedicated, mixed and flexible group had been a successful model which might be applied to other types of task in future.

Ms Campbell expressed thanks to the whole team at the General Synod Office which had continued to work since the previous meeting of Synod to support the usual work of the boards and committees as well as responding to the extra demands arising from the pandemic. As the Synod turned to consider finances, she paid particular thanks to the Treasurer for his work on accounts and budgets.

She referred Synod to the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2020. The Standing Committee members were the charity Trustees of the General Synod and so were responsible for preparing the Report and Accounts. The Accounts were prepared on a going concern basis and the Committee had assessed the Synod's ability to continue as a going concern. She confirmed that, in formal terms, the Committee had a reasonable expectation that the Synod had adequate resources to continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future.

In 2020, there had been many cost savings because many normal activities had had to be curtailed and so it was difficult to make comparisons with previous years. The main areas in which there had been less expenditure than budgeted were a direct consequence of the pandemic and the restrictions on travel and physical meetings imposed by lockdown. Total costs incurred by the General Fund had been approximately £235,000 less than budgeted. As well as savings on expenditure, there had been extra

income and Ms Campbell drew attention to the continuing 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, providing an additional £41,000 of income to the General Fund. There had also been a remarkable increase in the value of investments with a total gain on investments during the year of £20.7 million, a 36% increase. She expressed thanks to the Investment Committee and the Fund Managers for those positive results.

As had been explained at General Synod 2020, one of the Standing Committee's decisions in response to the pandemic had been to agree to redistribute the financial benefits which had arisen by inviting applications to a Recovery and Renewal Fund. Guidance on applying to the Fund had been issued to dioceses earlier in the year and she drew to the attention of all Synod members the importance of encouraging congregations to take advantage of that opportunity.

She invited anyone with detailed questions about the Accounts to email the Treasurer.

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 2020.”

The Primus opened the motion for debate and questions.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained he had been considering the membership and communicant statistics for the previous three years. He asked whether there had been a change in the methodology for the collection of such statistics and whether the statistics could be used for anything? To what extent did the statistics allow the Church to draw conclusions about the state and trajectory of church membership? He suggested that there were potentially different stories which could be drawn from the statistics. Ms Campbell responded by saying that she personally had been relying on the figures and drawing conclusions from them, but she invited the Secretary General to comment. She emphasised that the intention was for the figures to be capable of being relied upon. The Secretary General confirmed that there had not been any change to the methodology of statistical collection in recent years. However, the Mission Board was currently in the course of considering the collection of a broader range of statistics because some concern had been voiced that the current statistics did not adequately reflect the true life of the Church. A pilot project, using a new form, had been undertaken in the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness but following discussion with the College of Bishops, any decision to take that forward more broadly had been postponed because it had been felt that to require the submission of a broader range of statistics at the current time would be to impose an unhelpful additional burden on congregations during the pandemic.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 112 in favour, 2 abstentions.

1.2.2 Budgets

Ms Campbell then turned to consider future Budgets to provide context for many of the debates which would arise during the meeting. In some sessions, members were likely to think about additional funding required for particular important issues. She emphasised that agreement for extra resources for any particular issue would entail an adjustment to expenditure elsewhere in the overall budget.

In recent years, the Standing Committee's key financial objective had been to achieve a balanced budget and avoid deficits. However, the process of setting a balanced budget at the beginning of the year had regularly been followed by the generation of significant surpluses. That had generally happened because actual expenditure in particular areas or projects had been less than estimated, for example because of lower than expected uptake of grants. Because of the pandemic, there had been a very significant reduction in many areas of expenditure resulting in a surplus rather than the large deficit which had originally been budgeted. Accurate budgeting for future years was a particular challenge as the Standing Committee sought to establish how far patterns of working would change in the light of the experience of the previous 15 months. In agreeing budgets for future years, the Standing Committee intended to carry on with a prudent level of over commitment because it expected that underspends would occur and that, in the short-term, reserves would be sufficient to fund any likely deficit.

Ms Campbell outlined the process followed in the province for the agreement of budgets and those included in the Synod Papers reflected decisions made since the previous November, when the budgets had been considered originally. The numbers were dynamic and had changed even since the papers had been prepared for the current meeting. A recent decision by the Investment Committee had been to increase the Unit Trust Pool distribution, with the preliminary distribution for 2021 being set at 30p per unit and with an indication that, based on current performance, the total distribution for the year would be 65p per unit, an increase of 11% on the previous year's distribution. This was greater than the distribution assumed in the budgets. If the 65p distribution were achieved for 2021, the General Fund's income would be £113,000 greater than that detailed in the budget, reducing the budgeted deficit to £386,000. That would also mean that budgeted deficits would be smaller in 2023 and 2024 than had previously been expected.

She invited any high-level comment on the budgets.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) wished to revert to a point which he had raised with Robert Gordon at the previous Synod, namely that he found the budget figures difficult to follow because they were expressed

to the nearest pound. Mr Gordon had indicated that this matter would be looked at by the Standing Committee. He wondered whether it had been considered and, if not, whether it could be. He suggested that the figures could be rounded to the nearest hundred pounds.

Ms Campbell responded and said she was unaware of the previous history but would certainly arrange for the matter to be considered and whether the clarity of the figures could be improved.

1.2.3 Strategic Direction

Ms Campbell then turned to the question of strategic direction. She was aware of previous work undertaken on setting a strategic direction for the General Synod. She suggested that setting a strategic direction meant establishing an appropriate framework for determining how best to use the Church's resources at provincial level which would allow a sensible allocation of resource between competing demands.

As her predecessor, Robert Gordon, had described in 2020, work on defining a vision and strategy had had to be postponed because of the pandemic so that effort could be concentrated on tackling various urgent issues facing the province. That was what had led to the very successful work of the Advisory Group.

The baton had been passed to her and she was pleased to report that the College of Bishops and Standing Committee had decided to take forward previous discussions by preparing a vision, strategy and action plan for the province's work to meet the challenges of the second decade of the 21st century. That would obviously need to include how the Church would respond to the social, economic and environmental impacts of the global emergencies of the Covid 19 pandemic, and of climate change, and indeed the linked crisis of biodiversity loss.

The College of Bishops and the Standing Committee had agreed to produce a statement of vision, strategy objectives and action plan which would allow the province to maximise the effectiveness with which it met the challenges expected to be faced in the following 10 years. The statement needed to be capable of being used to inform the work of provincial boards and committees, including as a basis for prioritising and de-prioritising work, effective decision-making and efficient allocation of financial and human resources. It would also inform the work plans of General Synod Office staff. The statement would need to include:

- An expressive and inspiring vision – that might meet the need for an overarching narrative about what the Church stood for and which had been discussed at previous General Synod meetings.
- The priorities for cross-Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) action at provincial level in the following 10 years including measures which would lead to growth in membership.

- The provincial structures of the SEC (boards and committees) which would be expected to align their work with the statement
- How far it was important or desirable for services and activity at provincial level to lead to consistent outcomes at diocesan level.

Ms Campbell explained that she had offered to facilitate a process, with the help of members of General Synod Office staff, to gather views on what ought to be covered and prepare initial drafts for comment which she hoped would be the subject of much discussion. The Standing Committee intended that a draft statement containing those elements would be available from December 2021 to inform practical decision-making and be ready for presentation to General Synod 2022. The College of Bishops and Standing Committee would be asked to agree the statement before it came to Synod.

The Standing Committee wished to invite the Synod to make an initial contribution to that process of discussion by asking members in the current meeting to take part in breakout groups and contribute to early thinking on the subject.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Standing Committee Task Group:

1. What does a "vision" for the SEC need to say and what issues does a strategy to realise that vision need to cover?
2. What are the priorities for action at provincial level across SEC over the next ten years?
3. How would you ensure that provincial boards and committees focus on priorities once identified?

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

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

2.1 Faith and Order Board

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

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway introduced the session. He explained that the Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021) came to Synod upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board. Members of Synod were encouraged to comment upon the liturgy but because liturgy could only be adopted upon the recommendation of the Board, it would not be possible to amend the liturgy on the floor of Synod. The liturgy was being presented for a first reading after which it would be

sent to Diocesan Synods for consideration. The Board would then consider all comments received from dioceses and present the liturgy, with possible alterations, to General Synod 2022.

The Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor (Convener, Liturgy Committee) referred Synod members to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2020.

He explained that a new impression of Daily Prayer would shortly be available which would correct a number of typographical errors and replace the blue paper on which the Psalter, canticles and prayers of the Evening Office had previously been printed with "desert yellow". Advice on the choice of colour had been received from the Scottish Churches Disability Group and it was hoped that the new colour would prove more easily readable.

The Faith and Order Board had approved, and the College of Bishops had authorised for an experimental period, the introduction of a Season of Creation to the Liturgical Calendar with collects, a Eucharistic Prayer with post-Communion Prayer and Blessing, and Propers for Morning and Evening Prayer. These had been circulated to clergy and lay readers electronically in two booklets, one for the Eucharist and the other for Daily Prayer. A third booklet, containing intercessory material for use at any act of worship, had not been authorised but was provided as an additional resource. The material was also available on the provincial website. Starting in 2021, the Season of Creation would begin on the first Sunday of September and run for four weeks, culminating on the fifth Sunday. The readings from the Revised Common Lectionary for that period would be used to avoid disrupting the continuous reading of the Epistle and Gospel of the year. In order to encourage feedback on material which had been authorised for experimental use, an online platform was in the course of being designed and would be available shortly.

Two sessions on Zoom to introduce the Season of Creation and the new feedback process would be offered during August 2021. Clergy and lay people involved in conducting worship would be welcome to attend but it would be necessary to register in advance.

The disruption in established patterns of worship and the truncated nature of General Synod 2020 had delayed the process of authorising material which had been in experimental use for some years. The texts which were the subject of the motion on the Synod agenda reflected two discrete tasks in the continuing process of liturgical renewal, hence the two rationales set out on pages 43 and 44 of the Synod Papers.

The revisions to the Scottish Liturgy 1982 largely concerned the use of gendered language of God, the Church and human beings. It had been pointed out that an occurrence in the appended intercessions had not been rectified. That would be rectified by the Committee when other feedback was considered, and a revised text submitted to the Faith and Order Board ahead of General Synod 2022. A typographical error had entered the text

of the Proper Preface for Christmas use with Eucharistic Prayer 1 and that would similarly be corrected prior to a second reading.

Eucharistic prayers for the seasons of Christmas and Epiphany, which had not previously been provided, were interpolated into the liturgy. Paragraph spacing in Eucharistic prayers 2a and 2b would be corrected prior to second reading.

The Chair invited comment.

The Rev Canon Peter Moger (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the Committee for its work and expressed support for the removal of masculine gender pronouns for God. However, he wished to take issue with a line in the *Sursum Corda* (line six of the Eucharistic Prayer). The issue was not a nit-picking exercise over wording but a broader theological one. "Our" thanks and praise were only part of a much bigger picture. The original version "it is right to give him thanks and praise" did not specify who or what might be giving the thanks. The publication the previous month of liturgical material for the Season of Creation was a reminder of the important emphasis in Christian scripture and theology that the whole contingent created order praised its Maker. To date, that had been implicit in the *Sursum Corda* and indeed in the wider Eucharistic Prayer, including, for example the *Sanctus*. He recognised that it was the case that some other Anglican provinces had opted for the wording "our" thanks and praise, but Canon Moger urged the Committee to consider the approach taken by yet other Anglican provinces of adopting the wording "it is right to give thanks and praise".

Canon Taylor thanked Canon Moger for his comment. On instruction from the Faith and Order Board, the Liturgy Committee would give the matter serious consideration along with any other feedback received in the following months. He recognised that there had been various attempts to give an English rendition for that line across the Anglican Communion and ecumenically and, ultimately, a decision would need to be taken on which wording to adopt.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) recognised that the wording in question was derived from "dignum et justum est" and suggested that a doubling of the adjectives might be appropriate, such as the term "right and just".

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) commended the new version of the 1982 Liturgy as skilful and sensitive. He also commended the new Eucharistic Prayers which compensated the, perhaps regrettable, loss of Proper Prefaces. He was glad, however, that the liturgy being presented had not incorporated all of the permitted changes included in the experimental version on the provincial website, some of which were not as elegant as those now being presented to Synod. The permitted changes document did have an excellent preface. His question related to section 25, "the Blessing", which he recognised was optional. There was a truncated, weak version of the Blessing in the permitted changes document to which he had referred. He considered the version being presented to

Synod was a better version but nevertheless it omitted the words "his Son". He assumed that the deletion had been to remove masculine imagery but in the permitted changes document, the blessing was related to its source in Philippians 4:7 which referred specifically to Christ Jesus. Liturgical texts frequently used Scripture but did not slavishly follow it. He invited Canon Taylor to confirm that it was not the policy of the Liturgy Committee to conform liturgical texts to the Bible without reference to the liturgical tradition through which they had been received. People carried the liturgy within them, and he felt it was a pity that the phrase "his Son" or "God's Son" had been lost.

Canon Taylor expressed thanks for the comments which had been made. They were being noted. The Committee drafted texts on behalf of the Faith and Order Board which were finalised in conjunction with the College of Bishops. There was a dynamic relationship between Scripture and the liturgy which dated back to the earliest days of the Church. It was not a slavish relationship either way but a dynamic and creative one. There was a strong tradition in SEC liturgies to make allusions to Scripture but without a slavish following of particular texts.

The Primus 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 first time."

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

House of Laity: 48 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions

House of Clergy: 49 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions

House of Bishops: unanimously in favour.

2.1.2 Liturgy Committee – Addition to Calendar of Jane Haining

Canon Taylor reported that the Calendar had been cause for reflection, not only in Scotland but across the Anglican Communion. That was particularly true of the more minor commemorations, many of which elevated people whose witness had either been of very local significance, or had proved not to be of enduring value, or indeed had been compromised by information which had subsequently come to light, or which changing values in society and the Church had cast into rather different relief. Several provinces had also been vexed by proposals to include figures of quite recent history and were struggling to determine appropriate criteria to apply. In Scotland, the historical background included more than a century of being subject to penal laws, during which allegiance to the movement which had become the SEC had been costly, and for some their consciences had brought them into conflict with the State. The Committee was reflecting on how that period in the SEC's history ought most appropriately to be commemorated, when the names of those whose faith was heroic had been largely forgotten and those who were remembered might be controversial. A submission

would be made to the Faith and Order Board in due course. In the meanwhile, the Committee had no hesitation in recommending that Jane Haining, a Church of Scotland worker in Hungary who had perished at Auschwitz, should be added to the Calendar¹. She had been brought to the attention of the Faith and Order Board by the Rev Gerry Dillon of the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

A video, compiled by Mr Dillon, was then shown to Synod recounting her life and witness.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) strongly supported the inclusion of Jane Haining in the Calendar. He suggested that if the motion were approved the tradition of the Eastern Church should be adopted, namely that notification should be given not only to other churches in the Anglican Communion but also the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church and the Hungarian Reformed Church to the effect that Ms Haining would be part of the SEC's ongoing worship.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) also strongly supported the proposal. He had personal reasons for doing so. His wife was a Hungarian Jew born in Budapest in 1944, at the height of the deportations. Had it not been for the courage of people like Ms Haining, his wife might not be alive. Her mother would have known some if not many of the children cared for by Ms Haining.

The Rev Gary Clink (Breachin) commended the work which Ms Haining had done. However, those on the catholic wing of the Church asked the saints to pray for them. That was more difficult in the case of Ms Haining who was a Presbyterian. He wished to emphasise that Synod was being asked to make a decision about the inclusion in the Calendar of a Presbyterian missionary who, as a Presbyterian, would not have believed in praying to the saints.

Canon Taylor responded by confirming that discussion had taken place between the Convener of the Inter-Church Relations Committee and his counterpart in the Church of Scotland before the proposal had been formulated. It was understood that the proposal had the full support of the Church of Scotland. The question of how individual members of the Church prayed was up to their conscience. The kind of devotions mentioned by Mr Clink were above and beyond the discipline provided in the Authorised Liturgies of the SEC. Those members of the Church who did observe such a tradition would have to decide for themselves whether particular names in the Calendar ought to be invoked in that way. However, this would not be the first example of someone in the Calendar who, in their lifetime, would not have prayed to the saints. Consequently, the proposal was not a departure from existing practice.

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

¹ It was noted after the Synod meeting that the paper about Ms Haining included in the Synod Papers incorrectly stated that she was born in the Borders. She was in fact born in Dumfries and Galloway.

“That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended by the inclusion of Jane Haining.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 106 in favour, 1 against, 6 abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Canon Taylor and the Liturgy Committee.

2.2 Inter-Church Relations Committee – *Our Common Calling: approval of the St Andrew Declaration*

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reminded Synod that the church of Old St Paul's stood on the site where Bishop Alexander Rose had famously led members of his Cathedral congregation of St Giles in 1689 or 1690 to set up a new church following the establishment of Presbyterianism by King William. It was likely that he had not envisaged that that separation from the presbyterian party of the Church of Scotland would be a permanent arrangement. If he had had the gift of seeing into the future, might he have been surprised at the continued separate identities of those two parts of the Church of Scotland 332 years later? Would he have recognised the nation of Scotland as it was now, where the deadly religious wars of the century of his birth had given way to one of the least religiously observant states in Europe? The religious landscape of Scotland still bore the scars of that bloody 17th-century but the battles that had caused them were far in the past. Since then, both episcopalian and presbyterian traditions had benefited from the Liturgical movement, evangelical revivals, the insights of biblical scholarship, the growing convergence in the practice of Christian spirituality, dialogue with Orthodox, Lutheran and Roman Catholic brothers and sisters, from the richness of interfaith encounter and, above all, from a growing sense that the Church was united in its mission to participate in God's work of renewing creation and healing humanity in its brokenness. It was that call from God that was front and centre of the commitments of the St Andrew Declaration being presented to Synod. Two sister churches, forged in the same turbulent history, were invited to work together, united in a common purpose and delighting in an enriching diversity. That work was not an organisational merger, but an organic and creative co-operation in the work of God's mission of love, healing and reconciliation.

The Our Common Calling Working Group, which had begun in 2016 and whose progress had been warmly endorsed by Synod in 2019, had kept that mission focus throughout its deliberations. The Group had visited rural and urban contexts across Scotland as well as exploring the work of mission communities of churches in Cumbria. The needs of each community were different and so the response of churches also had to be appropriate to context. The proposal was not any kind of one size fits all approach but rather one which gave permission and encouragement to each local partnership of churches to share human, spiritual and physical resources in the work of mission in the most appropriate way. For some that might mean the sharing of a building; for others sharing pastoral care or regular worship. For many it might be shared projects such as food banks, joint eco-congregation ventures, meditation groups, Messy Church, befriending schemes, Bible studies or courses for those new to faith. Such activity was already

common across Scotland, but the intention was to encourage more of it and, as two of the Churches that sought to offer ministry to every community in Scotland, to recognise that there was a particular and distinctive commitment to work together to that end.

As well as energising such work in local communities, the St Andrew Declaration constituted a formal recognition of both churches as belonging to the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ. To many, that might feel like a statement of the obvious, but it was important to pause and note the significance of such a step between two churches which shared so much history, not all of it glorious. It represented a profound and joyful recognition, a moment of healing and hope.

The Declaration recognised that, because of the two churches' distinctive identities, each had much to offer one another and much to receive. It recognised that each existed not for themselves but for the mission of God. It also recognised that, although there were unresolved matters, not least the nature of the Church's ordained ministry, such matters need not hold the Churches back from doing all that could be done to share in a life of faith. The Declaration represented the start of a journey, not its end. It was a journey that two sister churches in Christ were being invited to undertake together in faith, unity and the strength of the Holy Spirit.

The Rev Sandy Horsburgh, Convener of the Church of Scotland's Committee on Ecumenical Relations, expressed thanks for the invitation to address the Synod and noted that this was the second time he had had such an honour and hoped that that in itself was a sign of the growing closeness of the relationship between both churches. The decision to include Jane Haining in the Scottish Episcopal Church Calendar had also been a wonderful sign of ecumenical convergence.

Addressing each other's Synods and Assemblies was one of the signs of developing unity and it had been a great pleasure for him that the Primus had been able to accept the Moderator's invitation to address the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland two weeks earlier. His reference to the Church of Scotland and the SEC being more than just friends, more even than best friends but truly sisters and brothers, was a sentiment which he wholly endorsed.

In the time taken by the Our Common Calling process to work together, both Churches had grown closer together. The fact that both Churches shared a virtually identical ecumenical policy was a sign of that. Most importantly, the fact that many congregations shared worship from time to time and co-operated on local projects and that many clergy found genuine support and friendship with one another demonstrated that the Churches had moved from being neighbours living parallel lives, to friendship in responding to a mutual call into the mission of God in Scotland.

The times were tough for churches in Scotland and that also had drawn both Churches together. There was a need for mutual support and prayers. Out of that need the Churches could be more effective in working together in ministry and mission in different but complementary ways.

The St Andrew Declaration had been received by the General Assembly with some enthusiasm helped by the commendation received not only from the Primus but from the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane who had been the SEC representative at the Assembly. It had clearly struck a chord with ministers and congregations of the Church of Scotland. The Declaration followed very closely the pattern adopted by other ecumenical agreements, notably the Reuilly Agreement and the Columba Declaration. In that sense the Declaration was in known and trusted territory, following a familiar pattern which recognised and celebrated the unique gifts and characteristics of each Church but pointed to the core of what was held in common. It also looked to the future, laying the ground for further co-operation in mission and service.

The decision on whether or not to adopt the Declaration was one for the General Synod but along with sisters and brothers in the Church of Scotland, he prayed that the Synod would adopt it and that, building on that foundation, together both Churches would find more and richer ways to glorify God together.

Finally, Mr Horsburgh expressed pleasure at being able to work with John McLuckie as Co-Convener of the Our Common Calling Group. As Canon McLuckie stepped down as Convener of the Inter-Church Relations Committee, he would look forward to working with the Rev Canon Professor Charlotte Methuen as she took on that role.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Inter-Church Relations Committee:

1. The St Andrew Declaration invites SEC and Church of Scotland congregations to work together for the sake of the Church's mission in Scotland. Can you share specific examples from your own experience of such collaboration between our two churches?
2. Looking to the future, what other examples of collaboration would you like to see in your own context?
3. Are there any barriers to co-operation that we need to overcome?

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Synod resumed in plenary session and the Chair opened the matter for comment.

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke as someone who had been one of the SEC delegates more than 25 years previously to the Scottish Churches Initiative for Union and expressed thanks to Canon McLuckie and others for the work to achieve the St Andrew Declaration. The acknowledgements in the Declaration stressed that there was work to be done. There was a need to take that seriously and think of a plan of attack. Differences between denominations, which might seem important to those in churches, were not seen as important by people "out in the real world". There was a need to recognise that. Undertaking

joint activity, without concentrating on the differences which divided the Churches, was a very real way ahead and also a way of attracting others into the Church.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the proposal. He was an SEC member of the Our Common Calling Working Group and had helped in the drafting of the Declaration. For the first time, the Declaration enabled the Churches to name their complex history, including the pain caused to one another. The statement also clarified what the Churches were allowed to do already. It was not a commitment to do anything which was not already in place. The world was yearning for healing and meaning, and the Gospel could be proclaimed more effectively when the Churches spoke with a united voice. Also, however, in supporting the proposal, he did so with some heartache. How the statement was understood could cause confusion and even pain. As Episcopalians, it was necessary to recognise that the Declaration was not a "full communion" statement, nor, from his perspective, could it be at the present time. Also, his heartache related to the fact that further movement could mean a significant change in the SEC's ecclesiology, identity and sacramental theology, specifically the theology of ordination. Much time had been spent on the marriage Canon in recent years, and it was important to reflect on the consequences when such a proposal was being made. Ecumenism was like apple pie – who would not vote in favour of it – but he wondered whether it was in fact faithful to the ecumenism of recent decades. The question was how to move forward without jeopardising the Church's unique identity and how to involve those who had strong and divergent views about tradition and theology in these conversations.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) did not wish to speak against the Declaration but wished to express reservation. Ecumenical partnership involved working together and close friendships. He himself was involved in joint training. As an Episcopalian, it had been good to see the developments within the General Assembly especially the renewal plan announced in 2019 and, at the 2021 Assembly, the interim report of the Theological Forum which had recommended demoting the status of the Calvinist Westminster Confession, which would be appreciated by many Episcopalians. However, there were problems with the St Andrew Declaration. In the preamble, there were two inaccuracies which revealed deeper problems. Following the Reformation, Christians in some parts of Scotland had been happy to remain Roman Catholic rather than being Presbyterian or Episcopalian. That was an omission from the preamble. That was doubtless an innocent mistake but nevertheless had its roots in Scotland's shame, namely sectarianism. The Roman Catholic Church was one of the three main parts of Scottish Christianity in the current era. It was an unconscious slip, but the language revealed an attitude of who was "like us" and who were outsiders. A further criticism of the preamble was the phrase "English immigration" in the establishment of qualified chapels. That was not true. From the time of Queen Anne research showed that there had been mixed congregations which included Jacobites. English support was important but not the reason for the establishment of such chapels.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that the reasons which Mr Dünzkofer had given for supporting the proposal with a heavy heart were in fact reasons to oppose it, with a heavy heart. Had the document been limited to the Commitments set out in the paper, he would have been able to support it

but if the document was to be taken seriously, he had difficulty with Acknowledgements iv and v particularly. Such acknowledgements ran the risk that the episcopal ministry was seen as an adiaphoron, that the episcopal ministry of the Church was a secondary matter. Those were sufficient grounds for the SEC to reject the document.

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reported that it had been an immense privilege to represent the SEC at the General Assembly when the St Andrew Declaration had been affirmed so enthusiastically the previous month. He had explained to the Assembly that he had a personal interest in the Declaration in that his family had originally been staunch Presbyterians from Fife. His father had told the tale of an ancestor, Russell Paton, who was allegedly one of the Covenanters who had ambushed James Sharp, Archbishop of St Andrews in 1679. He personally might, therefore, be in the unusual position of one of his predecessors having been assassinated by one of his ancestors. The Declaration invited both Churches to acknowledge such pain of the past but also, and this was why he supported the Declaration, to turn to the needs of the present and the challenges of the future. The commitments made by both Churches were highly significant and would need to be worked at to be real and effective. There would be a need to go beyond the nice relationships and joint services to joint planning of how together the Churches would serve the nation. He was aware in his own diocese of many congregations where there was a real desire to do things together and structure their life more closely. Where the Declaration would lead the Churches, one could not say, but he believed both Churches were called to full communion not because all differences had been resolved but rather because they remained.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) reported that she had been a member of the General Synod of the Church of England when the Columba Declaration had been voted upon a few years previously. There had been a level of discomfort in the meeting because the SEC was not a party to the arrangement. It had been voted through because the Archbishop of Canterbury had asked the Synod to vote in favour. She had not been able to bring herself to vote against it but considered now that she ought to have done. The St Andrew Declaration included wording with which she could not agree – they were principally set out in the Acknowledgements section. It was a document which included statements of doctrine in the expectation that they would all be agreed. She was wholly in favour of ecumenism and there was no doubt that there was a need to try to work better together not just with the Church of Scotland but also with the Roman Catholic Church and others, but she could not vote in favour of the Declaration as a base from which to work. With a measure of regret she would vote against.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) agreed with the previous speaker and would also vote against the Declaration not because he did not believe in ecumenism (he did) but he struggled with the full visible unity model which appeared to be strongly inherent in the Declaration. His main reason for voting against was because the same words were used in the Declaration as were used in agreements of full communion. He struggled with using the same words to people with whom there was a different relationship. That could lead to friends thinking that the SEC meant something which in fact it did not. It might be thought that the SEC was willing to say anything to anyone – and that would not help. He also found the wording of the Acknowledgements section very difficult and did not

agree with all of them. If the document were limited simply to the Commitments, he would find it easy to accept. He would vote against, with a heavy heart.

Canon McLuckie thanked members for their contributions. The language used in the Declaration was careful and allowed a breadth of interpretation, but he would not call it a fudge. The fact was that both Churches did differ in their emphases on theology (both between and within each Church). Within the SEC, for example, there were extraordinarily divergent views on the nature of the Eucharist, as was also the case in the Church of Scotland. The statements in the document were intended to show that there was a significant level of common ground while continuing to differ on emphases and significant areas of theology. However, both Churches shared the catholic Creeds and Scriptures and so there was a common apostolic faith which both churches were able to affirm, while recognising diversity. On the specific question of Episcopacy, he did not read the document, at all, as suggesting that episcopacy was an adiaphoron. Canon 1 made very clear that threefold ministry of Bishops, priests and deacons was a gift of God to the Church and that was not about to be changed. It was indispensable. That was one reason why further work was needed in relation to ministry, albeit co-operation was already possible under the ecumenical Canon in certain circumstances. The document was not expressing a direction of travel in relation to SEC theology but rather expressing a diversity of theology within which both churches could work together. He deferred to Dr Holmes' historical knowledge and apologised if there were inaccuracies in the document. Also, the Roman Catholic Church was indeed the third church which shared the commitment to cover the whole of Scotland in its ministry. In making the agreement with the Church of Scotland, other ecumenical partners were not being excluded. The Church of Scotland already had a very fruitful theological forum with the Roman Catholic Church and the Declaration would enable the SEC to benefit from that.

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

“That the St Andrew Declaration as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 78 in favour, 21 against, 7 abstentions.

The Chair thanked Canon McLuckie for his work on the Committee and welcomed his successor the Rev Canon Professor Dr Charlotte Methuen.

SESSION THREE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Convener, Institute Council) reported on the work of the Institute Council and referred members to the written report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2020.

God continued to call people into worship and service and so, in every time, even in a pandemic, the emergence of vocations and the training and formation of ministry candidates continued. Vocational discernment and the central SEI provision had continued through the pandemic. It had been undertaken online and there had been great creativity and generosity in its provision and reception. Some candidates were just completing their first year of training and had never had the opportunity to meet another student face-to-face thus far. Friendships and spiritual relationships had been formed in other ways. They would meet in person in Kinnoull in the summer and being together might bring challenges and surprises.

The Periodic External Review which had taken place early in 2020 had been extensive and had considered all aspects of the SEI provision including the student experience and had included interviews with staff and incumbents, diocesan advisors, placement supervisors and so on. Bishop Dyer reminded Synod that training and formation of a candidate "takes a village". The Review had been very good in its outcomes and the Council was grateful for the help the report gave to shape future training and formation. Following reception of the report, there had been further developments in relation to Common Awards. The validation contract had been confirmed until 2024. Postgraduate diplomas and MAs had been added to the suite of Common Awards programmes. Also, at present there was a review into the mixed mode pathway and all that that had brought to the richness of the training and formation provision. The Review would report to the Council in November and Synod would be updated in 2022.

Bishop Dyer closed by asking the Church's prayers for all those who were sensing the call of God to ministry of some kind, for all those involved in vocational discernment, for the student body, the SEI staff and the Council itself.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) agreed that it "took a village" to train and form a candidate. The most important was the village which sent the candidate to training in the first place. The SEI did a wonderful job. The amount of time expected of candidates was incredible and it was clear that the SEI was very supportive of its students, but she made a plea not to forget the village from which the candidate came originally and to which they would return and where they could enable others to catch the vision of vocation.

The Chair thanked Bishop Dyer, members of the Council and the SEI for their work.

3.2 Standing Committee and Pension Fund – Triennial Valuation

Mr Richard McIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) had been due to address the meeting but experienced technical difficulties and was unable to join.

In his absence Ms Daphne Audsley, Pension Fund Administrator, summarised the outcome of the preliminary results of the SEC Pension Fund Triennial Valuation as at 31 December 2020. She explained that the results contained both good and bad news. The good news was that the valuation indicated that the Fund was in surplus in relation to past service. The value of the assets had increased since

2017 but the liabilities had also increased. She outlined the principal reasons for the changes since 2017. Market conditions had not been favourable to pension funds because of the fall in gilts yields. However there had been positive investment returns. Also, a new method had been introduced for assessing mortality and had resulted in an improvement. The bad news was that the future service rate had increased again. In 2017, the future service rate had been 35.9% but it had been possible, because the Fund had been in surplus, to continue the actual contribution rate at 32.2%. In the 2020 valuation, the future service rate had increased to 41%. However, the surplus on the Fund was such as to enable the contribution rate to be maintained again at the same level of 32.2%. Another aspect of the valuation process was assessing the strength of the "employer covenant", namely the relationship between the Church and the Trustees and the Church's ability to continue to fund the scheme. The covenant remained strong.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) thanked the Chair of the Trustees, Richard McIndoe, and the other Pension Fund Trustees for their extremely hard work on managing the Fund over the previous year. The Church was also very grateful to Mr McIndoe for his willingness to stay on as Chair of the Trustees as a suitable successor was identified. She also paid particular tribute to Daphne Audsley who had worked to support this vital element of the Church's provision for more than 20 years and had even postponed her retirement. The Standing Committee had held a special meeting the previous month with the Chair, Ms Audsley, the Secretary General and Treasurer to discuss the preliminary results of the valuation. The Committee had confirmed the Trustees' view that the contribution rate payable should be maintained at 32.2% from January 2021 and endorsed the proposal for the motion being presented to Synod.

Comment was invited but there was none.

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

"That the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be maintained with effect from 1 January 2022 at 32.2% of standard stipend and salary respectively."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 104 in favour, 2 abstentions.

The Primus also thanked Richard McIndoe for his willingness to stay on as Chair and Daphne Audsley for all her work and for stepping in at the last minute to present the report.

SESSION FOUR: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Mission Board

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Convener, Mission Board) reported on the work of the Board. She expressed thanks to the Rev Canon Jane Ross, her predecessor as Convener, from whom she had taken on the role and offered thanks to General Synod Office staff and the pendant committee Conveners. The previous 15

months had been a period when the Church had looked at its mission and connections through a very different lens, quite literally in many places. Churches had connected with their people and places through creative and innovative ways and had been able to be alongside those who might not otherwise have had such connections to church communities. The Board would continue to discern the most appropriate time to gather such shared experiences and learning from lockdown. It was still too early to gather such data, but the Board did not wish to miss valuable stories and she encouraged everyone to keep notes and reflections on mission for the previous 15 month period so that, in due course, examples could be drawn on to shape the future mission of the Church.

Provost Murray expressed thanks to the Rev Dr Richard Tiplady for his development of a number of courses and seminars over the previous year which had been well received. They had enabled a learning community to gather to explore mission. He had also convened the Local Mission Resourcing Group until recently which had brought together those with a missional remit in their dioceses enabling them to share best practice and provide peer support. The Board was in the process of forming a new committee, the Local Mission Development Committee, which was to be convened by the Rev Diana Hall. The remit of that Committee was in the course of preparation with the hope that the Committee could be a resource to support vision cast by the College of Bishops and strengthen the work of dioceses.

In the year ahead, the Board would address various issues including the possible revision of the annual statistics collected within the Church and how that data could best be used to inform the work of the Church. The Board would also work with the Standing Committee and the College of Bishops to ensure that its remit reflected the vision and priorities of the Church and to ensure that the Board's work reflected a joined-up approach with others. One of the current priorities, and one of the priorities of mission, was the response of the Church to the climate crisis to which the Synod would turn shortly.

4.2 Church in Society Committee – Climate Change

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Convener, Church in Society Committee) noted that barely six months had passed since the meeting of the General Synod in December 2020 when it had tasked the Church in Society Committee with setting the province on a pathway to achieve the target of net zero carbon emissions by 2030. The bulk of the response to that motion would be contained in the action plan on which Dr Donald Bruce would separately address Synod.

A subgroup of the Church in Society Committee, the Climate Change Technical Group, had been hard at work to produce a programme of actions in response to the request of the 2020 motion. The programme now being presented to Synod represented a beginning only.

Through the work of the Technical Group, as well as a provincial group which had met at regular intervals with the Primus, it had been recognised that climate change generally, and achieving the net zero target specifically, would require whole Church involvement and action. It was not enough for one committee to undertake the work – all boards and committees would need to be involved at

some point, the province and dioceses would need to make changes and dioceses would need to enable their charges to engage with necessary action. All charges themselves would need to take seriously their role in reducing emissions and forming whole life disciples to be responsible for and care for the Earth. To that end, a proposal had been brought to the provincial Standing Committee in preparation for General Synod that a provincial Environment Group be established not only to deal with the 2030 goal, but also wider matters associated with climate change, such as biodiversity. The aim of that Group would be to formulate a strategy to enable the realisation of the 2030 target, building upon the programme of actions being presented to the current meeting and to be responsible for the implementation of that strategy. Monitoring and assessment would be carried out by the Group which would report regularly to Standing Committee and General Synod.

There would be many questions ahead since achieving net zero by 2030 was no small feat. However, neither were the obstacles insurmountable. She hoped that the programme of actions, the current presentation to Synod and the group discussions which would follow shortly would be the first of many such conversations. It was recognised that support and resources at both provincial and diocesan level were necessary and the feedback from the breakout groups would help determine priorities for the future. She assured Synod that the Church would not be left alone in its efforts to reduce carbon footprint. The motions to be presented later in the session would determine how the Church moved forward, recognising that creation was good and that there was a need to do everything possible to preserve the world for the current and future generations.

Dr Donald Bruce (Convener, Climate Change Technical Group) reminded Synod that the Apostle Paul had written to the Christians in Rome “that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth up to the present time”. That had never been more true than in the present day. Human activity was changing the global climate catastrophically, with recent scientific measurements of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere being 50% more than before the Industrial Revolution. The greenhouse effect was inexorably warming the whole planet in ways which were harmful to lives, communities, health, food and God's creation itself. Different parts of the world were affected in different ways, but the common feature was that the consequences fell disproportionately on the world's poor and disadvantaged, who had the least means to adapt. Every person was part of the cause and the current and previous generations had been living off a legacy of cheap fossil fuels without taking heed of the waste that had been accumulating. Whilst the past could not be changed, the future could which was why the world's governments had signed the historic 2015 UN Paris Agreement and would come to Glasgow in November to take forward the urgent process of reducing emissions. Scientists were warning that action in the following five to ten years would determine the state of the planet bequeathed to future generations – those generations were dependent on what happened now.

Simply put, there was a need to move away from burning fossil fuels for heating, transport and industrial processes. The changes needed encompassed most aspects of church life but also every area in which fossil fuels were burned. The need was to replace those with electricity or other renewable alternatives or, where that was not possible, to reduce, save and offset. Scotland had one of the lowest

carbon footprints for its electricity in the world and so electricity, rather than gas, ought to be used as often as possible.

The challenge was not underestimated but the Technical Group was keen to encourage not just the need for action but also that action was possible. The SEC and the Church of England, Church in Wales and Church of Scotland were all making commitments towards reducing emissions to net zero by 2030 – hence the set of resources and practical recommendations being presented to Synod. The intention was to "resize" what might otherwise seem like a daunting task into steps which could be undertaken and then be built upon progressively and realistically.

The SEC was not alone in the task. There was a movement across the churches in the whole of the UK and excellent experience to draw upon such as Eco-Congregation Scotland. Expert advice was also available within the Church of England and Church of Scotland on what to do in church buildings. There were also good secular sources such as Home Energy Scotland, Zero Waste Scotland, the Energy Saving Trust and Historic Environment Scotland where grants might be available.

The Group wished to encourage "champions" – a person or small group who could take matters forward and work and learn together. The paper presented to Synod was a summary and work was in hand to supplement it with a toolkit providing a more detailed set of resources which would be available later in the summer. The Group recognised the sheer diversity of situations across the province. The toolkit could not be a "one size fits all" document but would offer a set of actions and resources. He hoped, if feasible, that there might be an interactive website to enable people to find advice relevant to their situation.

In Morning Prayer at the beginning of the day's business, Synod had read "*today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts*". There was now a race against time and transition to net zero emissions required action from everyone. Secular environmentalists could be gloomy, but the Church had a saviour. He urged Synod to join in the task of caring for Christ's creation, as people who shared St Paul's "hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God".

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Church in Society Committee:

1. Have you had a watershed moment that changed the way you think about climate change?
(A person or newspaper article that inspired you to do things differently, to engage more in a personal or corporate way?)
2. How is your church (or community) engaged with environmental issues and tackling climate change? (What are your good news stories?)
3. What do you understand by net zero carbon emissions?
(Skip this question and move on to the last one if there is too little time.)

4. What do you find most daunting about the way forward to 2030 and how can the Church structures best support you and your congregation?

(What do people think will be difficult for their church to achieve with regard to the 10 points of guidance and the action plan? What advice/guidance/support do they think they need going forward from the province and the dioceses?)

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Synod then resumed in plenary session.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Convener, Church in Society Committee) then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, recognising the urgency of the climate emergency, endorse and commend

- *the Ten Points of Guidance set out in the paper from the Technical Group of the Church in Society Committee*
- *the programme of actions set out in the paper.”*

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) commended the report as an excellent roadmap. He wished to comment on three of the practical suggestions identified in the report drawing on his own experience in his own charge of St Andrews, St Andrews. Having an energy audit to drive a carbon reduction plan was essential. It enabled actions to be prioritised and could also produce projects for submission for external funding. In the previous year, his charge had been awarded £14,000 by the Scottish Government's Community Challenge Asset Fund but there had been a window of only a few weeks in which to make the application and having a set of actions ready to be funded had been crucial to success. Secondly, it was important to make a distinction between making better use of the energy already being used and moving to low carbon energy sources. For better use of existing energy sources, he suggested checking out smart heating controls on boilers and radiators, improving insulation, reducing drafts and installing double glazing where possible. Those were lower cost actions which could be undertaken relatively quickly. Switching to an energy tariff from renewable sources would also generate carbon savings. In the longer term, replacing a gas or oil burner with heat pumps would also significantly reduce carbon footprint but typically those incurred much higher cost. The Eco-Congregation Scotland website had many very good suggestions. Solar panels on church roofs were also an obvious way to reduce carbon footprint, not least given the orientation of churches. Several years previously, his church (a B listed building in a conservation area) had applied for planning permission for solar panels on the roof. That had been rejected by Fife Council. However, the climate emergency had changed the context within which such planning applications were now decided. Local authorities now had to balance conservation heritage arguments against the carbon savings which would result. His charge had just submitted a revised application, prepared by a professional planning consultant, and awaited the result. If it proved successful, it might prove the first such application from a church which was both listed and in a conservation area, in

which case it could be a valuable test case to cite in subsequent applications from other charges. He strongly endorsed the motion.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that his first job had been as a lecturer in the Department of Environmental Science at the University of Bradford when such issues had been talked about many decades ago. He applauded the Church in Society Committee for bringing forward the material and for producing it so soon after the previous Synod. Whilst recognising that it was the start of a process, he considered the material was something of a curate's egg. Aside from the quote from Romans 8:22 and the mention of God in one place, the paper could have been written by a secular organisation. People had created the climate emergency and, on their own, were not capable of averting it. Action by the Church needed to start by asking God for help, in prayer. The Church was part of the problem and there was a need to lament that fact and then repent and turn back to God. The elephant in the room, which was briefly alluded to in the report, was the fact that the climate emergency was caused by over-consumption. All elements of solution had to be underpinned by consuming less. There was a need to avoid simply moving the problem around by exporting emissions or dumping waste in other parts of the world. It was sobering that, at present, the world was capable of recycling only 2% of the lithium being used in batteries. It was not acceptable to achieve a "green glow" at the expense of others. The paper correctly emphasised that much of what could be done was dependent on local circumstances which was why a framework was needed to assist in making local decisions. That framework needed to be "reduce, reduce, reduce, reuse and only then recycle".

The Rev Canon Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that a further elephant in the room was the need to challenge the whole political and economic system in which people lived. The Church needed to undermine the neoliberal economic model. There was a need to be evangelical about that and tell congregations what they needed to hear.

Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) commended the report as excellent. However, he had a few concerns. An audit needed to be organisational so that there were standard measurements and numerical targets because otherwise it would not be possible to know what point had been reached by 2030. That, therefore, also implied a need for timescales. There was a need for an asset register which included land as well as buildings. There was a need for reduction in demand first followed by issues of recycling and reusing. Some buildings were multi-use and there was a need to take account of the carbon consumed in those different uses. It was also important not to ignore biodiversity targets. Nature could help the human population reduce its demand and sequester some of the emissions. There was also a need to reduce water demands.

Miss Morag O'Neill (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested there were some missing words in line 6 on page 89 of the Synod Papers.

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he had been intending to speak on the motion on the Synod agenda inviting the Standing Committee to put new structures in place. The issue of climate change had been discussed frequently at Synods and his concern was that the Church risked

becoming bored with it. Therefore, it was important for Standing Committee to set up a mechanism to continue to work on the issue because it would continue not just for the following 9 years but for much longer. Climate change needed to be seen as being at the heart of discipleship and mission. Putting it on future Synod agendas needed to be done in a way which attracted people to talk about the issue.

Dr Wright responded briefly to some of the comments and confirmed that the intention of the wording on page 89 of the Synod Papers was to encourage rescheduling of the times when church buildings were used so as to avoid having to reheat them from scratch every time. More generally, she thanked members for their comments. She emphasised that the Technical Group had produced the document within just four months. There had been a need to produce something for Synod, but the Group was also conscious that the work was ongoing, forever. Both science and the political agenda were changing and there was a need to be responsive to both. All of the comments would feed into the ongoing work.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 106 in favour, 3 abstentions.

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

“That this Synod call on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to put in place appropriate structures to enable action at provincial level and report back to General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 110 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Dr Wright then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod call on Dioceses to put in place appropriate structures to enable action at diocesan level and to support action at congregational level and report back to General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 108 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

Dr Wright then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Synod call on the Scottish Episcopal Church to support through prayer, advocacy and practical action those people and nations suffering the most from the impacts of climate change.”

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) observed that the Synod had earlier approved the St Andrew Declaration. All of the motions regarding climate change addressed the SEC internally. He hoped that it would be possible to collaborate on such matters ecumenically.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged that in responding to the climate crisis it would be important for the Faith and Order Board to keep in focus appropriate liturgy to help the Church. The way the Church prayed was often liturgical, but he was not convinced that the liturgical resources available at

present reflected the tone of the current debate with themes such as lament and repentance.

The Chair confirmed that note would be taken of such points.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 114 in favour, 1 abstention.

SESSION FIVE: THE VERY REV FRANCES BURBERRY IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Faith and Order Board - Review of Canon 4

The Rt Rev John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) reported as the Convener of the Canon Four Review Group. Over the previous six months, the Group had consulted across the province about two options for revising Canon 4 (*Of the Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees*). The consultation had initially been rolled out to General Synod members in the autumn of 2020 and had been opened up for comment from Diocesan Synods, vestries and individuals. The basic question was whether to retain the present system whereby Bishops were ultimately chosen by the Electoral Synod of their diocese or for the election process to be owned instead by a smaller Electoral Council including representation from the wider province. The consultation had not been a scientific survey but sought to involve as many people as possible in the conversation and to allow an honest exchange of views. It was possible that some respondents had contributed in more than one forum and any votes taken had been purely indicative and non-binding.

A number of points had emerged in the responses from all parts of the province. There had been strong, albeit not unanimous, support for the option of retaining the Electoral Synod. That had been expressed in terms of a wish to retain diocesan power over the process and that at the point of the election there ought not to be any provincial input. The choice of Bishop was felt to be a matter for every charge in the diocese, not a select group of electors. There had been a clear desire to simplify the Canon and make it more easily understood with less rigid timescales. A commentary on the Canon and guidelines for its implementation was thought to be a helpful addition. Many had sought a Canon which was more obviously compassionate to those involved in the process. In particular, the publishing of names on the shortlist was considered by many to be unnecessary, and cruel to those not elected. Much had been said about the size of the shortlist. Some considered that the current minimum number of three was too large and that in some circumstances a shortlist of one should be permissible. More generally, a shortlist of two was felt to be the minimum. There had been overwhelming support for the proposal that more training should be offered to Synod/Council members, the Preparatory Committee and, indeed, to the Church at all levels. It had been clear from the consultation that some church members did not understand the process, nor what a Bishop did. Better use might be made of the initial meeting of the Electoral Synod or Council with input from those skilled in spiritual discernment and human resources, as well as an introduction to the Canon itself.

Following discussion in breakout groups, Synod members would be invited to indicate which option they wished to be developed into a draft Canon ready for first reading in 2022. Following Synod, the Review Group would present the

preference articulated by Synod to the Faith and Order Board and, under that Board's instruction, would work with the Committee on Canons to draft the new Canon. It would also seek the permission of the Board to develop a commentary to the Canon and a set of guidelines for its compassionate and effective working. These would all be ready in draft form for General Synod 2022.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Canon 4 Review Group:

1. Discernment of vocation is at the heart of the election of a Bishop. What training or preparation for this would help you, if called on to serve on a Preparatory Committee or as an Elector?
2. As a member of the College of Bishops, a Bishop in the SEC has both a Provincial and a Diocesan role. What do you think the balance should be between province and diocese in the selection of candidates and the election itself?
3. Canon 4 has to be put into practice for each election. Do you think it would be helpful to have a Commentary on the text of the Canon, and practical Guidelines based on the experience of previous elections? What would help you as a member of a Preparatory Committee, a Candidate, or an Elector?
4. Having read the Report on the Consultation, which do you believe should be the best way forward for the revision of Canon 4: the Electoral Council, or the Electoral Synod?

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Synod then resumed in plenary session.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) had wished to raise a point of order before moving into breakout groups. His question had been whether there was scope for options other than those indicated in the Synod Papers to be discussed. The Chair confirmed that any other options raised could be passed to Bishop Armes.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) wished to make the general point that whilst discussion in breakout groups was good, he wondered whether that could inhibit discussion in plenary session within Synod and suggested adequate plenary discussion in future.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested that one of the problems encountered in the most recent electoral process in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway had been about how individuals in the process were cared for. It was difficult for an individual to allow their name to go forward and explain that to their congregation without giving the impression that the individual wished to leave the congregation. She was keen for the Review Group to consider how such care and support could be offered. Her breakout group had all wished to stay with the Electoral Synod option.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) emphasised that confidentiality was crucial. It became impossible to care for people if their details were made public.

Bishop Armes responded to comments made. His own breakout group had in fact spoken about other options. However, the discussion process had already been going on for some time and conversation could not continue forever. The Group had consulted with candidates who had been involved in previous processes, and with other provinces in the Anglican Communion and, in the end, it had come down to the two options of Electoral Synod or Electoral Council. He looked forward to receiving the written feedback from the breakout groups. When Synod debated a first reading of any new Canon, that would be discussed in plenary and, if passed, Diocesan Synods would similarly have the opportunity for full debate on the floor. The Group also noted the question of care for candidates. How candidates were cared for could be addressed perhaps in a protocol rather than in the Canon itself. Certainly, those who might not be elected could be disappointed, but it would be unfortunate if the process made that worse for them. Confidentiality was an aspect of that. The overwhelming view expressed in feedback thus far had been that shortlists ought not to be published and for members of Electoral Synods not to share such details. He closed by inviting any who wished to make further comments to write to him or the Review Group directly.

The Chair explained that the options about to be put to Synod were not to be regarded as a vote of Synod as such but rather an indicative vote of the members. The options were then put to the vote with the following result:

- Electoral Synod (Option 1) - 74 in favour
- Electoral Council (Option 2) - 39 in favour
- Neither of the above options (Option 3) - 5 in favour
- Abstain (Option 4) – 1 in favour

The Chair expressed thanks to members for their contributions both in breakout groups and plenary and also to Bishop Armes and members of the Review Group.

5.2 Administration Board

5.2.1 Clergy Stipends

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) referred Synod members to the report of the Administration Board and its pendant committees in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2020. The focus of the current session would be on clergy wellbeing but before proceeding he wished to report that since the Synod Papers had gone to press, the Investment Committee had decided to increase the distribution from the Unit Trust Pool for the first six months of 2021 to 30p per unit, an increase of 13% on the corresponding distribution in 2020, with the hope of making a total distribution for the year of 65p per unit, thus increasing budgeted income for the province by £113,000. The Church was well served by the expertise of the Investment Committee and Baillie Gifford as Fund Managers.

The previous Synod had affirmed the Church's value for its clergy and had noted that further work was being done on the topic of clergy stipends and clergy wellbeing. Behind the work detailed in the Synod Papers lay dedicated work of SEC staff and active and engaged participation of board and committee colleagues to whom he extended thanks.

The position regarding clergy stipends was summarised in the Synod Papers. Fourteen recommendations had been made and the full report of the Clergy Remuneration Package Interim Review Group was set out in the Synod Papers. In its deliberations, the Board had been conscious of a number of interrelated factors and in particular the work which clergy had been doing during the pandemic and the strain which that had involved, as well as of congregations' ability to pay and the need to keep pace with inflation. Of the 14 recommendations, three related to stipend policy and needed the approval of Synod. The Board also recognised that the Church of England was undertaking a remuneration review. The Board would maintain a watching brief on that and consider whether it might have an impact on SEC policy but, for the moment, the position of the Board was that it wished to break the link with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark and restore stipend to its 2006 level, adjusted for inflation, since there was a gap of approximately £1,440. To bridge that gap, the Board proposed a gradual approach which was set out in the three motions on the Synod agenda. The proposal comprised maintaining parity with the Church of England rate for 2020 (or Consumer Price Index, if greater). The Church of England had just announced that its rate for 2022 would comprise an increase of 1% but since the latest CPI figure for April 2021 showed an increase of 1.5% the Administration Board would confirm the position at its September meeting for 2022 in the light of CPI information available at that time. From 2023 onwards, the proposal was to increase stipends by 1% more than the Church of England, or 1% more than CPI, if the CPI increase was larger. He could not say how long it would take to bridge the gap but for the purposes of the current discussion he was assuming perhaps a catchup period of four years. Once the gap was finally bridged the intention was to use the same uplift as the Church of England but so as not to fall behind inflation, a triennial review would be undertaken to assess any changes in CPI and any other relevant factors.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) then proposed the following Motion:

“That Standard Stipend 2022 be increased in line with increases in Church of England National Stipend Benchmark or CPI if greater.”

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded the motion and explained to Synod that the purpose of the proposals was about valuing clergy. He recognised that the fact that there had been no increase in stipend in either the SEC or the Church of England for the current year had been difficult. The proposal was, therefore, about care for the Church's clergy but also about increasing the level of stipend gently so that it did not create a financial crisis for charges which might have been weakened by the pandemic. He supported the proposals enthusiastically.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 113 in favour, 1 against, 4 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That from 2023, Standard Stipend should rise at rate one percentage point above the rate applied to the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark, or by one percentage point above CPI if greater, until such time as it reaches a level equal to 2006 Standard Stipend scaled up pro rata with CPI.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 109 in favour, 6 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That in subsequent years, Standard Stipend maintain the same percentage uplift compared with Church of England National Stipend Benchmark, subject to a triennial review in the light of changes in CPI and other relevant factors.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 113 in favour, 4 abstentions.

5.2.2 Personnel Committee

The Chair reported that a number of amendments had been received in relation to Motions 22 and 23 on the Synod agenda and an amendment to an amendment had also been received in relation to Motion 22. Each would be taken as a separate item of business once the Convener of the Personnel Committee had spoken.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Convener, Personnel Committee) explained that the Committee was bringing motions to General Synod this year in relation to a Complaints Procedure, a Policy on Bullying and Harassment and a paper proposing altered Guidelines for Clergy Holiday and Time Off. All three were offered as a direct response to the findings of the Clergy Wellbeing Survey of 2019. That survey had highlighted concerns around bullying and harassment and, because of that, the development of a bullying and harassment statement had been a priority. Neither the Complaints Procedure nor the Bullying and Harassment Policy were to be seen as set in tablets of stone. They were a first step which had been agreed at a series of meetings of the Personnel Committee, the College of Bishops and the Administration Board and could, and would, be expanded upon over the next year and beyond. They were, however, a vitally important first step.

Bullying and harassment was an unfortunate part of life of most organisations and, sadly, the SEC had not been exempt. Such behaviour could arise in almost any area of church life and experiences shared with her during her time as Convener had indicated that such behaviour could stem from both clergy and laity. The policy, she believed, would start the

process whereby everyone could consider their behaviour and relationships with one another. Christ had called upon his followers to love one another.

The Committee had always believed that alongside a policy on bullying and harassment there would have to be a complaints procedure to enable complaints about bullying or harassment to be processed. The procedure being proposed to Synod was not at the current time a detailed, fully worked out process but reflected, to a very large extent, what happened in practice at present. The Committee had drawn together in the procedure a description of how complaints were likely to be dealt with at present and made the process easier and more accessible. It also gave accountability. It was possible that it might engender complaints, but that possibility ought not to make the Church shy away from having a robust procedure.

Since the procedure had been agreed for presentation to Synod, the Canonical Review Group had identified one small change which was needed to reflect a little-known provision in Canon 53, and she would shortly propose a minor amendment to reflect that.

Finally, the motion regarding guidance for clergy time off was offered as a result of the Wellbeing Survey but also reflected comments made at General Synod 2020. For a number of years there had been guidelines from the Administration Board about clergy time off which envisaged one day off per week (or the equivalent every two weeks). The Committee and listened carefully to comments made at Synod 2020 and wished to update the guidance, as set out in the Synod Papers. They would still retain the status of guidelines, but she hoped they would be of use to both clergy and vestries. She hoped it would encourage vestries in turn to encourage their clergy to see their "working week" as 5, not 6, days out of 7. Ensuring that clergy had their proper time off was a very tangible way of showing the Church's appreciation of them and their families and of supporting their wellbeing. As the clergy cared for church members, church members had a mutual duty to care for them.

5.2.2.1 Complaints Procedure

Ms Whiteside then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following motion:

“That the Complaints Procedures for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Chair then invited Ms Whiteside to propose her initial amendment to the motion, being brought under Rule 9(c) of the Rules of Order.

Ms Whiteside explained that she wished to propose a small amendment which recognised that the Complaints Procedure was a first step and which also addressed a point which had come to light since the Synod Papers had gone to print. She explained that Canon 53.12 provided an appeal mechanism to the Episcopal Synod in certain circumstances and

that it was therefore appropriate that reference ought to be made in the Complaints Procedure to that.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Convener, Personnel Committee) then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following amendment to the motion so that it would read:

“That the Complaints Procedure for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted as an initial step to improving the Church’s process for handling complaints and that

- 1. the following words be added at the end of section 2 of the section entitled “Complaints against a member of a diocesan or provincial board or committee”:**

The Diocesan Secretary or the Secretary General, as appropriate, will endeavour to resolve the matter. If it cannot be resolved in that way disputes should be referred to the Episcopal Synod under Canon 53.12. Contact details for the Episcopal Synod are available from the Secretary General at the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh EH12 5EE.”

The Chair opened the amendment to debate but there was none.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed by majority: 109 in favour, 1 against, 5 abstentions.

Before taking further amendments, the Chair invited any comment of a high-level nature which members of Synod wished to make.

Bishop Swift indicated as the seconder of the motions in question that the material being proposed to Synod should be viewed as a starting point. He recognised that there was work to be done over the coming year but it was a complicated business navigating territory intended to cover officeholders, employees, volunteers, etc. He encouraged Synod to see the proposals as an endeavour to ensure that everyone in the Church could feel safe.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) explained that she had practised prior to ordination as a litigation solicitor with experience in areas such as occupational bullying and harassment and alleged misconduct. A common feature of many cases and which had reached litigation had been the absence of good internal procedures to enable dispute resolution at an early stage. A good complaints procedure safeguarded procedural justice and gave details, time constraints, appropriate frameworks including relevant investigatory and appeal processes to give the complainers, and those complained about, confidence in the system. That was important for reasons of wellbeing, reputation and the Gospel. The

Complaints Procedure before Synod was welcome because it filled a gaping and unconscionable hole in procedures and she would vote in favour. However, she was concerned that, as they stood, they were not complete they did not offer assurances of procedural justice since there were no timescales, nor how details of how a complaint would be investigated or responded to, nor any clear means of appeal. She welcomed comments that had been made about such matters being work in progress. She also wished to know what support structures would be put in place – for example who would offer support for a cleric against whom a complaint was made, where their own Bishop, their ecclesiastically appointed pastor, was charged with investigating. Where was a Bishop to make a complaint to and who cared for members of the College when they were under attack. Also, how did the policy and procedures integrate with Canons 53 and 54?

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that he was fully supportive of the motions before Synod and all of the work which had been done and he agreed with what the Rev Diana Hall had just said. His aim in bringing amendments was to strengthen the material and support the Committee as it undertook further work in development. He then proposed, and Dr Nicola Mills (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

“22(ii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: a final section be added to the Procedure as follows:-

“WRITTEN RECORDS

A written record must be kept of any complaint made. This written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution. This document must be approved and signed by all parties involved in the complaint. All other documentation involved in the process should also be kept on record, subject to appropriate confidentiality and data protection principles.”

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered the amendment should be considered by the Synod.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) indicated that he wished to propose an amendment to Mr MacDonald's amendment. He was not sure that attempting to write procedures on the floor of Synod was the correct way to progress and he was glad that it had been indicated that the material represented a work in progress. His proposed amendment to the amendment was because he believed that any record drawn up ought to be made at the end of the procedure so that it could be a moment for reconciliation. He had conferred with Mr MacDonald in the chat facility but that was difficult in the context of a Zoom meeting. He therefore proposed, and the Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) seconded an amendment to Mr MacDonald's amendment to delete the words "to be" from the sentence "this written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution."

The Chair opened that amendment for debate.

Mr MacDonald noted that at the end of a complaints process, it was the case that parties were not always content with the resolution and, consequently, all parties might not be willing to sign off on such a record at the end of the resolution. The intention of his original amendment had been to sign off on the process. He would therefore be concerned with the proposed amendment.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) accepted that the matters dealt with in the motions in question were serious ones and it was important to put in place procedures soon. However, he wondered what was driving all of the amendments. He wondered whether those proposing the amendments believed the material was fundamentally flawed or whether there was a lack of trust in those who had been charged with the responsibility of implementing the task. Were they a vote of non-trust in the procedures?

The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) queried whether all documentation needed to be signed and suggested that a summary would be sufficient to keep for the future.

Dr Jacobs amendment was put to the vote with the following result: 38 in favour, 51 against, 25 abstentions. The Chair declared Dr Jacobs' amendment not passed.

The Chair invited the Synod to resume debate of Mr MacDonald's original amendment. In response to a point of order from Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), the Chair confirmed that the amendment from Dr Jacobs had not passed and that, consequently, Synod was now considering the original amendment proposed by Mr MacDonald.

In the absence of further comment, the Chair put Mr McDonald's amendment to the vote with the following result: 80 in favour, 17 against, 17 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment (iii) to Motion 22:

“22(iii). [Amendment] after “be approved and adopted”, add: the section entitled “Complaints relating to training at the Scottish Episcopal Institute” be altered by the addition of a final sentence as follows: “Where a complaint is not addressed by these specific policies this Complaints Procedure may be used.”

Mr MacDonald explained that the procedures applicable to SEI at the present time did not cover all situations of possible complaints. His proposal was to protect ordinands.

Ms Whiteside opposed the amendment because there had been no opportunity to discuss it with representatives of the SEI or the Institute Council.

There being no further comment, the Chair put the amendment to the vote with the following result: 44 in favour, 51 against, 24 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:

“22(iv). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the procedure should be revised to provide for the appointment of an Independent Complaints Officer and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate.”

Mr MacDonald explained that complaints might be dealt with in a variety of locations but sometimes there was a need for someone outwith the situation to handle the matter. He recognised that the appointment of an independent complaints officer might have budgetary implications.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered the amendment should be considered by Synod.

Dr Anne Martin (Edinburgh) supported the amendment. There was a need for someone to be specifically responsible for overseeing complaints to make sure they were fully dealt with. Such a person could also identify any areas not covered in the Complaints Procedure and how they were to be dealt with – one area not mentioned was that of complaints against vestries. Also, such a person could keep an overview of how complaints had been dealt with generally and could be consulted for advice.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 99 in favour, 11 against, 7 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:

“22(v). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate a more detailed procedure specifying the precise process of how a complaint must be dealt and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”

Mr MacDonald explained that the amendment reflected what had been said earlier in the meeting by the Rev Diana Hall, namely that there was a need for more detailed procedures to be drawn up.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that it had always been the intention as part of the process to draw up more detailed procedures. She agreed that the matter should be considered by Synod.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 110 in favour, 6 against, 4 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:

“22(vi). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate an Appeal Process for any significant actions and decisions that are excluded from the Complaints Procedure and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”

Mr MacDonald explained that his proposal stemmed from the reference in the Complaints Procedure to the fact that complaints could not be made about decisions or actions which had been taken as part of, or as a result of following legal or canonical processes or protocols, due process and any appeal processes. The question was how narrowly or broadly that sentence was to be understood. If it were to be understood broadly, then there were many things that could be excluded from the Complaints Procedure. If it were not to be included in the Complaints Process, he considered it appropriate to be dealt with in some other way. It was a question of natural justice and the fair treatment of individuals in the decision-making process.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she was content for the matter to be considered by Synod.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 97 in favour, 6 against, 5 abstentions.

There being no further amendments, the motion incorporating amendments which had been agreed was put to the vote in the following form:

“That the Complaints Procedure for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted as an initial step to improving the Church’s process for handling complaints and that

- 1. the following words be added at the end of section 2 of the section entitled “Complaints against a member of a diocesan or provincial board or committee”:*

“The Diocesan Secretary or the Secretary General, as appropriate, will endeavour to resolve the matter. If it cannot be resolved in that way disputes should be referred to the Episcopal Synod under Canon 53.12. Contact details for the Episcopal Synod are available from the Secretary General at the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh EH12 5EE.”

2. *a final section be added to the Procedure as follows:-*

“WRITTEN RECORDS

A written record must be kept of any complaint made. This written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution. This document must be approved and signed by all parties involved in the complaint. All other documentation involved in the process should also be kept on record, subject to appropriate confidentiality and data protection principles.”

3. *the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the procedure should be revised to provide for the appointment of an Independent Complaints Officer and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate;*
4. *the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate a more detailed procedure specifying the precise process of how a complaint must be dealt and bring proposals to General Synod 2022;*
5. *the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate an Appeal Process for any significant actions and decisions that are excluded from the Complaints Procedure and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”*

Ms Whiteside had no further comment to make and there was no other comment from members of Synod.

The amended motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 117 in favour, 1 abstention.

5.2.2.2 Bullying and Harassment Policy

The Chair noted that Ms Whiteside had already addressed Synod in connection with the Bullying and Harassment Policy.

Ms Jan Whiteside proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Bullying and Harassment Policy for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Chair noted that a number of amendments had been raised.

The Chair invited any high-level comments.

Mrs Karen Ellis (Edinburgh) welcomed the Bullying and Harassment Policy and acknowledged that more work was to be done. She asked

whether, in the light of recent comments by the Archbishop of Canterbury calling for a ban on the use of nondisclosure agreements in the Church of England after racial abuse had been exposed, confirmation could be given that nondisclosure agreements would not be used again in the SEC at any level.

Ms Whiteside responded that she had not considered the subject matter of the question. The Personnel Committee would need to consider that. She was unaware that nondisclosure agreements had been used in the Church.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he was fully supportive of the Bullying and Harassment Policy. His proposed amendments were to strengthen the Policy. His first amendment was to remove section 3.5 of the Policy, he believed that the section was too vague, and its meaning was unclear. His first two amendments sought to address those points by removing section 3.5 and adding a statement to the effect that if an individual believed that they were being bullied or harassed then they had a grievance, and it should be treated as a complaint until it was shown not to be. His third proposed amendment was to add a statement about false accusations. The Policy ought never to be used to harm others and making a false accusation was a very serious matter. His first three amendments went together.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and the Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

“23(i). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: subject to the following: That section 3.5 be removed and the remaining sections are renumbered.”

Ms Whiteside indicated she considered that the amendments should be considered by Synod.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 87 in favour, 14 against, 13 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment to the Motion:

“23(ii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.1 “On the whole it is safest to take the view that if a person complains that they are being bullied or harassed, then they have a grievance, which should be dealt with regardless of whether or not their complaint accords with a standard definition.”

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered that Synod should debate the amendment.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged that Synod resist the amendment. He believed it would cause confusion because of the use of the word “grievance”. The term “grievance” was a technical one under the Canons and the Church’s Grievance Procedure in Appendix 29 to the Code of Canons was open only to some people. The purpose of the Complaints Policy was to deal with matters which did not fall under the Grievance Procedure. He urged Synod members to trust the Personnel Committee to take the comments made on the floor of Synod and work through them during the following year. The current discussion did not appear to be a good way of writing a policy. He invited Mr MacDonald to consider withdrawing all of the amendments.

Professor Atkinson noted what Provost Holdsworth had said but believed the issues of bullying and harassment could be hard to define. The key issue was that if an individual made a complaint it needed to be taken seriously and not become lost in a welter of definitions. That is what the intention of the amendment was. He urged support for the amendment.

Mr MacDonald agreed with the comments made by Professor Atkinson.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 52 in favour, 45 against, 18 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

23(iii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.2 "False accusations are a serious matter. The behaviour of anyone who is found to have made an unfounded, malicious complaint or allegation will be regarded with the utmost seriousness and formal disciplinary action may be taken. A member of either the clergy or laity could be subject to an action for defamation if they have made false accusations against someone else."

Ms Whiteside confirmed she believed the amendment should be considered by Synod.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged rejection of the amendment since it did not marry well with the Church's disciplinary Canons. It was not clear who would take disciplinary action, nor with what authority. He reasserted that the current process was not a good way to proceed within Synod.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) considered that matters were becoming muddled with so many amendments. The issues at stake were very important and there was a need for procedures, but she suggested that Synod should trust the Personnel Committee and would like to see

matters coming in due course to dioceses. The material being presented represented a good start and she expressed thanks to Ms Whiteside.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) wished to raise a point of order in relation to rule 11(b). In the light of what had recently been said by the previous two speakers, whether it was possible to move the motion "that the question now be put" to the original motion and disregard the amendments which had been proposed.

The Chair explained that some amendments had already been dealt with and she intended to proceed with the remaining amendments without further debate from the floor. Synod would be given the opportunity to express its mind by voting on the amendments.

The amendment was put to the vote with the following result: 34 in favour, 56 against, 25 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

"23(iv). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.3 "These matters are to be treated with appropriate confidentiality in order to protect all parties and no action will be taken without the willing consent of the person who feels he or she has been a target unless someone is at risk or has performed an action which is unlawful."

Mr MacDonald indicated that he had not had an opportunity to respond to Provost Holdsworth's point in relation to the previous amendment. Professor Atkinson similarly indicated he had not had an opportunity to respond. The Chair explained that in the light of the proposal that the question be put the Chair had discretion to press ahead.

The amendment was put to the vote with the following results: 37 in favour, 45 against, 27 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

"23(v). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That a clear link to the Complaints Procedure be included in the Bullying and Harassment Policy."

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 54 in favour, 38 against, 19 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

“23(vi). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the post of Independent Bullying and Harassment Adviser should be created and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate.”

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 57 in favour, 34 against, 17 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald proposed, and the Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

“23(vii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies consider revision of the policy to include the following sections and bring proposals to General Synod 2022

- I think I have been the target of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- I have been accused of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- Sources of advice”

The amendment was put to the vote and was passed: 50 in favour, 44 against, 18 abstentions.

The Rev Peter Mead (Breachin) wished to raise a point of order in relation to the motion that the question be put under Rule 11. He noted that under Rule 11 any such motion required to be seconded and he did not believe that it had been. The proposal then ought to have been voted upon. He was concerned that the rules had not been followed.

The Chair explained that the chat function on Zoom had indicated sufficient disquiet or concern and that it had been reasonable to conclude that the motion that “the question be put” would have been seconded and further that the Chair would have discretion to continue the debate without granting the right to respond. She thanked Mr Mead for his point of order. She was aware how difficult the debate was proving to conduct online and also that the session had already overrun considerably on time.

The text of the motion incorporating the agreed amendments, was displayed as follows:

“That the Bullying and Harassment Policy for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted subject to the following:

- 1. That section 3.5 be removed and the remaining sections are renumbered.*
- 2. That the following statement be added to section 4:*

4.1 “On the whole it is safest to take the view that if a person complains that they are being bullied or harassed, then they have a grievance, which should be dealt with regardless of whether or not their complaint accords with a standard definition.”

3. *That a clear link to the Complaints Procedure be included in the Bullying and Harassment Policy.*
4. *That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the post of Independent Bullying and Harassment Adviser should be created and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate.*
5. *That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies consider revision of the policy to include the following sections and bring proposals to General Synod 2022:*
 - *I think I have been the target of bullying or harassment, what can I do?*
 - *I have been accused of bullying or harassment, what can I do?*
 - *Sources of advice”*

The Chair opened the amended motion to debate.

Ms Whiteside reiterated that the matter was one of work in progress. It was a starting point and, on that basis, she was happy to consider all amendments, whether they had been agreed or not, back to the Personnel Committee for consideration in the coming months. It had been a long debate and she had been grateful for all of the contributions.

The Rev Gary Clink (Breachin) noted that part of the Bullying and Harassment Policy referred to gender and gender reassignment. The policy adopted "he" and "she" terminology. He agreed with Provost Holdsworth about the difficulty of discussing the detail of policy in plenary debate. He was concerned that inadvertently the Synod could adopt terminology which encouraged discrimination.

Ms Whiteside noted the comments which had been made and would give them consideration.

The amended motion was put to the vote and passed: 92 in favour, 8 against, 14 abstentions.

The Chair thanked Ms Whiteside, Mr MacDonald, those who had seconded the motion and amendments and all who had contributed to the debate.

5.2.2.3 Clergy Time Off Guidelines

The Chair noted that Ms Whiteside had already addressed the substance of the guidelines for clergy holiday and time off.

Ms Jan Whiteside proposed the following Motion:

“That the Guidelines Concerning Holiday and “Time Off” Provision for Stipendiary Clergy as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

Bishop Swift seconded the motion and indicated that the recommendation was a significant one. Clergy did not have contracts and, as office holders, certain matters were less well defined than in an employment context. The key issue was about self-care, healthy patterns of life and space for recreation. These were essential for positive ministry, particularly coming out of the pandemic. There was a need for clergy to exercise self-care and be encouraged to do so. Would all clergy now take two days off each week? He thought probably not, but at present many clergy took little or no time off and sometimes congregations and others did not respect the boundaries about time off. The recommendation was therefore an encouragement and an authorisation to take time to re-equip themselves. He thoroughly commended it. In due course it would be worked out in dioceses and charges.

The Rev Roxanne Campbell (Brechin) spoke in favour of the motion and thanked the Committee for the proposal. She particularly welcomed the proposal in the preamble referring to support for clergy with young families and the fact that the Church wished to care not only for clergy but also for their families.

Ms Helen Vincent (Edinburgh) expressed concern to hear the seconder of the proposal indicate that the guidance might not be enacted in practice. She asked whether, in terms of transitioning to the new arrangements, there would be any guidance produced for vestries. She strongly supported clergy taking time off. Congregations might be concerned about the potential impact on their parish life. Her own trade union was currently lobbying for shorter working hours. For some people that was a cause of stress because if the work itself did not reduce it would have to be carried out in fewer hours. It would be helpful to have guidance in relation to the 48-hour time off provision about disconnecting from both email and social media. It was much harder to step away from the Internet for 48 hours than for 24.

Dr Vicki Clark (Edinburgh) said that life/work balance was a buzz phrase and relevant to the subject of clergy time off. Her issue with the motion was the specific reference to "days" in the documentation. Much clergy work took place in the evenings or weekends. Most church members defined their working week in terms of hours. She suggested it might be more appropriate to express clergy working time in terms of hours rather than days.

The Rev Carol Latimer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) very much welcomed the concerns for the wellbeing of clergy as expressed in the guidelines. She agreed the matter was a hugely important one and timely. However, she wondered why the guidelines appeared to apply only to stipendiary clergy and did not address the wellbeing of non-stipendiary clergy or give an indication of their entitlement to time off. She thought non-stipendiary clergy would appreciate the clarity of a definitive guideline.

The Rev Peter Mead (Breachin) thanked Ms Whiteside and the Personnel Committee for the progress which had been made in the previous 12 months. He drew a connection between the current issue and that of the carbon emissions targets. There was a direct correlation between climate change issues and hours worked. Recent reports from the World Health Organisation, the Institute of National Health in France and the Institute of Personnel Management in the UK indicated that over-work could also store up health issues for the future. The Institute of Personnel Managers had discovered that those who were now working from home were working on average 10 hours more per week than others. Working from home was a norm for clergy. There were initiatives in parts of the world to reduce the working week to four days and so he urged that this matter to be seen as a work in progress and that the Church keep up to date with developments elsewhere. He was supportive of the motion.

Ms Whiteside thanked members for their comments. She was happy to look at the idea of guidance for vestries in putting the new provision into practice. She had assumed that the guidance would also apply to non-stipendiary clergy but that was an issue to be looked at. She was aware of the significant contribution to the life of the Church made by non-stipendiary clergy. She noted Mr Mead's comments about a four-day working week. One of the difficulties in relation to work life balance was that whilst the Church could offer guidelines, it could not actually change how people worked. Some clergy had indicated to her that they worked 80 hours per week to which her response had been that they needed help with their time management. The Personnel Committee could not help directly in such situations.

The motion was put to the vote and passed: 112 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair again thanked Jan Whiteside and the Personnel Committee for their work and also all those who had participated in the debate.

SESSION SIX: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Standing Committee

6.1.1 Feedback from Session One (Strategic Direction)

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) reported on the feedback which had been provided from the breakout group discussions

during Session One of the Synod meeting the previous day. She expressed thanks to all of the facilitators and the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew for having collated the responses and provided a summary. The content of the discussions had been rich and diverse.

Ms Campbell then summarised the feedback which had been supplied. The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting. Ms Campbell confirmed that there was much to think about and there would be opportunity the following year for further discussion.

6.1.2 Ethical Investment

Ms Campbell reminded Synod that in response to a motion adopted at General Synod 2019, the Standing Committee had established an Ethical Investment Advisory Group. The Committee was grateful to the Group and in particular its Convener Alan McLean QC for work on what was a challenging subject. At General Synod 2020, an interim report from the Advisory Group had been given and, as that report had explained, the Group was then about to consider the question of investment in pooled funds by the provincial Unit Trust Pool. Since December, the Group had worked on a proposed policy framework for investment in pooled funds which would now be presented to Synod by Mr McLean.

Mr McLean then presented the product of the work of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group, namely the proposed policy framework for investment of Unit Trust Pool monies in pooled funds.

The SEC was an unusual UK church body in that its central activities were funded to the extent of approximately 60% by the income received from its investments held in the Unit Trust Pool. To fund much of what the Church did, the money came not from its members' pockets but from money given over many years by people who had wanted to bless future generations and allow the mission of the Church to continue. This allowed much more to be done than if bills had to be met entirely from the contributions of current members.

Whilst the fund from which the income was derived might be thought to be very large – in excess of £120 million – in fact, in investment terms that was not a particularly large fund and was notably smaller than funds held by other UK church bodies and other denominations. However, for the SEC, it was conspicuously important. The UTP was managed by highly expert managers of investments, currently Baillie Gifford reporting to a small group of investment experts comprising the Investment Committee. In its turn, that Committee was responsible through the Administration Board to the Standing Committee as the Church's charity trustees.

The investments had performed extremely well under that stewardship structure. However, the Church recognised that investment was often not value neutral. There were strongly held views as to what the Church should or should not be invested in. Over the years this had led to a number of "red lines" being put in place by Synod – areas in which the Church had

agreed not to invest directly, including income earned from tobacco, armaments, gambling, pornography and the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands. Following the debate about wider investment in fossil fuels at Synod 2019, the last direct UTP holding in a company that obtained significant income from extracting fossil fuels, Total, had been disposed of and instruction had been given to Baillie Gifford that there should be no further direct investment in such companies.

The Ethical Investment Advisory Group had been set up to assist in shaping what ethical investment should mean for the Unit Trust Pool. Whilst the Church permitted no direct investments in various sorts of companies, the question arose as to indirect investments. Such holdings were themselves comprised fundamentally of collections of other investments selected and managed by a fund manager, and were known as "pooled funds". The benefits that pooled funds brought were set out in section 5 of the framework document. Further, there was a growing range of ethically screened pooled funds from which in due course the Investment Committee might be able to identify suitable funds matching the Church's ethical criteria and investment requirements. That was a fast-developing trend in the investment industry. However, the risk in utilising pooled funds was that the possibility was entertained that there might be investments held within a particular fund which the Church would not wish to hold directly. To this, there was a spectrum of arguably ethical responses. At one end of the spectrum, it could be argued that the investment adviser should be given a relatively free hand to produce the best possible investment returns. One might accept that this was a situation of "wheat and tares", namely that there was a need to accept for now, in the current impure age, that the investment market contained companies which do wonderful things but also companies which did less wonderful things. That approach would suggest that one should not pull up the tares but, subject to giving such guidance to those managing the Church's funds as was possible, and relying on their environmental, social and governmental screening processes to avoid the ethically worst, the overall profits be taken and repurposed to the glory of God. At the other end of the spectrum, there could be an approach that the only ethical approach was one to avoid all ethically dubious investment. Therefore, the Church would either avoid indirect investment or withdraw from investment altogether and fund the Church's activities first by spending the accumulated capital in the UTP and then out of members pockets, cutting cloth accordingly. Whilst that might have an attractive purity of vision, it would be important not to be blind to the practical effect of such a decision, namely hazarding the long-term future of approximately 60% of what the Church did.

The Group had wrestled with those and many other related issues in recent months. There were members of the Group who would probably place themselves at different points along the spectrum which he had just outlined. Struggling under God to reach consensus, the Group had sought to bring forward a proposed policy framework that would be both workable and practicable going forward and which gave ethics significant primacy but also acknowledged that absolute purity might be impracticable if the Church wished to go on relying on investment income.

Mr McLean then outlined the main aspects of the proposed framework. Firstly, the Investment Committee would be required to review every investment or proposed investment in a pooled fund from an ethical perspective with the aim of avoiding any investment which might lead to more than 1% of the total UTP being held ultimately in holdings which would not be invested in directly. The 1% limit had been chosen after considering policies adopted by other UK church bodies and discussing various alternative possible figures. The Group's collective judgement had been that 1% was an acceptable limit although higher figures had been discussed. Further, the Investment Committee would once a year examine closely the pooled funds held by the UTP. If the result was that no more than 1% of funds was invested in businesses in which the Church would not invest directly then that comprised compliance with the framework. In other words, 99% or more of the Funds held by the UTP would be invested in companies in which the Church would be content to invest directly. That was the current state of affairs. If the 1% limit had come to be jeopardised the Investment Committee would be obliged to report that to the Standing Committee with an explanation of the problem and proposals for addressing it. There might be many different permutations applicable to such situations and therefore it was impossible to lay down rigid rules for how each situation should be dealt with. The Group's view was that it was best to leave it to the good ethical sense of the Investment Committee and Standing Committee. Finally, if at any point between annual reviews the Investment Committee became aware of a threat to the 1% limit, it could bring that to the attention of the Standing Committee who would have the same powers as it would in relation to the annual review.

The policy framework represented a compromise and was a result of careful negotiation between people coming at the issue from very different perspectives. It was a way of balancing just some of the difficult issues raised by investment of the UTP. There would be people from both ends of the spectrum of views about investment who would be unhappy with the conclusion which the Group had reached but it nevertheless represented a solution which the Group viewed as holding in suitable tension the many considerations required. He commended it to Synod for approval.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to ask how far the proposed policy framework differed from the pooled fund policy which had been proposed to the Synod in 2019 and which had been voted down.

Dr Michael Green (Edinburgh) spoke as a member of the Investment Committee. He had no difficulty with the terms of the proposed policy but noted that it used the term "investments" throughout. At least one of the funds contained assets which were in fact loans, mainly to nations states. Those needed to be taken into account because some of the countries in question would not be considered to be ethical. He asked that that be borne in mind in the next iteration of the policy.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) spoke as proposer of the motion. The work of the Group under Mr McLean's careful and attentive

chairing had drawn together both a prophetic voice, challenging injustice, and also prudence in relation to care for the investments of the Church. Two years ago, the work had not been sufficiently advanced to reach that point. It had been a complex and emotive task, but the policy was both prophetic and careful.

Mr McLean indicated that, since the point at which the Group had been formed, he had not looked at what had been said in 2019. The work of the Group had been one of going back to basics. The Group had looked at a raft of approaches by other churches which had similarly struggled with the issue. The proposed policy had been put together based on first principles. He would not wish Synod members to feel that an attempt was being made to enable the adoption of a policy which had not been successful in 2019. On the question of loans to unethical countries, Mr McLean noted that others had made the same point and that that was a matter which the Group needed to look at. The next piece of work which the Group had before it was to look at broader rules of approaching what was or was not ethical and to endeavour to formulate an overarching framework for that. It was possible that that might produce further red lines. A benefit of the policy being proposed was that new red lines could be introduced into it as matters developed in future.

Bishop Swift then proposed, and Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposed policy framework for investment of Scottish Episcopal Church Unit Trust Pool monies in pooled funds as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 107 in favour, 2 against, 4 abstentions.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that he wished to raise a point of order. He explained that his point of order in fact concerned earlier debate in Synod. He wished to suggest that the Standing Committee consider reviving the Organisation Review Committee to consider what could be learned from the discussions earlier in the meeting regarding the Complaints Procedure and Bullying and Harassment Policy. The Chair explained that that would need to be considered by the Standing Committee, but he took note of the point.

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

6.1.3 Budgets and Quota

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) turned to the business of approving quota.

She illustrated quota figures on a PowerPoint slide and explained that those which she was illustrating were different to those shown in the table on page

27 of the Synod Papers and reflected the actual sums requested from dioceses for 2021. She apologised and explained that the anomaly arose owing to an error in the calculation of the quota allocation between dioceses for 2021 which had resulted in Glasgow and Galloway being asked to pay more than it should have been (and all other dioceses being asked to pay slightly less). The figure shown in the Synod Papers reflected the sums which ought to have been requested from each diocese whilst those on the slide were the actual figures used for quota 2021, as had been agreed at General Synod 2020. The calculation of 2022 quota included an adjustment for that error which the Treasurer had discussed and agreed with Diocesan Treasurers.

Ms Campbell reminded Synod that the total being requested for 2022 was £660,000 an increase which was in line with the general approach to quota for the period 2021-2024 which had been outlined by the Standing Committee in its finance report to General Synod 2020. The key points in that approach were:

- a large reduction in quota from 2020 to 2021 to provide assistance to dioceses and charges in meeting some of the financial challenges of Covid-19;
- a gradual increase over three years back to approximately the 2020 quota level (£750,000);
- a proposed quota for 2022 in line with that general approach, namely a 10% increase in total quota to £660,000; and
- an anticipation that in 2023 the quota would be £710,000 and in 2024, £750,000.

The amount payable by each diocese reflected the relative changes in its income assessable for quota which was why dioceses were facing different levels of increase above and below the 10% figure. The information submitted by each diocese was reviewed by the Treasurer and considered jointly every year by the Diocesan Treasurers and the allocation reflected a long-standing formula. Any detailed questions should be directed to the Treasurer.

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

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2022, agree to a quota figure of £660,000 for that year.”

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that whilst Covid had been mentioned in the context of the Recovery and Renewal Fund, it was not mentioned in the broader context of how the Church's finances were taken forward in the post Covid era. He was aware that a number of churches would have some difficulties in being able to fund activities as a consequence of the Covid lockdown on matters such as church attendance and giving. That in turn would make it difficult to respond

to requests for diocesan and provincial quota. He asked what thought had been given to that. If churches were to face difficulties going forward, how would they be dealt with?

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) thanked those who had been involved in preparing the figures. He asked that quota deliberations be part of the future vision and strategic planning.

Ms Campbell thanked members for their contributions. In response to Professor Atkinson, she indicated that throughout the Covid period the Treasurer had been having regular discussions with the Diocesan Treasurers. Through that process he was obtaining regular feedback about what was happening locally. She would ask him to comment. She agreed with the comment made by Mr Dünzkofer.

Mr Malcolm Bett (Treasurer) confirmed that he had been in contact with Diocesan Treasurers and would continue to liaise with them in terms of the impact of post Covid on the finances of charges. One of the decisions which had been made by Standing Committee the previous year in terms of the quota being proposed was a significant reduction in provincial quota which was designed specifically to give flexibility to help dioceses and charges as they responded to the aftermath of Covid. Clearly that position would continue for longer and would affect churches and their incomes in different ways. That would in turn impact the calculation of quota. He would continue his discussions with Diocesan Treasurers.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Ms Campbell.

6.1.4 Elections

6.1.4.1 Institute Council Membership

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

“That Patsy Thomson be appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstentions.

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

“That the Rev Stewart Cutler be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 111 in favour, none against, 5 abstentions.

6.1.4.2 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

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

“That the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 114 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

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

“That the Rev Canon Marion Chatterley be appointed as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 107 in favour, 4 against, 5 abstentions.

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

“That the Hon Lord Arthurson be appointed as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

6.1.4.3 Preliminary Proceedings Committee

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

“That John Stirling be re-appointed for an additional term on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 112 in favour, 2 abstentions.

6.1.4.4 Pension Fund Chair

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

“That the term of office of Richard McIndoe as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees be extended until 31 December 2021 and that the Standing Committee be authorised to make an appointment to fill the vacancy arising then, subject to ratification of any such appointment by General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 115 in favour, 1 abstention.

6.1.4.5 General Synod Trusteeship

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

“That Professor Patricia Peattie be appointed as a General Synod Trustee.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 111 in favour, 2 abstentions.

6.2 Mission Board

6.2.1 Provincial Youth Committee

A video from the Youth Committee was shown in which young people spoke about the urgency of climate change. They called upon the Church to act since the time for words had passed.

The Rev Beki Cansdale (Argyll and The Isles) spoke of the steps which had been taken in her diocese and indicated how a community could be drawn together to take action.

The Chair commended the young people and their leaders and thanked them for their poignant call to action.

6.3 Thanks from the Primus

The Primus expressed thanks to all Synod members for their participation, to the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson and the Very Rev Frances Burberry for chairing the meeting, to those who had acted as Facilitators and to the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated the Facilitators and collated feedback from the breakout groups. The Primus thanked the Assessor and all those Conveners and members who were stepping down at the current Synod or had done so during the previous year including: the Rev Prof David Jasper (Doctrine Committee); Dr John Davies (Liturgy Committee), the Rev Canon John McLuckie (ICRC), The Rev Elaine Garman (Acting Convener, Church in Society), and Mr David Kenvyn (GPC).

The Primus also thanked Sanctus Media who had supported the technical aspects of the current virtual meeting, the staff of St Paul's & St George's, those who had arranged the Eucharist and led Morning and Evening Prayer and the staff of the General Synod Office.

Ms Bridget Campbell expressed gratitude to the Primus for his remarks and thanked him for having chaired sessions of the meeting.

6.4 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.

6.5 Technical Matters

The Rev Simon Cake (Edinburgh) wished it to be noted that he had been unable to vote during the meeting.