GENERAL SYNOD AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED ALL MEETINGS WILL TAKE PLACE IN PALMERSTON PLACE CHURCH, EDINBURGH

A “Freshers’ Meeting” will be held at 09.00 on Thursday, 10 June for new members of Synod.

Thursday, 10 June 2010

10:30 Opening Eucharist at Palmerston Place Church, including Primus’ Charge Offering for the Sisters of St Margaret, Haiti
Constitution of General Synod

11:45 Coffee

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

12:00 Primus: Welcome to delegates and guests

Preliminary Business (Page 9)

Minutes of General Synod 2009 (Page 10)

Motion 1: That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 11-13 June 2009.

Elections: (Page 35)
Standing Committee Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Convenership
Administration Board Membership

12:25 Standing Committee

Accounts

Motion 2: 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 2009.

Budgets and Quota: Overview (Page 39)

12:45 Lunch
SESSION TWO: PROF PATRICIA PEATTIE IN THE CHAIR

14:15 Faith and Order Board

Anglican Covenant (Page 65)

**Motion 3:** That this Synod, recognising the publication of the Anglican Covenant and the need to address the Covenant in a manner which is careful and prayerful, request the Faith and Order Board to advise General Synod 2011 on what process or processes might be appropriate to be followed by this Synod to enable due consideration of the final version of the Covenant by the Scottish Episcopal Church.

15:15 Information and Communication Board

16:00 Tea

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

16:30 Standing Committee

Gender Audit Report (Page 74)

**Motion 4:** That this Synod receive the report of the Gender Audit carried out in relation to the Scottish Episcopal Church and invite the Standing Committee to consider the recommendations made in the report.

Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Material from Standing Committee (Page 87)

Canon 57 – *Of Notices provided for by this Code of Canons* (Page 89)

**Motion 5:** That the amended text for Canon 57, Sections 1 and 3 be read for the second time.

Standing Committee Membership (Page 95):

Canon 52 – *Of the General Synod* (Page 96)

**Motion 6:** That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 3 be read for the second time.

**Motion 7:** That section 2.1.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended by the addition after the existing paragraph (f) of the following:
“(g) the foregoing paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f) shall 
apply to the appointment of the Convener of the Standing Committee as if references to the Convener of a Board were references to the Convener of the Standing Committee.

Motion 8: That Section 1.8 of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted and that that sections 1.9 to 1.11 be renumbered as sections 1.8 to 1.10 respectively.

Motion 9: That Section 2.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words “The Standing Committee shall have responsibility for the oversight of the Provincial and Other Expenditure Account, the General Synod Office Account, the Unallocated Legacies Account and the Development Fund.”

17:30 Evening Office

Friday, 11 June 2010

SESSION FOUR: MR DAVID PALMER IN THE CHAIR

09:00 Morning Office

9:15 Mission and Ministry Board

Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy (Page 97)

Motion 10: That this Synod receive the report of the Mission and Ministry Board entitled “Moving Towards a ‘Whole Church’ Mission and Ministry Policy”.

Ministry Development Committee

Overseas Committee

10:45 Coffee

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

11:15 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)

Rural Commission Report (Page 100)

Motion 11: That this Synod accept the report of the Rural Commission and commend it to its boards and committees and to Diocesan Mission Committees for further study.
Motion 12: That this Synod ask the Liturgy Committee to investigate the feasibility of pulling together into one place liturgies, especially those related to the word, focused on natural and rural seasons as a means of providing a resource for rural congregations.

Motion 13: That this Synod, mindful of the significant changes with a major impact on rural societies which are likely to occur in the foreseeable future, request its representatives on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to keep it informed of those developments likely to need action by the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Motion 14: That this Synod, conscious of the need to continue working with other denominations, request the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to consider the value of running an annual conference dealing with emerging rural issues.

Motion 15: That this Synod, conscious of the developing interest in rural pilgrimage, request its members on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to encourage that Committee to make the development of rural pilgrimage one of its priorities for action.

Motion 16: That this Synod commend to rural charges the importance of identifying and documenting organisations active in their respective areas with whom they should be meeting on a regular basis.

Motion 17: That this Synod request the Ministry Development Committee to consider the ways in which training for those intending to work in rural areas might be most effectively provided.

Motion 18: That this Synod, recognising the importance of Broadband as a vital means of communication in rural areas, request the Mission and Ministry Board to urge upon Scottish Government the importance of having high speed Broadband links available to all areas of Scotland in the near future.

Motion 19: That this Synod, recognising the role which electronic communication could have in the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church, request the Information and Communication Board to identify ways in which congregations might best be helped to use technologies such as Broadband in their mission works.

Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths
**Motion 20:** That this Synod ask dioceses to map their engagement, and that of their congregations, with local Inter-Faith Associations, to encourage greater engagement where applicable and to send the findings of that mapping exercise to the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths by the end of December 2010.

12.15  **Pension Fund/Standing Committee**

Report from Standing Committee regarding the Pension Fund (Page 124)

**Motion 21:** That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee regarding the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund.

12:45  **Lunch**

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

14:15  **Administration Board**

**Investment Committee**

**Finance Committee**

**Buildings Advisory Committee**

**Canons for Second Reading**

Canon 35 – *Of the Structure, Furniture and Monuments of Church etc* (Page 126)

**Motion 22:** That the amended text for Canon 35 be read for the second time.

**Motion 23:** That the amended text for Canon 50, Section 9 be read for the second time.

**Motion 24:** That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the second time.

**Motion 25:** That the text for Resolutions 1 to 10 under Canon 35 be adopted in substitution for all existing Resolutions under that Canon.

**Motion 26:** That the text for Appendix 30 to the Code of Canons be adopted.
**Motion 27:** That sections 2.3.3(d) and 2.3.7 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the words “Buildings Advisory Committee” wherever they occur and by the substitution therefor of the words “Buildings Committee”.

**Personnel Committee**

**SESSION SEVEN: THE REV CANON DR ALISON PEDEIN IN THE CHAIR**

15:00     College of Bishops
15:30     Faith and Order Board

**Doctrine Committee**

**Committee on Canons**

**Canons for First Reading**

Canon 62 – *Of Retiral of Clergy* (Page 136)

**Motion 28:** That the amended text for Canon 62 be read for the first time.

**Canons for Second Reading**

Canon 8 – *Of the Separation, Subdivision or Union of Dioceses*  
(Page 138)

**Motion 29:** That the amended text for Canon 8, Section 1 be read for the second time.

**Liturgy Committee**

16:00     Tea

**SESSION EIGHT: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR**

16:30     Faith and Order Board

**Inter-Church Relations Committee**

EMU (*Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership*)  
Porvoo Communion  
Edinburgh 2010
17:00 Address by the Most Rev Dr Katharine Jefferts Schori, Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church (USA)

17:15 Evening Office

19:30 Synod Dinner at Caledonian Hotel, Lothian Road

Saturday, 12 June 2010

SESSION NINE: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

09:30 Morning Office

09:50 Mission and Ministry Board

Church in Society

Motion 30: That this Synod affirm that effective theological and practical responses are required for the sustainability of the environment due to the distortion created by human over-consumption, and that such responses should be a matter for continuing and urgent review within the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Motion 31: That this Synod ask the Church in Society Committee to prepare a Statement of Principles in 2010/11 confirming the necessity for all dioceses and congregations, as an expression of their faith in action, to encourage and protect a sustainable environment and to consider steps to reduce energy consumption; and that, once prepared, the Statement of Principles be offered to the College of Bishops for its endorsement.

10:40 Coffee

FINAL SESSION: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

11:00 Mission and Ministry Board

Provincial Youth Network
Standing Committee

Budget and Quota (Page 39)

**Motion 32:** That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2011, agree to a quota figure of £602,929 for that year.

Elections (Page 35):

Standing Committee Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Convenership
Administration Board Membership

11:50 Confirmation of Acts of Synod and close of meeting.
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1 Prolocutors and Tellers
The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

Prolocutors:
- Clerical Prolocutor: Rev Canon David Bayne
- Clerical Vice-Prolocutor: Rev Susan Macdonald
- Lay Prolocutor: Miss Hilary Gibson
- Lay Vice-Prolocutor: Professor Alan Werritty

Tellers:
- Dr Daphne Audsley
- Mr Malcolm Bett
- Mrs Elspeth Davey
- Mr Leo Lanahan
- Mr John Payne

2 Assessor
The Primus has appointed the Rev Canon Joe Morrow, Advocate, as Assessor.

3 Welcome to Delegates from other Churches and Faiths
Margaret Boland, Religious Society of Friends
Lieut. Colonel Alan Burns, Salvation Army
Rev Patrick Coltman, United Free Church of Scotland
Ms Pramila Kaur, Scottish Inter-Faith Council
Rev Susan Kirkbride, United Reformed Church
Rev Gilmour Lilly, Baptist Union of Scotland
Rev Dr Donald McEwan, Church of Scotland
Mr Bruce McKenzie, Roman Catholic Church
Rev Malcolm Muir, Action of Churches Together in Scotland
Rev Lily Twist, The Methodist Church in Scotland

Guests from outwith Scotland
Rev Dr Maurice Elliott, Church of Ireland

4 Minutes of General Synod 2009

5 Any Matters Arising from Minutes

6 Elections
Standing Committee Convenership
Standing Committee Membership
Administration Board Convenership
Administration Board Membership

7 Roll Call
Please detach the attendance slip towards the end of this document and place it in the box.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT PALMERSTON PLACE CHURCH, EDINBURGH FROM 11th TO 13th JUNE 2009

Freshers’ Meeting

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

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at the celebration of the Eucharist in Palmerston Place Church, Edinburgh at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday 11th June 2009.

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist.

The Primus referred to the song from *South Pacific*, “Happy talking, talking happy talk – talk about things you like to do. You’ve got to have a dream, if you don’t have a dream how you gonna have a dream come true?” which in biblical terms might equate to the text “Where there is no vision, the people perish”. He had been asked by a vestry earlier in the year to share his vision. He believed growth was possible (indeed without growth there was only death) but expectations had to be realistic and achievable. By God’s grace, things which might seem inspirational could be achievable. His vision for the Church was to see it and its members living a life in conformity to the life of Christ with each congregation living out its witness to the love of God and each member of Christ being a faithful disciple. The forthcoming Synod was unlikely to be described as “ground-breaking” but it would certainly be “ground-clearing” since it would prepare the ground for work that would come in the following years. Part of that would be the election of a new Primus which, though not a work of Synod, would involve the witness and prayers of Synod members. The Primus wished to place the discussions at Synod in a wider context by referring to remarks in a paper by the Bishop of Clogher, at a recent Porvoo consultation on diaconal ministry, that the Millennium Development Goals could be innovative in equipping people to tithe their time in missional service to local communities. There was a need for a tremendously centripetal church to become much more centrifugal. In seeking to address the mission of God, the Church could not allow itself to be strangled by financial constraint.

Referring reluctantly to the national atmosphere and the question of MPs’ expenses, the Church needed to offer encouragement and support to people of honour and to urge the higher human values – Christian values – on all who served in public life. Increasingly, it was a climate which allowed the powerful to inherit the earth and the weak to go to the wall. Under pressure from Government, local authorities were looking to make provision for the homeless with a reduced budget. The example of Christ and His kingdom was a direct contradiction to allowing the successful to take all. The call to the Christian community was to witness to the example of Christ by the norms of its own common life. That witness did not come by being quick to point the finger so much as by absorbing the meaning of the response “let the one among you without sin cast the first stone”. The incarnation of Christ invited the Church not to withdraw but to engage with the mess in the world and find an opportunity to serve God and forward his purposes of love. What was needed was not for Christians to withdraw from involvement to form their own little group so much as for those who were overtly Christian and who had the necessary abilities to join political parties across the spectrum.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken for the appeal of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for Zimbabwe which amounted to £1,620 (including tax reclaims).

SESSION ONE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members of Synod and the following delegates representing other Churches and Faiths:-

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church), the Rev Patrick Coltman (United Free Church of Scotland), Major Alan Dixon (Salvation Army), Mrs Jenny Easson (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev David James (Religious Society of Friends), the Rev Muriel Pearson (Church of Scotland), the Rev Donald Reid (Scottish Inter-faith Council), the Rev Lindsey Sanderson (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Rev Andy Scarcliffe (Baptist Union of Scotland), Dr Gillian Todd (Church in Wales) and the Rt Rev Joseph Toal (Roman Catholic Church).

The Primus offered the congratulations of Synod to the Very Rev Clifford Piper who had won the Primus’ Championship Cup the previous day and which had been generously sponsored by Ecclesiastical Insurance.

At the Primus’ invitation, the Synod agreed that a message of goodwill be conveyed to Ms Pat McBryde, former Deputy Secretary General, who was unwell and to the Rt Rev Edward Luscombe.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Rev Dr Alison Peden and the Rev Canon David Bayne were elected as Clerical Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

Mr Nicholas Bowry and Miss Hilary Gibson were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice-Prolocutor respectively.

1.3 Election of Tellers

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, Mrs Elspeth Davey, Mr Leo Lanahan and Mr John Payne were appointed Tellers for the meeting.
1.4 Assessor

The Primus announced that the Rev Paul Romano had been appointed as his Assessor.

1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2008

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 12-14 June 2008.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.6 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.7 Elections

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by General Synod comprised the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, one vacancy for a General Synod representative on the Administration Board, vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee for three members, one alternate member and the secretary to the Committee, one clerical vacancy on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal and one vacancy for a General Synod Trustee.

In relation to the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, nominations had been received of the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth and the Rev Robert Warren. No nomination had been received for the General Synod representative post on the Administration Board and Synod agreed to extend the time for receipt of nominations until 11.15 the following morning. The nominations for the vacancies on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and Clergy Discipline Tribunal were set out in the Synod Papers and the nomination for the vacancy on the General Synod Trustees was the Hon Lord McEwan.

1.8 Roll Call

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 140 members attended.

1.9 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of Synod: the Rev Robert Anderson, Dr Elaine Cameron, the Rev Marion Chatterley, Ms Chloe Clemmons, Mr Simon Mackintosh and the Secretary General. The delegates from other denominations and faiths were also welcomed to speak.

1.10 Standing Committee

1.10.1 Annual Report and Accounts to 31st December 2008

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) presented the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008.

The Accounts showed two key things: a healthy surplus for the year 2008 and a severe decline in the value of the General Synod’s investments. A surplus of £190,965 had been returned for the year. This represented the total surplus on all funds and a large part of the surplus was derived from the restricted funds. Of greater significance to the health of the Synod’s finances was the surplus on the General Fund of £67,160. The intention of the Standing Committee was not to return surpluses but to use the funds in furtherance of God’s work. Traditionally, it had been possible to budget for a deficit on the basis that some grants were not always taken up in full, or at all, within the year for which they had been allocated.

As explained in the Report, the transfer of Braeburn Care Home had been completed and progress had also been made in moving forward the transfer of St Serf’s Care Home to which a modest loan had been made in 2008 for essential health and safety works. Two further items of expenditure were incurred (but had not been specifically provided for in the budget because it was not known how much would be required) namely software for the General Synod Office’s finance systems which would enable efficiency gains in future, and the funding of the Child Protection Historic Case Review. Professor Peattie expressed gratitude to those who had carefully managed their affairs so as to produce a surplus. As far as investments were concerned, the drop in the balance sheet value reflected the current global situation. It had had no real impact on the financial performance during 2008 but would have an impact in future years. In presenting the Report and Accounts, Professor Peattie expressed thanks to her colleagues on the Standing Committee and the officers of the General Synod Office.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (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 2008.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con.
1.10.2 Budgets

Professor Peattie referred to the budgets contained in the Synod Papers for 2009 to 2011. The figures were not intended to frighten but were intended to give a true picture of the size of the tasks facing the Synod. She reminded the meeting that at General Synod 2008, she had indicated that the budget deficit for 2010 was unsustainable and that dramatic steps would be needed. In the budget setting process in the autumn of 2008, whilst the anticipated expenditure of the work of boards and committees for 2009 was acceptable, the ongoing effects of what was proposed for future years would incur an unacceptably high level of deficit. This was particularly the case in the light of the results of the then prospective Pension Fund valuation and the worsening financial situation globally. Cuts were therefore made in the proposed allocations for 2009 which, if all other factors had remained the same, would have produced very modest surpluses for 2009 and an acceptable level of deficit for 2010 and 2011 such that a break even position for those years could have been expected. However, circumstances had changed. The Investment Committee had managed the level of UTP distribution to avoid unhelpful peaks and troughs. As a result, the income for 2008 had been unaffected. However, it was recognised that changes in the investment climate would affect income in 2009 (though the extent of the effect was unknown). The budgets shown on page 49 of the Synod Papers assumed a 51p distribution from the UTP for 2009 which was 10% less than the previous year and thought to be prudent. Since the budgets had been prepared, however, the first half-yearly distribution for 2009 had been determined by the Investment Committee at 24p and if the second distribution were to be at a similar level, this would produce a further reduction in income of £60,000 for the year as compared with that shown in the budgets. In addition, bank interest rates had dropped. The risk of exposure to the banking sector for the Church had been severe and steps had been taken to open accounts with other institutions in order to spread risk and maximise yields. These arrangements added further complexity to the managing of cash flow and Professor Peattie expressed gratitude to the Treasurer, Mr Malcolm Bett. Professor Peattie also expressed gratitude to those who made gifts or legacies to the General Synod. Smaller gifts were taken to revenue whereas larger ones were capitalised.

The budgeted deficit of £131,466 for 2009 shown on page 45 of the Synod Papers might, on present calculations, need to be increased by a further £60,000. Boards and committees had therefore been instructed earlier in the year to curtail all spending that was not already committed for the year so that the deficit could be reduced as much as possible. Efforts would, however, mainly be directed towards reducing deficits for future years. Some surpluses had been made in recent years and some of that could be used to alleviate future deficits but it was not intended that all such surpluses should be so used. Professor Peattie explained that the Pension Fund valuation had now also been received and the figures from 2010 onwards took account of the increased impact on staff costs resulting from that valuation. This had a significant effect on the budget of the Standing Committee and on those other board budgets which included staff costs.

The budgets presented, therefore, were to illustrate the size of the problem if no action were to be taken. Such budgets were clearly unsustainable. Standing Committee had agreed that, apart from the measures which she had outlined for 2009, the concentration should be on a new zero-based budgeting approach from 2010 onwards. Restricted funds would continue to be available as before but would also be adversely affected by investment returns and interest rates. There were, therefore, likely to be major changes and cuts in all budgets in order to meet obligations to the Pension Fund (which would be discussed in further detail by Synod the following day). In the past, it had been possible to budget for a deficit of up to £50,000 on the basis that this normally produced a break even out-turn. In more stringent times, this was less likely to be the case.

The Standing Committee recognised that financial pressures also affected dioceses, charges and many individuals. It was nevertheless the case that many individuals were benefiting from lower mortgage rates and Standing Committee hoped that efforts in relation to stewardship would continue to bear fruit. Against that background, a 3% increase in provincial quota for 2010 was considered reasonable.

Despite the current situation being painful and negative, Professor Peattie wished to affirm to the Synod that the finances were not “broken”. Whilst it might be necessary to realise some capital, there was no desire to do so where this could be avoided at a time when capital values were low. The necessary belt tightening, however, came at an opportune time since it would lead to a revisiting of priorities. She hoped that by General Synod the following year, the economic green shoots talked of by economists might have produced more than one leaf and that, as the Primus had referred to in his charge, the ground might have been cleared to allow for decisions to be made in the light of the forthcoming debate on matters of mission and ministry. The financial situation would improve but the question was “when?”.

The Primus invited comment but there was none.

SESSION TWO – Mr Ian Stewart in the Chair

2.1 College of Bishops

The Most Rev Dr Idris Jones (Primus) welcomed Mr Michael Harvey, of Back to Church Sunday, who had convened a lunch time session for Synod members. A number of congregations were involved in the Back to Church Sunday initiative.

In opening the College of Bishops session, the Primus explained that during the previous year the Bishops had processed a significant volume of work and a number of areas had been tackled in some depth. He expressed thanks to the Secretary General for the support given to the College.

In the light of the prospective retirement of the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles in September 2009, the Primus paid tribute to the Rt Rev Martin Shaw and his wife Elspeth. The Bishop of Argyll had kept the College focused on the spiritual aspects of Christian discipleship. The Primus expressed warmest wishes both for their retirement.

The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) then gave a presentation on aspects of ministry. He explained that the College of Bishops was aware of his general approach but not of the specific material which he would deliver. The ministry of the Church was founded on that of Jesus Christ. The basic unit in Anglicanism was a Christian community with a shepherd whose function was to guide and lead that community and who delegated that office to others, whether ordained or lay. That shepherd was the bishop. The ecclesiology of the Church was based on the three-fold order of ministry. The Scottish Episcopal Church was catholic but reformed. It held to evangelical truth and
apostolic order. In looking at where the Scottish Episcopal Church had come from, it was also important to note the history of the Church and the implications of its involvement with the Jacobite rebellions.

In considering where the Scottish Episcopal Church was at the present time, it was important to recognise that it had been shaped by the recent past (over the previous 50 years). The problems of church decline had begun before the First World War but in fact the ordained ministry expanded in the years after the Second World War. The highest number of ordination candidates after the Second World War had come from the services. Despite increasing numbers, however, there was a difficulty in relation to deployment because numbers were not evenly distributed (Bishop Mantle was referring essentially to the position in the Church of England). Projections in the 1960s envisaged significant increases in the number of ordinands. However, they proved to be completely wrong to the extent that it had been indicated to clergy in training in the 1980s that they were “the last generation of stipendiary clergy”. In fact, vocations had not decreased. In England numbers had risen between 2006 and 2008 and the age profile had reduced. The same was true in the Scottish Episcopal Church. There was also a healthy lay ministry. There were 84 lay readers across dioceses as well as many eucharistic assistants and other forms of lay ministry. Whilst the annual directory suggested there were currently 512 clergy available in Scotland, the collaboration of statistics from dioceses suggested that there were currently 150 full-time and part-time stipendiary clergy, 250 non-stipendiary ministers and 147 retired and semi-retired clergy. He suggested that the total number of available clergy was 377. The clergy in Scotland comprised approximately 75% from Scotland, 17% from England, 7% from overseas and less than 1% from each of Ireland and Wales. In the Diocese of Brechin, all recent posts had been filled from England.

In turning to look at the future, Bishop Mantle considered that the current statistics suggested that there was a need to produce more candidates for ministry, especially stipendiary candidates. Between 2009 and 2015 approximately 33% of stipendiary clergy would reach the age of 65, representing a possible loss of some 50 stipendiary clergy. It was a fact that the Scottish Episcopal Church would not be able to replace stipendiary clergy at a rate that would meet the number of vacancies and would therefore have to recruit from outside Scotland. It was important to be bold about different kinds of ministries, both lay and ordained, and to encourage younger candidates, especially for stipendiary ministry. A balance needed to be maintained between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministries. The only qualification for priesthood was holiness of life but it was important not to be hidebound by a political correctness which said that there was no difference between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministry. At the point of service and deployability, there could be significant differences. He believed that the answer to the difficulties he perceived in relation to the administration of Communion from the Reserved Sacrament was for there to be more non-stipendiary ministers. It was also important to be able to provide ministry in colleges, the services, hospitals, prisons and classrooms. Above all, there was a need for younger candidates to carry on the learning and teaching for the future.

It had been suggested to him that it was the duty of archbishops and bishops to provide clergy. In fact, ministers for the future came from the pews. He encouraged Synod members to return to their dioceses and charges, to talk to people there and prepare for the church of tomorrow.

2.2 Faith and Order Board

2.2.1 Introduction

The Primus presented the report of the Faith and Order Board. He explained that for as long as the Primus chaired Synod he could not, as Convener of the Faith and Order Board, present motions to Synod. Now that Synod chairing was shared, he was able to do so and in so doing wished to emphasise that the material which came to Synod under the heading of the Faith and Order Board had been agreed by the Board. He outlined the areas of activity falling within the remit of the Board namely Doctrine, Liturgy, Canons and Inter-Church Relations (including the Anglican Communion).

2.2.2 Inter-Anglican Women’s Network/UN Commission on the Status of Women

Dr Elaine Cameron explained that she was the Scottish Episcopal Church link on the Inter-Anglican Women’s Network. The Network had been established in 1996 and facilitated networking amongst women and women’s organisations both within the Church and beyond. It built on the work of the Mother’s Union. The Network was for all women in the Church and for those prepared to speak about injustices in their own country. Some spoke at considerable personal risk.

Political and social concerns were at the core of the Network. The provincial link people on the Network sought to build awareness of the social focus of the Network (best defined as the promotion of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals). Dr Cameron highlighted in particular Goal Three (The Empowerment of Women and Gender Equality). The focus of work for the next triennium would be the elimination of violence against all women and children. The Network was also concerned with Church structures especially with the promotion of ACC Resolution 13-31 which sought equality of representation between men and women in all decision-making units responsible for policy design in the churches. She had submitted a report to the Network on the progress of the Scottish Episcopal Church in implementing that resolution. She identified a continuity with the former Movement for Whole Ministry which had promoted the opening of the priesthood and episcopate to women.

Dr Cameron considered it important to support the work of the Network because the meetings of the provincial link people made the personal contact real. People in one part of the globe knew that they were being prayed for around the Communion. The Network also was one way of increasing awareness of the international and inter-Communion aspects of current issues.

Dr Cameron then turned to the question of gender audit. The Scottish Episcopal Church was proud of its mission. Any institution was best placed to fulfil its objectives when its members were able to acknowledge their gifts and talents fully. The Anglican Consultative Council had urged full implementation of its Resolution 13-31 and had requested a further report from provinces. The best way of working towards the goal of equal representation was in the execution of a gender audit. So-called “gender issues” related to both men and women, boys and girls and their promotion sought to uplift the disadvantaged gender. The Church in Wales had completed a gender audit during the course of the previous year and the Scottish Episcopal Church had access to its methodology. She commended the motions which would be proposed shortly by the Primus regarding commitment to the work of the Inter-Anglican Women’s Network and to the undertaking of a gender audit.

The Rev Marion Chatterley thanked the College of Bishops for the opportunity to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church at the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women meeting in New York earlier in the year. The written report contained in
2.3.1 Report on Anglican Consultative Council–14

Standing Committee

2.3.1 Report on Anglican Consultative Council–14

Mr John Stuart (Secretary General) reported on his attendance, as the Scottish Episcopal Church representative, at ACC-14 in Jamaica the previous month. A written report had been circulated with the Synod Papers and he expected that the resolutions which had been passed at the meeting would be remitted by the Standing Committee to appropriate boards and committees of the General Synod for consideration. Whilst he had been the sole Scottish Episcopal Church representative, Miss Sarah Tomlinson had also been present as one of the two Anglican Communion Youth representatives co-opted to the ACC and Mr John Rea had also been in attendance for part of the meeting in relation to some of the Anglican Communion Networks.

On the question of the Anglican Covenant, Mr Stuart explained that the suggestion for an Anglican Covenant had been one of the recommendations of the Windsor Report of 2004. Since then, there had been three drafts of the Covenant: the Nassau draft, the St Andrew’s draft and, most recently, the Ridley Cambridge draft. The General Synod had in the past debated both the Nassau and St Andrew’s drafts and these had also been discussed in dioceses. The hope of the Anglican Communion Covenant Drafting Group had been that ACC-14 would remit the Ridley Cambridge draft to provinces for adoption. However, there had been a feeling at ACC-14 amongst a number of representatives that it would be appropriate for further consultation to take place.
especially on Section 4 of the Covenant. This was probably the most contentious part of the Covenant. In the Ridley Cambridge draft, there had been a move away from more directly “punitive” measures to a greater recognition of the autonomy of provinces. However, the principle of “autonomy” was balanced by the concept of “communion” and, in particular, the relational consequences of communion. In one sense, because the principle of autonomy was respected, churches were free to make their own decisions (subject to the obligations under the Covenant to seek a shared mind with others, engage in theological debate etc.). Ultimately, however, if a church took steps in terms of its own polity which were not compatible with the Covenant, then under the proposed Section 4 the matter would come before the Joint Standing Committee of the Communion (to be known in future simply as “the Standing Committee”). The Standing Committee would have power to make a request to a covenanting church to defer action until various processes had been completed and it could take advice from bodies such as the ACC or the Primates’ Meeting. Having taken such advice, the Standing Committee could make a declaration that a church had acted in a way which was “incompatible with the Covenant” and could make recommendations about the “relational consequences” which would flow from such action. Under the Covenant, it would be for each Instrument of Communion to make its own response to any recommendation emanating from the Standing Committee in such circumstances. As a result, there was a degree of uncertainty as to what those consequences might be. Mr Stuart suggested that an obvious question might be whether a province which had acted incompatibly with the Covenant, would continue to be entitled to enjoy membership of a body such as the ACC or whether its Primate and bishops would be invited to the Primates’ Meeting and the Lambeth Conference respectively. As far as continued membership of the ACC was concerned, the ACC had a constitution which listed the member churches. The Communion’s Standing Committee had power to alter the list of membership but only with the assent of two-thirds of the Primates of the Communion. Therefore, one-third of the Primates exercised a right of veto over any change being made to the membership of the ACC.

Mr Stuart explained that the Covenant addressed the question of a province wishing to withdraw (which, for practical purposes, would be dealt with in a similar way to a province “acting incompatibly” with the Covenant). The Covenant did not, of course, address the situation where a province decided not to sign the Covenant in the first place since the Covenant could only bind those parties who had signed up. His expectation, however, was that if, after a reasonable period, a province either decided actively not to sign the Covenant or simply did not take a decision about signing, then the separate Instruments of Communion would need to arrive at their own decision in much the same way as would be the case if a province had acted incompatibly with the Covenant. Whilst many provinces undoubtedly would sign the Covenant, if some did not, there would be a two-tier Communion and the nature of relationships within such a two-tier arrangement could only be speculated upon. Over time, it was possible that there might be a “cooling” of companion link arrangements. Another factor might be whether mutual interchange of ministry between provinces would or could continue as it did at the present time.

The Agenda and papers for the Synod had had to be prepared and sent to the printer before ACC-14 had taken place. As a result, there was no motion in the Synod Agenda concerning the Covenant. Since returning from Jamaica, Mr Stuart had discussed the matter with the College of Bishops and, as had been the case with previous drafts, he would arrange for the Ridley Cambridge draft to be sent to dioceses for their consideration and comment. A response had been asked for by the Anglican Communion office by 13th November 2009. The comments received would be considered by the Communion’s Standing Committee in December 2009 and he thought that provinces could expect to be invited in the early part of 2010 formally to commence a process of consideration of the final version of the Covenant and for a decision on acceptance of it. The specific request received from the Anglican Communion office since ACC-14 was for provinces to consider Section 4 of the Ridley Cambridge draft to and to identify issues of “unclarity or ambiguity”. He would be writing to dioceses with the draft Covenant and inviting comments by mid-October so that those comments could be considered by the Provincial Faith and Order Board in late October. The Board had previously indicated that, until the final version of the Covenant were available, the precise process to be followed in the Scottish Episcopal Church for consideration and possible adoption of the Covenant could not be finally determined. He expected that the Covenant might come before General Synod 2010 at least for initial consideration. He invited members to comment on the Ridley Cambridge draft since these would be helpful to the Faith and Order Board.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the College of Bishops had issued the statement a couple of months previously responding to requests from the Anglican Communion for various moratoria. He indicated that not everyone could affirm what the bishops had said nor feel happy about their statement. He had a specific question regarding the comment made by bishops that none of them ever attended same-sex blessing services. In the interest of transparency, he asked whether the bishops could indicate to which of them had themselves blessed or taken part in the blessing of a same-sex couple at any time in their ministry and which of them, since becoming bishops, had attended civil partnership ceremonies and blessed them, if not with their prayers, at least by their presence. He also asked whether those bishops who had taken part in been present at such ceremonies would give consideration to using their teaching ministry to explore what they had learned by their participation. He had given a couple of days’ notice of the question to Secretary General and hoped that an answer later in Synod would be appropriate.

The Primus responded that he was not in a position to give a detailed answer at the present time but the College of Bishops would examine the question and give a considered response.

The Rev Martin Robson (Edinburgh) expressed personal unhappiness at the way in which the Anglican Church was being steamrollered to meet timetables regarding the Covenant process. He considered that not only the Scottish Episcopal Church, but also other provinces, had had insufficient time to weigh and discuss the issues in question. He was also unhappy with limits being placed on the scope of the response. His concern was not so much with Section 4 specifically but rather with the entire Covenant which evinced a highly deficient theology of revelation. As a result, he was unhappy with the Covenant being remitted to the Faith and Order Board because more time was needed.

The Primus responded that the question of timetable had been raised previously with the Communion and that the response to the St Andrew’s draft had specifically referred to that. It appeared, however, that some other provinces did not share that view.

In response to a question, the Chair clarified that the Ridley Cambridge draft would be sent to dioceses for comment with a view to the Faith and Order Board considering such diocesan comments and making a response to the Anglican Communion in November 2009. The Primus emphasised that, as before, if any individual members of Synod or congregations wished to submit comments or proposals they were welcome to do so. There was no intention to foreclose the expression of opinion but it would have to be done in such a way as to meet the timetable. The reason the Covenant process was continuing was because a very
large number of provinces wished it to do so. The Rev Martin Robson (Edinburgh) asked for clarification of the process. The Primus responded that dioceses would be invited to express opinions and that they would be collated by the Faith and Order Board. The Chair sought the Synod’s acceptance to the process which had been outlined and this was agreed.

2.3.2 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Ms Lexy Plumtree (Convenor, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) presented the report of the Committee. Commenting on the written report contained in the Synod Papers, Ms Plumtree indicated that the final report on the Historic Cases review prepared by Helen Kenward, the Independent Reviewer, had been received earlier that week. Ms Plumtree had not had an opportunity to consider it in detail but the recommendations had not changed from those contained in Ms Kenward’s interim report. If any Synod member had specific questions regarding the report since they might relate to confidential material, such questions should be addressed to the provincial officers. The Committee was next due to meet in the autumn and would consider the report in detail at that stage.

Ms Plumtree then referred to recent issues concerning the obtaining of disclosure certificates from Disclosure Scotland for persons working with “adults at risk”. Since March 2009, it had not been possible for the Church to obtain enhanced disclosure certificates in such cases. This was beyond the control of the Church, it having been an internal decision of Disclosure Scotland. All other Scottish churches were similarly affected. The Scottish Government had now put down a Statutory Instrument for Parliament to adopt and this was expected to come into force at the end of June 2009. The effect of this would be to allow enhanced disclosure certificates for those working with adults at risk to be available once again.

Questions were invited but there were none.

2.4 Information and Communication Board

The Very Rev Clifford Piper (Convener, Information and Communication Board) referred to the written report of the Board contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008. He also referred to the brief report in the notes to those accounts regarding the dissolution of Scottish Episcopal Church (Newscan) Ltd. The winding up of Newscan had considerably streamlined the production of inspires magazine. The budget of inspires had now been brought within the Information and Communication Board.

In the previous year, the Board had continued to implement its communications strategy. That strategy identified the need for clear objectives and priorities, the need for the support of the Information and Communication Board, the College of Bishops, the Standing Committee and the General Synod and for the strategy to be regularly evaluated. Dean Piper outlined the objectives of the strategy which included raising the profile of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the “messages” which the strategy intended to convey and the resources which could be used to do so, including the Provincial website, inspires, diocesan and church magazines and newsletters, mailings, blogging, exhibitions and resources such as Flickr, Facebook, Twitter etc. The website had been launched two years previously and had gone from strength to strength. The site averaged 250 hits every day and in the period from 8th May to 8th June 2009, there had been 6,632 hits. The agenda and papers for the General Synod could be downloaded from the website and, once again, comprehensive coverage of the Synod was available. There were exciting plans for further development of the website which might include a monthly electronic newsletter, the development of “Red Book plus” to include wider information that the general public might wish to know, a wedding section and general information about the sacraments. There was increasing evidence that many visitors now researched and decided their place of worship through the internet. If General Synod members came from congregations which did not have their own website, he encouraged them to take action. The most popular pages on the website included the church directory, the liturgies and the Scottish Episcopal Church blogs page. The new diocesan website and the Theological Institute website which were now hosted on the provincial site were also very popular. A significant development in the past year had been that the Dioceses of Aberdeen and Orkney and Edinburgh had both decided to host their diocesan websites on the provincial site. Whilst electronic means of communication advanced significantly, there was still a strong sense that there was a place for the printed medium. He invited Synod members to take every opportunity to support and promote inspires. The major burden of production was carried by the Communications Officer, Miss Lorna Finley, who was helped by a small editorial committee. In closing, Dean Piper explained that he had served on the Board for 13 years. It had been an amazing experience and he had enjoyed immensely the privilege of working with many talented people, not least Miss Finley. He thanked the Synod for its support and urged members to “keep communicating!”.

Questions were invited but there were none.

Dean Piper then proceeded to present an album of photographs and tributes to the Most Rev Dr Idris Jones who was due to retire as Primus the following day. The album included contributions from a number of people including the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of Wales, the Bishop of Gothenburg, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow, a former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Chief Executive of the Scottish Inter-faith Council.

In closing the session, the Chair expressed thanks to Dean Piper who had left a tremendous legacy as Convener of the Board.

SESSION THREE – The Rev Dr Alison Peden in the Chair

3.1 Standing Committee

3.1.1 Response to General Synod Review Group Report

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod Papers which represented the response of the Standing Committee to the recommendations contained in the report of March 2006 of the General Synod Review Group. She reminded Synod that comment had been made at General Synod over the course of several years on a number of the recommendations contained in the 2006 report. She noted that the Provincial Conference planned for October 2009 had had to be cancelled but the concept of a Provincial Conference would be kept on the agenda. Issues relating to the Rule 10 motion passed in 2006 had been the subject of separate consideration by Standing Committee and the College of Bishops and would be commented on towards the end of the current General Synod. In any event, there appeared to be little desire for a reduction in the number of dioceses although Standing Committee had been considering the question of diocesan and...
congregational viability. A further result of the continuing consideration of the General Synod Review Group Report was that an improved evaluation form for General Synod had been developed. The Standing Committee received a report on the completed evaluation forms each year and, therefore, there was no need for the Organisation Review Committee to continue to meet annually. It was proposed that it would continue to meet in future but less frequently.

Comments were invited but there were none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee regarding the report of the General Synod Review Group of 2006.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

3.1.2 Electronic Communication

Professor Peattie turned to the proposal in the Synod Papers that facility be included in the Canons to allow for the initial notice convening the meeting of General or Diocesan Synods, under Canons 52 and 50 respectively, to be sent electronically. This would be a more effective means of communication as well as saving expense on postage. The main Synod papers would continue to be provided in hard copy.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) asked why the proposed change to Canon 57.3 envisaged that material posted by second class would be deemed to have arrived within 48 hours when the Royal Mail undertook to deliver within three days. It was agreed that in proposing the amended Canon 57 for first reading, the reference to “48 hours” in Section 3 should be deemed to be a reference to “72 hours”.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion (incorporating the change from 48 to 72 hours referred to above):-

“That the amended text for Canon 57, Sections 1 and 3 be read for the first time.”

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed unanimously in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy unanimously and in the House of Bishops nem con.

3.1.3 Practice Note for Diocesan Synods

Professor Peattie spoke to the Practice Note dated December 2008 which had been prepared by the Standing Committee to assist Diocesan Synods in the handling of business intended for General Synod. In consequence, it was proposed to make a small change to the Appendix to Resolution 9 under Canon 52 in particular so that the voting figures taken in relation to Canons should include reference to the vote of the Diocesan Bishop.

Professor Peattie proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for the Appendix to Resolution 9 under Canon 52 be adopted.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

3.1.4 Standing Committee Membership

Professor Peattie reminded General Synod that the composition of the Standing Committee had been expanded in 2006 and this had proved a most helpful development. However, at that time, it had not been immediately apparent that if the additional members elected to the Standing Committee thereafter soon ceased to be members of General Synod, this could present a risk of frequent change to the Standing Committee membership and limit continuity. The proposals now being brought forward were, therefore, to enable members elected to the Standing Committee to continue as members of General Synod until the completion of their term of office on the Standing Committee. Since Canon 52.3 also referred to the Principal of the Theological Institute (an office which no longer existed), opportunity was being taken to update the Canon but the Mission and Ministry Board had also been invited to consider whether it would be appropriate to include reference to the Pantonian Professor becoming a member of General Synod ex-officio.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 3 be read for the first time.”

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed unanimously in each House.

SESSION FOUR – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

4.1 Response from the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles

The Rt Rev Martin Shaw (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) responded to the thanks expressed to him by the Primus earlier in the meeting. One of his greatest privileges had been to work in Argyll and The Isles. He encouraged Synod members to visit the small charges in the diocese whenever they were able in order to experience “the inexpressible”. He encouraged use of the Retreat Houses on Cumbrae and Iona
since they would only survive if use was made of them. In the words of St Columba, he exhorted Synod members “be the great God between your two shoulders”.

4.2 Administration Board

Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) referred to the reports of the Board and its committees in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008. He explained that the only conveners who had been invited to address Synod were those whose committees had specific matters to bring before Synod. However, all conveners were present and were happy to answer questions.

4.3 Investment Committee

Mr Graeme Thom (Convener, Investment Committee) reported on the work of his committee. He explained that investment conditions had continued to be difficult with investments generally having lost a third of their value in little more than a year. There had also been a significant reduction in dividend payments which had affected investment returns. In relation to the Unit Trust Pool, it had become clear that it would be impossible to maintain previous levels of distribution and that was likely to be the case for the foreseeable future. In those circumstances, the Committee had worked hard on the asset allocation of the Unit Trust Pool in order to limit the damage. The investment policy of the Fund had been altered. The scope of investments had been widened to include more fixed interest and overseas investments and a "total return" policy had been introduced where both income and capital gain would be used to provide the necessary funds for distribution. It would take some time for the new policy to show results. The distribution level for 2009 had been given consideration. The Committee was well aware of the need for income on the part of unit holders but this had to be balanced against the actual returns made by the investments. If the distribution exceeded the actual return earned, this would reduce the value of the investments and affect future investment returns. It had been decided that the distribution in August 2009 would be at the level of 24p per unit (compared with the distribution in August 2008 of 28.25p). The distribution in February 2010 would be decided later in 2009 in the light of investment conditions and returns.

Mr Thom explained that the performance of the Fund Managers had been disappointing and a review had been initiated. Whilst the underperformance of the current managers had been a factor in deciding to undertake a review, the Committee was, in any event, due to carry out a review at the end of the year.

Questions were invited but there were none.

4.4 Finance Committee

The Rev Canon David Bayne (Convener, Finance Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. He reminded Synod that the Committee principally dealt with the allocation of certain grants, and not with finance generally. The previous year, Synod had been invited to make suggestions for an alternative name for the Committee but the response had been "underwhelming". Referring to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008, Canon Bayne pointed out that approximately one-third of Scottish Episcopal Church congregations had benefited from one form of grant or another from the Committee. Each year, the Finance Committee recommended the level of stipend to the Administration Board. For a number of years this had been tied to the Benchmark Stipend of the Church of England. It was understood that the relevant meeting of the Church of England had taken place the previous day but there was, as yet, no announcement. He expected that any increase was unlikely to be large.

There would be very significant provincial deficits in 2010, 2011 and possibly thereafter. Of all the Synod’s boards and committees, the Finance Committee had by far the largest discretionary spend and, therefore, the Committee’s budget was likely to take the largest hit. In considering the latter, the Finance Committee had noted that the Grants for Ministry Fund had already had its budget cut by £25,000 for 2010 and £50,000 in 2011. This was a source of concern to the Committee and it had decided to try to protect the rest of the Grants for Ministry budget. The Committee was therefore proposing to the Administration Board that there would be a two-year moratorium on buildings grants so that in 2010 and 2011 there would be no Maintenance and Development grants nor any Dunderdale Buildings grants. A small contingency fund would be retained for genuine emergencies. Over two years, the saving would be of the order of £300,000. Canon Bayne recognised that this would be difficult for those planning major buildings projects and for those hoping for more modest support from the Dunderdale Building Fund for matters such as the creation of toilets for the disabled. He acknowledged that there would be congregations which would find themselves in need of Grants for Ministry support simply because of the increase in Pension Fund contributions but the view of the Standing Committee was that such congregations would need to look to their own dioceses for assistance (in view of the fact that a substantial upfront capital contribution was proposed to be made to the Pension Fund out of General Synod funds). There would be no transitional relief as there had been at the time of the last significant Pension Fund contribution rate increase. He considered there was more work to be done on this area.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Brecchin) accepted the dire financial situation but expressed concern that the single reference to expenditure cuts appeared to be in relation to disabled access. She referred to the charge of the Primus at the beginning of Synod where he had pointed out that those most affected by the financial crisis were likely to be the most vulnerable. She was concerned that the Church should be looking at how it could act to include the most vulnerable in its life and worship.

Canon Bayne responded that his reference to the creation of toilets for the disabled had simply been an example. He agreed with the comments made by Ms Waller. He reminded Synod that the Disability Discrimination Act had been passed in 1995 and if some congregations had not yet complied, then it was necessary to ask why they had not. He regretted the fact that there would be a lack of provincial resources available in the following two years to assist those who needed to catch up in implementing changes to their buildings.

4.5 Buildings Advisory Committee

Permission was given to the Rev Canon James Milne to speak during the debate. As a member of the Committee on Canons, he had been involved in the redrafting of Canon 35 which the Synod would be invited to consider shortly.
The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Convener, Buildings Advisory Committee) referred to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008. He invited any questions on the report.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Brechin) asked whether it would be possible for obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act to be included within the Canons which dealt with buildings matters. There were still churches which had not complied with the legislation and she wondered what consideration had been given to this within the Buildings Advisory Committee.

The Rev Canon James Milne explained that it was not generally the case that all legislation was reflected in Canons. The assumption was that, generally speaking, the Canons dealt with matters which the Church required its members and congregations to comply with and that state legislation applied anyway without the need for incorporation into Canons.

Dean Duncan reported that the Buildings Advisory Committee had considered disability issues and intended to keep the matter on their agenda for the Committee meeting in the autumn. The guidance notes which had been prepared on the Disability Discrimination Act and issued in 2003 would be placed on the provincial website to enable wider distribution. The Committee also had an access audit checklist which would be placed on the website and was already being used within the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. The Committee was also engaged with the Information and Communication Board whose proposals in relation to the “Red Book plus” would allow more information about disability access to be included on the provincial website.

Dean Duncan then turned to the proposals for alteration to Canon 35 set out in the Agenda and papers for Synod. The Synod was being invited to give a first reading to the text of Canon 35. The Resolutions which had been reproduced in the Synod Papers would be voted on only if and when the Canon returned for a second reading at General Synod 2010. The Buildings Advisory Committee and the Committee on Canons were happy to note any comments on the Resolutions.

Canon 35 was the law which determined how the Church controlled alterations to the interiors and exteriors of buildings in ecclesiastical use. Its present form had been in use for nearly a decade and had proved effective and successful. It was designed, by ensuring a credible process of consultation and decision-making, to preserve the exemption from Listed Building Consent for alterations to interiors. More importantly, it was intended to encourage creative approaches to the use of all church buildings which were based on proper consent and consultation. Experience within the dioceses during the previous 10 years suggested that the Canon needed some minor alteration to improve certain aspects of its operation. The proposals before Synod were the result of a careful process of consultation with every diocesan building committee and with Historic Scotland as well as with the Committee on Canons. Dean Duncan highlighted two significant changes in particular. The first was that Section 1 of the new Canon and the proposed new Resolution 6 would empower the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee to issue a list of minor works which would not require canonical consent. The Committee had begun work on this and intended to finalise a draft list at its meeting in the autumn so that it could perhaps be made available to Diocesan Synods in early 2010 and certainly for General Synod 2010. Secondly, Resolutions 3 and 4 would clarify the distinction in procedures as between listed and non-listed buildings. This was in response to clear representations during the consultation process.

Questions and comment were invited.

Miss Lisbeth Thoms (Brechin) spoke in support of the proposal. She considered that the reference in Resolution 11 to the Voluntary Scheme to apply Listed Building Control to the Exteriors of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use would be better incorporated in Resolution 3 under the Canon (perhaps as a Section 3.2). Also, she was concerned at the possibility of confusion about advice on listed buildings. In the booklet published by Historic Scotland, it was stated that there was no need for consultation in relation to interiors. She appreciated that for the purposes of the Canons, it might be advisable to retain the requirement to engage in such consultation but she suggested that the Committee might consider the issue of guidance to avoid misunderstanding.

The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) supported the remark made by Miss Thoms in relation to Resolutions 11 and 3. He was concerned that if Historic Scotland changed its mind in relation to buildings interiors, the process for altering Canons and Resolutions would inevitably take time before the Church could “catch up”. He suggested that consideration might be given to exploring whether the matter might be dealt with in a way which did not involve incorporation in the Canons. He also noted that Resolution 9 made provision for a full or partial reinstatement if works had been carried out without the necessary consents. He considered that this could be a cause for significant disagreement in future and queried whether it was appropriate to include such provision in a Resolution.

The Rev Ursula Shone (Brechin) noted that Canon 35.4 stated that no church consecrated for public worship could be used for any purpose which was not religious or ecclesiastical without the consent of the bishop. Her church was regularly used for concerts and they had never thought that the consent of the bishop might be needed.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) noted the reference in the proposed Resolution 6 to a list of minor works. He welcomed the idea of minor works in principle. He asked whether the Committee had considered creating three classes of works: those which required the full canonical procedures; those which did not require any consent whatsoever and those which might be approved, for example, by the Dean of the Diocese.

Mrs Kate Sainsbury (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the acquisition of additional land might extend the ownership of a church. She was concerned that the process under the Canon would be too lengthy to meet the necessary timescales required for acceptance of a legal offer.

Dean Duncan, responding to the point made by the Bishop of Edinburgh, said that the Committee had not thought of creating three classes of work but would give consideration to that suggestion. The Rev James Milne, referring to the comments made in relation to Resolution 11, explained that the reason why the Voluntary Scheme was referred to was because it was voluntary and, therefore, not a requirement of the general law. The Committee on Canons would be willing to consider whether the provision might be better placed in the proposed Resolution 3. He also indicated that as a result of discussions with Historic Scotland, it had been very clear that Historic Scotland wanted to be consulted in relation to interiors as well as exteriors. In relation to the proposed Resolution 9, he accepted that it would be difficult for reinstatement to be enforced but by including the Resolution, it was hoped to emphasise the fact that the Canon should be taken seriously.

On the question of gifts of land to the Church, whilst the Canon 35 process was lengthy, it was important that things were done properly.

Dean Duncan then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-
“That the amended text for Canon 35 be read for the first time.”

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy nem con, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

Dean Duncan proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for Canon 50, Section 9 be read for the first time.”

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy nem con, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

Dean Duncan proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

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

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed in each of the Houses of Laity and Clergy nem con, and in the House of Bishops unanimously.

4.6 Personnel Committee

Mr Graeme Hely (Convener, Personnel Committee) reported on behalf of his Committee. In addition to the matters being brought specifically before the Synod at the current meeting, the Committee was also considering the possibility of a capability procedure for clergy. It had been hoped that one of the Committee members, Miss Sheila Galbraith, would present the Grievance Procedure to Synod but, unfortunately, she was unwell and, at short notice, Mr Nick Bowry, another member of the Committee, had agreed to present the material.

Mr Bowry then explained the Grievance Procedure which sought to provide a process for matters of grievance on the part of clergy, who were regarded as “atypical workers”. Since the draft had been produced to General Synod 2008, the only change to the text appeared in Section 3 of the Grievance Procedure on the issue of representation. A new ACAS document had been published in April 2009 and the wording of that had been reflected in the draft Grievance Procedure being presented to Synod.

Questions were invited but there were none.

The Rev Jeremy Auld (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained the proposed alteration to Canon 53 which was being presented for a second reading in order to incorporate the Grievance Procedure as an appendix to the Canons. The reference to the issue of instructions in the proposed Canon 53.10 arose from the fact that clergy did not have a line manager and it was possible that different persons, such as the bishop or vestries, might issue instructions. The new Canon also stated that the raising of a grievance could not be made in relation to any accusation made under Canon 54 until after the matter of the accusation had been resolved.

Comment was invited.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) noted that the Canon referred to clergy generally but the Grievance Procedure restricted the scope of its application so that clergy licensed to institutions such as prisons or hospitals were not included. Whilst the Church could not handle an issue of grievance relating to an individual’s employment in such an institution, it might nevertheless be the case that such an individual might have a grievance in relation to an issue concerning the Church (for example, membership of Diocesan Synod).

Mrs Gill Young (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to encourage the use of mediation since there were many people within the Scottish Episcopal Church who had been trained in mediation skills.

Mr Hely confirmed that clergy working in other institutions would normally have their own contract of employment and any grievance would be dealt with under that. If such individuals fell outside the Canon, he suggested that an aggrieved cleric might contact the Secretary General for advice. The comments made by Synod would be taken back to the Committee.

The Rev Jeremy Auld then proposed, and the Rev Canon Robin Paisley (Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for Canon 53 be read for the second time.”

The motion was put to the vote in houses and passed nem con in each House.

Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

“That the text of the Grievance Procedure set out in the General Synod Papers 2009 be adopted as the text for Appendix 29 to the Code of Canons.”

The motion was put to the vote and carried nem con, with one abstention.

Mr Auld then explained that the motions numbered 14 to 16 in the General Synod Agenda related to questions of age discrimination. This was an area where the Church needed to comply with legislation. He explained the proposed alterations to Canons 1.2 and 11.5 which would remove the age limits on ordination to the Episcopate, Presbyterate and Diaconate.

Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

“That Canon 1, Section 2 be repealed in its entirety. (Second reading)"
Mr Auld then proposed, and Canon Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

“That Canon 11, Section 5 be repealed in its entirety and that the Canon be re-titled “Of the Qualifications and Title of candidates for Holy Orders”. (Second reading)”

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

- House of Clergy: passed by majority (one against)
- House of Laity: passed by majority (one against)
- House of Bishops: passed nem con.

Mr Auld then proceeded to explain the alteration to Canon 62 which was being proposed for a second reading. Under Section 2 of the current Canon, if any person holding stipendiary office wished to continue working after the age of 70, it was incumbent upon them to give notice that they wished to continue. The proposed change reversed the onus so that the bishop would be required to give notice. This would be more in keeping with current employment legislation. In relation to the proposed change to Section 1, which proposed that the Canon should state that the normal retirement age was 70, Mr Auld explained that, in fact, the proposed change did not alter the status quo. The proposed change in wording was in fact consistent with the terms of the Canon which currently provided that no-one in stipendiary office could continue beyond the age of 70. “Normal retirement age” was a phrase used in current employment legislation and it meant the age beyond which ordinarily an employee would not work. The reason for proposing a deletion of the reference to retirement age for pension purposes was that in its current form the Canon confused two issues. Matters relating to the Pension Fund were dealt with in the Pension Fund rules. The Canon was intended to relate simply to the question of whether an individual could carry on working. He was aware that the Diocese of Edinburgh wished to propose an amendment which was set out on page 123 of the Synod Papers and would wait before commenting further until that matter had been raised.

The Rev Robert Warren wished to propose an amendment. He was aware that at second reading stage, amendments could only be proposed at General Synod if they had been adopted by Diocesan Synods. Given that the amendment he was about to propose had been adopted by the Diocese of Edinburgh, he was surprised that it had not been reflected in the wording presented to the General Synod. He considered that General Synod should be more loath to pass a Canon at first reading stage if the wording was not right. The word “normal” used in the Canon had a technical meaning but the difficulty was that the Canons were not a purely internal document and were used broadly throughout the Church. They were used, for example, by selection committees considering clergy appointments. Similarly, the Canons were used by vestries who might give a conventional understanding to the work “normal” in the context of discussions with their cleric about retirement. In the Diocese of Edinburgh, out of 15 recent retirements, 14 had involved retirements between the ages of 63 and 67. Sixty-five was the “normal” age for retirement as understood in most congregations. The discussion which had taken place within the Diocese of Edinburgh essentially was about the pastoral implications of no longer being able to have a discussion with clergy about their retiring at age 65. Clergy were not all equal. At 70, some people would have before them a decade of retirement, others would be within a few years of their death. He opposed using the word “normal” in a context when in fact it did not mean “normal”. He proposed an amendment as follows:-

“That the italicised words “The normal retirement age in this Church is seventy years. No” should be taken out and be replaced with the words “Notwithstanding that, in this Church, the retirement age of clergy for pension purposes is sixty-five years, no”.”

Mrs Quetta Johnston (Edinburgh) seconded the amendment. There was an element of unease about the proposals. It had been explained that the purpose of the change was to reflect provisions in the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006. She expressed concern that that if the Committee on Canons were selective in which parts of legislation they chose to embody in the Canons, the effect of the original legislation might be distorted if the Canons did not also contain the safeguards contained in the original legislation. Also, there was the potential for much time and energy being taken up in amending Canons every time the Government chose to change legislation. Concern had been expressed at the Edinburgh Diocesan Synod as to why the Committee on Canons was proposing a change from a statement in the Canons about retirement age which was currently accurate to one which would not be. It remained the case that the retirement age for pension purposes was 65. It was not true that the normal retirement age in the Church was 70. The proposals therefore cast doubt over the age at which clergy could draw their pension. The proposed changes to the Canon, combined with the deficit in the Pension Fund, gave rise to considerable anxiety about future pensions. To an outsider, it appeared that the change might be paving the way for a change to the age at which pension could be drawn. Whilst she was sure that Synod would be assured that that was not the case, the very fact that it had been mentioned, meant that it was an issue. She urged support for the proposed amendment brought by the Diocese of Edinburgh.

The Rev Dr John Armes (Edinburgh) recognised that legislative requirements had to be reflected in the Canons. However, if the Canons aped legislative requirements slavishly, they could result in a nonsense and in unforeseen consequences on the culture of the Church. In this case, the nonsense was that the word “normal” did not bear its “normal” meaning and the risk of consequences on the culture of the Church was the alarm caused to congregations and clergy within the Church. The pensions deficit invited a proper debate on when pensions should be payable but he was opposed to predetermining the outcome by canonical “sleight of hand” or clumsiness. He supported the amendment from the Diocese of Edinburgh.

The Chair indicated that the use of language such as “sleight of hand” was unparliamentary and grossly unfair. He proceeded to explain that for the amendment to be adopted a two-thirds majority in each House was required.

The amendment as proposed by Mr Warren and Mrs Johnston was then put to the vote. In the House of Bishops, the voting was three in favour, four against. The Chair declared that since the amendment had not been passed in the House of Bishops it fell.
Raising a point of order, the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) asked for clarification on where in the standing orders it was stated that an amendment required a two-thirds majority. The Chair referred to the explanatory note on voting procedures contained in the Synod Papers which stated that such amendments required a two-thirds majority and confirmed the advice of his assessor that this was set out in Canon 52.17. The Very Rev David Mumford (Brechin) sought clarification that the wording in question applied not just to the final vote adopting an amended Canon but also to amendments proposed during second reading stage. The Primus confirmed that a two-thirds majority in houses was required in the case of amendments proposed during debate at second reading stage.

The Rev Jeremy Auld then proposed, and the Rev Canon Robin Paisley seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for Canon 62 be read for the second time.”

The motion was put to the vote in houses. The House of Clergy voted 24 in favour 31 against. The Chair declared that the motion fell in the House of Laity and it was therefore not put to the House of Laity or House of Bishops.

4.7 Ethical Banking

The Very Rev David Munford (Brechin) wished to ask the Convener of the Administration Board in the light of the report by War on Want entitled “Banking on Bloodshed” which detailed the significant involvement of the present Scottish Episcopal Church bankers in financing armaments, what plans the Board had to consider both the report and the place of ethical criteria in the choice of bankers for the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Mr Stewart responded that he would take the matter to the Administration Board for consideration. In fact, the Standing Committee was responsible for the selection of bankers for the General Synod but the Board could engage in discussion and make a recommendation to the Standing Committee.

In closing the Administration Board session, Mr Stewart thanked the Conveners of the Board’s pendant committees.

4.8 Pension Fund – Triennial Valuation

Mr Simon Mackintosh (Chairman, Pension Fund Trustees) reminded Synod that when he had reported at General Synod 2008 he had made reference to what had then been a gathering crisis in world financial markets, to the demanding and volatile investment environment and to the then forthcoming valuation of the Pension Fund due as at 31st December 2008. He then referred to the additional papers which had been circulated with the General Synod Agenda for the current meeting and which made reference to the funding deficit in relation to past service of £8.8 million. It was a matter of very great regret that the Pension Fund was in its current position but that was also the position of very many other final salary pension funds. Referring to the debate which had taken place earlier in the morning on Canon 62, he explained that he had had no knowledge of the proposals regarding normal retirement age and this had played no part at all in the deliberations of the Pension Fund Trustees.

The paper which had been circulated highlighted the material deterioration in the position of the Fund due principally to the fall in investment values. It also explained the actions which the Trustees required to take in conjunction with the employer. In short, a recovery plan had to be produced which had to be approved by the Pensions Regulator. In considering the position revealed by the valuation, the Trustees had met three times to agree the assumptions adopted and the terms of the recovery plan. Representatives of the Trustees had also met with the Standing Committee to discuss the valuation and its implications. Following that meeting, a draft recovery plan had been developed and this was now produced to Synod. The role of the Trustees was to protect the interest of the members of the scheme and to be satisfied that the recovery plan was achievable. The first stage of this was to be satisfied with what was described in the pensions world as the “Employer Covenant”, namely the willingness and ability of the employer to deliver its part of the bargain. The Trustees were aware that the Church scheme had aspects of a multi-employer scheme although in fact there was only one employer under the Trust Deed.

The first motion to be proposed was recognition on the part of the General Synod, on behalf of the Church, that the recovery plan be funded. The Trustees were of the view that the plan put forward struck a reasonable balance between what was achievable and the wish and duty of the Trustees to see the Scheme restored to balance as quickly as possible. The Trustees therefore supported the proposal in the paper which involved the following main elements: an assumed investment return rate of 5.5%, a plan lasting 15 years, a lump sum contribution of approximately £2,000,000 and an annual employer’s contribution of 34.9% of standard stipend or pensionable salary. Prudent assumptions had been made in relation to a number of factors such as the number of members choosing to commute pension for a lump sum and it was considered that the deficit of £8.8 million had been prudently assessed. Having had discussions with the Standing Committee, the Pension Fund Trustees were satisfied with the recovery plan put forward. If the proposed motions were adopted by Synod, the Pension Fund Trustees, together with the Standing committee, would put forward the recovery plan to the Pensions Regulator. There was a possibility that the Pensions Regulator might require a shorter period for the recovery plan in which case the recovery plan would have to be adapted. The finalised recovery plan had to be agreed by 31st March 2010 which was why some flexibility was sought from Synod in the motions shortly to be proposed. In closing his report, he thanked his fellow trustees and Dr Daphne Audsley, Pension Fund Administrator.

Professor Patricia Peatlie (Convener, Standing Committee) explained the role of the Standing Committee in relation to pension matters. She reminded Synod that members of the Standing Committee constituted the Charity Trustees of the General Synod and acted as the employer representative for the Church. The Standing Committee had considered a number of scenarios with two key priorities: affordability and acceptability. Consideration had been given to the level of future asset return, the period of the recovery plan and the possibility of contribution of a lump sum. In the original papers, the actuaries had produced figures showing an asset return of 5% and it was also the case that the normal duration of the recovery plans in the past had been 10 years. If those figures had been used, and no capital sum were to be injected, the contribution rate would have had to rise to 50.7% of stipend or pensionable salary. This was considered neither affordable nor acceptable. The actuaries had advised that an assumption of a 5.5% investment return remained prudent and this had been agreed by the Standing Committee. Standing Committee had also been advised that, given the global nature of the financial crisis, the Pensions Regulator was more likely to agree to a plan of longer duration than 10 years. Accordingly, a 15 year recovery period had been agreed. The Standing Committee had agreed that a lump sum contribution should be made at provincial level partly because the majority of the deficit related to people already receiving a pension and whose employers were not necessarily still making a contribution to the Fund. Therefore, it would have been inequitable for the full burden to be borne by current contributors. A lump sum of £2,000,000 was being proposed and this would need to be found from current investments. Consequently, there would be an adverse effect on investment income available to General Synod Funds. The combination of assumed future investment returns, the duration of the recovery plan and the lump sum injection resulted
in a proposed increase in contribution rate to 34.9%. This contribution rate was significantly less than current rates in many other churches albeit higher than the Standing Committee would have wished. As a result of the significant pressure which this would have on provincial resources, the Standing Committee was of a view that on this occasion dioceses should be charged with responsibility for short term assistance for charges for whom the rise in contribution rate would be too great a challenge. In addition, the Standing Committee, together with the Pension Fund Trustees, would review the current benefit structure of the Fund. This did not necessarily mean any change would be made. The Standing Committee had considered spreading the injection of the lump sum over a period of two years but that would have resulted in a further increase in the contribution rate of 0.3-0.4%. The proposals as put forward would represent a major challenge for all parts of the Church.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

“That, in order to assist the Trustees of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund in their assessment of the General Synod’s covenant in funding the SEC Pension Fund, this Synod recognises the obligation of the General Synod on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church to ensure that the SEC Pension Fund is adequately funded.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con.

Professor Peattie proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

“That the Standing Committee be instructed to work with the Trustees of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund to prepare a Recovery Plan, acceptable to the Pensions Regulator, to address the deficit arising on the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund as at 31st December 2008 and that the Standing Committee be authorised to contribute such capital sum to the Pension Fund as may be required in terms of such Recovery Plan.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Stewart seconded, the following motion:-

“That with effect from 1st January 2010, the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be increased to 34.9% of standard stipend and pensionable salary respectively save that in the event that the Pensions Regulator, following consideration of the Recovery Plan submitted by the Pension Fund Trustees and Standing Committee, determines that a different contribution rate is necessary, the Standing Committee be authorised to alter such rate following consultation with the Pension Fund Trustees.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr Mackintosh and Professor Peattie.

SESSION FIVE – The Very Rev Gregor Duncan in the Chair

5.1 Mission and Ministry Board

5.1.1 Introduction

The Rt Rev David Chillingworth (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and Convener, Mission and Ministry Board) introduced the report of the Board.

The Board had warmly welcomed the report received the previous year on the implementation of New Century, New Directions and Journey of the Baptised. The Board had established a Task Group to carry out an examination of the report and identify the main recommendations and he expressed thanks to the Very Rev Richard Kilgour who had chaired that Task Group. There were two key questions which the review brought to the Church. The first related to training for ministry in general and the role of TISEC in particular. TISEC fulfilled an important role in providing quality-assured training for authorised ministries and the question was whether that role should be extended so that TISEC should act as the single training agency for all ministry across the life of the Church. His view was that this would be a logical step. It made sense to take a holistic and integrated view of training for ministry at every level. The second issue raised by the report was the need to consider what the future of congregational development and ministry ought to be. A wonderful resource of experience and material in local collaborative ministry had been developed and the Board considered that the Church was being challenged to find ways in which those treasures should be allowed to mature and find their place in the mainstream life and ministry of the Church.

One of the key functions of the Board was to attempt to take an overview and develop a “whole Church” policy in mission and ministry. The Board hoped to bring at least a first attempt at such a policy to General Synod 2010 which would arise from a number of places. The debate about to be undertaken by Synod about the mission of the Church was one strand of the development of such a policy. Also, the Board saw the need for a new process of consultation between the Board and the dioceses. Whilst there were diocesan representatives who offered valuable service on the Board, that was not quite the same thing as consultation between the Board and diocesan leadership namely the bishop, key clergy and laity in each diocese. To undertake such a consultation would have a secondary benefit of creating greater cohesion among dioceses.

Bishop Chillingworth emphasised the importance of recognising that the current time was a particularly difficult period for the Church. The Board oversaw significant spending and the period of financial difficulty ahead would impose particular strains on that work. The Board’s aim would be to protect key areas of work but also to use the challenge brought by such financial pressures to ask painful questions about priorities.
The Board had also recognised that there were some particular issues in need of exploration. Consultation had already taken place about “younger ordinands” which attempted to clarify questions about whether and how the Church might encourage vocation to the ordained ministry amongst younger people. Such consultations could be a helpful way of moving quickly on some of the policy issues faced by the Board.

In closing, Bishop Chillingworth referred to the situation regarding St Serf’s. He paid tribute to the Transfer Group and also to the House Committee chaired by St Michael Bonallack for the work which they had completed. The challenge had been to establish financial viability in the hope that, as with Braeburn, St Serf’s might be transferred to a church-rooted instrument of governance. Whilst it had been possible to bring St Serf’s to a situation of near financial viability on a day to day basis, it had never been possible to achieve the necessary financial stability for a long term or to allow the Church to respond to the many requirements which any residential institution had to face. With reluctance, therefore, the Board had proceeded to give effect to the decision made by the General Synod in 2006 which allowed for the transfer of St Serf’s to a suitable third party operator and that process was currently underway. It would be the hope of the Board, although it could not be guaranteed, that a significant pastoral involvement from the Scottish Episcopal Church would continue to be part of the ethos and value of what St Serf’s offered to its residents and their families.

5.1.2 Debate: What is the Mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church in 2009?

The Very Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) considered there were two important strands of mission activity: the first in local congregations and the second in the way the Church related to wider Scottish society. Building local congregations would enable people who would never expect to discover God to find that they were already welcomed and loved. Engaging with wider society was a question of taking the churches to places where people did not expect it to go. Examples of this included appearing at the Wedding Show, the broadcast studio and engaging with the Press, Parliament and higher education with wider society. What was required was a question of taking the churches to places where people did not expect it to go. Examples of this would enable people who would never expect to discover God to find that they were already welcomed and loved. Engaging with the world in the way the Church related to wider Scottish society was a question of taking the churches to places where people did not expect it to go.

It was an exciting part of the Church’s calling to enable people to read the Scriptures anew with passion and with the old fashioned orthodoxy of common sense. Finally, love, because mission was simply finding ever more creative ways to share what it meant to be utterly loved by God.

Spirituality, the Bible and the love of God were all the heritage of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Rev Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) reminded Synod that “the church that loses its sense of mission is in peril of its life. The church exists for mission as a fire exists by burning.” This summed up the passion and urgency of mission. There was no need to re-invent or rediscover mission because the Church had already been set the Great Commission of Matthew chapter 28 verse 19. The Church’s role was to obey the Great Commission by finding out how it could make disciples in a way which was relevant to 21st Century Scotland using the unique gifts, style and opportunities which the Scottish Episcopal Church had. He wished to make three slightly provocative suggestions. Firstly, it was necessary to narrow the definition of “mission”. When the word was used broadly, it lost its meaning. The Church fooled itself that it was doing mission when in fact the statistics from the Annual Report showed that current strategies were not working. The Five Marks of Mission were helpful but he considered it was necessary to focus on “expressed mission” such as personal faith sharing, proclamation and witnessing. The Scottish Episcopal Church was good on mission interpreted as justice, peace and acts of compassion but mission in scripture also had a strong emphasis on proclamation. As an inclusive Church it was important to reach the least, the last and the lost with the message of Christ. He suggested using “mission” to mean words of proclamation and “mercy” to mean love in action. Secondly, it was important to be clear about the gospel which the Church was communicating, as Jesus had been. The Scottish Episcopal Church had learnt to be good listeners: there was a need to receive confidence in the gospel of repentance, forgiveness and baptism. Mr Round challenged Synod members as to whether they were confident to explain the gospel to a stranger. Thirdly, members of Synod needed not just to engage in discussion but to model this pattern of mission. He suggested that Synod members might ask themselves how many un-churched people had joined their congregation in the previous three years. How many un-churched people had Synod members shared their faith with in the previous year? How many “not yet” Christians had members invited to their congregation in the previous year? Synod members could not expect others to take steps which they themselves were not prepared to take. Synod the following year could include sessions on personal faith sharing and personal invitation and the arranging of guest services in congregations. Pairs of Synod members, led by the bishops and Standing Committee, could go out into the streets of Edinburgh and share their faith. Next year, Synod members could return and tell their stories of how they had shared their faith. His vision of the Church was a missional one with missionary dioceses and mission-orientated charges full of confident mission-minded individuals.

Mrs Elspeth Strachan (Edinburgh) asked how the God of mission wished to use the Scottish Episcopal Church in 2009? The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church was to let the world know that God loved the world with passion. That was the mission of every Christian and every church, so what was particular to the Scottish Episcopal Church? At a conference in the Diocese of Edinburgh the previous year, there had been an attempt to identify what was distinctive about the Scottish Episcopal Church. The response was that the Church was small, eccentric, inclusive, prayerful, intelligent, smug and hugely diverse in liturgy, theology and size of congregations. She believed that the Church’s calling lay in its gifts and a significant theme which recurred at that conference had been that of diversity. She compared the Scottish Episcopal Church to the street dance group Diversity which had recently won “Britain’s Got Talent”. That group had been an intelligent, quirky group of friends and family very diverse in age, colour and ability but which moved together with great passion. They also had a fabulous choreographer. The love and trust which the members had in one another was clear and they loved not being distinguished but because, they were different. The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church was similar – setting a hurting and divided world alight not by cleverness but by a risky love which church members had for one another and for the world. Within the Scottish Episcopal Church, there were differences but perhaps the difference in approaches was in fact the Scottish Episcopal Church’s particular window into God. It was the case
that in Britain many people believe but no longer belonged. The mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church could be to learn to
dance together to the music of the Spirit, that great choreographer, with such a sense of hope, love and fun that people were
drawn into that dance and could find God at its heart.

Synod then broke into buzz groups for a few minutes to discuss the presentations which had been made after which the debate
was opened to the floor for contributions.

The Rev Robert Harley (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that he served on the Missions Committee of Scripture
Union which co-ordinated beach missions and holiday clubs for children. The aim was to teach children the faith. Children often
returned each year and could be seen to be deepening their faith and they then moved into the role of helpers. The themes of
reaching out and encouraging into service were relevant to the Church’s mission.

The Rev Dean Postekew (Edinburgh) spoke as one who had been involved in the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church for
some 10 years. He loved the Church and its diversity but it needed to stop apologising for what it was not and be proud of what it
was.

The Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that as he had arrived at Synod he had been conscious of the
presence of a stranger beside him asking “Do you love this Church?” Looking around, he had been conscious of the diversity of
the Church. At the confession during the Eucharist he had responded “Yes I do, but just” and asked for grace to love the Church
more. The stranger had responded “The mission of the Church is to love who you are here and now”.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) considered that the answer to the question about mission was to be
confident in the proclamation of the scripture which the Church knew to be true and meaningful. At times, the Church tended to
behave like a chaplaincy to an Anglican Diaspora, rather than as a confident church in its own right. The smallness of the Church
did not need to affect its confidence. The Church could be confident in applying what it knew of scripture to the current
problems of financial systems and climate change. Referring to the 80% reduction target for carbon emissions by 2050, he
suggested the Church could apply its biblical understanding to strategies for mitigating climate change. The mission of the
Church should be about confidence and clarity in how the gospel was expressed.

Dr Jamie Hill (Glasgow and Galloway) reminded Synod that the debate was taking place on the feast of St Barnabas who had
been a man of true mission and stewardship. Dr Hill was involved in stewardship in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway, for
the second time. First time around, the Diocese had produced information to support stewardship campaigns and the emphasis
had been on finance. Second time around, the Stewardship Committee had concluded that stewardship was about mission, not
finance; service to God, not fundraising. The definition of mission in the review of Journey of the Baptised and New Century,
New Directions was “alerting the world to God’s presence in it”. The Five Marks of Mission were all about stewardship. He
believed that stewardship was a sacrament as fundamental as the Eucharist. The service of God required the Church to engage in
the stewardship of creation, of God’s gifts of the poor, vulnerable and exploited. This was the mission of the Scottish Episcopal
Church in 2009 and in every year. From mission and true stewardship came faith, commitment and finance. The Church could
do no better than follow the example of St Barnabas.

Professor Barbara Parfitt (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to question the question which was being posed in the debate. She
thought it was the wrong question. The mission of any Church was that of Christ. That mission was written clearly within the
Scriptures and was shared by all churches and all Christians. The mission was to reach out to those who did not know and love
Christ. She considered the question ought to read “How can the Scottish Episcopal Church fulfil effectively the mission of Christ
in 2009?” What were the gifts, skills and expertise which the Scottish Episcopal Church had which could make a difference in
the context of the Christian Church so that the Scottish Episcopal Church could make an impact locally, nationally and
worldwide.

The Rev Anne Haselhurst (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to echo the words confidence, diversity and inclusion.
She believed that confidence was already growing within her diocese and referred to the “Casting the Net” strategy. The
Diocesan Standing Committee had a policy that items of mission and ministry came at the top of its agenda. As Convener of a
diocesan group charged with addressing work with children and young people, she was conscious that the Church would not see
greater numbers of younger ordinands unless there were more children in church. There was great diversity within the young
people. At the Corpus Christi Service held the previous evening at Old St Paul’s there had been a significant number of young
people in what was an old fashioned ritualistic, but nevertheless very vibrant, service. The young people quite obviously had
related to that form of worship. Young people were able to relate both to the charismatic evangelical forms of worship but also to
older forms. Inclusion was very important since young people wanted to be listened to. The Church needed to go into schools
and the uniformed organisations to meet the young people where they were.

The Rev Ian Barcroft (Convener, Church in Society Committee) spoke of his experience as a priest for 20 years. He had always
asked questions and wanted to continue to do so. He agreed with much of what had been said during the debate but wished to
emphasise the need for the Church to listen to the community around it. In his capacity as Convener of the Church in Society
Committee, there was a wide range of issues which arose. Even in his first year as Convener, the following had required
attention: criminal justice, family matters, climate change, land reform, poverty and social justice, personal debt, end of life
issues, nuclear weapons, asylum, the internet and the equalities agenda. In asking “Where is God?” in such issues, the starting
point was to listen and to take personal responsibility. Another issue which had not been mentioned hitherto during the debate
was that of valuing older people. The Church was overwhelmingly local and it was important not to stop listening. He hoped
that each diocese would have a Church in Society Action Group (four dioceses already had such a group). The Church was
called to speak in the public sphere but actions spoke louder than words. The work of the local churches in the caring for
community was what people sought. He hoped that the Church could carry on what it was doing but in a co-ordinated way so
that the listening could be brought to a conclusion.

The Rev Annalu Waller (Breckin) said that mission occurred when Christians shared their faith with other people. People in the
workplace were thirsty for spirituality and church members had a mission to share their faith in all situations. The problem was
that often there was a lack of confidence. How could the Church prepare its members to share their faith? The Scottish
The Rt Rev John Mantle (Bishop of Brechin) agreed with the comments which had been made regarding the Great Commission but emphasised Christ’s call to each person to live it out themselves. He also made a plea for funding for university chaplains. Full time university chaplains had been lost but their influence could be significant.

Mrs Nan Kennedy (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) disagreed that the issue was one of confidence. Diversity had won “Britain’s Got Talent” because they had talent and had practised. Church members needed training and education to enable them to engage in mission. If that were the case, they might lose the “cringe factor” and acquire the “X factor”.

Mr Nick Cox (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that no mention had been made during the debate of the cross of Jesus Christ. At a baptism service he had attended a number of years previously a “turn or burn” sermon had given him cause for reflection. The mission of the Church was to serve and make a difference but principally was to see people coming into God’s Kingdom and moving from darkness into light. People needed to be able to answer the question “If you died tonight, where would you be going?”.

The Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers (Glasgow and Galloway) observed that there had been little reference to the ecumenical dimension of mission. In Ireland, he had often heard it said that the Anglican Church was both catholic and reformed. If that were embraced, it gave confidence because the Scottish Episcopal Church could legitimately say to both major traditions that it belonged with them.

The Rt Rev Martin Shaw (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) referred to the experience of Jean Vanier, founder of the L’Arche Community who had been asked by a Downs Syndrome child “Do you love me?”. Jean Vanier had been unable to answer the question but recognised the gaze of Christ in that of the boy. The Bishop was concerned at the over-use of the word “confidence”. He was not sure whether he was confident in his faith or not. “Confidence” meant to “have faith with”. In the Episcopalian tradition, even in his moments of atheism, he was carried by the body of Christ. There were two views of mission. The first was to believe that the Christian “had Christ” and was to take Christ out to others. The second view was that Christ was in the people one met and one’s task was to respond to their question “Do you love me?”. In concluding the session, the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane thanked the three opening contributors and all other participants. The debate had contributed to the creation of a mood. The Synod had engaged in “conversations about the work of God”. Moving from the debate towards policy involved a number of stages. He considered that three things had emerged from
the debate. Firstly, there was an issue of depth. There was a sense that the Church was good at welcome and invitation –
community and friendship was built. However, the Church was not quite sure how to deploy its treasures. These treasures
included faith, the heritage of Scripture, theology and worship and working with people who believed but did not belong. Such
people sought the answers to deep questions. Secondly, he spoke of a moment of personal revelation regarding questions of
inclusiveness and diversity. His experience was that in situations of deep conflict, it was essential to speak the truth since
otherwise confusion resulted. This was true in a situation of diversity which prized inclusion. Nothing less than the truth would
do. Thirdly, there was the issue of confidence, namely a self-belief which arose out of a belief in God. The Scottish Episcopal
Church was also re-establishing a picture of itself within the ecclesiastical life of Scotland. All denominations were now
minority churches in a secular society. He had recently had the opportunity to meet with the 30 most recently consecrated
bishops in the USA. At the gathering, he had become more difficult to distinguish the liberals and conservatives and one bishop
had said “we all now talk about Jesus”. The focus was not on what divided them. If the Church gathered itself around a vision of
its mission, other difficulties would find their place and level.

SESSION SIX – Professor Patricia Peattie in the Chair

6.1 Mission and Ministry Board (continued)

6.1.1 Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office

The Rev Ian Barcroft (Convener, Church in Society) welcomed Ms Chloe Clemmons, the recently appointed Scottish Churches
Parliamentary Officer.

Ms Clemmons addressed the Synod. The primary role of her Office was to build relationships between Scottish churches and the
Parliament. This was carried out through a research team which undertook comprehensive parliamentary monitoring and the
production of monthly briefing materials and the Office also created space for churches and politicians to talk to one another. As
an example, she cited the fact that Eco-congregations had identified that the Climate Change Bill being promoted by the Scottish
Government lacked a mechanism whereby the Government could inform and empower communities and individuals to work
towards the targets proposed in the Bill. Eco-congregations had considerable practical experience in this field and through her
Office, approaches had been made with a view to amending the Bill. Her Office also supported the ecumenical discussions in the
Scottish Churches’ Social Inclusion Network and the work of the Joint Faiths Advisory Board on Criminal Justice. Whilst most
of the work of the Office involved engaging with churches at denominational level, the Office was also very happy to support
individual congregations.

6.1.2 Provincial Youth Network

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Convener, Provincial Youth Network) reported that there had been a scene shift at the Glenalmond
Youth Weeks in 2008 in that ecumenical delegates from the Swedish Church had attended for the first time. Contacts had been
maintained since. Attendance in 2008 had been the biggest ever. Whilst the event had grown each year, he had anxiety that the
finances had not. He expressed gratitude for donations which had been made and encouraged churches to continue to support
their young people. A pilgrimage to Iona for the 18-25 year group had taken place in 2008 and the Youth Network had also
attended the Lambeth Conference and run the Labyrinth there, encouraging bishops to think about the place of young people. A
CD had been produced and sent to most provinces since the event.

There was now a full complement of Youth Officers across the dioceses and 20 people had trained in the Network’s Leadership
course. There had been talk about “vocation” for many years. Many young leaders gave up significant time and it was important
that people felt included in the programmes already on offer. For those in smaller congregations, there was no network able to
support them in exploring vocation and the idea of a postulancy network which had been aired within the Mission and Ministry
Board earlier in the year would be very helpful. However he urged people not to adopt the attitude “when are we going to get
round to doing something about our young people” because the young people were frustrated at continuing to hear this.

Questions were invited but there were none.

6.1.3 Rural Commission

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Convener, Rural Commission) spoke about the work of the Rural Commission. He emphasised that
the work of the Commission was not intended to concentrate on rural issues at the expense of urban ones. He was aware that
both were important. There was, however, an urgency in relation to certain rural issues. For example, within his own diocese,
one community was no longer served by public transport at all. Bishop Strange drew attention to the leaflet which had been
produced for use at the Royal Highland Show later in the month. He explained that there would shortly be a facility on the
Provincial website to encourage comment on rural matters. The Commission intended to organise a series of three day
conferences to look at the following issues: the rural environment in general; rural issues within the Scottish Episcopal Church
(for example, liturgy, doctrine, buildings); connections with local communities. He expected that these would result in the
production of a short report.

Questions were invited but there were none.

6.1.4 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

The Rev Donald Reid (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) referred to the report in the Annual
Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008. 2008 had been a good year for the
Committee culminating in a stimulating inter-faith consultation which had been hosted by the Scottish Episcopal Church in
Edinburgh for the Porvoo Communion. He reminded Synod members that the Grosvenor Essay, The Inter-faith Encounter, had
been produced a few years previously and inspired had subsequently featured responses to the booklet from a number of other
faiths. In 2007, the Committee had staged an inter-faith dialogue with a Rabbi and an Imam at General Synod and had raised the
issue of including representatives of other faiths in local clergy gatherings. In 2008, Synod had engaged with A Common Word.
The First Minister had noted the leading stand taken by the Scottish Episcopal Church in the inter-faith arena and the current political climate was benign. The Scottish Inter-faith Council was now 10 years old and was promoting Scottish Inter-faith Week which took place around St Andrew’s Day. At a time of year when Scottish identity was celebrated, it was an occasion to recognise that Scottish identity comprised people from a range of faith communities. Mr Reid suggested that Synod members might wish to engage with a member of another faith during Inter-faith Week, perhaps by participating in one of the organised activities, details of which could be found from the Scottish Inter-faith Council website.

Mr Reid referred to the work of the Edinburgh Inter-faith Association and of the Festival of Spirituality and Peace, the theme of which in 2009 would be “The Call of Home”. Participants would include the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

Finally, Mr Reid referred to the open meeting which the Committee was organising later in the year at the Inter-faith Centre on Holy Isle. The event would involve conversation with the Buddhist Community on the subject of what Christians referred to as the Kingdom of God and what Buddhists might refer to as the Buddha mind or mindfulness.

Questions were invited but there were none.

6.1.5 Overseas Committee

The Rev Canon Duncan McCosh (Convener, Overseas Committee) referred to the report of his Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008. He expressed thanks to Mrs Gill Young who was now retiring from the Committee having served for a number of years. She had organised a very successful conference earlier in the year on companion links. The current edition of inspires featured an article on the work of the Committee and the emphasis was on partnership with others.

Ms Catriona Beel spoke regarding the small grants portfolio of the Committee for which she was responsible. There were two categories of grant: small project grants normally subject to a maximum of £750, and travel grants for which members of the Scottish Episcopal Church could apply if they wished to work overseas on community-based projects. Recipients were asked to provide reports and it was heart warming to read of the benefits which such grants had brought. She encouraged members to inform others of the availability of such grants.

The Rev Robert Anderson spoke on the work of Scottish World Exchange, of which the Scottish Episcopal Church was a founder member. It had been created as one of the first actions of ACTS. Its first initiative was the creation of the ecumenical volunteer programme which sought to build ecumenical social capital. It had sent 1,200 volunteers abroad. There were two main programmes: a volunteering programme (which sent people abroad) and a learning programme (which delivered courses). The learning programme sought to build capacity in member churches both at home and overseas. The volunteering programme was costly and there had to be a clear justification for sending a person abroad. The volunteering programme included both capacity building and network building. There were currently three Scottish Episcopalian volunteers abroad and he outlined some of their work. He was convinced of the benefit of working ecumenically.

Questions were invited.

The Rev Canon Roy Flatt (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the Overseas Committee for the award of a grant to a small group in mid-Argyll. This group brought together local people from Argyll and gave them the opportunity to meet people from Africa. It had been a marvellous experience.

In closing the Mission and Ministry Board session, the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane thanked all those who had contributed. He expressed thanks to the Rev Dean Fostekew for the work which he had carried out on stewardship and also thanked the conveners and members of the Board and its committees.

6.2 Faith and Order Board

6.2.1 Doctrine Committee

The Very Rev Gregor Duncan (Glasgow and Galloway) reported on the work of the Committee in the absence of its new Convener, the Rev Professor David Jasper. He drew attention to the new booklet which had been produced ecumenically entitled Talking of the Trinity. It contained materials from the Roman Catholic, Church of Scotland and Orthodox traditions as well as that of the Scottish Episcopal Church and could be ordered from ACTS. owing to the past success of Grosvenor Essays, the Committee had decided to produce a further series on aspects of the Nicene Creed. The first would deal with the death and resurrection of Jesus and it was hoped to publish this in the autumn.

Questions were invited but there were none.

6.2.2 Committee on Canons

6.2.2.1 Canon 62

The Rev Jeremy Auld (Convener, Committee on Canons) drew attention to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008 which reiterated that it was not the role of the Committee to make church policy. It responded to proposals put forward by the General Synod and its boards. Once a Canon had received its first reading and been submitted to Diocesan Synods for comment, the Committee took careful cognisance of the comments which were made and these were also considered by the Faith and Order Board.

He considered that it had been unfortunate that the second reading of Canon 62 had not proceeded because failure of that second reading meant that it was no longer possible to bring forward at the current time further alternations to that Canon as had been set out in the Agenda for the meeting. The Committee on Canons would give further
consideration to this but he invited Synod members to indicate to the Committee any comments which they had on the proposals which would have been brought during the current session had the earlier second reading not fallen. He explained that as a result of the changes made the previous year in relation to Canon 36, it was now possible for non-stipendiary ministers to be rectors. There was, however, an anomaly in that a stipendiary rector was required by the Canon to cease holding stipendiary office at the age of 70 whereas a non-stipendiary minister could continue without limit. He hoped the Synod could agree that there ought to be parity. The alterations to Canon 62 which would have been proposed also addressed the situation where individuals wanted to continue indefinitely. He understood that certain aspects of the proposals might be controversial and any comments on the material should be passed to the Committee on Canons through its Secretary, Elspeth Davey, at the General Synod Office. He considered it likely that material would need to be proposed afresh in 2010.

6.2.2.2 Canon 8

Mr Auld explained that, in its current form, Canon 8 stated that no discussion could take place about a division or amalgamation of dioceses when there was a vacancy in any See. In practice, it was often the case that there was at least one vacancy and, consequently, there were significant periods of time when no discussion about diocesan structure could be initiated. He emphasised that he was not aware of any plans to initiate such proposals, but the proposal to amend the Canon would allow such discussion to take place notwithstanding a vacancy.

Mr Auld then proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the amended text for Canon 8, Section 1 be read for the first time.”

Comment was invited but there was none.

The motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:-

House of Laity: passed nem con.
House of Clergy: passed by majority (3 against, 3 abstentions)
House of Bishops: passed unanimously.

6.2.2.3 Digest of Resolutions

Mr Auld explained that in the light of the changes which had been made the previous year to Canon 36, it was necessary to amend the Digest of Resolutions to alter the reference from Canon 36, section 2 to Canon 36, section 12.

He proposed, and the Bishop of Edinburgh seconded, the following motion:-

“That paragraph 7.7 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended by the deletion of the words “Canon 36, Section 2” and the substitution therefore of the words “Canon 36, Section 12”. “

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

6.3 Motion from the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke to the motion set out in the Synod agenda which emanated from the Diocese of Aberdeen & Orkney. He explained that the most recent episcopal election process in his Diocese had involved two elections. Under the terms of the current Canon, the electors had remained the same for the second process despite the fact that new clergy had since arrived in the Diocese. It was also the case that Church Army officers were not entitled to participate in the process and religious houses were also disenfranchised. The purpose of the motion was for Synod to request that these matters be remitted to the Faith and Order Board for consideration.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) indicated that if there was to be consideration of the election process, it should also include the fact that currently no distinction was drawn between very small congregations and very large ones in the electoral process. If religious houses were to be brought into the process, it was arguable that there was an inequality if very large congregations continued only to have the same number of electors.

Mr Peter Kemp (Secretary for the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles) wished to suggest that the Faith and Order Board consider extending the principle behind inclusion of stipendiary clergy and Church Army officers even to a first election. In the forthcoming election in the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles, there were very few stipendiary priests eligible to vote and one who had recently joined the Diocese since the time of the most recent Diocesan Synod would be disenfranchised. He expected that only four stipendiary clergy in the Diocese would be eligible to vote.

The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) welcomed the motion and noted in particular its reference to Church Army officers. The Canons did not currently provide a straightforward mechanism for licensing Church Army officers and he considered that the position of such officers should be regularised on a wider front, not just in relation to episcopal elections.

The Primus noted that the motion asked for the matter to be considered by the Faith and Order Board. He would be delighted for it to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Board. However, he wished to note that the suggestion that religious houses should be entitled to elect a member of Diocesan Synod “if the order so desires” was not good enough.

The Bishop of Aberdeen then proposed, and Ms Lesley Platford (Aberdeen & Orkney) seconded, the following motion:-
The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

SESSION SEVEN – The Rt Rev the Bishop of Edinburgh in the Chair

7.1 Faith and Order – Inter-Church Relations Committee

Mrs Norma Higgott (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reported that various initiatives within the Porvoo Communion had enabled a confident sharing of faith including the Inter-faith Conference for the Porvoo churches which the Scottish Episcopal Church had hosted in Edinburgh in November 2008 and a conference on the diaconate in Sweden which had been attended by the Rev Dr John Armes and the Rev Freda Alexander from which a number of recommendations had been brought back. Mrs Higgott emphasised the fact that though the Scottish Episcopal Church was small it had a great deal to offer and was valued by others.

The report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31st December 2008 provided an update on the Episcopal, Methodist and United Reformed (EMU) talks. She invited the Primus to speak further on the subject.

The Primus spoke to the material contained in the Synod Papers including the Statement of Partnership between the Scottish Episcopal Church, the National Synod of Scotland of the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church in Scotland. It had been hoped that at the current Synod a joint initiative regarding theological training would be launched. This had been delayed but he commended it to the Church when it became available. The EMU conversations had moved at an even pace and whilst they would continue, all three partners were at a stage where it was felt appropriate to recommit to one another. There had been a declaration of intent signed with the Methodist Church in the 1990s which remained in force. Signs of hope had already emerged from that arrangement but the partnership was now one of three churches. Joining together would increase the confidence of all three churches as they sought to commend the gospel.

The Primus then proposed, and Mrs Elspeth Strachan (Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the Statement of Partnership between the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the United Reformed Church (National Synod of Scotland) and the Methodist Church in Scotland be approved.”

Mrs Jenny Easson (the Methodist Church in Scotland) expressed gratitude for the approach adopted in the EMU arrangement to doing things together. The Statement being considered by the Synod would go to the Methodist Synod later in the year. The Methodist Church already had partnerships south of the border and the signing of the Statement in Scotland would be important beyond the Scottish Border. There was now a Scottish Episcopalian representative on the Joint Implementation Commission of the Anglican Methodist Covenant south of the border. Indeed there were both Scottish and Welsh representatives from the Methodist Churches north and south of the border, the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales. Statements were evidence of how the churches worked together and she commended it and expressed gratitude for the opportunity to walk together and develop personal friendships.

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

Mrs Higgott explained that the Statement would also be presented to the Scottish Synod of the United Reformed Church later in the year. She thanked the Primus for his support of ecumenical relations.

Mrs Higgott explained that the review which had been undertaken of the structure of CTBI would require the Church to look at how ecumenical work continued at the Four Nations level. It was possible that some of the work formally organised by CTBI would in future have to be dealt with within the Four Nations. She then invited the Rev Lindsey Sanderson to speak.

The Rev Lindsey Sanderson (Action of Churches Together in Scotland) explained that she was a minister in the United Reformed Church. It was very exciting that the Synod had just approved the Statement of Partnership. She referred to the work of the National Sponsoring Body for local ecumenical partnerships. It had provided opportunities for the churches to meet and work together. By bringing together appropriate expertise, it had been possible to support local ecumenical partnerships, especially where difficulties had arisen as a result of differences in church governance structures. A major aspect of the work of the National Sponsoring Body was that of review of local ecumenical partnerships which included ensuring that the requirements of all relevant denominations were met. The General Assembly had now approved the fact that there should be a single process of ecumenical review. It was likely that a review would equally apply to a partnership statement between the Scottish Episcopal Church, the United Reformed Church and the Methodist Church. A further aim of the National Sponsoring Body was to be a bridge builder between national and local levels. Its work would not be possible without the dedication of the denominational ecumenical officers and she expressed thanks to Elspeth Davey for her contribution to the work of ACTS in general and the National Sponsoring Body in particular.

Mrs Higgott referred to the Edinburgh 2010 Conference which was due to take place in June 2010. The Inter-Church Relations Committee hoped that the Scottish Episcopal Church would work with its ecumenical neighbours in order to celebrate the centenary of the 1910 conference. More information regarding Edinburgh 2010 was available from the website www.edinburgh2010.org.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rev Canon John Lindsay seconded, the following motion:-

---

**Minutes, General Synod 2009**

---

**Preliminary Business**

---

“That the Faith & Order Board be requested to consider:

i) amending Canon 4 so that, in the event of there being a second Episcopal election, those who were stipendiary clergy and lay Church Army officers licensed in the diocese the day before the issue of the mandate would be added to the list of qualified electors;

ii) in order to resolve anomalies in the house of laity, amending the appropriate section of Canon 50.3 to include as full members of a diocesan synod: deaconesses licensed to definite pastoral work; lay Church Army officers ministering under a license from the Bishop in a manner similar to clergy; and Lay Readers, if in charge of a congregation, be members whilst they hold such charge;

iii) amending Canon 63 so that each Religious House situated in the diocese be treated as a congregation and be entitled to elect one lay member of the order as a member of Synod (if the order so desires).”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con (one abstention).
“That this Synod encourage all congregations of the Scottish Episcopal Church to support and participate in local ecumenical events to celebrate the centenary of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 and to work with their ecumenical neighbours in their shared mission during 2010 and beyond.”

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church) explained that he was part of the local organizing committee for the Edinburgh 2010 Conference. It had undergone a major change and the size of the Conference had been slimmed down to approximately 250 delegates partly in the light of the global financial situation and also because of difficulties within the world-wide church in planning the Conference. It was hoped that this would allow time to be freed up for local initiatives to take place in different places across the world-wide church.

The Primus explained that it was expected that approximately 10 Anglican delegates would attend Edinburgh 2010. The Scottish Episcopal Church had been invited to host those delegates and this would be a means of enabling the Scottish Dioceses to participate in the wider celebrations.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mrs Higgott drew attention to the publication of *The Legal Systems of Scottish Churches*. The book covered the legal systems of the Church of Scotland, the Roman Catholic and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Indeed, the Episcopalian section, written by Sheriff Alexander Wilkinson, represented a sizeable part of the publication. She expressed thanks to him. The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) also commended the publication. It was the first substantial book which covered the Scottish Episcopal Church structures since L’Empriere.

In closing the session, Mrs Higgott expressed thanks to the Rev Gordon Fyfe, who was retiring from the Committee, to the Primus and to Elspeth Davey.

The Primus drew the Faith and Order Board session to a close and expressed his thanks to members of the Board and of its pendant committees. He reminded Synod that the Committee on Canons acted only on the instructions of the Faith and Order Board. The Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) thanked the Primus formally for handling business of the Board as its Convener.

*******

At this point during the General Synod, an Episcopal Synod was convened for the election of a new Primus, the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones having retired as Primus with effect from the end of Friday 12th June 2009. The Episcopal Synod took place at 9.30am on Saturday 13th June 2009 and elected, as the new Primus, the Most Rev David Chillingworth, Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

*******

SESSION EIGHT – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

8.1 Statement by the new Primus

The new Primus expressed his thanks to the members of the Episcopal Synod. There were a thousand reasons why it was challenging to be elected as Primus but the point was that this was a vocation, and a calling was an extraordinary and wonderful thing. He expressed his personal thanks to his predecessor as Primus, the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones, to whom tribute had been paid at the previous evening’s Synod Dinner. In the context of the General Synod, the Primus thanked Dr Jones for the ministry which he had given to the Church and wished him and his wife Alison a long and happy retirement.

The Primus said he approached the task with deep humility and no small apprehension. The Scottish Episcopal Church had been extraordinarily generous in the trust which it had placed in him. That spoke of the spiritual strength of the Scottish Episcopal Church and its willingness to take risks. He sought to honour it in the passion of his own commitment to ministry and service. He asked for the prayers of the Church for himself and for all bishops as they worked out together what leadership meant in the Scottish Episcopal Church where collegiality and collaboration were much valued. The Church was richly blessed in the quality and commitment of laity and clergy and this was a precious moment of calling for the Scottish Episcopal Church. Firstly, the Church was being called to take its place in a new way among the family of churches in Scotland and in the wider community. Minority churches did not have to be marginal and small churches could bring special gifts to the whole. The strengths of the Scottish Episcopal Church in spirituality and service, in dignified liturgy and inclusive openness, were gifts for the current moment. The calling was to offer Jesus – new ways of exploring faith – in a time when people searched for answers but feared that they might not find them in traditional churches. Secondly, the Church faced a time of difficult decision-making as it responded to new financial circumstances. Adding new areas of activity was relatively easy; deciding what mattered when resources did not stretch to cover everything was much more difficult since it tested decision-making and relationships. That was the period the Scottish Episcopal Church was about to enter and his prayer was that this would bring a creative refining and pruning out of which would come more growth.

At a personal level, he paid tribute to the contribution of his wife Alison and the support which she provided to him. Scotland had been good to them.

The Primus looked forward to playing his part in the adventure in faith which the whole of the Scottish Episcopal Church would undertake together.

8.2 Standing Committee

8.2.1 Strategic Review

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) referred to the report regarding the Strategic Review contained in the Synod Papers. Since General Synod 2008, the Standing Committee and the College of Bishops had considered matters related to structures, the role of dioceses and their bishops and how these could be adjusted to meet changing needs. As a result of that, Synod had been asked earlier in the current meeting to agree a first reading of an alteration to Canon 8. Standing Committee had further considered how, practically speaking, risks should be minimised and managed in relation to both financial and other areas. The report identified a number of areas which required appropriate expertise and which might ideally be provided on a
province-wide basis. Current financial circumstances did not appear to allow the possibility of expansion within the General Synod Office but the Standing Committee would continue to carry out a careful review to establish what the actual risks might be and might come forward with further proposals. She referred to the special policy arrangement, noted in the report, which was being negotiated with Ecclesiastical. There appeared to be support for a greater degree of centralisation of services relating to issues of compliance. She explained that the reference in the written report to the strengthening of resources available at local level for issues of mission and ministry reflected a desire for more things to be done closer to the local level where mission and ministry actually took place. She expected that there would be further discussion regarding such issues in the light of the debate that had taken place earlier during Synod regarding the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Standing Committee and the College of Bishops were of the view that specific avenues of work had been identified which they would like to pursue (some of which might require to be modified in the light of financial constraints). There would also be other matters which would be set in train as a result of other discussions which had taken place at the current Synod. The Standing Committee was, therefore, now proposing to take off the agenda the “Strategic Review”. She had received a comment that, in fact, the exercise had not been a “Strategic Review” but she explained that the original consultation document had deliberately been framed with a wide range of open questions in order to elicit views within the Church.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr Idris Jones (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod receive the report of the Standing Committee and College of Bishops regarding the Strategic Review.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

8.2.2 Budget and Quota

Professor Peattie referred to the explanation of the financial position of the General Synod which she had given during Session One. Since then, Synod had voted on motions regarding the Pension Fund. In order to continue to meet essential needs, and to minimise as far as possible the amount of disinvestment that would be required to make the capital contribution to the Pension Fund, the Standing Committee recommended that Provincial Quota for 2010 should be increased by 3%. The context for such an increase was the loss of approximately 15% of the General Synod’s income. The Budget Report contained in the Synod Papers outlined the impact on each diocese of the proposed 3% rise. She appreciated that this was a difficult time. The draft Budgets provided in the Synod Papers gave the opportunity for Synod members to note the size of the difficulty. The budget deficits set out in the papers were not acceptable and Standing Committee would be working to bring matters into line. By careful management, some surpluses had been accrued in the previous three years and Standing Committee expected to spend some of that. She commended all those who had worked prudently to enable the achieving of such surpluses. It was not entirely by chance that God had seen fit to give the General Synod a legacy in the current year which would be of assistance. However, it was likely that the figures for 2009 would show a deficit.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Professor Peattie then proposed, and Mr Ian Stewart (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following motion:-

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2010, agree to a quota figure of £585,368 for that year.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed nem con.

8.3 Provincial Conference 2010

The Rt Rev Dr Robert Gillies (Bishop of Aberdeen & Orkney) referred to the fact that the Provincial Conference which had been planned for October 2009 had had to be cancelled. He reminded Synod that the recommendation of General Synod Review Group in 2006 had been that the Provincial Conference provided a major focus for the development for the whole life of the Church and that it should continue to be held regularly. The planning for the Conference had been superb. A large number of facilitators had been trained and their enthusiasm had been as palpable as their disappointment when the Conference had had to be cancelled owing to low take-up. For the future, the Planning Group had recommended that certain organisational processes should be streamlined, such as on-line booking. Why had the Conference not taken off this time? Perhaps, in a celebrity age, celebrity speakers were needed (though in fact the proposed speakers were among the best); perhaps the focus on the Five Marks of Mission did not appeal (though the discussions at the current Synod had shown there was a need to talk about mission); perhaps publicity could have been more effective (the fact that some dioceses had responded more strongly than others suggested that this might be the case); cost was certainly a problem and the Planning Group were aware of other conferences which had had to be cancelled recently. In the immediate future, he urged dioceses and congregations to make use of the skills of the facilitators who had been trained. At the very least, the facilitators could offer two or three evenings of interaction on the story of the woman at the well. He had lists of the facilitators which he would pass to the other members of the College of Bishops. It was too early to say what shape any future conference might take. He expressed his thanks to the members of the Planning Group, the facilitators and General Synod Office staff.

The Primus expressed thanks on behalf of the Church to the Planning Group for its work.

8.4 Ballot

A ballot was conducted for the election of the Convener of the Information and Communication Board.
SESSION NINE – The Most Rev the Primus in the Chair

9.1 Liturgy Committee

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) reported on behalf of the Committee in the absence of its Convener, the Rev Darren McFarland. The Committee was most grateful for the responses which had been received to the questionnaire which had been sent out to clergy and lay representatives in relation to the Scottish Liturgy 1982. The responses led to the production of a list of proposed textual amendments. The responses also evinced support for a new Eucharistic Rite. There had already been some discussion at the Faith and Order Board and it was intended that there would be a day consultation for the wider church before any work was commenced on the creation of a new Eucharistic Rite. The Board agreed in principle that the Committee could commence work on a new rite but it was recognised that, owing to financial constraints, the matter might require to be spread over a number of years. The Committee remained committed to the principle of consultation before commencing work. This was one reason why Synod members had themselves been provided with a copy of the questionnaire. The earlier circulation of the questionnaire to clergy and lay representatives had resulted in 119 responses which was a significant number compared to previous similar consultations. Ninety-five percent of the returns had been positive but a recurring theme was in relation to the language used and it was noted that a number of changes were already being adopted in various places in order to make language more inclusive. The Liturgy Committee proposed that the recommended changes would be presented to the College of Bishops so that diocesan bishops could authorise such changes as they felt appropriate for permissive use. Those changes would then be available from the Provincial website.

The Committee had also received a mandate from the Faith and Order Board to prepare a provincially acceptable structure for a Service of the Word and Administration of the Reserved Sacrament. The Committee would provide resources to help members of the Church produce an expanded Service of the Word using current structures. The College of Bishops would consider how the Reserved Sacrament was used currently in the Church and provide guidelines for its use for congregations and worship leaders. The Liturgy Committee would commence work on the production of a stand-alone Service of the Word which could be used with Communion from the Reserved Sacrament (Administered by a Deacon or Lay Person) 1997. The draft text of that new Service of the Word would be presented to the Faith and Order Board at its next meeting.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness referred to discussion on earlier occasions regarding the preparation of a new Scottish Prayer Book. It had been suggested that this would involve confirming or revising existing texts, namely the Calendar, the Lectionary, Daily Prayer, the Psalter, the 1970 and 1982 Liturgies, Baptism, Affirmation, Funerals, Marriage and the Ordinal. It might also determine those parts of the Scottish Prayer Book 1929 which would be included, for example, Holy Communion and Morning and Evening Prayer, and create new texts and submit for canonical authorisation, new collects, a service of reconciliation and healing and services of the Word. Further, it had been suggested that pastoral and theological notes would be prepared. In the light of the current financial constraints, however, it had been agreed that the project should be put on hold. That was not to say that the work would not continue but it was not appropriate to make a clear decision to embark on a project which would have a substantial cost to the Church.

Comment was invited.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked the Liturgy Committee for its work. Since liturgy was so definitive of who the Church was, he wished to express some sadness that the proposal in relation to the changes to the 1982 Liturgy would be permissive and would therefore not have the same status as the main text. The Liturgy Committee had been encouraging the Church to think about liturgical formation for a number of years but this did not appear to be being carried through in the way that the Committee proposed to deal with the changes incorporating inclusive language. He asked that the matter be kept under review.

The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness explained that the discussion on how to make the changes had taken a long time. The reason for proposing that changes be dealt with permissively was because of the proposal for a creation of a wholly new Eucharistic Rite. There was, therefore, an assumption that in due course there would be a wholly new text available.

Mrs Mary Moffett (Edinburgh) indicated that she often found herself providing services for people with dementia. In such circumstances, the “Yellow Book” was not much help. She wondered where she could ask for advice. The Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness responded that she should contact a member of the Liturgy Committee or there would be people within her diocese who could help. He recognised that within such circumstances there might be specific issues which she would want to include and he would take that back to the Committee.

9.2 Response to Question from Provost Holdsworth

Responding to the question which had been asked by the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) earlier in the meeting, the Primus responded that the statement from the College of Bishops in March 2009 arose out of the experience of members of the College at the Lambeth Conference and the requests to the provinces for a period of “gracious restraint” expressed through the three moratoria. The Statement expressed a collegiate response to the request for a moratorium on the authorisation of rights of same-sex blessing – prior to the moratoria, members of the College had responded in different ways to pastoral requests for same-sex blessings. The Statement made clear that, in respect of authorising or attending such blessings during the moratorium, the bishops believed that they should express a gracious restraint.

9.3 Elections

9.3.1 Information and Communication Board Convenership

The Secretary General announced the result of the election for the Convenership of the Information and Communication Board, the result of which was the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth 56 votes, the Rev Robert Warren 52 votes. Accordingly, Provost Holdsworth was elected as Convenor.

9.3.2 Administration Board Membership

There being no competing nominations, the Rev Ian Pallett (Moray, Ross and Caithness) was elected as General Synod representative to the Administration Board by general acclaim.
9.3.3 Preliminary Proceedings Committee

The nominations for the membership of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee were set out in the Synod Papers, there being a single nomination for each vacancy.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following:-

Two Practising Lawyers: Mr Derek Buchanan
Rev Paul Romano

Lay member: Mrs Mary Birch
Alternate Lay member: Mr David Palmer
Secretary: Mr Graham Robertson.

9.3.4 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

There being no competing nominations, the Very Rev Richard Kilgour (Aberdeen and Orkney) was elected by general acclaim to fill the one clerical vacancy on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

9.3.5 General Synod Trusteeship

There being no competing nomination, the Hon Lord McEwan was elected as a General Synod Trustee by general acclaim.

9.3.6 Home Mission Committee Convenership

Professor Patricia Peattie (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and the Rt Rev Brian Smith (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:-

“That the convenership of the Rev Lewis Smith, as the Convener of the Home Mission Committee, be extended until 31st December 2009.”

The motion was put to the vote and passed by majority (one against).

9.4 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed the thanks of Synod to those who had arranged the Eucharist and led Morning and Evening Prayer, to retiring conveners the Very Rev Clifford Piper and in due course, the Rev Lewis Smith, to those who had chaired sessions of Synod, to the Rev Paul Romano as Assessor, to Mr Kennedy Fraser for operating the IT and audio visual facilities, the Rev Rob Warren and Ms Ruth Green for arranging audio and website updates during the meeting, to members of Cursillo who had served teas and coffees and to the other volunteers who had assisted behind the scenes, to the Kirk Session and Mr and Mrs David McColl of Palmerston Place Church and to the General Synod Office staff. Professor Peattie thanked the present and former Primuses for their chairing of Synod.

9.5 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing at approximately 11.00am on Saturday 13th June 2009.
ELECTIONS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. **Convenership: Standing Committee**

Professor Patricia Peattie retires this year as Convener of the Standing Committee and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Mr David Palmer is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new convener.

Brief biographical details:
- Province: Member, Standing Committee (2007-11); Member, Finance Committee (2007); Convenor, Residential Homes Governance Group;
- Edinburgh Diocese: Vice Convener, Standing Committee; Convener, Finance and Management Committee; Member, Personnel Committee; Diocesan Secretary;
- St Michael and All Saints Church, Edinburgh: Lay Representative (2009-); Member, Edinburgh South Area Council (2009-).
- Deputy Director of Finance for the Health Service in Scotland (1991-2006), Scottish Executive Health Department (Retired). Responsible for: the Health Service Budget of £9.3bn; preparation of the budget for the use of these funds; distribution and effective use of the funds; accountability for the funds to Health Ministers and the Scottish Parliament; management and training of staff; the provision of financial and accounting advice.

In the event that Mr Palmer is elected as convener of the Standing Committee, he will resign from his current position as an elected lay member of the Committee, in which case a vacancy for one lay person will arise (see below). In the event of Mr Palmer being elected as convener, then should any circumstances give rise to a conflict of interest as between his roles in the Diocese of Edinburgh and those in the provincial Standing Committee, normal practice would be adopted to address such conflict.

Other nominations may be submitted by Synod members (in which case the nomination must be signed by at least five members of General Synod) and must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request).

2. **Convenership: Administration Board**

Mr Ian Stewart retires this year as Convener of the Administration Board and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Following consultation with the Administration Board, Mr Michael Lugton is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new convener.

Brief biographical details:
- Chief Executive of the Scottish Law Commission (2005-2008) (now retired); Head of the Constitution and Parliamentary Secretariat (1999-2005) and from 2004 head of the Constitution and Legal Services Group of the Scottish Executive (this included devising
and implementing procedures for passing legislation in the new Scottish Parliament, managing the Government legal service for Scotland and devising and implementing the Freedom of Information regime in Scotland); 1976-1999 various roles including Principal Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for Scotland; Head of the Scottish Office’s Management and Organisation Division; Head of Criminal Justice and Licensing Division and Head of Public Health Division, Scottish Home Health Department; Head of Town & Country Planning Policy Branch, Scottish Development Department; Head of Branch, Police Division, Scottish Home Health Department.

Voluntary Roles: Governor, Merchiston Castle School and Chairman of the Education and Pastoral Committee (1998 to date); Trustee, Eric Liddle Centre, Edinburgh (2009 to date).

St Michael’s and All Saints: member for about 5 years, having previously attended St Mary’s Cathedral. Member of the Restoration Committee at St Michael’s (which coordinated the final phase of restoration project involving the refurbishment of the interior), sidesman, occasional reader, and house group member.

Other nominations may be submitted by Synod members (in which case the nomination must be signed by at least five members of General Synod) and must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request).

3. **Standing Committee: General Synod Representative (Lay)**

If Mr Palmer is elected as Convener of the Standing Committee, as noted above, a vacancy will arise for one lay person on the Standing Committee. In 2007, the composition of Standing Committee was expanded to include two clerical members (elected by the House of Clergy) and one additional lay member (elected by the House of Laity). (Only one additional lay post was created because the Convenership of the Committee requires to be filled by a lay person.)

The members of the Standing Committee constitute the Charity Trustees of the General Synod for the purposes of the Charities Act. The Committee has a number of functions. Under Canon 52, it is the body responsible for the issuing of the agenda of General Synod. Under the Digest of Resolutions, it has the general control and management of the administration of the General Synod and is empowered to exercise generally all financial powers vested in the General Synod. It is responsible for recommending to Synod the level of provincial quota and for presenting budgets to Synod.

Nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request). In the event of an election, only lay members of Synod will be entitled to vote.

In considering the making of nominations, lay members of General Synod may wish to note that following the retiral of Professor Peattie as Convener of the Standing Committee, there will be no continuing female member on the Committee.
Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

4. **Administration Board: General Synod Representatives**

In terms of the Digest of Resolutions, the membership of the Board includes three members appointed by the General Synod from its own membership. With effect from General Synod 2010, one position becomes vacant since Mr Nicholas Bowry will complete his term of office.

Nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request).

Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

5. **Election Procedure**

An announcement will be made at Synod during the Preliminary Business session regarding procedure and voting forms will be distributed if necessary.

John F Stuart  
Secretary General
Budget Report

Format

The summary of all Funds (page 43) details the 2009 actual figures in the first column and the 2010-2012 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 45-63) detail the 2009 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2010-2012 budget figures in the final three columns.

Budget setting process

Boards agree budgets each autumn for the subsequent year and indicative budgets for the following two years. The budgets and associated requests for funding from the General Fund are submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration at its November meeting each year.

In its oversight of the General Synod’s finances the Standing Committee’s focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget (which can be found at page 43) summarises all unrestricted income and its allocation to the Standing Committee and boards to fund their work. The budgeted allocations in effect represent the budgeted expenditure of each of the boards and therefore the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position. In considering the budgets the Standing Committee is guided by two underlying principles:

- Budgets should be set with a view to achieving a breakeven position on the General Fund.
- Large one-off receipts (such as legacies) should be capitalised to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

The significant reduction in investment income experienced in 2009, combined with the increase in pension costs from 2010, resulted in the need to identify a number of savings to ensure that large deficits were avoided. This required a slight change in the budget setting process. Having established the level of General Fund income likely to be available in 2010 the Standing Committee had an additional meeting to consider how best to allocate the available funds and therefore the cuts required to be made by the four boards and the Standing Committee. Having discussed the nature and extent of each board’s income and expenditure with particular regard to the availability of funding sources other than the General Fund (mainly restricted funds), the mix of discretionary expenditure (such as grants) and non discretionary expenditure (in particular staff costs and grant funding committed for a fixed number of years) the Standing Committee was able to agree “target” funding requests for the Standing Committee and the four boards which resulted in a breakeven budget for 2010. The cuts necessary to balance the budget were significant – (approx £314,000 – 16% of General Fund Expenditure.) The Standing Committee’s task was greatly eased by the suggestion by the Administration Board (Finance Committee) of a two year moratorium on building grants.
All boards were able to agree budgets and funding requests within the targets set by Standing Committee and therefore, at its November meeting, the Standing Committee was able to approve all budgets submitted to it.

Given the extent of cuts required Standing Committee is of a view that the likelihood of actual expenditure being considerably less than budgeted is reduced and therefore considers that it is no longer appropriate to budget for an annual deficit on the General Fund of approximately £40,000-£50,000 in the anticipation that the actual results will broadly breakeven (ie, no surplus or deficit). The Standing Committee will therefore aim to produce breakeven budgets.

The General Fund budgets agreed by Standing Committee in November 2009 resulted in the following budgeted surpluses/deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Surplus/Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Surplus of £20,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Deficit of £781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Deficit of £171,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further revision of budgets

Standing Committee is committed to ensuring that, as far as possible, deficits are not incurred on the General Fund and is grateful to boards and committees for identifying the necessary savings to produce balanced budgets for 2010 and 2011. The Committee is however concerned that a significant deficit is budgeted for 2012 onwards and will continue to work with boards and committees in addressing this issue. This will be a significant challenge and will be constrained by a number of factors, including:

Income

Whilst the Investment Committee is reasonably confident that the rate of distribution from the UTP will be no less than that for 2009 there appears to be little prospect of any significant growth in the rate of distribution. The 2010 distribution rate is therefore likely to be in the region of the 2009 level of 48p per unit rather than the 2008 level of 56½p per unit. General Fund investment income will therefore be some £165,000 less than that of 2008. It is anticipated that this in effect will be the new base level of investment income and that, at least in the short term, only very small increases on this figure are anticipated. The General Fund’s cash reserves have also been depleted by the need to make the agreed £2 million lump sum payment to the Pension Fund and therefore interest income is also unlikely to increase in the foreseeable future. (There may also be the need to realise investments to fund the payment – further reducing investment income.) Given that congregational and diocesan finances will also be under pressure at this time there is unlikely to be any prospect of any significant growth in quota income available to the General Fund.

Expenditure

The cost savings identified by boards and committees that have enabled such a significant reduction in budget deficits include a reduction in Provincial staff numbers (following retirement of two General Synod Office staff), a reduction in the activities of the Home Mission Committee (pending a review of mission strategy by the Mission and Ministry
Board) and a reduction in a number of grants programmes. As previously noted, one of the largest cuts relates to the two year moratorium on the provision of building grants resulting in annual budget savings of some £150,000. Standing Committee is conscious that the moratorium effectively moves the financial problem elsewhere within the Church and will limit charges’ ability to maintain their buildings and to undertake building development projects. It is recognised that the moratorium will result in some building works being delayed and it will therefore be necessary to consider reinstating the building grants programme to ensure that the quality of the Church’s buildings is not allowed to deteriorate resulting in even greater repair costs being incurred in the future. (It is also anticipated that there will, understandably, be requests to reinstate some of the other grants programmes that have been curtailed in order to balance the budget.) The two year moratorium on building grants has in effect provided a “breathing space” to enable a review of the working practices of all boards and all Provincial budgets to ensure that balanced budgets are achieved in the future.

Given the Provincial budgeting cycle there is a relatively short period in which to undertake this review and to identify the necessary adjustments to produce a balanced budget for 2012. (Boards will be required to agree the 2012 budgets by September 2011.) I have written to all board and committee conveners reminding them of the need to review future budgets.

The Standing Committee will work to ensure that a framework is established to allow a review and clarification of priorities. It is anticipated that the development of a whole church mission and ministry policy by the Mission and Ministry Board will be a significant factor in this process.

**Total budgeted surpluses / deficits**

The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 43. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue surpluses / deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Surplus of £31,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Surplus of £29,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Deficit of £143,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total budgeted surpluses / deficits differ from those budgeted for the General Fund due to small surpluses budgeted for some of the miscellaneous and restricted funds. For example the Retirement Housing Fund is budgeted to produce a revenue surplus which is then used as required to fund the purchase of new retirement housing.

Professor Patricia Peattie  
Convener, Standing Committee  
April 2010
QUOTA 2011

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be increased by 3% to £602,929.

The allocation between dioceses is based on dioceses’ quota assessable income. The amount of provincial quota requested from each diocese will therefore vary according to relative changes in its income. The allocation will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 £</th>
<th>2010 £</th>
<th>Change from 2010 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen and Orkney</td>
<td>66,563</td>
<td>64,859</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and The Isles</td>
<td>22,007</td>
<td>22,478</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>38,165</td>
<td>37,171</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>216,935</td>
<td>207,337</td>
<td>9,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow and Galloway</td>
<td>139,940</td>
<td>138,264</td>
<td>1,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray, Ross and Caithness</td>
<td>44,737</td>
<td>44,371</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>74,582</td>
<td>70,888</td>
<td>3,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                          | 602,929 | 585,368 | 17,561            | 3.00%
# BUDGET SUMMARY - includes all revenue funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2010</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2011</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,632,983 General Fund</td>
<td>1,626,752</td>
<td>1,664,910</td>
<td>1,704,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,645,483)</td>
<td>(1,606,450)</td>
<td>(1,665,691)</td>
<td>(1,876,079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12,500)</td>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>(171,484)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481,816</td>
<td>481,816</td>
<td>502,118</td>
<td>501,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421,316</td>
<td>502,118</td>
<td>501,337</td>
<td>329,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>773,519 Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>773,910</td>
<td>783,116</td>
<td>815,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(773,519)</strong></td>
<td>(773,910)</td>
<td>(783,116)</td>
<td>(815,670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477,548 Administration Board</td>
<td>408,800</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>623,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,919</td>
<td>273,051</td>
<td>264,574</td>
<td>259,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(777,736)</td>
<td>(660,066)</td>
<td>(680,266)</td>
<td>(849,538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626,763</td>
<td>21,785</td>
<td>38,308</td>
<td>33,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>358,662 Mission &amp; Ministry Board</strong></td>
<td>369,435</td>
<td>376,335</td>
<td>383,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,299</td>
<td>117,982</td>
<td>120,348</td>
<td>122,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(478,336)</td>
<td>(498,235)</td>
<td>(503,215)</td>
<td>(512,509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,228)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209,332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14,308 Faith &amp; Order Board</strong></td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>13,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14,308)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,554)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21,446 Inform &amp; Comm Board</strong></td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26,680)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6,331</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,632,983 Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,626,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,664,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,704,595</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>482,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>384,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>382,120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>(143,752)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(32,871)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(31,120)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(23,470)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(14,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,248,874</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,322,309</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,042,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,047,933</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,261,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,042,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,047,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>890,181</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Income</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP income</td>
<td>939,429</td>
<td>958,917</td>
<td>978,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment property income</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>17,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>959,119</td>
<td>978,607</td>
<td>999,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration fees</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP / investment administration</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund administration</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Funds</td>
<td>29,265</td>
<td>29,874</td>
<td>30,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>56,265</td>
<td>57,374</td>
<td>58,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quota</strong></td>
<td>585,368</td>
<td>602,929</td>
<td>621,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>1,626,752</td>
<td>1,664,910</td>
<td>1,704,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donations and legacies</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>1,691,666</td>
<td>1,632,983</td>
<td>(58,683)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>773,910</td>
<td>783,116</td>
<td>813,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Board</td>
<td>408,800</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>623,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Ministry Board</td>
<td>369,435</td>
<td>376,335</td>
<td>383,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>13,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Communication Board</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allocations</strong></td>
<td>1,606,450</td>
<td>1,665,691</td>
<td>1,876,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>20,302</td>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>(171,484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to capital (St Serf’s short term loan)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance brought forward</strong></td>
<td>481,816</td>
<td>502,118</td>
<td>501,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>502,118</td>
<td>501,337</td>
<td>329,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

In addition to allocations from the General Fund some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources.
### Standing Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009 fav (adv)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

- **Allocation from General Fund**
  - 776,600
  - 773,519
  - (3,081)
  - 773,910
  - 783,116
  - 815,670

#### EXPENDITURE

##### A Costs of General Synod Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised 2010</th>
<th>Revised 2011</th>
<th>Revised 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees Salaries</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>358,204</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>355,500</td>
<td>361,600</td>
<td>369,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N I C</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>34,634</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>36,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension contributions</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>90,100</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>125,200</td>
<td>128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions ex-staff-old scheme</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel &amp; subsistence</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Costs</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>498,820</td>
<td>489,684</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>521,950</td>
<td>531,146</td>
<td>542,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Premises Building repairs & maint. | 31,500 | 25,171 | 6,329 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 30,000 |
| Rates                            | 5,050 | 4,066 | 984 | 5,000 | 5,150 | 5,305 |
| Light, heat & cleaning           | 20,000 | 20,889 | (889) | 21,000 | 21,997 | 22,713 |
| Insurance                        | 5,900 | 6,512 | (612) | 6,600 | 6,798 | 7,002 |
| **Sub-total**                    | 62,450 | 56,638 | 5,812 | 47,600 | 48,945 | 50,020 |

| Administration Telephone        | 5,000 | 3,658 | 1,342 | 4,500 | 4,635 | 4,774 |
| Postal charges                  | 10,500 | 7,187 | 3,313 | 10,000 | 10,300 | 10,609 |
| Printing & stationery           | 7,000 | 6,999 | 1,010 | 7,000 | 7,210 | 7,426 |
| Photocopier                     | 10,500 | 9,060 | (560) | 10,000 | 10,300 | 10,609 |
| Computing - Maintenance - Equipment | 10,000 | 9,153 | 847 | 10,300 | 10,609 | 10,927 |
| Payroll Bureau processing costs | 12,000 | 21,478 | (9,478) | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Payroll Bureau processing costs | 6,900 | 6,975 | (75) | 7,500 | 7,725 | 7,957 |
| Miscellaneous                   | 3,000 | 4,963 | (1,963) | 3,000 | 3,090 | 3,183 |
| Office equipment & furniture    | 1,000 | 82 | 918 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **Sub-total**                   | 65,100 | 69,655 | (4,555) | 55,300 | 56,869 | 58,485 |

**Total Costs of General Synod Office**

- 626,370
- 615,977
- 10,393
- 624,850
- 636,960
- 666,305

##### B Provincial Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised 2010</th>
<th>Revised 2011</th>
<th>Revised 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Primus' expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>(3,502)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Diocese</td>
<td>6,675</td>
<td>8,425</td>
<td>(1,750)</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>10,413</td>
<td>10,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of Bishop</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod Annual meeting</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>20,229</td>
<td>(729)</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>21,115</td>
<td>21,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod Annual meeting</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod Annual meeting</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>3,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Protec'n of Children &amp; Vulnerable Adu</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic case review</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>(9,120)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestry Handbook</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Canons</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Human Sexuality / Conference</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Clergy Induction Day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Seminars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Legal Expenses Insurance</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,159</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>4,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Liability Insurance</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Parliamentary Officer</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fee Audit</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,330</td>
<td>11,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; advisory</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>(1,214)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,480</td>
<td>16,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Sponsors Licence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>(269)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches Main Committee etc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Provincial Costs</strong></td>
<td>95,245</td>
<td>100,181</td>
<td>(6,936)</td>
<td>99,310</td>
<td>95,584</td>
<td>97,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standing Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C Committee Meeting Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Standing Committee</th>
<th>2,025</th>
<th>2,000</th>
<th>2,060</th>
<th>2,142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Organization Review Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Citizen of Children &amp; Vulnerable Adult</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>Total Committee Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D Subscriptions to Church Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>World Council of Churches</th>
<th>2,050</th>
<th>2,649</th>
<th>2,250</th>
<th>2,250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>Conference of European Churches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>CTBI / ACTS etc</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,660</td>
<td>24,660</td>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>26,162</td>
<td>26,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,710</td>
<td>54,587</td>
<td>Total Subscriptions to Church Bodies</td>
<td>46,650</td>
<td>47,412</td>
<td>48,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Primus discretionary</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Total Grants</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>776,600</td>
<td>773,519</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>773,910</td>
<td>783,116</td>
<td>815,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BALANCES

|                |         |         | Surplus/(deficit) for year | -     | -     | -     |       |
|----------------|---------|---------|Balance brought forward | -     | -     | -     |       |
|                | -       | -       | Balance carried forward | -     | -     | -     |       |
Administration Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>fav/(adv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>574,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>477,548</strong></td>
<td><strong>(96,514)</strong></td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>408,800</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>623,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574,062</td>
<td>477,548</td>
<td>(96,514)</td>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>408,800</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>623,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURE**

**Meeting Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Welfare Committee</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Advisory</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Committee</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation to Finance Committee funds**

| 400,112 | 310,573 | 89,539 | Grants for Ministry Fund | 379,800 | 425,000 | 450,000 |
| 128,750 | 129,000 | (250)  | Maintenance & Development Fund | - | - | 128,750 |
| 41,200  | 35,950  | 5,250  | Dunderdale Building Fund | 25,000 | 25,000 | 41,200 |
| 570,062 | 475,523 | 94,539 | **Sub-total** | 404,800 | 450,000 | 619,950 |

| 574,062 | 477,548 | 96,514 | **Total Expenditure** | 408,800 | 454,000 | 623,950 |

**BALANCES**

**Revenue**

| -      | -      | -      | Surplus/(deficit) for year | -      | -      | -      |
| -      | -      | -      | Transfer (to)/from capital | -      | -      | -      |
| -      | -      | -      | Balance brought forward | -      | -      | -      |
| -      | -      | -      | **Balance carried forward** | -      | -      | -      |
## Administration Board - Finance Committee

### Grants for Ministry Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>fav/adv</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>400,112</td>
<td>310,573</td>
<td>(89,539)</td>
<td>379,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>(1,590)</td>
<td>9,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies &amp; donations</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>16,026</td>
<td>(974)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>428,512</td>
<td>336,409</td>
<td>(92,103)</td>
<td>405,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curate grants</td>
<td>57,391</td>
<td>63,638</td>
<td>(6,247)</td>
<td>82,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend Support</td>
<td>326,526</td>
<td>232,171</td>
<td>94,355</td>
<td>281,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel / Island grants</td>
<td>35,415</td>
<td>35,415</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Allowance</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement grants</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>428,512</td>
<td>336,409</td>
<td>92,103</td>
<td>405,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>17,751</td>
<td>17,751</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>17,751</td>
<td>17,751</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,750</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Earmarking surrendered</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,750</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants - Issued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Earmarked</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,750</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>(20,250)</td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administration Board - Finance Committee
### Dunderdale Building Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

- 41,200 35,950 (5,250) Allocation from General Fund 25,000 25,000 41,200

- 41,200 35,950 (5,250) **Total Net Income** 25,000 25,000 41,200

#### EXPENDITURE

- 22,620 Grants - Issued
- 13,330 - Earmarked

- 41,200 35,950 (5,250) **Total Expenditure** 25,000 25,000 41,200

#### BALANCES

- Revenue
- Surplus(deficit) for year

- 9,374 9,374 - Balance brought forward 9,374 9,374 9,374

- 9,374 9,374 - **Balance carried forward** 9,374 9,374 9,374
### Administration Board - Finance Committee

#### Loans Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2010</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,585</td>
<td>(4,415)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans)</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on loans</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td>(3,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>293,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALANCES</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>5,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special deposit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supplementary Fund

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,783</td>
<td>35,507</td>
<td>36,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Special Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies &amp; Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,033</td>
<td>37,757</td>
<td>38,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Widows &amp; Orphans</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Christmas payment</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,313</td>
<td>20,672</td>
<td>21,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yearbooks (retired clergy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund (CRBF) top up</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>6,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,033</td>
<td>37,757</td>
<td>38,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>43,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>43,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Deposit Account balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board - Retirement Welfare Committee
### Housing Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

| 20,000  | 23,331 | 3,331 | Interest - Special deposit       | 10,000 | 2,500 | 5,000 |
| 7,236   | 6,810  | (426) | Investment income                 | 6,810  | 6,925 | 7,094 |
| 55,000  | 60,340 | 5,540 | Rents                              | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |

### EXPENDITURE

| 5,000   | 5,297  | (297) | Insurance                          | 5,500  | 5,665 | 5,835 |
| 35,000  | 49,894 | (14,894)| Repairs                           | 35,000 | 36,050 | 37,132 |
| 5,000   | 5,642  | (642) | Gas appliance testing              | 6,000  | 6,180 | 6,365 |
| 2,500   | -      |       | Property surveys etc               | 2,500  | 2,500 | 2,500 |

| 11,510  | 11,510 | -     | GSO Administration charge          | 11,510 | 11,750 | 11,990 |

### Total Expenditure

| 59,010  | 72,343 | (13,333)| 60,510 | 62,145 | 63,822 |

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>16,300</th>
<th>12,307</th>
<th>8,272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(26,495)</th>
<th>(12,433)</th>
<th>14,062</th>
<th>Transfers (to)/from capital</th>
<th>(25,474)</th>
<th>(12,307)</th>
<th>(8,272)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>200,000</th>
<th>100,591</th>
<th>(99,409)</th>
<th>Profit on sale of property</th>
<th>90,000</th>
<th>20,000</th>
<th>20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>268,813</td>
<td>268,813</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>161,571</td>
<td>11,571</td>
<td>Purchase of property</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,293</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>Capital repairs</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>548,268</td>
<td>183,268</td>
<td></td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>335,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposals of capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,505,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,732,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding of capital movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>227,417</th>
<th>381,837</th>
<th>154,420</th>
<th>Funding required</th>
<th>114,544</th>
<th>32,307</th>
<th>28,272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>100,591</td>
<td>(99,409)</td>
<td>Profit on sale of property</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>268,813</td>
<td>268,813</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,495</td>
<td>12,433</td>
<td>(14,062)</td>
<td>Transfer from/to revenue</td>
<td>25,474</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>8,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>267,891</td>
<td>Funding shortfall</td>
<td>(920)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1,039,010| Special Deposit Account Balance | 813,554| 605,861| 394,133 |
## Mission and Ministry Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>369,435</td>
<td>376,335</td>
<td>383,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>369,435</td>
<td>376,335</td>
<td>383,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Conference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Commission</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Strategy Review Group</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Century, New Direction / JoB Review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Consultation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Homes Transfer / Governance costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>9,406</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allocation to Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Committee</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Mission Committee</td>
<td>56,935</td>
<td>27,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society Committee</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>45,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Development Committee</td>
<td>265,410</td>
<td>263,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Selection</td>
<td>12,690</td>
<td>12,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total allocated to committees</td>
<td>401,035</td>
<td>349,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditure**: 369,435 | 376,335 | 383,709

### Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>36,325</td>
<td>36,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>36,325</td>
<td>36,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,000)</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98,426</td>
<td>92,636</td>
<td>(5,790)</td>
<td>Investment income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td>Special Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>(386)</td>
<td>Noel Phillips Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Grant Provision not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121,208</td>
<td>98,945</td>
<td>(22,263)</td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>23,795</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,525</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>Asia (inc Middle East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>7,719</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>Small grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>Companion Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Agency Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>MiDGies (formerly Justice, Peace and Creation Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Committee expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>Publicity / correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133,800</td>
<td>110,266</td>
<td>23,534</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12,592)</td>
<td>(11,321)</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,738</td>
<td>86,738</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74,146</td>
<td>75,417</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mission and Ministry Board
### Home Mission Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>fav/(adv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,935</td>
<td>27,876</td>
<td>(29,059)</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>35,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56,935</td>
<td>27,876</td>
<td>(29,059)</td>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>35,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>Committee expenses</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCM costs (including LCMO travel)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>LCM Mentor training</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCM Advisory Panel</td>
<td>(571)</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>Mission Advisers (incl stewardship)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>Mission Advisers' meetings</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>Mission Advisers' training and equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,695</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Other Costs (incl Alban Inst)</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training for Mission/ LCM Mentor training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Rural work</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Retreats - grants</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retreats - other costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>17,444</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>Youth Network</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>26,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditure

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56,935</td>
<td>27,876</td>
<td>29,059</td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>35,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission and Ministry Board
**Church in Society Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td>faw/(adv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>45,898</td>
<td>(4,102)</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1,026</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>46,984</td>
<td>(3,016)</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>- 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>(2,300)</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FiOP / Caring for older people in the community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>(1,942)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,750</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>(1,690)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>- 1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>46,984</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2010</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2011</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265,410</td>
<td>263,204</td>
<td>(2,206)</td>
<td></td>
<td>274,470</td>
<td>283,420</td>
<td>289,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>265,410</td>
<td>264,919</td>
<td>(491)</td>
<td>276,970</td>
<td>285,920</td>
<td>291,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94,900</td>
<td>94,884</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,250</td>
<td>105,300</td>
<td>107,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>(962)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>97,050</td>
<td>97,188</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>105,400</td>
<td>107,459</td>
<td>109,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Co-ordinators costs</strong></td>
<td>124,500</td>
<td>124,483</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131,500</td>
<td>138,500</td>
<td>141,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>125,600</td>
<td>125,143</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>132,600</td>
<td>139,600</td>
<td>142,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td>820</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>(398)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>(1,013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>5,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Programme</strong></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>(939)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>(2,553)</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>(1,804)</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>(237)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Costs</strong></td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>36,440</td>
<td>37,225</td>
<td>(785)</td>
<td>33,150</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>33,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clergy Appraisal Scheme</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditure**: 276,970 285,920 291,820

**BALANCES**

- Revenue
- Surplus/(deficit) for year
- Balance brought forward
- Balance carried forward
## Mission and Ministry Board
### Recruitment and Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Variance fav/adv</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2010</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2011</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

| 12,690 | 12,278 | (412) | Allocation from General Fund | 13,415 | 13,795 | 14,165 |

| 12,690 | 12,278 | (412) | **Total Income**             | 13,415 | 13,795 | 14,165 |

### EXPENDITURE

#### Employees:
- PDO and PDO's assistant
- Salary & pension contributions
- Travel & subsistence

| 9,075  | 9,217  | (142) | 9,800 | 10,100 | 10,400 |
| 1,460  | 2,245  | (785) | 1,460 | 1,475  | 1,478  |

#### Administration:
- Telephone, postage, stationery, etc.
- Workshops

| 155    | 129    | 26    | 155   | 160    | 165    |
| 2,000  | 687    | 1,313 | 2,000 | 2,060  | 2,122  |

| 12,690 | 12,278 | 412   | **Total Expenditure**         | 13,415 | 13,795 | 14,165 |

### BALANCES

- Revenue
  - Surplus/(deficit) for year
  - Balance brought forward
  - Balance carried forward

| -      | -      | -     | -     | -      | -      | -      |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,535</td>
<td>14,308</td>
<td>(2,227)</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>13,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,535</td>
<td>14,308</td>
<td>(2,227)</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>13,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,535</td>
<td>14,308</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>13,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,554)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**
No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.
## Information and Communication Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>fav (adv)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>21,446</td>
<td>(18,654)</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>21,446</td>
<td>(18,654)</td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>6,505</td>
<td>Website Development</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>anglican.org domain (IT / Internet Project)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Provincial Conference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Exhibitions / promotion / publicity</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>18,786</td>
<td>5,214</td>
<td>inspires publication / distribution costs</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Miscellaneous projects</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>21,446</td>
<td>18,654</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>38,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,563</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,234)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>6,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>6,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**
No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.
THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION COVENANT

Introduction to the Covenant Text

“...This life is revealed, and we have seen it and testify to it, and declare to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us – we declare to you what we have seen and heard so that you also may have communion with us; and truly our communion is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. These things we write so that our joy may be complete.” (1 John 1.2-4).

1. God has called us into communion in Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 1.9). This communion has been “revealed to us” by the Son as being the very divine life of God the Trinity. What is the life revealed to us? St John makes it clear that the communion of life in the Church participates in the communion which is the divine life itself, the life of the Trinity. This life is not a reality remote from us, but one that has been “seen” and “testified to” by the apostles and their followers: “for in the communion of the Church we share in the divine life”\(^1\). This life of the One God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, shapes and displays itself through the very existence and ordering of the Church.

2. Our divine calling into communion is established in God’s purposes for the whole of creation (Eph 1:10; 3:9ff.). It is extended to all humankind, so that, in our sharing of God’s life as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, God might restore in us the divine image. Through time, according to the Scriptures, God has furred this calling through covenants made with Noah, Abraham, Israel, and David. The prophet Jeremiah looked forward to a new covenant not written on tablets of stone but upon the heart (Jer 31.31-34). In God’s Son, Christ Jesus, a new covenant is given us, established in his “blood … poured out for the many for the forgiveness of sins” (Mt 26:28), secured through his resurrection from the dead (Eph 1:19-23), and sealed with the gift of the Holy Spirit poured into our hearts (Rom 5:5). Into this covenant of death to sin and of new life in Christ we are baptized, and empowered to share God’s communion in Christ with all people, to the ends of the earth and of creation.

3. We humbly recognize that this calling and gift of communion entails responsibilities for our common life before God as we seek, through grace, to be faithful in our service of God’s purposes for the world. Joined in one universal Church, which is Christ’s Body, spread throughout the earth, we serve his gospel even as we are enabled to be made one across the dividing walls of human sin and estrangement (Eph 2.12-22). The forms of this life in the Church, caught up in the mystery of divine communion, reveal to the hostile and divisive power of the world the “manifold wisdom of God” (Eph 3:9-10). Faithfulness, honesty, gentleness, humility, patience, forgiveness, and love itself, lived out in mutual deference and service (Mk 10.44-45) among the Church’s people and through its ministries, contribute to building up the body of Christ as it grows to maturity (Eph 4.1-16; Col 3.8-17).

4. In the providence of God, which holds sway even over our divisions caused by sin, various families of churches have grown up within the universal Church in the course of history. Among these families is the Anglican Communion, which provides a particular charism and identity among the many followers and servants of Jesus. We recognise the wonder, beauty and challenge of maintaining communion in this family of churches, and the need for mutual commitment and discipline as a witness to God’s promise in a world and time of instability, conflict, and fragmentation. Therefore, we covenant together as churches of this Anglican Communion to be faithful to God’s promises through the historic faith we confess, our common worship, our participation in God’s mission, and the way we live together.

5. To covenant together is not intended to change the character of this Anglican expression of Christian faith. Rather, we recognise the importance of renewing in a solemn way our commitment to one another, and to the common understanding of faith and order we have received, so that the bonds of affection which hold us together may be re-affirmed and intensified. We do this in order to reflect, in our relations with one another, God’s own faithfulness and promises towards us in Christ (2 Cor 1.20-22).

\(^1\) *The Church of the Triune God*, The Cyprus Statement of the International Commission for Anglican Orthodox Theological Dialogue, 2007, paragraph 1.2.
6. We are a people who live, learn, and pray by and with the Scriptures as God’s Word. We seek to adore God in thanks and praise and to make intercession for the needs of people everywhere through common prayer, united across many cultures and languages. We are privileged to share in the mission of the apostles to bring the gospel of Christ to all nations and peoples, not only in words but also in deeds of compassion and justice that witness to God’s character and the triumph of Christ over sin and death. We give ourselves as servants of a greater unity among the divided Christians of the world. May the Lord help us to “preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus’ sake” (2 Cor. 4.5).

7. Our faith embodies a coherent testimony to what we have received from God’s Word and the Church’s long-standing witness. Our life together reflects the blessings of God (even as it exposes our failures in faith, hope and love) in growing our Communion into a truly global family. The mission we pursue aims at serving the great promises of God in Christ that embrace the peoples and the world God so loves. This mission is carried out in shared responsibility and stewardship of resources, and in interdependence among ourselves and with the wider Church.

8. Our prayer is that God will redeem our struggles and weakness, renew and enrich our common life and use the Anglican Communion to witness effectively in all the world, working with all people of good will, to the new life and hope found in Christ Jesus.

The Anglican Communion Covenant

Preamble

We, as Churches of the Anglican Communion, under the Lordship of Jesus Christ, solemnly covenant together in these following affirmations and commitments. As people of God, drawn from “every nation, tribe, people and language” (Rev 7.9), we do this in order to proclaim more effectively in our different contexts the grace of God revealed in the gospel, to offer God’s love in responding to the needs of the world, to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and together with all God’s people to attain the full stature of Christ (Eph 4.3,13).

Section One: Our Inheritance of Faith

1.1 Each Church affirms:

(1.1.1) its communion in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

(1.1.2) the catholic and apostolic faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. The historic formularies of the Church of England, forged in the context of the European Reformation and acknowledged and appropriated in various ways in the Anglican Communion, bear authentic witness to this faith.

(1.1.3) the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary for salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

---

3 The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons
4 The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886/1888
(1.1.4) the Apostles’ Creed, as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith\(^5\).

(1.1.5) the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself – Baptism and the Supper of the Lord – ministered with the unfailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him\(^6\).

(1.1.6) the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church\(^7\).

(1.1.7) the shared patterns of our common prayer and liturgy which form, sustain and nourish our worship of God and our faith and life together.

(1.1.8) its participation in the apostolic mission of the whole people of God, and that this mission is shared with other Churches and traditions beyond this Covenant.

1.2 In living out this inheritance of faith together in varying contexts, each Church, reliant on the Holy Spirit, commits itself:

(1.2.1) to teach and act in continuity and consonance with Scripture and the catholic and apostolic faith, order and tradition, as received by the Churches of the Anglican Communion, mindful of the common councils of the Communion and our ecumenical agreements.

(1.2.2) to uphold and proclaim a pattern of Christian theological and moral reasoning and discipline that is rooted in and answerable to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the catholic tradition.

(1.2.3) to witness, in this reasoning, to the renewal of humanity and the whole created order through the death and resurrection of Christ, and to reflect the holiness that in consequence God gives to, and requires from, his people.

(1.2.4) to hear, read, mark, learn and inwardly digest the Scriptures in our different contexts, informed by the attentive and communal reading of - and costly witness to - the Scriptures by all the faithful, by the teaching of bishops and synods, and by the results of rigorous study by lay and ordained scholars.

(1.2.5) to ensure that biblical texts are received, read and interpreted faithfully, respectfully, comprehensively and coherently, with the expectation that Scripture continues to illuminate and transform the Church and its members, and through them, individuals, cultures and societies.

(1.2.6) to encourage and be open to prophetic and faithful leadership in ministry and mission so as to enable God’s people to respond in courageous witness to the power of the gospel in the world.

(1.2.7) to seek in all things to uphold the solemn obligation to nurture and sustain eucharistic communion, in accordance with existing canonical disciplines, as we strive under God for the fuller realisation of the communion of all Christians.

\(^5\) The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886/1888
\(^7\) cf. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/1888
(1.2.8) to pursue a common pilgrimage with the whole Body of Christ continually to discern the fullness of truth into which the Spirit leads us, that peoples from all nations may be set free to receive new and abundant life in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Section Two: The Life We Share with Others: Our Anglican Vocation

2.1 Each Church affirms:

(2.1.1) communion as a gift of God given so that God’s people from east and west, north and south, may together declare the glory of the Lord and be both a sign of God’s reign in the Holy Spirit and the first fruits in the world of God’s redemption in Christ.

(2.1.2) its gratitude for God’s gracious providence extended to us down through the ages: our origins in the Church of the apostles; the ancient common traditions; the rich history of the Church in Britain and Ireland reshaped by the Reformation, and our growth into a global communion through the expanding missionary work of the Church; our ongoing refashioning by the Holy Spirit through the gifts and sacrificial witness of Anglicans from around the world; and our summons into a more fully developed communion life.

(2.1.3) in humility our call to constant repentance: for our failures in exercising patience and charity and in recognizing Christ in one another; our misuse of God’s gracious gifts; our failure to heed God’s call to serve; and our exploitation one of another.

(2.1.4) the imperative of God’s mission into which the Communion is called, a vocation and blessing in which each Church is joined with others in Christ in the work of establishing God’s reign. As the Communion continues to develop into a worldwide family of interdependent churches, we embrace challenges and opportunities for mission at local, regional, and international levels. In this, we cherish our mission heritage as offering Anglicans distinctive opportunities for mission collaboration.

(2.1.5) that our common mission is a mission shared with other Churches and traditions beyond this Covenant. We embrace opportunities for the discovery of the life of the whole gospel, and for reconciliation and shared mission with the Church throughout the world. We affirm the ecumenical vocation of Anglicanism to the full visible unity of the Church in accordance with Christ’s prayer that “all may be one”. It is with all the saints in every place and time that we will comprehend the fuller dimensions of Christ’s redemptive and immeasurable love.

2.2 In recognition of these affirmations, each Church, reliant on the Holy Spirit, commits itself:

(2.2.1) to answer God’s call to undertake evangelisation and to share in the healing and reconciling mission “for our blessed but broken, hurting and fallen world”\(^8\), and, with mutual accountability, to share our God-given spiritual and material resources in this task.

(2.2.2) to undertake in this mission, which is the mission of God in Christ\(^9\):

(2.2.2.a) “to proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom of God” and to bring all to repentance and faith;

(2.2.2.b) “to teach, baptize and nurture new believers”, making disciples of all nations (Mt 28.19) through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit\(^10\) and drawing

---

\(^8\) IASCOME Report, ACC-13
\(^9\) The five Marks of Mission are set out in the MISSIO Report of 1999, building on work at ACC-6 and ACC-8.
them into the one Body of Christ whose faith, calling and hope are one in the Lord (Eph 4.4-6);

(2.2.2.c) “to respond to human need by loving service”, disclosing God’s reign through humble ministry to those most needy (Mk 10.42-45; Mt 18.4; 25.31-45);

(2.2.2.d) “to seek to transform unjust structures of society” as the Church stands vigilantly with Christ proclaiming both judgment and salvation to the nations of the world\(^{11}\), and manifesting through our actions on behalf of God’s righteousness the Spirit’s transfiguring power\(^{12}\);

(2.2.2.e) “to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and to sustain and renew the life of the earth” as essential aspects of our mission in communion\(^{13}\).

(2.2.3) to engage in this mission with humility and an openness to our own ongoing conversion in the face of our unfaithfulness and failures in witness.

(2.2.4) to revive and renew structures for mission which will awaken and challenge the whole people of God to work, pray and give for the spread of the gospel.

(2.2.5) to order its mission in the joyful and reverent worship of God, thankful that in our eucharistic communion “Christ is the source and goal of the unity of the Church and of the renewal of human community”\(^{14}\).

Section Three: Our Unity and Common Life

3.1 Each Church affirms:

(3.1.1) that by our participation in Baptism and Eucharist, we are incorporated into the one body of the Church of Jesus Christ, and called by Christ to pursue all things that make for peace and build up our common life.

(3.1.2) its resolve to live in a Communion of Churches. Each Church, with its bishops in synod, orders and regulates its own affairs and its local responsibility for mission through its own system of government and law and is therefore described as living “in communion with autonomy and accountability”\(^{15}\). Trusting in the Holy Spirit, who calls and enables us to dwell in a shared life of common worship and prayer for one another, in mutual affection, commitment and service, we seek to affirm our common life through those Instruments of Communion by which our Churches are enabled to be conformed together to the mind of Christ. Churches of the Anglican Communion are bound together “not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference”\(^{16}\) and of the other instruments of Communion.

(3.1.3) the central role of bishops as guardians and teachers of faith, as leaders in mission, and as a visible sign of unity, representing the universal Church to the local, and the local Church to the universal and the local Churches to one another. This ministry is exercised personally, collegially and within and for the eucharistic community. We receive and maintain the historic threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, ordained for service in the Church of God, as they call all the baptised into the mission of Christ.

\(^{10}\) Church as Communion n26
\(^{11}\) WCC 1954 Evanston, Christ the Hope of the World
\(^{12}\) Moscow Statement, 43
\(^{13}\) IARCCUM, Growing Together in Unity and Mission, 118
\(^{14}\) Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, WCC,
\(^{15}\) A Letter from Alexandria, the Primates, March 2009
\(^{16}\) Lambeth Conference 1930
(3.1.4) the importance of instruments in the Anglican Communion to assist in the discernment, articulation and exercise of our shared faith and common life and mission. The life of communion includes an ongoing engagement with the diverse expressions of apostolic authority, from synods and episcopal councils to local witness, in a way which continually interprets and articulates the common faith of the Church’s members \((\text{consensus fidelium})\). In addition to the many and varied links which sustain our life together, we acknowledge four particular Instruments at the level of the Anglican Communion which express this co-operative service in the life of communion.

I. We accord the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the bishop of the See of Canterbury with which Anglicans have historically been in communion, a primacy of honour and respect among the college of bishops in the Anglican Communion as first among equals \((\text{primus inter pares})\). As a focus and means of unity, the Archbishop gathers and works with the Lambeth Conference and Primates’ Meeting, and presides in the Anglican Consultative Council.

II. The Lambeth Conference expresses episcopal collegiality worldwide, and brings together the bishops for common worship, counsel, consultation and encouragement in their ministry of guarding the faith and unity of the Communion and equipping the saints for the work of ministry \((\text{Eph 4.12})\) and mission.

III. The Anglican Consultative Council is comprised of lay, clerical and episcopal representatives from our Churches\(^{17}\). It facilitates the co-operative work of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, co-ordinates aspects of international Anglican ecumenical and mission work, calls the Churches into mutual responsibility and interdependence, and advises on developing provincial structures\(^{18}\).

IV. The Primates’ Meeting is convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury for mutual support, prayer and counsel. The authority that primates bring to the meeting arises from their own positions as the senior bishops of their Provinces, and the fact that they are in conversation with their own Houses of Bishops and located within their own synodical structures\(^{19}\). In the Primates’ Meeting, the Primates and Moderators are called to work as representatives of their Provinces in collaboration with one another in mission and in doctrinal, moral and pastoral matters that have Communion-wide implications.

It is the responsibility of each Instrument to consult with, respond to, and support each other Instrument and the Churches of the Communion\(^{20}\). Each Instrument may initiate and commend a process of discernment and a direction for the Communion and its Churches.

3.2 Acknowledging our interdependent life, each Church, reliant on the Holy Spirit, commits itself:

(3.2.1) to have regard for the common good of the Communion in the exercise of its autonomy, to support the work of the Instruments of Communion with the spiritual and material resources available to it, and to receive their work with a readiness to undertake reflection upon their counsels, and to endeavour to accommodate their recommendations.

(3.2.2) to respect the constitutional autonomy of all of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, while upholding our mutual responsibility and interdependence in the Body of Christ\(^{21}\), and the responsibility of each to the Communion as a whole\(^{22}\).

\(^{17}\) Constitution of the ACC, Article 3 and Schedule
\(^{18}\) cf. the Objects of the ACC are set out in Article 2 of its Constitution.
\(^{19}\) Report of the Windsor Continuation Group, 69.
\(^{20}\) cf IATDC, Communion, Conflict and Hope, paragraph 113.
\(^{21}\) Toronto Congress 1963, and the Ten Principles of Partnership.
(3.2.3) to spend time with openness and patience in matters of theological debate and reflection, to listen, pray and study with one another in order to discern the will of God. Such prayer, study and debate is an essential feature of the life of the Church as it seeks to be led by the Spirit into all truth and to proclaim the gospel afresh in each generation. Some issues, which are perceived as controversial or new when they arise, may well evoke a deeper understanding of the implications of God’s revelation to us; others may prove to be distractions or even obstacles to the faith. All such matters therefore need to be tested by shared discernment in the life of the Church.

(3.2.4) to seek a shared mind with other Churches, through the Communion’s councils, about matters of common concern, in a way consistent with the Scriptures, the common standards of faith, and the canon laws of our churches. Each Church will undertake wide consultation with the other Churches of the Anglican Communion and with the Instruments and Commissions of the Communion.

(3.2.5) to act with diligence, care and caution in respect of any action which may provoke controversy, which by its intensity, substance or extent could threaten the unity of the Communion and the effectiveness or credibility of its mission.

(3.2.6) in situations of conflict, to participate in mediated conversations, which involve face to face meetings, agreed parameters and a willingness to see such processes through.

(3.2.7) to have in mind that our bonds of affection and the love of Christ compel us always to uphold the highest degree of communion possible.

Section Four: Our Covenanted Life Together

4 Each Church affirms the following principles and procedures, and, reliant on the Holy Spirit, commits itself to their implementation.

4.1 Adoption of the Covenant

(4.1.1) Each Church adopting this Covenant affirms that it enters into the Covenant as a commitment to relationship in submission to God. Each Church freely offers this commitment to other Churches in order to live more fully into the ecclesial communion and interdependence which is foundational to the Churches of the Anglican Communion. The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, of national or regional Churches, in which each recognises in the others the bonds of a common loyalty to Christ expressed through a common faith and order, a shared inheritance in worship, life and mission, and a readiness to live in an interdependent life.

(4.1.2) In adopting the Covenant for itself, each Church recognises in the preceding sections a statement of faith, mission and interdependence of life which is consistent with its own life and with the doctrine and practice of the Christian faith as it has received them. It recognises these elements as foundational for the life of the Anglican Communion and therefore for the relationships among the covenanted Churches.

(4.1.3) Such mutual commitment does not represent submission to any external ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Nothing in this Covenant of itself shall be deemed to alter any provision of the Constitution and Canons of any Church of the Communion, or to limit its autonomy of governance. The Covenant does not grant to any one Church or any agency of the Communion control or direction over any Church of the Anglican Communion.

22 cf. the Schedule to the Dar es Salaam Communiqué of the Primates’ Meeting, February 2007
(4.1.4) Every Church of the Anglican Communion, as recognised in accordance with the Constitution of the Anglican Consultative Council, is invited to enter into this Covenant according to its own constitutional procedures.

(4.1.5) The Instruments of Communion may invite other Churches to adopt the Covenant using the same procedures as set out by the Anglican Consultative Council for the amendment of its schedule of membership. Adoption of this Covenant does not confer any right of recognition by, or membership of, the Instruments of Communion, which shall be decided by those Instruments themselves.

(4.1.6) This Covenant becomes active for a Church when that Church adopts the Covenant through the procedures of its own Constitution and Canons.

4.2 The Maintenance of the Covenant and Dispute Resolution

(4.2.1) The Covenant operates to express the common commitments and mutual accountability which hold each Church in the relationship of communion one with another. Recognition of, and fidelity to, this Covenant, enable mutual recognition and communion. Participation in the Covenant implies a recognition by each Church of those elements which must be maintained in its own life and for which it is accountable to the Churches with which it is in Communion in order to sustain the relationship expressed in this Covenant.

(4.2.2) The Standing Committee of the Anglican Communion, responsible to the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting, shall monitor the functioning of the Covenant in the life of the Anglican Communion on behalf of the Instruments. In this regard, the Standing Committee shall be supported by such other committees or commissions as may be mandated to assist in carrying out this function and to advise it on questions relating to the Covenant.

(4.2.3) When questions arise relating to the meaning of the Covenant, or about the compatibility of an action by a covenanting Church with the Covenant, it is the duty of each covenanting Church to seek to live out the commitments of Section 3.2. Such questions may be raised by a Church itself, another covenanting Church or the Instruments of Communion.

(4.2.4) Where a shared mind has not been reached the matter shall be referred to the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee shall make every effort to facilitate agreement, and may take advice from such bodies as it deems appropriate to determine a view on the nature of the matter at question and those relational consequences which may result. Where appropriate, the Standing Committee shall refer the question to both the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting for advice.

(4.2.5) The Standing Committee may request a Church to defer a controversial action. If a Church declines to defer such action, the Standing Committee may recommend to any Instrument of Communion relational consequences which may specify a provisional limitation of participation in, or suspension from, that Instrument until the completion of the process set out below.

(4.2.6) On the basis of advice received from the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting, the Standing Committee may make a declaration that an action or decision is or would be “incompatible with the Covenant”.

(4.2.7) On the basis of the advice received, the Standing Committee shall make recommendations as to relational consequences which flow from an action incompatible with the Covenant. These recommendations may be addressed to the Churches of the Anglican Communion or to the Instruments of the Communion and address the extent to which the decision of any covenanting Church impairs or limits the communion between that Church and the other Churches of the Communion, and the practical consequences of such
impairment or limitation. Each Church or each Instrument shall determine whether or not to accept such recommendations.

(4.2.8) Participation in the decision making of the Standing Committee or of the Instruments of Communion in respect to section 4.2 shall be limited to those members of the Instruments of Communion who are representatives of those churches who have adopted the Covenant, or who are still in the process of adoption.

(4.2.9) Each Church undertakes to put into place such mechanisms, agencies or institutions, consistent with its own Constitution and Canons, as can undertake to oversee the maintenance of the affirmations and commitments of the Covenant in the life of that Church, and to relate to the Instruments of Communion on matters pertinent to the Covenant.

4.3 Withdrawing from the Covenant

(4.3.1) Any covenanting Church may decide to withdraw from the Covenant. Although such withdrawal does not imply an automatic withdrawal from the Instruments of Communion or a repudiation of its Anglican character, it may raise a question relating to the meaning of the Covenant, and of compatibility with the principles incorporated within it, and trigger the provisions set out in section 4.2 above.

4.4 The Covenant Text and its amendment

(4.4.1) The Covenant consists of the text set out in this document in the Preamble, Sections One to Four and the Declaration. The Introduction to the Covenant Text, which shall always be annexed to the Covenant text, is not part of the Covenant, but shall be accorded authority in understanding the purpose of the Covenant.

(4.4.2) Any covenanting Church or Instrument of Communion may submit a proposal to amend the Covenant to the Instruments of Communion through the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee shall send the proposal to the Anglican Consultative Council, the Primates’ Meeting, the covenanting Churches and any other body as it may consider appropriate for advice. The Standing Committee shall make a recommendation on the proposal in the light of advice offered, and submit the proposal with any revisions to the covenanting Churches. The amendment is operative when ratified by three quarters of such Churches. The Standing Committee shall adopt a procedure for promulgation of the amendment.

Our Declaration

With joy and with firm resolve, we declare our Churches to be partakers in this Anglican Communion Covenant, offering ourselves for fruitful service and binding ourselves more closely in the truth and love of Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit be glory for ever. Amen.

"Now may the God of Peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of the eternal covenant, make you complete in everything good so that you may do his will, working among us that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen." (Hebrews 13.20, 21)
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1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1995 UN General Assembly endorses the Beijing Declaration & Platform for Action, as adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, *a journey of hope and restoration.*


2000 UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Eight goals to be achieved by 2015 in response to the world’s main development challenges.

Goal 3 *gender equality & the empowerment of women* relates to the achievement of all the MDGs. Research demonstrates that societies where women do not have equal rights with men do not develop in a sustainable manner.

[www.un.org/millenniumgoals](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals)

2005 The Anglican Consultative Council 13 affirms the work of the International Anglican Women’s Network (IAWN) in responding to the Beijing Platform for Action and the MDGs, thereby carrying forward the full flourishing of God’s Creation.

ACC 13 acknowledges the MDG goal for equal representation of women in decision making at all levels, and so requests several actions, including:

- all member churches work towards the realisation of this goal in their own structures of governance, and to report progress to ACC 14.
- a study of the place and role of women in the structures of the Anglican Communion be undertaken by the Standing Committee
- requests that each Province considers the establishment of a women’s desk.

This is the core of what is known as ACC Resolution 13.31

Mar 2009 IAWN reports to ACC 14 in particular requesting all member churches to work towards the realisation of this goal in their own structures of governance.

As few provinces have gender data on people, lay or clergy, in decision-making positions, the Steering Group of IAWN recommend strongly that all provinces gather gender-disaggregated data pertaining to clergy and to all persons (clergy and lay) in decision-making positions.

May 2009 ACC 14’s response to IAWN Report:

- urges the full implementation of ACC Resolution 13.31 across the Communion and encourages Provinces to report on further progress made to ACC-15;
- requests that appointments to all Inter-Anglican Standing Commissions, and all other inter-Anglican Committees, design groups, or appointed bodies, follow resolution ACC 13.31 to provide equal representation of women on each body.

June 2009 SEC General Synod

Aware of its commitment to the MDG and to ACC 13.31, the General Synod passes the Motion:

*That this Synod, affirming its commitment to the Millennium Development Goals, invites the undertaking of a gender audit within the SEC in time to report to General Synod 2010.*

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

In September, 2009, the SEC Standing Committee agreed the Terms of Reference for the Gender Audit. The methodology proposed was similar to that used by the United Nations in addressing issues of discrimination:

1. collecting the data to garner evidence of the nature of women’s participation in the life of the church.
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2. analysing this data; exploring possible hindrances to their broader participation and ways to resolve them; setting goals or measures for their greater involvement.

3. drafting a report which would help measure achievement to aid accountability.

One representative was nominated by each Diocesan Bishop to assist in the collection of data. In October a meeting was held to clarify a common understanding of the audit, and agree on the uniform collection of the data. The group were also grateful to have the Chief Executive of Engender give a presentation on the significance of gender equality.

More data has been collected than this Report analyses. It had not been part of the original intention to include the congregational level, but following the Bishops' request for gender breakdown to be included in the November returns, and the sense of the group collecting the data, some focus has been given to it.

3. **EQUALITY ISSUES**

3.1 **Global context**

The preceding brief historical background gives a flavour of global awareness and concern about gender issues – both in the secular and ecclesiastical worlds. The recent publication from United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) argues that sustainable development cannot be achieved without gender equality. The Elders, the small council of retired global leaders, brought together in 2007 by Nelson Mandela, & including Desmond Tutu, recently argued that when religious institutions exclude women from their hierarchies and rituals, the inevitable implication is that females are inferior. The World Council of Churches (WCC) commended the SEC gender initiative when they visited Scotland in December 2009.

It is important that women participate equally in decision-making bodies not only because we are each made in God’s image, but also because women’s experience informs decisions about church and society, about mission at home and abroad, about best use of resources. Particularly in the current economic climate, optimum use needs to be made of scarce economic resources.

A few people have wondered at the Synod’s decision to invite a gender audit, possibly thinking that the focus should have been on a more obvious injustice – such as violence against women. But these issues all weave together. This audit focuses on one specific aspect, which is a key to many of the unbalanced relationships throughout society. Does the Gospel not demand that the church takes a lead in challenging injustice, and does that not include gender justice? It is too easy for such issues to be seen as pertaining only to the developing world, but power relationships continue to be imbalanced throughout the first world, including the UK.

Some European churches have grasped this nettle. The Church in Iceland have a gender policy which states that the church should promote equality as that vision is part of the message of Jesus: baptism does not distinguish between men and women. Their General Synod also adopted a plan for 2010 – 2012 including education on equal rights, inclusive language, equal salaries and an analysis of the position of women in the church regarding work at both congregational and diocesan levels. In Finland the Church Council published an equality plan in 1998, and now most of the bigger parishes have one.

3.2 **UK context**

Nearer home, the SEC recently signed a unique Statement of Partnership with the Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church (EMU). The UK Methodist Church has a Gender Justice Committee, and completed an audit in 2003/04, Continuing their Ministry to the Whole People of God.

They anticipate further work in the near future, and would look forward to collaboration with the SEC. The URC has an Equal Opportunities Policy, & is committed to positive action, rather than containing discriminatory issues.

---

1. Making the MDGs Work better for Women UNIFEM publication Feb 2010
The Church in Wales, who seek to promote a culture of dignity, respect and fairness for all, completed a gender audit in June 2008, and have a draft Equal Opportunities Policy going to Synod 2010. As well as seeking equality of access to all aspects of life within the Church in Wales, it wishes to counteract the effects of discrimination through language, and monitor the policy’s application.

In the Church of Ireland, anti-sectarianism work led some years ago to the creation of the Hard Gospel Project, and from that emerged a further three-year project focussing on living with difference. Among other items, this project identified gender issues, particularly female participation in the decision-making structures of the Church of Ireland, as an area to be addressed. In 2009, the Hard Gospel Implementation Group was set up to progress work on a range of issues, including gender, and is currently researching these. They are interested in reading our Gender Audit, and possibly collaborating on these issues.

4. SEC CURRENT CONTEXT

The Scottish Government promotes gender equality through gender mainstreaming, so all its policy objectives have gender implications, complying with the Gender Equality Duty Act of April 2007. Independent research provides evidence that there is growing gender equality in certain areas, but persisting gender inequalities in others, notably in political institutions and public decision-making bodies. Women make up 14% of Scottish MPs, 39% of MSPs, and 22% of local authority councillors. Changes are slowly taking place, but one persisting significant disadvantage often contributes to others.

The booklet Gender Budgets, uplifting women, men and children produced by Anglican Women's Empowerment (AWE) quotes:

Many of us are not well versed with gender issues. And many equate gender issues to women’s issues. We need a lot of training to make our colleagues aware that when we talk of gender, we are talking about men and women, boys and girls, and trying to uplift the disadvantaged gender.

This succinctly sums up the concern of this audit. Women are half the population, and more than half of our congregations – though not as proportionately more, as many think. In baptism we are each welcomed equally, regardless of whether we are male or female. So it is important that all have an equal measure of opportunity with their voices in the SEC, in line with a culture which seeks fairness and justice, and cares for all.

Gender equality exists when men and women have equal opportunities, rights, and status. In the last twenty years, the Scottish Episcopal Church has made considerable progress in its commitment to this. Legislation opening the priesthood to women was passed in 1994, and the first women ordained within six months. Legislation opening the episcopate to women was passed in 2002, but as yet no woman has been elected to that office. The closest was the short-listing of a female candidate for the recent election for the diocese of Glasgow & Galloway.

5. REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN WORK AND STRUCTURES OF CHURCH

(Please note: Data sources may contain a small margin of error.)

5.1. REPRESENTATION IN CONGREGATIONS

The College of Bishops requested a gender breakdown be included in the November 2009 Sunday congregational returns. This was completed by almost 90% of congregations, and reveals an interestingly uniform gender division throughout the Province. The average male:female ratio among communicants is 35:65, and that for adherents is 38:62. There is probably a slightly higher preponderance of females in rural constituencies. See Figure 1

---

3 Church in Wales Draft Equal Opportunities Policy 2010
4 A Gender Audit of Statistics comparing the position of Women and Men in Scotland  March 2007 Scottish Govt publication
Figure 1  
*Congregational breakdown by gender, Sunday November 22, 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3085</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edin City Ed Borders</td>
<td>3785</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5907</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3523</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>5397</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7773</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>4932</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3038</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4502</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2861</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Congregations who did not submit gender breakdown figures are **not included** above.

These figures reflect the statistics noted by Brierley for national church attendance in Scotland in 2002 when the male:female ratio was approximately 40:60.

Gender statistics for some of the principal vestry posts were requested. This reveals a societal stereotypic preponderance of male treasurers, female secretaries and female Child Protection Officers.

Total percentages
- Secretaries: 29% male: 71% female
- Treasurers: 65% male: 35% female
- CPOs: 12% male: 88% female

Best practice requires that at all levels, the best person available for the job is the person who should undertake it. Gendered stereotypic assumptions short change both men and women.

5.2. **REPRESENTATION AT DIOCESAN LEVEL**

5.2.1 **Clergy**

The pool of clergy remains very male-oriented, but when we compare the current stipendiary clergy, as in Figure 3, with the commissioned & warranted, Figure 3a, male:female genders are slightly more balanced: 70:30 to 76:24. It is good to find that four of the current five curates are female.

---

5 UKCH Religious Trends No 4 2003/2004
5.2.2 Cathedral Chapters

The SEC is rightly proud of its work of mission. Any organisation is best placed to fulfil its mission when all members are equally enabled to make best use of their gifts and talents fully. In this way they exercise their unique individual calling, fully valued for who they are in God’s eyes. No organisation wishes to be seen as discriminatory, and the SEC has developed much good anti-discriminatory practice. Nonetheless, while a good 60% of our congregations are female, that percentage is not reflected among those in leadership positions and some decision-making bodies.

The fact that ordination was a male preserve until less than twenty years ago means that until recently it was reasonably argued that there had not been sufficient time for women to gain the experience needed for senior ordained positions. But are there not now able women, with sufficient talent and experience, ready to be considered for senior positions in the SEC?
Cathedral Chapters are composed firstly of Deans, Provosts and Synod Clerks, only one of whom, St Andrew’s diocesan Synod Clerk, is female. The additional members are either elected (by diocesan clergy) or selected (by the Bishop). These total 17 for the 7 dioceses. Of them, only 4 are women – 23.5%. While recognising that numbers are small, it might be expected that women might fill some more of these positions.

**Figure 4  Cathedral Chapters by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Abdn</th>
<th>Argyll</th>
<th>Brechin</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Moray</th>
<th>St Andrews</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 **Lay Readers**

The only common figures for structured lay ministry are those for Lay Readers. Apart from them, what is noted varies from diocese to diocese – e.g. some have statistics for Eucharistic Assistants; some have not. Given that ordination has only comparatively recently been open to women, it is surprising that male Lay Readers outnumber female – 47 male; 35 female.

**Figure 5  Lay Readers by gender**

5.2.4 **Diocesan Synods**

Dioceses have considerable autonomy about the internal structure of their dioceses, so gauging the degree to which women are present in decision-making bodies uniformly is not straightforward. For the purpose of this audit, the lay representation of Diocesan Synods, and the gender of diocesan committee convenerships was measured.

The clergy in Diocesan Synods are predominantly male; in contrast, the majority of lay members in all dioceses, are female.
5.2.5 Conveners of Diocesan Committees

The gender of the conveners of four major Diocesan Committees, or their equivalent body, was requested: Standing Committee; Finance Committee; Mission / Ministry Committee; Property Committee. Given the balance in Synod membership, it is surprising to find that of a total of 28 conveners, only 4 are women. And why are all conveners of Diocesan Standing Committees and Finance Committees men?

As will be seen, this imbalance is also evidenced in Provincial Boards and Committees.

Figure 7 Diocesan conveners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abdn</th>
<th>Argyll</th>
<th>Brechin</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Glas</th>
<th>Moray</th>
<th>St And</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Com</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>vac</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/Min</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of a total of 27 conveners, 23 men; 4 women.
5.3  REPRESENTATION AT PROVINCIAL LEVEL

5.3.1  General Synod

In September 2006, the General Synod Review Group sent Dioceses a Discussion Paper with several recommendations, including Principles for the election of members to General Synod. Although there was insufficient consensus for any change to be proposed at that time, one of several recommended principles was appropriate gender representation.

Clergy representation

On the whole, the heavily male clergy constituency at General Synod reflects the preponderance of male clergy, with some dioceses having a more balanced representation than others. One diocese, Brechin, has more female clergy representation than male.

Lay representation

The fact that diocesan lay representation is principally female – only one diocese has less lay women than lay men – goes some way to redress the dominance of male clergy.

Taken as a whole, however, does the membership of the General Synod reflect the overall membership of the Scottish Episcopal Church?

Figure 8  Bar-chart General Synod – ordained/lay and male/female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male:Female Ratio</th>
<th>Abdn</th>
<th>Argyll</th>
<th>Brechin</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Moray</th>
<th>St Andrews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>14:13</td>
<td>17:11</td>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>11:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total male membership: 73
Total female membership: 59
Total male: female ratio 55:44
(Alternates not included)
5.3.2 Provincial Boards & Conveners

Given the comparative equality of representation of lay members of both diocesan and General Synod, it was surprising to find a considerable imbalance in the Provincial Boards and committees. Out of 212 places on Provincial Boards and committees, only 69 are held by women – 32%.

Figure 9 Composition of Provincial Boards & Committees – gender breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board / Committee</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>No of members by sex (including convenor)</th>
<th>Sex of convenor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot of chil &amp; vul adults</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith &amp; Order</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Ministry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Mission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Network</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relats with Other Faiths</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info &amp; Communications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Welfare</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Advisory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The imbalance is partly brought about by membership of some Boards being based on the specific posts held (e.g. F & O includes all the College of Bishops). Numbers are small, and therefore the change in just one member of a committee may alter the balance significantly. Only three committees (ICRC, Youth, Overseas) are composed of more women than men; two (Protection of Children & Vulnerable Adults; Ministry Development) are evenly balanced. The Youth Network (and the largest committee) stands out with 64% female: 36% male. Several features give rise to specific questions:

- Does the SEC really only have one woman with sufficient financial competence to serve on Provincial Investment or Finance Committees?
- Why does Church in Society have so few women?
- Where are our women theologians to serve in Faith & Order?
- If the SEC is genuinely seeking the best people for these posts, is it really true that male Episcopalians are so much more gifted than female?
5.3.3  **Theological Institute of the Scottish Episcopal Church (TISEC)**

The TISEC website commendably states that their primary aim is formation for public ministry, which is seen as engagement with God’s mission. They place an important emphasis on their students seeing education and training as part of lifelong learning. This is in keeping with current educational practice, where policies on equal opportunities are standard. The academic staff and Board of Studies have a considerable preponderance of men. There is only one female DDO. The Provincial Selection Panel Pool is exactly balanced by gender.

![Figure 10  Theological Institute of Scottish Episcopal Church (TISEC)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub – groups</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic staff</strong></td>
<td>Ministry Development Officer &amp; Pantonian Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay Learning Officer (half-time post)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module Co-ordinators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar Convener (Tutors)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Studies</strong></td>
<td>3 Sem Conveners + diocesan reps from other dioceses (3 male, 1 female) + MDO + student reps (1 male, 1 female) Including 2 reps from York St John’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Staff:</strong></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IME (4 male 3 female)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMD (2 male; 3 female; 2 vacant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay Learning (2 male; 3 female; 2 vacant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director of Ordinands</strong></td>
<td>DDOs (1 vacancy)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Staff</strong></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prov. Selection Panel Pool</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>Ordinands in training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay in training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **LANGUAGE**

The cultural history of the church is one of male-dominance. This is slowly changing, but gendered stereotypic assumptions still prevail – shortchanging both men and women into unequal relationships. This is reflected in the way we use language. Although language was not a specific remit of this audit, it is the use of language which defines, to a large extent, our understanding of our world. Therefore choice of language plays an important role in liturgy and it is vital that ways are found to make worship more inclusive. The Liturgy Committee has made important strides in this regard, adapting language as liturgies are updated and ensuring that the words used in new liturgies reflect both the church as it is now and our contemporary understanding of the nature of God. These changes are very welcome, and hopefully may lead towards fully inclusive language as soon as possible.

7. **SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

7.1 **Introduction**

Several principles undergird the thinking of this audit:

- Each woman and man is named equally in baptism
- Each is called to a unique ministry as a Christian disciple
Gender Audit Report

- The church is a more whole & healing community when everyone is able to contribute to the best of their talents
- Gender equality is not an ordination issue, but an issue of right relationships, and of men and women working together as equals, not in dominance or discrimination.

7.2 Summary
The data about gender representation in the Scottish Episcopal Church in November 2009 may form a baseline against which change may be measured.

The data shows that:
- the average male:female ratio among communicant members is 35:65, and that for adherents is 38:62.
- at Provincial level only 69 out of 212 Board / committee places were occupied by women; and at Diocesan level, only 4 of 27 main committee conveners were women
- while the overall membership of General Synod was heavily male, the lay membership was predominantly female
- lay membership of Diocesan Synods was more female than male, helping balance the mainly male clergy
- out of 41 places on Cathedral Chapters, only 5 were occupied by women
- vestry posts reveal a societal stereotypic preponderance of male treasurers, female secretaries and female Child Protection Officers

7.3 Key Issues and Recommendations

7.3.1 Equality of Representation
The SEC is committed to modelling Equal Opportunities best practice because it is a Gospel imperative to care for the less privileged; to ensure resources are shared fairly; to enable us all to be the best possible disciples.

This Report makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: That there should be greater equality of gender representation on Provincial Boards & committees

Recommendation 2: That there should be greater equality of gender representation on diocesan committees.

Recommendation 3: That there should be greater equality of representation of women on Cathedral Chapters and generally into senior clerical posts.

Recommendation 4: That there should be a continuing commitment to inclusive language in the liturgy.

Recommendation 5: That the Standing Committee give serious consideration to the writing of appropriate equality policies for the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Recommendation 6: That a working group be set up to examine gender & other areas of possible discrimination.

Recommendation 7: That the annual congregational returns continue to reflect gender, and that another gender audit be conducted in November 2012 for which this snapshot will be a base line for establishing trends.
Membership of Group nominated by Bishops to collect data:

**Diocesan Representatives:**

- Aberdeen & Orkney: Mrs Audrey Masson
- Argyll & the Isles: Dr Peter Kemp
- Brechin: Miss Hilary Gibson
- Edinburgh: Rev Marion Chatterley
- Glasgow & Galloway: Mr Gib FitzGibbon
- Moray, Ross & Caithness: Mrs Norma Higgott
- St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane: Mrs Charmian Paterson

We wish to express our thanks to the above group, to the Standing Committee, College of Bishops, diocesan secretaries, and other staff who have helped so willingly and generously with their time in the compilation of this audit.

Dr Elaine Cameron with the Rev Marion Chatterley

May 2010
STANDING COMMITTEE

Session 3 of the Agenda for Synod will include a number of items of business from the Standing Committee.

Two of these concern second readings of canonical changes which received a first reading in 2009.

**Canon 57, Sections 1 and 3**

The change to Canon 57 was proposed in 2009 as part of the Standing Committee’s response to the recommendations contained in the General Synod Review Group Report. The Standing Committee considered that there would be merit in changing the Canon to allow the formal notice convening the General Synod under Canon 52.2 to be sent by email (where Synod members have an email address). This would result in a small saving on postage. The alteration also extends the same possibility of notification by email in relation to Diocesan Synods.

The principal mailing for General Synod includes a significant quantity of material and the canonical change proposed for second reading is not intended to include that mailing, which would continue to be sent by post. The canonical alteration is intended simply to cover the initial notice convening the meeting which is normally sent in the third week of March each year.

The opinions from Diocesan Synods (reported elsewhere in the Synod papers) show clear support for the proposals. Comments made in one or two Synods have asked questions about delivery by email.

It should be emphasised that the provision in Canon 57.3, that a notice sent by email should been deemed to have been given within 24 hours, is purely a deeming provision. The same Canon already provides a deeming provision for service of notices by post. This is not intended to be a guarantee that the notice will be delivered within the time given but is relevant for the purposes of other provisions of the Canons where a required number of days notice needs to be given of a meeting.

A comment was also made regarding the use of response receipts. Notices sent by post do not require a receipt and since the creation and sending of a response receipt lies entirely with the recipient (and indeed we understand that some programmes may not provide for automated receipts), it seems inappropriate to include such requirement within the Canon.

**Canon 52, Section 3**

A copy of the paper on Standing Committee Membership produced for General Synod 2009 is enclosed in the Synod papers for information and explains the reasons for the proposed change to Canon 52.

**Digest of Resolutions**

Three proposals are made by Standing Committee for change to the Digest of Resolutions:-
a) **Convenership of the Standing Committee:** As a matter of practice, the election by General Synod of the Convener for the Standing Committee has always been handled in the same way as the elections to the Convenership of a Board. Whilst the Digest of Resolutions contains specific provisions relating to the election of a Board Convener, it is in fact silent on the election of the Standing Committee Convener (except that Section 2.2.1 of the Digest requires the Convener to be a lay person). It is, therefore, proposed that Section 2.1.2 of the Digest be altered so as to state explicitly that the process for the appointing the Convener of the Standing Committee should be the same as that for Board Conveners.

b) **Bequests:** Section 1.8 of the Digest of Resolutions states that bequests, unless made for the benefit of a particular Board should be credited to the Unallocated Legacies Account, administered by the Standing Committee and that bequests to particular Boards or Committees should be added to the capital of such Boards or Committees. That provision is now inconsistent with the creation of the General Fund a number of years ago at which time the Unallocated Legacies Account was absorbed into the General Fund. Any legacy which is given for a restricted purpose is in any event handled in accordance with the terms of such a bequest and there is no need for the Digest to state this. Where an unrestricted bequest is made, the legacy is applied in accordance with the policy of the Standing Committee. The annual accounts contain a Statement of Accounting Policies in relation to legacies. In short, legacies which are, in the opinion of the Standing Committee exceptionally large are designated as capital and credited directly to the appropriate capital account and included in the Statement of Financial Activities. Other legacies are recognised as income. The Annual Accounts contain a table showing legacies received and the recipient fund to which they are credited.

In the light of this practice, Standing Committee recommends the deletion of Section 1.8 of the Digest.

c) **Other References:** Section 2.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions similarly contains reference to accounts which, since the creation of the General Fund, have ceased to exist. Accordingly, Standing Committee recommends the deletion of the references to those accounts.

Professor Patricia Peattie  
Convener, Standing Committee  

April 2010
CANON FIFTY-SEVEN
OF NOTICES PROVIDED FOR BY THIS CODE OF CANONS, AND OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE

The text to be added is shown in italics

1. Notices, including intimations and citations, shall be sufficiently served or given if sent by recorded delivery to the last known place of residence within the United Kingdom of the person to whom the notice, intimation or citation falls to be given. Notwithstanding the foregoing, notice convening the meeting of the General Synod under Canon 52, section 2 or the meeting of a Diocesan Synod under Canon 50 may also be sufficiently served if sent by email communication to the last known email address of the person to whom the same falls to be sent or by ordinary post to the last known place of residence of the person to whom the same falls to be sent. The sending of the agenda for General Synod under Canon 52, Section 2 may be sufficiently served if sent by ordinary post to the last known place of residence of the person to whom the same falls to be sent.

2. No objection shall be taken to the service of any notice which has duly reached the person to whom it fell to be given.

3. In cases where a notice falls to be given, or a paper to be lodged, within a prescribed time, the same shall be deemed duly given or lodged, provided it is posted by recorded delivery so as in due course of post to reach its destination before the expiry of the prescribed time. Notice sent by email communication under section 1 of this Canon shall be deemed to have been duly given within 24 hours of its having been sent and notice or paper sent by ordinary first class post under Section 1 of this Canon shall be deemed to be duly given provided it is posted 24 hours before expiry of the prescribed time and if sent by ordinary second class post shall be deemed to be duly given provided it is posted 72 hours before expiry of the prescribed time.

4. The College of Bishops and the Bishop may authorise in special cases substituted or other service or notice, and, in case of any injustice being sustained by any party in respect of failure of receipt of notice, they may make such remedial provision in connexion therewith as they see fit.
CANONS FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Canons 8, 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23), 52.3, 57

Aberdeen and Orkney:

**Canon 8**
Not approved  (9 in favour, but it was rejected by the majority)

The following amendment was passed by majority (6 votes against the amendment, 1 abstention):

“That Diocesan Synod in respect of Canon 8, Section 1, amend the final sentence to read, “Initiation of any proposal relative to a specific diocese shall not be made while that See is vacant.””

**Canon 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23)**
Approved unanimously

**Canon 52.3**
Concern was expressed that the person responsible for coordinating theological training for accredited ministry in the Province would not serve *ex officio* on the General Synod. Whilst it was recognised that the post of “Principal of the Theological Institute” no longer exists the Diocese expressed its view by majority that the holder of the successor post “Provincial Ministry and Mission Officer” should serve *ex officio* on the General Synod because of the importance of theological training to the life and work of the Province.

**Canon 57**
Approved unanimously

Argyll and the Isles:

**Canon 8**
Approved

- House of Clergy  9 in favour 1 against
- House of Laity  Unanimous

**Canon 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23)**
Approved

- House of Clergy  6 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions
- House of Laity  18 in favour, 3 against, 4 abstentions
Committee on Canons
Opinions on Canons for Second Reading

Canon 52.3
Approved

House of Clergy Unanimous
House of Laity 4 in favour, 1 against

Canon 57
Approved

House of Clergy 9 in favour, 1 abstention
House of Laity 24 in favour, 1 abstention

The Synod commented as follows on the proposed changes to Canon 57:

1. The time limits proposed for ordinary post being deemed to having been sent are inadequate for the islands and indeed parts of the mainland. The Royal Mail ‘normally’ expects to deliver First Class mail the following day and aims to deliver Second Class Mail by the third working day after posting. In the islands, delivery times are regularly two days later than these targets.

2. The Synod felt that the proposed wording on the delivery of email (“shall be deemed to have been duly given within 24 hours of its having been sent”) is imprecise (at which stage within the 24 hour period is it deemed to have been delivered?) This led to a discussion of legal and good practice safeguards on the use of email for formal communication including, for example:
   a. The right to opt out of email communication even if a valid email address is held (this is incorporated into the provisions of the Companies Act 2006 for company email and, while it is recognised that the Companies Act does not apply to the church, it might be good practice to provide the same safeguards);
   b. The use of sending techniques that do not result in the sending of long lists of email addresses in the headers (these are regarded as a breach of personal privacy by some, are a frequent cause of email being marked as spam and are operationally inconvenient);
   c. That extreme care must be taken to prevent formal email from the SEC being marked as spam and that read receipts should be used as a matter of course.

Brechin:

Canon 8
Approved

House of Clergy 13 in favour, 0 against
House of Laity 17 in favour, 0 against
Committee on Canons
Opinions on Canons for Second Reading

Canon 35
Approved

House of Clergy 11 in favour, 2 against
House of Laity 16 in favour, 1 against

Two members of Diocesan Synod felt there was a significant degree of confusion from Historic Scotland and suggested that Resolution 3 should be fit for purpose.

One member expressed the opinion that there could be major problems, even bankruptcy, if Vestries were required to carry out a full or partial reinstatement if any works had been carried out without consent or contrary to any conditions issued at the time of consent.

Canon 52.3
Approved

House of Clergy 13 in favour, 0 against
House of Laity 17 in favour, 0 against

Canon 57
Approved

House of Clergy 13 in favour, 0 against
House of Laity 16 in favour, 1 against

One member of Diocesan Synod expressed concern that data in the Red Book was not always up to date.

Edinburgh:

Canon 8
No comment

Canon 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23)
No comment

In relation to the text of the draft Resolution 8 the Diocese approved a proposal that the words “prior to the expiry of the original 3 year consent” be added at the end of the Resolution.

Canon 52.3
No comment

Canon 57
No comment
Glasgow and Galloway:

Canon 8
Approved, nem con.

Canon 35 (and Canon 50.9 and 52.23)
Approved, nem con.

Canon 52.3
Approved, nem con.

One member commented that similar issues in principle arose in relation to the diocesan representatives on the Faith & Order Board, membership of which was contingent on their being members of General Synod.

Canon 57
Approved, nem con.

One member commented that intensive study of Canon 4 had highlighted the excessive detail often included in Canons on how something should be done, which would be better left in a resolution or protocol, which could be altered in the light of experience without having to invoke the cumbersome and lengthy process for changing a Canon.

Moray, Ross and Caithness:

Canon 8
Approved

Canon 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23)
Approved
Para 4 – There was a question about the use of a church building for fundraising concerts which for many congregations are an important part of life and it was agreed that this should be queried with a suggestion that this category be removed to the more trivial areas of the canon. It was agreed that this is more relevant to churches which are being used when they have no halls.

Canon 52.3
Approved

Canon 57
Approved
A concern was voiced about the non delivery of email information

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

Canon 8
Approved
Committee on Canons
Opinions on Canons for Second Reading

Concern was expressed by one individual for a diocese when there is a vacancy. A diocese is at its most vulnerable at this time and it might feel that it has little say in this matter. Would it not be better to wait until a new Bishop is in place as this could have an effect on the nominations for that particular See? It was questioned as to whether we needed to qualify this deletion. The Bishop provided the response that the position of a vacant diocese was safeguarded by the automatic nature of the procedure for election of a new Bishop under Canon 4.

**Canon 35 (and 50.9 and 52.23)**
Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House of Clergy</th>
<th>House of Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 in favour, 1 against</td>
<td>36 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re Resolutions 2 and 9 it was asked whether a Charge would have to remove everything after a period of experimental re-ordering before applying for full permission. This is not made clear.

**Canon 52.3**
Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House of Clergy</th>
<th>House of Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 in favour, 0 against</td>
<td>36 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canon 57**
Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House of Clergy</th>
<th>House of Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 in favour, 0 against</td>
<td>37 in favour, 0 against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One individual suggested that if distribution was to be by email a response receipt should be considered to prove that the recipient had received the communication.
STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

General Synod 2006 accepted the recommendations of the General Synod Review Group that the membership of Standing Committee be extended. The Digest of Resolutions was altered to provide that the House of Clergy could elect two of its members to Standing Committee and the House of Laity could elect one additional lay person to the Committee (the Convener of the Standing Committee is already required to be a lay person). These new members would supplement the other members of the committee who comprise the Convener, the Primus, a Bishop appointed by the College of Bishops and the Conveners of the Administration Board, the Mission and Ministry Board and the Information and Communication Board,

The alteration to the Digest of Resolutions stated that the additional members of General Synod would be elected for a period of four years (with a possibility of re-election for an additional term) but that if such a person’s period of office as a member of General Synod ceased before expiry of their four year term on the Standing Committee, their membership of the Standing Committee would cease at the same point as their membership of General Synod. The rationale underlying that provision was that if the additional members of the Standing Committee were seen as representing the General Synod, they could not effectively continue to do so if they themselves ceased to be members of General Synod.

The Standing Committee has welcomed its expansion by the addition of new members. However, experience has shown that, in fact, it takes a period of time for new members to become fully familiar with the affairs of the Standing Committee and, given that such members are unlikely to be elected to Standing Committee during their first year of office on General Synod, it may well be the case that the term of office on Standing Committee for such an individual may only prove to be one or two years. The Standing Committee regards this as unsatisfactory.

In order to improve the situation, the Standing Committee proposes that the additional members of Standing Committee should be entitled to serve for a full term of four years (and for a second term, if re-elected by General Synod) and that if they cease to be members of General Synod (by virtue of their ceasing to be Diocesan Representatives on Synod), then they should become General Synod members (by virtue of their membership of the Standing Committee) for the remainder of their term on Standing Committee. Such a member would not, however, be entitled to serve a second term on Standing Committee unless at the beginning of any such second term, the individual was also a General Synod member by virtue of being a Diocesan Representative on Synod.

Since the membership of General Synod is regulated by Canon, this will require a change to Canon 52.3 and a motion to that effect will be presented to General Synod. Following second reading in 2010, a consequential change would be necessary to paragraph 2.2.1 of the Digest of Resolutions. Since a change is being proposed to Canon 52.3, opportunity is also being taking to tidy up the Canon by deleting reference in that section of the Canon to the post of Principal of the Theological Institute since that post has not existed for several years. The Standing Committee has, however, asked that the Mission and Ministry Board give consideration to whether it would be appropriate for a change to be introduced in due course to the effect that the Pantonian Professor should ex officio be a member of the General Synod.

Professor Patricia Peattie
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2009
CANON FIFTY-TWO

OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The text to be added is in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

3. MEMBERSHIP

The General Synod shall consist of the Diocesan Bishops, the Conveners of the main Provincial Boards specified in Section 23 hereof not otherwise members of the General Synod, the members of the Standing Committee of the General Synod not otherwise members of the General Synod, the Principal of the Theological Institute, any person elected to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on the Anglican Consultative Council and the elected members as set forth in Sections 4 and 5 hereof. The General Synod shall normally meet as one body but at the request of a majority of any House, shall meet in separate Houses.

There shall be three Houses of the General Synod, namely: The House of Bishops, comprising the Diocesan Bishops; the House of Clergy, comprising the presbyters and deacons who are members of the General Synod; and the House of Laity, comprising the lay members of the General Synod.
MISSION AND MINISTRY BOARD

MOVING TOWARDS A 'WHOLE CHURCH' MISSION AND MINISTRY POLICY

INTRODUCTION
The Mission and Ministry Board has been taking steps to move towards a clearer statement of policy in the area of Mission and Ministry. The intention has been to create at least the outline of a 'whole church' Mission and Ministry policy for General Synod 2010. There have been a number of aspects to this:

- discussion at General Synod 2009
- a paper from the Doctrine Committee on Clergy/Lay roles in Ministry as proposed by the Review of Journey of the Baptised and New Century New Directions
- a Consultation on 'Younger Ordinands'
- a Provincial/Diocesan Consultation on Mission and Ministry policy and priorities

The term 'whole church' policy has been used but not clearly defined. It has seemed to be a helpful way of gathering together an understanding of policy issues and priorities as they are understood at provincial, diocesan and charge levels. It hardly needs to be stated that, within the diversity and complexity of church life, it is not possible to make a single statement of policy and expect to be able to pursue its implementation at every level of church life. Nonetheless, it should be possible to identify common issues and challenges and, through processes of consultation, to develop some degree of cohesion about how they may be addressed. This is particularly important because, while 'control' of one area of policy may be located in one area of church life, its impact and implications may be experienced most directly in another. In general, there is a need to bring together policy and finance within our life. Unless we can move in this direction, we risk having policy development which has no resources for implementation or resource allocation which is not supported by clear policy.

The term 'whole church' as defined above is primarily focussed into the life of the SEC. However, it is important to remember that 'whole church' will also lead us to consider how our life and ministry develop in the context of the world church, of the Anglican Communion and of developing patterns of inter-church working in Scotland. One example of this is the way in which our EMU partnership is becoming a significant influence on our policy development.

A WAY OF WORKING
The Provincial/Diocesan Consultation which the Board held was an important attempt to establish a new way of working together. An encounter between the Board and those who exercise leadership in our dioceses is an important way in which the Board can begin to ensure that, in developing its own priorities for the use of provincial resources, it is responding to the expressed needs of the dioceses.

The Consultation also enabled a number of broad issues to be discussed. Among these was the important issue of low morale among clergy and congregations. In that discussion, it was possible to begin to explore issues of decline and growth, the importance of a new 'sense of direction' in mission and ministry and questions of congregationalism and isolation. There is a piece of work to be done by the Board concerning the articulation of what our Church’s mission is, including the values which the
Church already embodies in its mission. This might include exploration of what our current strengths are and how these could be further developed and enhanced, recognising the different but complementary roles of congregations, dioceses and province.

It was evident that one dynamic which might bring new energy to our life was that of inter-diocesan working. This is already evident in a number of places – for example in the work of devolved TISEC. But it is clear that there are many more opportunities where dioceses can support and encourage one another.

KEY POLICY AREAS

There are three key policy areas which have emerged during the year:

DEVELOPING OUR MISSION

We are living in times of great potential for the life of our church. As we move forward, we need to consider how as a Province and as dioceses we can best encourage, resource and support our Church, engaging relationally as well as structurally.

- We should explore the part which focused initiatives – whether from Province or dioceses - such as Mission 21 may continue to have in our life.
- We need to develop a new model of congregational development which draws on our strengths in collaborative ministry.
- We need to develop a shared understanding of the way in which we address our society and its issues.
- We need to develop “centres of excellence” which can model and share good practice as a resource for the Church as a whole.

TRAINING FOR MINISTRY

There are two aspects to this:

- Our church is living in a very challenging environment. The capacity of clergy to offer the level of leadership which is required is a major issue. This leads to consideration of the need for major developments in CMD. Alongside clerical leadership, issues of lay leadership similarly need to be addressed.
- The Review Report suggested that TISEC should become the ‘generic’ trainer for all levels of ministry. Clearly the major focus of TISEC will continue to be on training, for authorised ministry. It may be that TISEC should become the ‘quality control’ agent for a range of training programmes for lay people which would be delivered in the dioceses.

SUSTAINING OUR MINISTRY

It is clear that this is a major issue which arises in a number of settings and will require a range of initiatives.

- We need to develop a new understanding of how our congregations in areas of small population are going to be sustained. It is likely that this will continue to require some element of continuing provincial/diocesan co-operation. For reasons of consistency and equality, it will also require the development of a number of models of ministry which may be applied consistently across the province. As part
of this, we need to explore alternative models of clergy deployment and support.

- A review of our patterns of augmentation and its administration is required.
- We need to consider the establishment of a Growth Fund.
- We need to address the question of inequalities in our life and use of resources.

OTHER ISSUES

A number of other issues and questions have arisen and will need to be addressed.

- Work with children and young people is becoming a common diocesan concern
- Vocation and Ordination issues are a continuing preoccupation. The 'Younger Candidates' Consultation was an important opportunity to explore the need to ensure that our clergy are a diverse group in age, background and experience – and to identify the measures which we need to take to encourage, train and support such a group.

+David
Convener, Mission and Ministry Board
April 2010
RURAL COMMISSION FINAL REPORT

Introduction
The Rural Commission came into existence as a consequence of a motion passed by the General Synod meeting in June 2008. The preamble to the motion set the context for the study while the associated instruction specified the remit of the commission.

The Motion Agreed by the 2008 General Synod
“Synod notes with concern a series of recent proposals such as those which will lead to the loss of many rural post offices and the developing pressures on rural industries such as the EU’s intention to conduct a major review of CAP which seems likely to reduce the average farming income by one third.
It is concerned that recent government reviews of rural communities in Scotland have been dominated by an excessive economic bias which is inappropriate given the breadth of the contribution, environmental and cultural which rural communities make to Scotland.
Synod believes that changes of this type are such that they will impact on the SEC and other churches and their ability to meet the needs of rural people and so that there is urgent need to assess the relationship between the church and those who live and work in such areas.
It believes that consequently there is a need to revisit the issues which were last considered by the SEC’s Rural Commission over a decade ago.

Synod instructs the Mission and Ministry Board to set up a new Rural Commission with the following remit:
- to identify the major changes likely to impact on rural communities in the coming decade
- to assess where there is scope for the SEC both alone and working through the Scottish Churches Rural Group to act so as to mitigate the adverse impact of change
- to suggest what might be the most appropriate forms of ministry to meet the needs of rural communities in the future.

The issues as they were seen at the time of the 2008 General Synod

- The Scottish Executive identify that 21% of the population of our country live in rural areas, which represent 98% of the land mass of Scotland. 6% of the population live in what are defined as remote rural areas which in turn accounts for 69% of the land mass. Rural communities are thus important to Scotland as a whole. They are even more important to us in
the SEC as around one third of our congregations are situated in such areas.

- Many of the current key issues for rural communities are also important in urban areas but in rural communities they affect more of the population. Rural communities have been hard hit by the impact of rising energy costs. In most rural areas the option of taking the bus or train rather than using the car does not exist. Fuel has always been more expensive in rural areas and it has risen in cost more than the national average.

- Food poverty is also an issue. The Food Standard Agency recently conducted a major study on the costs of eating a healthy diet in Scotland. Food supply in rural areas is dominated by small shops. Here the cost of a healthy food basket is £10 more than in our cities.

- In 2008 we find our selves in a world where Rural Post offices could become a distant memory. The formula being used to assess Post Office retention is weighted against the rural sector. Post Office closures have however been seen by some churches as an opportunity to take over the running of post offices and increase community involvement. The closure legislation makes it easier for community bodies to take on a post office role.

- Despite recent rises in grain and milk prices Scottish farming, for long the engine of the rural sector, struggles. For many the single farm payment from the CAP represents over two thirds of income. Milk, meat, and until 2007 cereals, were all sold below the costs of production. The CAP has been reformed several times since 1993 most recently with the introduction of the Single farm payment in 2005. The CAP is scheduled for major review with implementation planned for 2013. A probable consequence of that review will be a reduction of CAP funding by 50% and thus a fall in farm incomes of one third. In addition, and perhaps most of concern, the need for the UK to have a food production sector at all has recently been seriously questioned by Government.

- The rural sector is important to our heritage and to our total environment. It matters to our spirituality in the most basic sense.

- Since 1993 Broadband has become a fact of life. Within a decade it will be responsible for delivering a range of services to rural communities. It offers to us the ability for churches to deliver something to those who live in isolated situations and for whom church attendance, at least at some times of the year is not possible.

**The 1993 Rural commission**

The current Commission is not the first time that our church has examined its responsibility for its rural churches and their communities. At its meeting in 1993 the General Synod established a rural commission with the aims of
• examining recent economic environmental and social changes in rural areas,
• documenting SEC provision in such areas
• And identifying theological insights related to ministry in such areas.
The commission presented its final report in 1996.
The work of the 1993 Commission raised the profile of rural churches within our church, resulted in the setting up of a rural committee which in 2005 became the Scottish Churches rural committee and lead to new ways of working within our church such as ICM.

The membership of the 2008 Rural Commission
The members of the commission were
Rt Rev Mark Strange (Chair)
Rev David Atkinson (Secretary)
Martin Robb

How We Have worked
The initial phase
This involved the setting up of the commission, discussions with the Mission and Ministry Board, scoping the exercise and a web based consultation with members of our church as to the issues that the Commission needed to consider. Issues related to the work of the commission were also discussed with other churches through the medium of the Scottish Churches Rural Group. During this period we also took advantage of events arranged by other organisations such as the Gifford lectures in Aberdeen University give on the subject of natural theology by Professor Alister McGrath, the Scottish Governments First Rural Gathering held in Perth, the opportunity to talk to the leaders of all political parties and including the Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs Richard Lochhead and the heads of bodies such as the Food Standard Agency at the RHAS show in summer 2009, the launch of the Care farming Initiative and the Scottish Governments Food and Drink Leadership Forum. From this the actual agenda that the commission would consider was identified. It was agreed that these issues could best be explored through the medium of a series of conferences which would allow the commission to bring together experts in particular areas and those in our church and other churches who wished to discuss these issues.

The conference phase.
A series of three conferences were held. In identifying speakers for these events emphasis was placed on having many from organisations with whom we might wish to continue to work in the future i.e. SCVO or members of the Mission and Ministry Board’s or the Faith and Order Board’s subcommittees or their Diocesan equivalents. The programmes for these events is given as appendix 1. The first of these conferences aimed to obtain foresight information on the major issues which will determine the shape of rural communities in 15-20 years time. All of the speakers were from secular and government bodies. This event was held in
partnership with the ACTS Rural Committee. It was held in Edinburgh in December 2009 and attended by around 65 people representing many of the major Christian denominations active in Scotland. The proceedings are available via the ACTS website.


This event was aimed primarily at providing the material needed to meet the first of the instructions to the Commission i.e. documenting the changes which were likely to drive the viability of rural communities in the next decade or so. Carrying out this fact finding in partnership with those from other churches provided a shared basis of understanding so as to aid future co-operation. In the following text references to material from this event is given under the title of “Rural Futures” Given the foundation nature of this event its proceedings are summarised as Appendix 2.

The second aimed to examine how the church would need to change its ways of working if it was to accommodate the issues identified in the foresight exercise. This event was held in Inverness in February 2010 and attended by around 30 people. This event was aimed at providing the material needed to meet the third instruction to the commission and to identify specific areas for change. Material from this event is referenced as being from “Rural Church”. Proceedings from this event will be available in advance of General Synod.

The third aimed to look at the options available for our church in developing new partnerships with non church organisations so as to take ahead and action areas of opportunity identified by the previous events. As with the foresight exercise, most of the speakers at this event were from non-church led organisations. This was held in Inverurie in March 2010 and attended by around 40 people. This event was aimed at supplying the information needed to achieve the second instruction to the commission developing partnerships. Material from this event is referenced as being from “Rural Church Partnerships.” Proceedings from this event will be available in advance of the general Synod.

The programmes for all three of these events are listed in Appendix 1.

The summation phase

The information gained from the conferences and the suggestions made by those who attended those events have been used to produce a document which summarises what we have found and the actions which we suggest are now needed for our church to take forward these issues. In addition the proceedings of each of the conferences will be made available as a document summarising the presentations given and made available via appropriate web sites.
How Rural is Scotland and what makes Rural Distinct

Figure 1 The map of Mainland Rural Scotland based on a Scottish Government urban rural classification (From Scottish Government’s Rural Scotland Key Facts 2009)

Scottish Rural Geography
The above figure shows the mainland of Scotland and some of the western islands. Areas coloured purple are areas classified as accessible rural while the yellow represent what is classified by the Scottish Government as remote rural. This is clearly most (94%) of the land. The basis of the Governments classification is related to distance from major centres of habitation as this influences the ease or difficulty of providing services such as schools or hospitals and what is needed in respect of communication links. Rural Scotland is however home to almost 1million people or almost 20% of our population. On the basis of the proportion of our land area which is inhabited by a significant proportion of our total population we can conclude that most of our land mass and a significant proportion of our population are rural.

Rural Demography and Characteristics
Despite this and for the purpose of this exercise it remains important to ask whether either the geographic issues which relate to rural living or social and sociological issues mean that rural life is sufficiently removed from urban living so that our church needs to plan separately for such areas.
One of the key supports for the need to plan separately for rural is that the Scottish Government does precisely that and that it documents on an annual basis the various ways in which remote and accessible rural areas differ from the rest of Scotland both in terms of demography and the needs for and the provision of services. The 2009 edition of the Scottish Governments Rural
Scotland Key Facts identifies the following as significant differences between urban and rural in areas where the differences are likely to have impact on the working of our church.

- Rural is the part of Scotland where during the past decade the population has been increasing most rapidly; over 5% in remote rural and over 10% in accessible rural. Most of these increases are due to migration from elsewhere in the UK particularly by those in the 25-60 age groups. Compared with those who live in urban areas rural Scotland has more people in the over 40 year age group. It is losing many more in the 16-24 year age group than is the case for urban areas. Life expectancy is higher for rural areas. For the period to 2030 rural areas will show the greatest increases in population. Data on this is presented in Rural Futures (pp5-8)

- Almost 1 in 2 people in remote rural areas and over 1 in 3 people in accessible rural areas is engaged in some form of voluntary work compared to a smaller % in urban areas. Households in accessible rural areas are more likely to recycle than those in the rest of Scotland.

- A higher proportion of houses in rural Scotland are rated as poor in energy efficient terms compared to urban areas and a corresponding higher percentage of households are classed as being in Fuel Poverty. Households in rural Scotland are more likely to have home internet access than the rest of Scotland but for many this will not be via broadband.

- In remote rural areas only 38% of people are within 15 minutes drive time by public transport from a GP, 63% from a post office and 20% from shopping facilities. In Rural households higher proportions have access to a car and around a third of the rural population spend £100 or more a month on fuel compared with 23% in urban Scotland.

- The public sector is the largest employment sector (19%) in rural areas but to a lesser extent than in urban areas (26%). Other major employment sectors are Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing (14%, urban 0%) and Tourism via hotels (10%, urban 6%)

**What then is rural?**

In most sectors of activity rural differs from urban by degree rather than in absolute terms. The role of agriculture forestry and fishing is one of the few absolutes and so the buoyancy of rural areas will be affected in a significant way by any changes in the flow of income into these sectors such as by changes to the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). However a number of the areas where rural differs from urban in degree are among those likely to be significantly affected by Climate Change Legislation and by increases in the costs and availability of Energy. The current impact of remoteness can be illustrated by the following figure from the Food Standard Agency which shows the location of most food stores in Scotland with Super markets indicated in red. This closely parallels the Scottish Governments Urban Rural map. The distances involved and
the distribution of population have inhibited the major supermarkets from populating many of our rural areas. If the supermarkets find such areas unattractive then life and associated costs will differ from that of most of our population and other organisations such as our selves will experience many of the same issues in attempting to serve such communities and like the retail sector we will need to devise different approaches.

Figure 2 The distribution of different types of retail outlets in Scotland. (From the Food standard Agency)

The above facts are not the only difference between urban and rural. Important differences can be identified in the question, why are increasing proportions of our population; and of those migrating from else where in the UK, choosing to come to live in our rural areas? Landscape and land use are absolute distinctive elements and give rise to a distinctive spirituality and also much which represents the basis of Natural Theology a subject recently reviewed by Rev. Prof Alister McGrath in his 2009 Gifford Lectures (A Fine Tuned Universe, Westminster John Knox Press). Unequivocally rural areas are dominated by clear evidence of God’s Creation and by clear evidence of the presence and workings of natural forces. Clear evidence of human impact is limited. It matters that we plan to help those in rural areas with the difficulties which are a consequence of rural life but the impact of the key geographic features of the rural environment have potential to help us in mission planning for Scotland.

At a time of falling Church numbers (our total members in 2008 were 33.0% lower than those in 1991 and communicant numbers 23.0 % lower) but a
remaining high interest in spiritual issues this represents a positive basis for a future church mission focus. It is this positive opportunity which has been the principle driver of the work of the commission. Rural areas represent an important mission field for the church but also provide a distinctive means of feeding the spiritual needs of our whole population. As the Director General for Rural Futures in the Scottish Government said at the first of our events “Governments supervise regional economies that link rural suppliers with urban consumers so that the real need is for proper joined up strategies for whole regions so that both urban and rural people can benefit from what the other provides” (Richard Wakeford, Rural Futures, pp17-18) The challenge to our church must similarly be to get the best from this joined up approach.

The Rural World of 2025
The Rural Futures conference documented many of the changes we expect to occur in the coming decades. The principle issues identified and which seem likely to have an impact on how we need to prepare for the future were the following:

People in the rural community
- Over the next 10-20 years the population of Scotland is expected to continue to grow but with much of that growth occurring in Rural Scotland, especially accessible rural areas.
- The increase in the rural population will be both by migration and to some extent associated with a fall in the population of urban Scotland. While the population of Scotland as a whole is expected to grow by 0.5% that of accessible rural areas should grow by 2.0% and remote rural areas by 1.3%. Over the period to 2030 Perthshire and Aberdeenshire should grow in population by around 30%.
- There will also be significant changes in the make up of both urban and rural populations. In all areas the % of people in the 0-15 and 25-44 age groups will decrease. The % in the 45-59 and 60+ groups will increase especially in rural areas which will also see high levels of migration of those aged 16-24. In Aberdeenshire Argyll and Dumfries over 50% of household in 2030 will be headed by someone over 60. (Rural Futures, pp6-8)
- Volunteering in well established in rural areas with there being more volunteers and more voluntary organisations per capita than in urban areas. Most voluntary organisations are rooted in and responsive to their communities and play a key role in service delivery and advocacy. Net works whether analogue, such as village meeting places, or digital such as broadband are critical to the sustainability of rural life. (Rural Futures, pp 65-72)
- As a result many of the most promising targets for growing the church will be in some of our rural charges.
The role of the rural community and rural areas

- By 2030 there will be a need for a world wide increase of 35% in the quantity of agricultural products. This will need to be produced with a reduced out put of green house gases and using a very similar land area. There is an opportunity for rural Scotland to play its part in increasing its contribution to global food supply particularly as we expect to experience fewer of the downsides of climate change and in addition so that our projected population rise does not result in additional food being drawn to us from areas of greater need. (Rural Futures, pp10-12)

- The production of energy with a limited carbon footprint will become increasingly important. Sources of renewable energy are found primarily in rural communities especially in relation to wind and small scale hydro. There is also potential for an increase in forestry. (Rural Futures, pp16-17)

- Soil carbon reserves in Scotland represent almost 70% of the UK's total. In addition Scotland has around 1,000,000 ha of blanket bog which represents a further store of carbon. Managing these reserves is important and vital to Scotland’s response to Climate Change. (Rural Futures, pp38)

- The rural landscape is home too much of our biodiversity. For Christians there is a moral duty to safeguard a significant element of God’s creation. Biodiversity is both culturally and spiritually important. It is a major contributor to quality of life and vital to what are now termed ecosystem services. Currently protected sites cover 1.04 million ha, 13% of our land area. There are government targets for halting the loss of biodiversity which are unlikely to be met as a result of underinvestment and adverse development. As a result there has been a continuing decline in farmland birds since the 1970’s. (Rural Futures, pp38-41)

- In the past rural areas have been significantly affected by the political process and by economic forces but with relatively little influence on either. The future development of rural business’s will require legitimate investment in physical infra structure and IT networks and major efforts to connect rural and urban developments and to see the importance of regional development. (Rural Futures, pp17-19)

- There is a real role for the church to act as an advocate for the people of rural areas and for it to use its diocesan structure as a means of urging the wisdom of joined up urban –rural planning (Rural Futures, pp19)

The Challenges Facing Rural Communities

The changes identified above are both a mixture of factors which have been working over recent years e.g. the loss of young people from our rural communities and factors which are gathering increasing prominence e.g. the impact of Global Climate Change. While there are changes which seem likely to result in problems there are others which seem likely to be the source of good news. The good news issues are dealt with in a later section of the report.
of the challenging issues will have an impact on the whole of Scotland but some, because of its rural significance i.e. the implications of remoteness and hence the need to travel by car will have a particularly significant impact on rural communities. The key issues identified and which seem likely to lead on to indicating the need for how we provide church for rural communities were the following:

• There will be a series of major challenges to the way that rural industries work as a consequence of Climate Change. (Rural Futures, pp 11,28-33)
• Climate change will affect land use, especially in relation to the extent of aorestation and flood protection. There is a key role for the church to help put such actions into the context of the care of creation. (Rural Futures, 12-15, 36-38)
• An increasing scarcity of energy and the need to reduce carbon generation will affect both the ways in which we manage facilities and the potential for travel. If we are not to have to build around 50 new power stations then by 2050 we need to have reduced our energy use by a third. This can only be done by improvements in the energy efficiency of buildings and by significant reductions in all forms of travel. This will have a particularly harsh impact on rural communities (Rural Futures, pp 32-34)
• The farming industry which is currently under major financial pressure is likely to come under further pressure in 2013 as a result of the reform of CAP. It also faces major challenges related to Global climate change which seems likely to have a particularly heavy impact upon farming both in relation to the changed climate in which farming will be done and in making its share of changes so as to reduce carbon release. (Rural Futures, pp45-51) The church will need to provide support from those who are adversely affected by such changes. This support will be in relation to helping those facing and often adverse and radical change and helping an urban public to understand the place and contribution of new developments such as those related to biotechnology, changes in the visible landscape, the types of farming systems being practiced and the use of immigrant labour. (Rural Futures, pp 51-53)
• There are a significant number of environmental challenges related to the protection of biodiversity and carbon storage. How funding to rural areas from Government and EU should best be directed is a major issue; most current funding is directed to intensive agriculture. A different distribution of current funds could aid the delivery of environmental goods but potentially at the expense of food production which currently receives 68% of EU funding. Currently 9% goes to agri-environment schemes. There is poor correspondence between the distribution of red listed birds and the parts of Scotland which receive most EU funding. (Rural Futures, pp40-43)
The Challenges for Rural Church
The ways in which we seek to organise our rural churches will be influenced by our vision for the mission of the rural church. This includes issues related to church buildings but more challenging issues linked our role in communities and training for a changing mission task. It certainly will involve being seen to meet a series of environmental challenges, identifying our selves with local concerns and making a series of positive connexions with the community and ecumenically. Context and relationships are critically important. Diversity is a significant feature of rural. There is diversity in relation to the people, communities, culture, landscapes, economies, remoteness and religion. It is also important to identify some of the “elephants in the room”. The largest of these are “Will there be a church here in 2025?” and “How can the church refind its place at the centre?”

Being at the centre of the community.
- We need to help promote the positive case for a vibrant rural community. The products from rural industries, e.g. Food, are important to those who live in urban areas. Urban Scotland needs Rural Scotland and should be content to see it's infra structure funded. (Rural Futures, pp18)
- The church needs to develop its social role and to serve the whole community but in doing this it must be more than just a new civic centre. However the ability of the church to be used as a community facility will be important. This may include the use of the church as a post office or a shop or as a social meeting place. It matters to ask what our church building says about what we believe about our God.(Rural Church:Eunson)

Equipping for future ministries
- The training needed by those who aim to have a ministry, lay or ordained, should cover some of the key issues related to the distinctive attributes of rural areas identified earlier in this report and particularly to issues such as the problems encountered by those who in later life move from urban to rural situations and the associated problems for the community in receiving such migrants who may come to reside in dormitory areas.(Rural Church:Eunson)
- Our theological institute (TISEC) has the potential to provide specific training for those who will minister in rural areas and currently has a significant focus on the ecumenical issues which are an important element in working in rural areas. The future role of TISEC has to be seen in the context of what constrains its ability to function in a wider rural context. The major constraints are meeting the needs of a valid academic framework, the needs of the Anglican Communion and resources. The increased use of electronic technologies which is covered later in this report is likely to help to eliminate some of our current constraints. (Rural Church: Fuller)
- The rural context questions what we see as the role of the clergy today and how we see them as making a real difference. The isolation which is a
feature of rural life can lead to limited support and to burn out. There would seem to be a real need to re-find and to apply Moses (Exodus 18, 13-27) model of team working which will include a priesthood of all. An important element of this is the appreciation that volunteers are not staff and so it matters to clarify expectations and period of working. The role of the vestry in all this may need to be revisited. (Rural Church: Eunson)

**Appropriate Liturgies**

- Many of our small churches have their worship organised on the same basis as large churches or Cathedrals rather than taking advantage of the opportunities presented by serving a dedicated small community. This is particularly the case in respect of music. The rural situation will necessitate serving visitors as well as the indigenous population. (Rural Church: Paton)

- Where a number of churches are served by a single priest there may be advantage in having only occasional Eucharist’s with most worship being services of the word and lead by appropriately trained lay leaders. This approach builds on the intimacy which is possible in small congregations. The place of and role of extended communion in the rural context needs to be reconsidered. (Rural Church: Paton)

- The rural situation helps an emphasis on the seasons of the church, events in the national year such as the start of the school year, exam time, mothering Sunday, holiday time and distinctive rural events during the year such as ploughing, sowing, rogation, harvest etc for which modified liturgies exist but may not be easy to find. (Rural Church: Paton)

- Developments in IT could help the provision of worship for those who are unable to travel to church either because of adverse weather or in the future because of restrictions on travel resulting from the cost or the availability of fuel. (Rural Church: Paton)

**Resource use**

- Environmental issues will be increasingly important in the rural agenda. Churches need to consider what they can do using their properties. Actions could include small scale wind power generation, carbon capture through perennial vegetation and aiding wildlife through appropriate land management. (Rural Futures, pp44)

- An increasing scarcity of energy and the need to reduce carbon generation will affect both the ways in which we manage churches e.g. heating, timing of services and the potential for travel to church. Different types of church activity e.g. more house church like formats, will be important. We make need to make provision for local people from out with individual denominations. (Rural Futures, pp34-35)
• The church will need to continue to be active in the Food Security and related debates. (Rural Futures, pp9-10)
• Tourism has the potential to bring new people, particularly as visitors, into our churches. As a means of developing our evangelism this needs to be explored. The churches have the potential to act as local visitor centres. (Rural Futures, pp51-52)

Using New Technologies
The use of new technologies such as broadband was raised in a number of the presentations we heard at all three events and so it seemed appropriate to deal with some of the issues in a distinct section. Broadband is available over much of Scotland but not always as a high speed service and not always in our more remote areas (Rural Futures, pp67-69) At best it can be the “death of distance leading to the end of peripherality and the development of a less urban-centric nation. The key issues which emerged in our discussion were as follows
• At the moment not every one has access to broadband. It will be some time before this is remedied.
• Web sites represent a good means of priding information and linked to discussion vehicles such as “blogs” can be a means of real discussion. Analysis of visits to web sites can provide guidance as to what interests its community. (Rural Church: Piper)
• Web sites can be used as a means of facilitating prayer and bible study
• The social software which is available currently has potential to reduce isolation, to provide mutual support to aid the sharing of ideas and even the building of real relationships. It is important to remember that around half of those in the 15-25 year age group know there best friend only through social networking.
• Voice over internet can provide a medium for small groups and meetings, home communions and even Sunday services. (Rural Church :Ross)

The Opportunities for Rural Communities and their Churches
The foresight exercise we conducted identified a number of ways in which there would be good news for those who live in rural communities. Rural areas can offer the wider community a sustainable supply of quality food, clean water supply, renewable energy, ecosystem services such as the ability to sequester carbon, a whole range of cultural assets and a good environment for an ageing population. As a consequence of population growth and climate change all of these seem likely to be increasingly valued. (Rural Futures, pp5, 20-21) Achieving this will be helped by the remaking of urban rural connections an area where the church can play an important role. All of the above seem in addition to provide a basis for all to appreciate the importance of God’s creation and of a
spirituality which links to that. The principle areas of opportunity identified for both church and society and it seemed inappropriate to separate these were:

**Planning our future**
- The changed planning system both makes it easier for churches to become involved in and to take a leadership role. The planning concept of the valley section which links urban and rural in joined up planning is important. Taking advantage of planning opportunities needs churches to show that there is real value to be had by whole communities if planning permission is to be granted for new church buildings or a church development. Currently churches are regarded as being bad neighbours. Taking account of the opportunities requires us to accept an advocacy role in relation to the planning process.
- It is important the churches should understand how the planning system works as it will influence potential new church developments. To compensate for the downsides which are a result of any change it matters that churches understand the importance of community links. (Rural Futures, 22-26)

**Partnerships in relation to the environment**
- The environment and Green issues are a major area of debate in society. They are the source of many of the challenges to rural communities and rural church but they also offer the prospect of making links with others in society who share our concerns relating to respect for creation and our concerns about ecological issues on a global basis. There are real opportunities to develop our links with environmental faith groups such as “a Rocha” and “Earth Abbey” and to develop an approach to oikos which links economy, ecology and ecumenism (Rural Church Partnerships: Murray)
- There is currently potential for the church to move beyond a tick box approach to dealing with the environment and to focus on ecojustice, creation or ecotheology. (Rural Church Partnerships: Murray)
- The potential role of rural areas in relation to being a significant source of renewable energy in the future should give these areas the opportunity to have a significant voice in the energy debate. The church has an important part to play in this area. In the past the CofS Society Religion and Technology Project with its ecumenical basis exercised such a role. Changes to the SRT Project in recent years have precluded this role. There remain important points to be made. Free market economics alone will never be able to adequately address the environmental or human issues related to energy supply. There is need for major changes in our use of energy but for these to occur people will need real incentives which will need to be applied at points of use. (Rural Futures, pp27-35)
Tourism as an approach to mission

• In 2009 11.2 million visitors came to rural attractions in Scotland an increase of 2.8% on 2008. Over the period from 2000 to 2009 the numbers visiting rural places of worship increased by 11% compared with an increase of 9% for Scotland as a whole. This represents a real means of increasing the impact of the church but to be effective it needs to be considered as a real part of mission. Currently there are major issues related to places of worship being closed at times when visitors would like to make use of them. (Rural Futures, pp 53-57)

• There is a significant renewal of interest in pilgrimage as both a type of tourism and as an expression of spirituality. While historic built settlements commonly represent the start and completion of a journey much of a pilgrimage will be through rural areas and thus can require the provision of facilities by rural churches. A New exercise which involves the publication of maps of traditional pilgrimage and other rural routes and which is backed by Scottish Government should help both the regeneration of traditional routes which may have fallen into disuse and the establishment of new routes on the basis of a traditional long distance footpath. (Rural Church Partnerships: Cooke)

• In addition to long distance paths which may take a day or several days to cover there is also interest in journeying over a more limited area and distance so as to connect with God’s Creation. We heard of the paths created on the Falkland estate in Fife which allow the visitation of historic buildings, walks with stops to reflect on particular ideas and the experiencing of natural features such as water falls as part of an approach to experiencing spiritual values through nature. (Rural Church Partnerships: Stuart)

Working with Others

One of the key elements which have come from the rural commission process is the identification of the need for the church to work both with other churches and with secular and commercial bodies and the willingness of many such bodies to work with the church. Some of the areas which we were able to identify during our work are detailed below:

Working with other Churches

• There are currently a number of examples of good practice in relation to working, in rural areas, with other denominations. Good practice exists both in relation to specific projects and more general examples of working together. During the work of the commission we heard of several of these which we suggest could provide useful models for work else where. Specific example include:
• The “Two Loch’s” Project in Lochaber involved 10 churches from 3 denominations coming together to provide and to resource a Christian youth worker the high school which served that area. (Rural Church: Rivers)
• Banff Churches together was an example of several churches from five denominations joining together in an area of above average unemployment and below average incomes to develop a joint approach to community involvement and worship. To date this has involved a shared web site, joint approaches to the press, joint approaches to and involvement in community activities and a co-ordinated approach to community worship occasions such as Holy Week, Remembrance Sunday and Seafaring Sunday. (Rural Church: Woodside)

Community issues
• Although the rural environment provides a good environment which is conducive to health there are a number of real health issues which link to age, isolation and to remoteness. Many of these relate to mental health. While initiatives such as Care farming show that being and working in the rural setting can help with stress and mental health issues the isolation which is also a feature of rural can accentuated other forms of stress related illnesses. Our own point of view affects what we see hear and do in a major way. There is a particular need for church to be involved in both re-active and pro-active pastoral care. There is a place for church to both work in partnership with the health service but also to act to help change unreasonable circumstances as it is an inability to cope with these which results in stress and to a personal feeling that they are “different”. Christian theology which emphasises interdependence challenges views of the role of the individual. Rural Church Partnerships: L. Murray)
• The rural churches potential contribution to faith and community can help to meet two of the needs related to well being, the need to believe that my life has a purpose and the need to belong. This challenges us to identify whether our church building and our church community help to meet this need in our communities. Through doing this we can help to address issues related to inequality and suicides which is especially high in rural Scotland. (Rural Church Partnerships: L. Murray)
• There are also issues linked to poverty. This is a primary concern of RSABI, formerly the Royal Scottish Agricultural Benevolent Institution with whom the church has had links since its formation in 1897 as a way of helping agricultural workers prior to the introduction of state pensions. RSABI provide financial help to those from land based occupations but they also increasingly provide friendship and regular visits i.e. pastoral care for those in the 70-90 age groups. (Rural Church Partnerships: Rennie)
Education is critical to allow our heritage to help with preparation for the future. In rural areas many children need to leave their home area for education and perhaps to receive an education which does not sufficiently honour their rural or island heritage. This has been identified as a real problem for the Crofting counties. Crofting Connections is a programme which aims to develop the links between schools and our Crofting heritage. The components of the programme which relate to history, community, environment and language all provide areas where the church could develop its connections with Crofting. (Rural Futures, pp 58-64)

Ministry training in our churches needs to include training for work in rural communities which must include an understanding of activities such as Crofting and of how it would be most appropriate for the church to engage. (Rural Church: Fuller)

Involvement with business

Housing is both a social issue and a business. Housing associations are run as businesses but for social reasons and are a major player in the provision of housing for those needing a home. As part of the work of the commission we heard of the work of Albyn Housing Association who are one of around 200 such associations active in Scotland and most of whom are charities working under the same rules as apply to Building Societies. Albyn manages over 2,500 properties for rent and has a further 200 properties in shared ownership. Shared equity schemes are important for first time buyers in rural situations In rural Scotland homelessness is frequently hidden as rooflessness is a small proportion of the total but there are many in unsecure, overcrowded or bad accommodation predominantly as a result of the breakdown of relationships. The ability of housing associations to help the rural homeless is restricted by the availability of land for building small housing complexes. A potential role for churches is the release of land not required for this purpose. However there is also a need for the churches to help in lobbying for such approaches to meeting the needs of the homeless and to the running of Homelessness Sundays. (Rural church Partnerships: Nairn)

The rural Post Office has traditionally been a place of meeting for rural communities and the basis for providing a range of other services for both the local community and for visitors. In recent years as a financial economy Government has closed many rural Post Offices on the basis of a % of the population formula which tends to work against the rural situation. As a result of such closures it has become an option for Churches to provide a home for Post offices as a service to the community. Examples of churches where this has occurred provide helpful guidance to where this is appropriate and to how it might be done by others. (Rural Church partnerships; Davidson)
• Food is one of the essentials of life. It is something which provides a clear connection between creation and our faith. However food is more expensive in rural areas and not uncommonly of indifferent quality. As with Post Offices this is a need which Churches can help to meet by working with organisations such as the Co-operative Group who have extensive experience of community retailing. Current schemes both allow access to discounted food purchases for community groups such as churches and help in setting up community retailing enterprises. (Rural Church Partnerships: Justad)

Continuing relationships with others

• Those who attended the various conferences organised as part of the commission have been enthusiastic about the opportunity to meet and to discuss issues related to the rural situation. There is a clear role for the church in continuing to provide such opportunities.

Conclusions and Resolutions for General Synod

In its work the Rural Commission has identified a range of both challenges and opportunities for our rural churches. It would be fair to say that we began our work impressed by the problems which seemed likely to beset our rural communities but during the course of our work we have been able to identify so many opportunities both for the church to meet real and significant needs and for real growth in both numbers and impact and so we complete this task with a sense of genuine excitement as to the opportunities for mission that rural Scotland provides.

Resolution 1: That this Synod accept the report of the Rural Commission and commend it to its boards and committees and to Diocesan Mission Committees for further study.

Resolution 2: That this Synod ask the Liturgy Committee to investigate the feasibility of pulling together into one place liturgies, especially those related to the word, focused on natural and rural seasons as a means of providing a resource for rural congregations.

Resolution 3: That this Synod, mindful of the significant changes with a major impact on rural societies which are likely to occur in the foreseeable future, request its representatives on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to keep it informed of those developments likely to need action by the Scottish Episcopal Church.
Resolution 4: That this Synod, conscious of the need to continue working with other denominations, request the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to consider the value of running an annual conference dealing with emerging rural issues.

Resolution 5: That this Synod, conscious of the developing interest in rural pilgrimage, request its members on the Scottish Churches Rural Committee to encourage that Committee to make the development of rural pilgrimage one of its priorities for action.

Resolution 6: That this Synod commend to rural charges the importance of identifying and documenting organisations active in their respective areas with whom they should be meeting on a regular basis.

Resolution 7: That this Synod request the Ministry Development Committee to consider the ways in which training for those intending to work in rural areas might be most effectively provided.

Resolution 8: That this Synod, recognising the importance of Broadband as a vital means of communication in rural areas, request the Mission and Ministry Board to urge upon Scottish Government the importance of having high speed Broadband links available to all areas of Scotland in the near future.

Resolution 9: That this Synod, recognising the role which electronic communication could have in the mission of the Scottish Episcopal Church, request the Information and Communication Board to identify ways in which congregations might best be helped to use technologies such as Broadband in their mission works.

Appendix 1
The programmes of the three conferences held as part of the Rural Commissions work.

Rural Futures, 9th December 2009, 121 George St, Edinburgh

Opening comments  Rt Rev Mark Strange, Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness

OUR RURAL WORLD NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.
Strategies for the Future Rural World. Richard Wakeford, Director General Rural Futures, Scottish Government
Planning for Rural Scotland 2010-2025
Veronica Burbridge, Royal Town Planning Institute in Scotland

BIG PICTURE ISSUES
Energy in 2025: what the world and Scotland may look like, in terms of energy use and supply
Donald Bruce, Edinethics

The Impact of Environmental Concerns on the Rural Landscape. Stewart Housden, Director, RSPB Scotland

RURAL ACTIVITIES AND EMPLOYMENT
Rural Futures – Looking towards 2025. What will farming look like?
Ken Rundell SAC Edinburgh

The Future Face of Rural Tourism.
Riddell Graham, Visit Scotland

FUTURE RURAL COMMUNITIES
Education as a Means of Integrating our Heritage into Planning for the Future.
Pam Rodway, Soil Association, Edinburgh

Networks and Connections in Rural Scotland.
Norman MacAskill, SCVO, Inverness

Being Rural Church in 2025, 20th February, Inverness.

Introduction to the day and key points from the “Rural Futures” Event

Liturgy.
Ian Paton, Old St Paul’s, Edinburgh.

Church Structures.
Lisa Eunson, St Ternan’s, Banchory, Aberdeenshire

Information Technology.
Cliff Piper, St John’s Forres, Moray and Jane Ross, St Clements, Aberdeen

Training for Rural Ministry.
Michael Fuller. TISEC, Edinburgh

Ecumenical Issues.
John Woodside, Roman Catholic Church, Banff, Aberdeenshire and Jeremy Rivers, Lochaber, Argyll.


Introduction and review of the relevant key issues from “Rural Futures”

Green Theology. Richard Murray, St Anne’s, Kemnay

Poverty and Health. Lorna Murray, Inverurie, (Faith group’s representative with Choose Life) and Henk Rennie (RSABI).

Housing. Robin Nairn, Albyn Housing, Inverness.

Business. Nancy Davidson, Church of Scotland, Tannadice (Post Offices) and Tor Justad The Co-operative Group, Inverness

Pilgrimage Nick Cooke, Clear Services and Ninian Stuart, Falkland Estate, Fife.

Appendix 2
The principal points made by the papers presented at the Rural Futures Conference held in December 2009 were as follows:

Richard Wakeford: pp 3-21

- We have a tendency to focus on the negatives of rural living. – Everything is seen as a problem but there are many advantages and opportunities offered to those living rurally and we should try to adopt a more positive approach to rural life.

- While the world drives towards economic growth the feeling is often that people should move out of rural areas, but how would urban life survive without the essential rural input? Where would urban life be without its rurally grown vegetables, meat, water, energy? We should aim to get the rural area valued more in today’s world.

- In the period since 2000 the general population of the country has increased with the biggest change seen in accessible rural areas. Looking at change by age shows people coming into these rural areas falling into the ‘over 45’ age group with younger (16 – 24) people leaving. This is most apparent in the Western Isles.

Food Challenge:
- The 2% increase expected in global temperature will effect food growth and production through floods and drought and other constraints are in measures to be more bio diverse which means restriction in yield and
more animal disease. This delivers a huge challenge in producing enough food for all. As food prices continue to come down more and more work is needed to produce what we consume.

Climate Change

- Land use is likely to be restricted with climate change. While Scotland’s climate is expected to improve in the next 20 years, what will follow from that is not good news. There will be heavier rain and more flooding. We can build on Fair Trade and we can plant and grow. We also need more people championing the rural scene. Economics tends to be based on cities while politics tends to be rural or urban creating the foundations of misunderstanding as no one has the full picture.

Veronica Burbridge: pp 22-26

- Planning has a leadership role in the rural landscape through local government, development companies and government bodies. The new system on planning has made it easier for people to be involved in the processes along the way.
- The Scottish Planning Policy is to enable development in all rural areas which supports prosperous and sustainable communities, while protecting and enhancing rural quality of life.
- Many other planning issues are addressed in housing, energy efficiency, community services, regeneration, transport, protection of natural heritage and the historic and cultural environment.

Stuart Housden: pp 36-44

- Scotland is 90% rural and/or agricultural land. The support mechanisms in force for rural life have remained since the 2nd world war despite massive changes to the rural scene.
- The biggest challenge facing the rural scene is in climate change and tremendous effort will be needed if we are to achieve the less than 2% change in emissions target by 2010. Scotland’s agriculture is a huge emitter of green house gases,
- One of the biggest challenges is water and flooding. We need to take on new ways to deal with drainage and flood prevention – we need a different approach to the way in which we deal with land.
- We have a moral duty to protect birds and wildlife, biodiversity in important. Many of the subsides of land management support and related services go to the east of the country while most of the birdlife is situated elsewhere.
- Across Europe the money spent on rural development is interesting. Finland tops the list which Scotland comes last. Northern Ireland gets twice as much as Scotland. Yet Scotland has a rich biodiversity, with large areas of high nature value farmland. Funding will be further at risk after
2013 as the European finance is keen to cut the agricultural spend. Without funds land managers can't deliver environment management.

Donald Bruce: pp 27-35
- The ways in which energy is generated need to be rethought with an increased emphasis on the use of renewables which will have an environmental and visual impact. The Nuclear question can not be avoided.
- How we use energy is also important. Reducing the energy needs of buildings is important. This will be affected by the frequency of their use, their design and decisions on temperature standards.
- Transport is a key energy user. The ability to travel is likely to decline over the foreseeable future.
- Co2 emissions from the use of energy will also be important and will change rural industry profiles.

Ken Rundle: pp 45-53
- A continual, relentless change in climate will take place over a period of time, season by season. It will become hotter and drier in the east and wetter in the west but Scotland will fare better than many being part of the ‘northern arc’ which spreads over Scandinavia but even this will bring challenging conditions.
- Much of Scotland’s land is ideal for growing timber and a call by the government for more planting has been made.
- The world’s grain stock are mainly in balance at the moment but is won’t take much to change the balance either way. Volatile price increases and uncertainty is on the horizon.
- The control of flood water, temporarily using floodplains as just that – letting them flood to protect communities may become common but there may be a question about just how much land will be available for this.
- The changes will force lifestyle changes for everyone. Scotland’s rural communities are 98% white. Can the rural communities adjust to migrant labourers settling in their villages and communities?

Riddell Graham: pp 53-57
- Tourism brings £4.2 billion to Scotland’s economy. It provides 200,000 jobs, 20,000 diverse businesses bringing opportunities for all and it has the advantage of being unable to be moved to a Mumbai Call Centre.
- The main attractions to Scotland are its scenery, its castles, churches and historic sites. The number of rural places of worship visited has gone up on the previous year.
The impression given to the tourist is everyone’s responsibility. Another disadvantage is the need to tell and sell, something we are not too good at.
- Lack of public transport in rural areas
- Rising fuel costs (especially in rural areas)
- Church buildings could be used for lots of community services. Scottish communities may need help to adapt.

**Pam Rodway: pp 58-64**
- The 2007 Highland Homecoming saw a project in Crofting Topics included in the project were:
  - History of Crofting
  - Food history – collection of local recipes
  - Housing – looking at future housing
  - Encouraging local awareness and a sense of pride
  - Growing traditional crops and vegetables on crofts
  - Fruit growing and gathering: Crofts rich in rhubarb and gooseberries
  - Looking at sea crofts
  - Language of the community, differences in local dialects
  - Songs, Stories, arts, crafts, poetry and photography all locally sourced.

**Norman MacAskill: pp 65-72**
- Network connections are vital in rural Scotland. The Village Halls website supports those with problems in maintenance of their village halls.
- High Speed broadband connect is an essential tool for modern life used greatly by those living in rural Scotland, however, broadband coverage is essentially provided to urban Scotland on the central belt and the east. Many areas in the north and west have little or no coverage and it’s ironic that those rural places that need the service most can’t access it while those living in areas where access is not considered a lifeline have the best service. Barriers to access are not only in availability but also in training and support.
SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH PENSION FUND

Report of the Standing Committee

Following the triennial actuarial valuation of the Pension Fund as at December 2008, which estimated a deficit of £8.8 million, General Synod 2009 approved a recovery plan based on a 15 year recovery period which required:

- a £2m lump sum contribution from Provincial funds;
- an employer contribution of 34.9% of stipend/salary.

Subsequently, the plan has received the approval of the Pensions Regulator and the lump sum has been paid into the Fund.

The Standing Committee recognised that the revised pension fund contribution would be a significant challenge, and undertook to review the pension benefits structure and funding arrangements, especially in terms of risk and affordability.

The current scheme is a non-contributory final salary, defined benefits scheme in which the Church (as employer) bears all the risk. A defined contribution scheme is at the other end of the risk spectrum – in which the employer defines the contribution rate (and thereby controls the costs), and all risks (both pre and post retirement) are borne by the members of the scheme. In a defined contribution scheme the level of pension is not guaranteed and will depend on a number of factors including investment performance of the fund. There is a range of possibilities between these two extremes which allow for different combinations of shared risk. Currently all contributions to the Fund are paid by the Church. All forms of possible pension scheme, including the present defined benefit scheme, would allow for the possibility of compulsory contributions from members.

During 2009/10 the Standing Committee considered the impact on cost of some possible changes to the design of the scheme (such as retirement age and rate of pension accrued for each year’s service). The impact of a range of external factors on pensions costs and benefits and over which the Church has minimal influence (such as investment returns and life expectancy) were also considered. Members of the Standing Committee met with the Pension Fund Trustees and the Scheme Actuary/Advisers to discuss a number of options and scenarios during which the importance of reducing the scheme’s exposure to the volatility of investment markets was acknowledged. The Pension Fund Trustees have agreed a revised investment strategy, which is designed to reduce the Fund’s exposure to volatility, and are working towards its implementation.

In considering possible changes to the scheme, radical changes which would shift the risk wholly or in part to the members were perceived as altering the relationship between the Church and its clergy/employees and, therefore, not a desirable route to follow. Some changes to the current scheme’s specific benefits could be pursued which would reduce costs without shifting any risk from the Church. It is also the case that the present...
arrangement, whereby the full contribution is paid by the employer, is increasingly unusual.

It should be noted that, were any changes to be proposed the pension earned to date from past service in the current scheme would not be affected. Due process of consultation with members regarding any proposed changes would be undertaken.

It was the significant downturn in the financial markets that caused the deficit in 2008. An interim valuation as at 31st December 2009, showed a much improved position in the amount of the deficit faced by the Pension Fund. There is no certainty that the markets have stabilised, or will continue to improve, or that another severe drop in values might not occur. However, the improvement is such that the current recovery plan is sufficiently robust to meet the deficit as at 31st December 2008 and includes provision for possible increase in life expectancy.

The Standing Committee is of the view that no immediate action is required but that, in preparation for the next triennial valuation in December 2011 (at which time the recovery plan will be revisited), it should give consideration to:

(a) the implications of setting a maximum contribution rate which is affordable in the long term to the Church;
(b) what changes to the scheme need to be consulted upon in order to achieve this;
(c) any consequential changes that might then arise/be desirable.

Professor Patricia Peattie
Convener, Standing Committee
May 2010
CANON 35

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The principal changes are as follows:-

1. The term “Advisory” has been dropped throughout. Consequential amendments are required to Canons 50.9 & 52.23 and paragraphs 2.3.3 (d) and 2.3.7 of the Digest of Resolutions.

2. Section 1 and Resolution 6 – Enables the Provincial Buildings Committee to publish from time to time a list of minor works for which consent is not required. Resolution 6 states that this would be prepared in consultation with the Convenors of the Diocesan Buildings Committees.

3. Resolution 2 - Requires the Vestry to notify the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee when the period of experimental reordering comes to an end.

4. Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 5 & 10 - Allows for another person designated by the diocese to take the stated role of the Diocesan Secretary.

5. Resolutions 3 and 4 – Separates the procedures for listed and non-listed buildings.

6. Resolution 3 – Abolishes the requirement for consultation with Local Planning Authorities with respect to interior works.

7. Resolution 3 – Requires Vestries of listed buildings to comply, where appropriate, with the Voluntary Scheme to Apply Listed Building Control to the Exterior of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use.

8. Resolution 5 – Requires Vestries to submit full extracts from the Minutes of the Meetings of the Vestry at which the application was discussed and to state when the proposals were advertised to the congregation.

9. Resolution 5 – Gives explicit permission for the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee to discuss the application.

10. Resolution 5 – Increases the period in which an application is considered from 4 weeks to 6 weeks.

11. Resolution 5 – Requires the Diocesan Secretary (or designated person) to communicate to the Vestry the decision of the Bishop and Diocesan Buildings Committee together with the procedures for appeal in an approved manner. The Vestry in turn is required to communicate these to the congregation.
12. Resolution 8 – Allows the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee to extend the
duration of consent for a period not exceeding three years following a request by the
Vestry. That request must be made prior to the expiry of the original three year consent.

13. Resolution 9 – Enables the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee to require the
Vestry to carry out a full or partial reinstatement if any works have been carried out
without consent or contrary to any conditions issued at the time of consent.

14. Resolution 10 – Enables the Bishop and/or the Diocesan Buildings Committee to inspect
the works at any reasonable time and requires the Vestry to notify the Bishop and the
Diocesan Buildings Committee when the works have been completed.

The Right Rev Gregor Duncan
Convener, Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee
The Rev Canon James Milne
Member, Committee on Canons
The text to be added is in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through.

The text for the proposed resolutions under the Canon was notified to General Synod 2009, with the explanation that the resolutions would be put to Synod 2010 for adoption only once the changes to Canon 35 had received their second reading. Some small alterations are suggested to the text of the resolutions and, in the resolutions shown below, text added since the 2009 draft is emboldened in italics and text deleted since the 2009 draft is emboldened in italics and scored through.

1. With the exception of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee, no change (whether by introduction, alteration or removal) shall be made in the structure, ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments, monuments, mural tablets or painted windows of any Church used for public worship, nor shall any scheme of redecoration or any alteration of lighting or heating system be undertaken unless the Vestry of the same with the consent of the Rector shall have obtained the approval in writing of the Bishop and of the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee; provided always that such approval does not violate any restrictions contained in the Constitution or titles of the Church. Subject to the Constitution or titles of the Church, a Vestry or twenty per cent of the members of the Communicants’ Roll, as defined in Canon 41, Section 2, of the charge concerned shall have a right of appeal against the decision of the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee or of the Bishop to the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee. Notwithstanding the above, the Vestry with the consent of the Rector, may undertake re-ordering of the ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of the Church for an experimental period.

2. None of the holy vessels or ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of any church shall be sold, exchanged, or otherwise disposed of without the written consent of the Bishop, Dean, and Registrar of the Diocese.

3. The Vestry with the Rector shall cause all proper and reasonable care to be taken of the places of worship within its charge, and of the furniture and ornaments thereof, and shall use every endeavour to keep them decent, clean, and in good repair. The Vestry shall make provision for the adequate protection and insurance of all Church fabric and property.

4. No church that is consecrated or set apart for public worship shall be used for any purpose not religious or ecclesiastical without the consent of the Bishop.
RESOLUTIONS UNDER CANON THIRTY-FIVE

Resolution 1. The Vestry, unless the duty is placed under the constitution of the charge on Churchwardens or others, shall be responsible for seeing that a detailed inventory of all church goods and ornaments, registers and other property belonging to the charge in accordance with the print in use with the authority of the Bishops, which has been issued by the General Synod, subject to any adjustments thereof which may be approved from time to time by the Standing Committee of the General Synod, shall be prepared and kept up to date, and a copy of such inventory, amended from time to time as necessary, shall be sent by the Vestry to the Registrar of the diocese.

Resolution 2. Experimental reordering of the ecclesiastical ornaments and furniture of a church may be carried out for a period of not less than three months nor longer than nine months, provided that all work is fully reversible and no structural alteration is involved. Notification of intention to undertake such reordering must be given in writing to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese, at least two weeks before any work is undertaken. When the period of experimental reordering comes to an end the Vestry shall notify the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese.

Resolution 3. In the case of a building included in the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest the Vestry shall, before making a formal application to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee for any change under this Canon, advertise the proposals to the congregation, and in the case of a building included in the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest, to Historic Scotland, the local planning authority, the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland, the Scottish Civic Trust, and any local civic or amenity society affiliated to the Scottish Civic Trust, and in the case of exterior works the local planning authority, allowing members of the congregation and these bodies four weeks in which to make written representations on the proposals. Any representations received shall be considered by the Vestry before a formal application for consent is made.

At the same time as the proposals are advertised they shall be notified to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese.

The Vestry shall also comply, where appropriate, with the Voluntary Scheme to Apply Listed Building Control to the Exterior of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use.

Resolution 4. In the case of a building not included in the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest the Vestry shall, before making a formal
application to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee for any change under this Canon, advertise the proposals to the congregation, allowing members of the congregation four weeks in which to make written representations on the proposals. Any representations received shall be considered by the Vestry before a formal application for consent is made. At the same time as the proposals are advertised they shall be notified to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese.

Resolution 4.5. After advertisement and notification as laid down in Resolutions 3 or 4 the Vestry may, within six months of the end of the period allowed for written representations, make a formal application for consent to carry out the alterations, either as originally proposed or as amended in response to representations received, to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese, and shall send to the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese, copies of all written representations received following the advertisement of the proposals together with full extracts from the Minutes of the Meetings of the Vestry at which the application was discussed and a note of the date on which the proposals were advertised to the congregation. The Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee may discuss the application but shall separately decide whether to grant consent, with or without conditions or refuse consent within four six weeks of the formal application being received by the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese. In the event of one body deciding to grant and the other deciding to refuse consent the application shall be deemed to have been refused.

The decision of the Bishop and Diocesan Buildings Committee shall be communicated to the Vestry by the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese, together with the procedures for appeal in terms of Appendix 30. The Vestry in turn shall communicate these to the congregation.

Resolution 6. The Provincial Buildings Committee may publish, from time to time, in consultation with the Convenors of the Diocesan Buildings Committees Deans of each Diocese, a list of minor works for which consent from the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee is not required.

Resolution 5.7. Within four weeks of a decision having been made by the Bishop and Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee, an appeal, lodged in writing with the Secretary General of the General Synod, may be made to the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee either by the Vestry against one or more conditions attached to a consent or against a refusal of consent, or by not less than twenty per cent of communicant members of the congregation against a granting of consent. Such an appeal shall be decided within twelve weeks by the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee whose decision shall be final.

Resolution 6.8. If work for which consent has been granted has not been begun within three years the consent shall lapse. The Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee may, however, extend the duration of consent for a period not exceeding three years following a request by the Vestry prior to the expiry of the original three year consent.
Resolution 9. The Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee may require the Vestry to carry out a full or partial reinstatement if any works have been carried out without consent or contrary to any conditions issued at the time of consent.

Resolution 10. The Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee may inspect the works, together or independently, at any reasonable time. When the works have been completed the Vestry shall notify the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee through the Diocesan Secretary, or such other person as may be designated by the diocese.

Resolution 11. In the case of a building included in the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest the Vestry shall comply, where appropriate, with the Voluntary Scheme to Apply Listed Building Control to the Exterior of Churches in Ecclesiastical Use.
APPENDIX No.30

FORM FOR COMMUNICATING THE DECISION OF THE BISHOP AND DIOCESAN BUILDINGS COMMITTEE FOLLOWING AN APPLICATION UNDER CANON 35, RESOLUTION 5

Either - (in the case of Approval)

Your Application for Approval for – (Insert nature of alterations) at – (Insert name of Church) has been approved. (If condition(s) have been attached include the following) The following condition(s) has/have been attached – (Insert condition(s))

Within four weeks, an appeal, lodged in writing with the Secretary General of the General Synod, may be made to the Provincial Buildings Committee either by the Vestry against one or more conditions attached to this consent, or by not less than twenty per cent of communicant members of the congregation against the granting of consent. Further information about this is available from me. Such an appeal shall be decided within twelve weeks by the Provincial Buildings Committee whose decision shall be final.

Please bring this decision to the attention of members of your congregation, either by intimation at Sunday worship, or by placing this letter on your notice board.

Please note that you are required to notify me when the works have been completed. The Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee may inspect the works, together or independently, at any reasonable time.

Or - (in the case of Refusal)

Your Application for Approval for – (Insert nature of alterations) at – (Insert name of Church) has been refused.

Within four weeks, an appeal, lodged in writing with the Secretary General of the General Synod, may be made to the Provincial Buildings Committee by the Vestry against this refusal of consent. Further information about this is available from me. Such an appeal shall be decided within twelve weeks by the Provincial Buildings Committee whose decision shall be final.

Please bring this decision to the attention of members of your congregation, either by intimation at Sunday worship, or by placing this letter on your notice board.
CANON FIFTY

OF DIOCESAN SYNODS

The text to be deleted is scored through

9. The Diocesan Synod shall appoint a Diocesan Buildings Advisory Committee which shall include the Dean ex officio and persons with expert knowledge of architecture, ecclesiastical artefacts and liturgy to consider and determine proposals relating to all changes to the fabric of Church Buildings as provided for under Canon 35, Section 1.

CANON FIFTY-TWO

OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The text to be deleted is scored through

23 BOARDS AND COMMITTEES
Without prejudice to its right of appointment of Special Committees, the General Synod shall appoint with such duties as it sees fit, a Standing Committee, a Faith and Order Board, a Mission and Ministry Board, an Administration Board, an Information and Communication Board and the Provincial Buildings Advisory Committee as provided for under Canon 35, Section 1 and which shall include persons with expert knowledge of architecture, ecclesiastical artefacts and liturgy.
The following is a list of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee as referred to in Canon 35, Section 1.

A. Furniture and Fixtures

1. Decorative banners used for displays not lasting more than three months.

2. Fire Extinguishers (subject to the recommendation of the local Fire Officer as to location).

3. Introduction of movable bookcases or display stands.

B. Items of Work/Maintenance

1. Works of routine maintenance on the fabric of the church not involving demolition or additions of any sort, except where in the opinion of the Diocesan Buildings Committee they will result in a material alteration either externally or internally to the appearance of the church or affect its setting. This permitted work includes, for example, the replacement like-for-like of broken roof tiles or slates, clear, stained, painted or coloured window glass, cleaning gutters and down pipes.

2. Works of maintenance, repair and minor alterations to existing heating systems and electrical equipment and fittings (but not including alterations to light fittings).

3. Installation of a new heating system for the church building which does not involve any alterations to the exterior or interior of the building (the introduction of new radiators are regarded as alterations to the interior for this purpose).

4. Installation of a loop system for the heard of hearing (but if the system requires placement of loudspeakers approval must be sought).

5. External or internal decoration or redecoration (but only in the same colour scheme as the existing decoration) and replacement of carpets and curtains in the same colour as existing.

March 2010
ALTERATIONS TO THE CODE OF CANONS

VOTING PROCEDURES – AN EXPLANATORY NOTE

The alteration of a canon contained in the Code of Canons requires two “readings” in successive years at the General Synod. The voting procedure on each reading is different. An alteration, for these purposes, includes any modification or abrogation of any canon, any addition to a canon and the enacting of any new canon. The process is set out in Canon 52, Section 17.

Canons for First Reading

A first reading requires a simple majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. Voting is, therefore, in houses.

Canons for Second Reading

A second reading requires a two-thirds majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. (Again, therefore, voting is in houses.) Before confirming any alterations at a second reading, the Synod must consider any opinions received from Diocesan Synods.

On a second reading, amendments may be incorporated provided they are not, in the judgement of the chair, irrelevant to, beyond the scope of or inconsistent with the general subject-matter and purport of the canon as put to Diocesan Synods after the first reading. Such amendments must themselves receive a two-thirds majority.

Also, no amendment may be moved on a second reading which, in the judgement of the chair, does not substantially reflect an opinion communicated by a Diocesan Synod or is not merely a verbal or drafting amendment unless due notice has been given or the Chair grants leave to dispense with notice. Due notice, for this purpose, means that notice must have been received by the time limit stipulated for the receipt of resolutions when the notice convening the Synod is despatched (Canon 52, Resolution 10).

John F Stuart
Secretary General
1. Subject to Section 3 of this Canon but without prejudice to a cleric’s right to retire at an earlier age and draw a pension. Notwithstanding that, in this Church, the retirement age of clergy for pension purposes is sixty-five years, no person shall continue to hold stipendiary office in this Church who has attained the age of seventy years and no cleric who has attained the age of seventy years shall be appointed to any such office or be granted such licence. “Office” in this Canon shall mean the offices of diocesan bishop, provost of a cathedral church, rector, priest-in-charge, assistant curate and any holder of a licence under Canon 14, section 5. No person shall be appointed to a stipendiary office as Bishop, Provost of a Cathedral Church, Rector, Priest or Deacon licensed under Canon 14, Section 5, member of a Team Ministry, or Assistant Curate, who, at the time that appointment is made, shall have attained the age of seventy years.

2. Anyone who shall have been appointed to any stipendiary office in this Church or hold such licence referred to in subsection 1 after the date at which this Canon comes into force shall vacate that office on the date on which that person attains the age of seventy years. The Bishop shall give notice of impending retirement to the Bishop and where appropriate, to the Vestry, or in the case of a Bishop as provided in Canon 7, Section 1, not less than six months before that date. Any office-holder receiving such notice may apply to the Bishop in writing for an extension of office under Section 3 of this Canon.

In the case of a Bishop, notice shall be given as provided in Canon 7, Section 1, not less than six months before that Bishop attains the age of seventy years.

Anyone who on 15th July 1991 held any stipendiary office in the Scottish Episcopal Church is not subject to compulsory retirement on account of age in terms of this Canon whilst they continue to hold the office they held on 15th July 1991.

3. A Bishop who considers that
(a) the pastoral needs of a congregation within the Diocese make it desirable that a person

(i) who has already attained the age of seventy years should be appointed to an office within this Church; or
(ii) holding office the office of Rector, Priest-in-Charge, Member of a Team Ministry, or Assistant Curate, should continue in that office after the date on which that person would otherwise retire in accordance with the provisions of this Canon;

(b) who considers that the needs of such a person described in (a)(ii) above make continuance in that office desirable,

may, subject to, with the consent of the Vestry of that congregation to which the cleric is to be appointed, make such appointment or authorise the continuance in that office of that person as the case may be after that date for such a period, not exceeding one year, as may be specified by the Bishop. Any such extension granted in writing shall
be deemed to include notice of impending retirement of the office-holder at the end of such period of extension. Any such office-holder may apply to the Bishop in writing for a further extension of office. The aggregate of any such extensions granted may not exceed three years save with the consent of the Episcopal Synod.

4. Any person who has retired from office in accordance with the provisions of this Canon shall nevertheless be eligible, with the consent of the Bishop of the Diocese and subject to Canon 14 (Of clergy who are not incumbents), to serve as a non-stipendiary priest or deacon in terms of Canon 14, Sections 6 and 7, and for services in such capacity to receive payment of travelling expenses and repayment of outlays in accordance with the provisions then in force, and to retain any honoraria which may be payable in consequence thereof.


**CANON EIGHT**

**OF THE SEPARATION, SUBDIVISION, OR UNION OF DIOCESES, AND OF ALTERING THE LIMITS THEREOF**

*The text to be deleted is scored through.*

1. The Episcopal Synod, by a majority of two-thirds of the whole number of Bishops, shall have sole authority to initiate proposals concerning the separation of Dioceses which are united; the subdivision of existing Dioceses; the unification of two or more Dioceses under one Bishop, and the transference of any district from one Diocese to another. Initiation of proposals shall not be made during the vacancy of any See.

2. Discussion shall proceed on a directive, outlining the proposals of the Episcopal Synod, from the Primus to the Faith and Order Board and the Administration Board. The Faith and Order Board, within six months of receiving said directive, shall prepare in detail, a report outlining its perspective of the advantages and disadvantages of the said proposals. The Administration Board, within a similar period of six months, also shall prepare in detail a Report on the financial consequences of implementing said proposals, together with a comparative report on the current financial position applicable to the status quo.

3. The reports from both Boards last above mentioned shall be sent to all Diocesan Synods which shall submit in writing their views and recommendations to the General Synod at its next meeting. The General Synod shall at its next meeting decide, by a two-thirds majority, on the proposals emanating from the Episcopal Synod, which decision shall be final.
The Scottish Churches’ National Sponsoring Body for
Local Ecumenical Partnerships (LEPs)

The National Sponsoring Body, which is facilitated by ACTS exists
1) to provide a means whereby those involved in LEPs across Scotland can share their stories and learn from each other
2) to act as a reference and support body providing advice and guidance to those who seek to develop as LEPs in Scotland.
3) to act as a bridge builder between national and local expressions of ecumenism

During the course of the year the Sponsoring Body has worked to these aims focusing on the role of the Regional Advisory Groups (RAGs). The full Sponsoring Body met on two occasions and a consultation on Regional Advisory Groups also took place.

The Regional Advisory Group consultation took place in March, bringing together people involved in local, regional and national expressions of ecumenism. The consultation’s purpose was to hear experiences and perspectives from Local Ecumenical Partnerships (LEPs), RAGs and denominations as to their expectations of the RAGs and to discern ways of working which would be bridge-building between national and local expressions of ecumenism. The consultation highlighted the need for a flexible approach which could be adaptable to different contexts within Scotland while still meeting the requirements of the denominations. The valuable role of accompaniment as a method to support LEPs was highlighted and this has been taken forward as a method for future development. The outcomes of the consultation were referred to a small group which then worked on a proposal for the future remit and structure for the regional bodies. The proposal was adopted by the Sponsoring Body at its September 09 meeting. In future Regional Review Groups will have the sole function of superintendency of Local Ecumenical Partnerships as carried out through the Ecumenical review process. The new remit for Regional Review Groups will be introduced at the 3rd LEP Gathering in March 2010 and will be rolled out amongst LEPs thereafter.

During the course of the year work also continued on the provision of resource documents. New guidelines for Churches Together Groups constitutions are now available and have been piloted in a number of locations. All Sponsoring Body resources are available on the re-launched ACTS website www.acts-scotland.org Consideration was also given to guidelines on child protection in ecumenical situations and this is continuing, as is work on a liturgy for Induction services at LEPs.

During 2009 Rev. Colin Brown (United Free Church) concluded his term of office as Convener of the Sponsoring Body. The new Convener is Rev. Bill Brown (Church of Scotland). Rev. Bill Slack (Baptist Union of Scotland) resigned from the Sponsoring Body and the role of Vice-Convener was taken up by Mrs Norma Higgott (Scottish Episcopal Church). Looking to 2010, the Sponsoring Body will host another LEP Gathering, launch the Regional Review Panels and develop the accompaniment scheme for LEPs.

Further information about the Scottish Churches’ National Sponsoring Body may be obtained from denominational Ecumenical Officers or their equivalents, or by contacting Revd. Lindsey Sanderson, ACTS, 7 Forrester Lodge, Inglewood, Alloa FK10 2HU. Tel. 01592 222361 E-mail: lindseysanderson@acts-scotland.org
RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(Amended 12 June 1997)

1 Application

These rules of order shall apply to the proceedings of the General Synod whether sitting as one body or in separate Houses of Bishops, other Clergy and Laity.

2 The Chair – Powers and Duties

Deference shall at all times be paid to the authority of the Chair. All points of order shall be addressed to the person occupying the Chair, stated briefly and audibly, and raised immediately the perceived irregularity occurs, otherwise the person occupying the Chair shall dis-allow them. Points of order shall not introduce new subject matter. Speeches shall not be allowed on points of order. Where, in the view of the person occupying the Chair, the matter raised does not constitute a point of order, the person occupying the Chair shall rule accordingly. On all points of order the ruling from the Chair shall be final and not open to discussion. When the person occupying the Chair rises to speak, any member of the Synod who is addressing the meeting shall sit down.

It shall be the responsibility of the person occupying the Chair to preserve order and secure that members obtain a fair hearing, to decide all matters of order arising at meetings of the Synod and to decide, if two or more members rise in their places, which to call to speak. In the event of disorder arising at any meeting of the Synod, the meeting may be adjourned by the person occupying the chair who shall also, then or subsequently, fix a time for its reconvening. Quitting the Chair in such circumstances shall, without further procedure, have the effect of a formal adjournment of the meeting.

3 Order of Debate

Members desiring to speak shall rise in their places. Those called upon to speak shall address the Chair. Speeches shall be directed to the motion or amendment being proposed, seconded or otherwise under discussion or to a question of order. No member shall be allowed to speak more often than once on any subject under discussion, save on a point of order or, with consent of the Chair, to make an explanation, but the mover of a motion shall have a right of reply. A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall sit down until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.

4 Matters Taken in Private

The Synod may decide by a majority of those present and voting that:-

(a) any business shall be taken in private;

(b) the Synod shall go into Committee for the informal discussion of any subject.
5 **Adjournment**

(a) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to such other place, time or day and hour as may be set by the person occupying the Chair.

(b) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to a later time on the same day and such an adjournment may be made on the direction from the Chair, or failing such direction, on the motion of any member, the vote on which motion, on being seconded, shall without amendment or discussion be taken by a show of hands as one House.

6 **Quorum**

The Quorum of the Synod shall be one half of the eligible membership of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity and not less than three members of the House of Bishops, but no business shall be invalid because transacted without a quorum being present, unless the attention of the Chair has been called to the absence of a quorum. The person occupying the chair shall then ascertain, in such a way as seems fit, that no quorum is present, and declare the fact. This shall be a responsibility of the person occupying the chair, whose declaration, whether or not a quorum is present, shall be final. If it has been declared from the Chair that no quorum is present, no business shall be transacted until a quorum is declared from the Chair to be present except: (a) the consideration of a motion to adjourn; (b) such non-contentious business as the meeting, with consent of the person occupying the chair, sees fit to transact. If, however, a division is challenged on any subject other than on a motion for adjournment, the same shall not be dealt with by the meeting. No motion for adjournment shall be submitted until at least fifteen minutes after the declaration from the Chair that a quorum is not present, except with the consent of the person occupying the Chair.

7 **Obstructive or Offensive Conduct**

(a) In the event of any member at any Synod meeting disregarding the authority of the Chair, or being guilty of obstructive or offensive conduct, a motion may thereupon be moved and seconded to suspend such member for the remainder of the sitting. The motion shall be put without discussion.

(b) The person occupying the Chair shall warn any member of the public who interrupts the proceedings at any meeting. If that member of the public continues the interruption the person occupying the Chair shall order the person concerned to leave the meeting, and not return.

8 **Duration of Speeches**

The mover of a motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes except with the consent of Synod. All other speakers taking part in the discussion on the motion or amendment shall not normally speak for more than five minutes, subject to the discretion of the person occupying the Chair. The mover of the original motion shall
have the right to speak for five minutes in reply, but shall not introduce any new matter into the debate. Thereafter the discussion shall be held closed and the question shall thereupon be put from the Chair.

9 Motions

(a) The Synod shall consider only the following motions:-

(i) motions which have been included in the agenda and papers for that meeting;

(ii) motions which the Synod has agreed to consider in terms of Rule 10;

(iii) formal or procedural motions.

(b) All motions and amendments shall be stated, immediately on their being proposed to the meeting, by the mover, before being spoken to. All motions under Rule 9 (a) (ii) and all amendments shall be submitted in writing, signed by the mover and seconder and delivered to the Secretary General immediately on being moved.

(c) Every amendment shall be relevant to the motion on which it is moved. A motion may be amended by the mover with the consent of the meeting, which consent shall be by the majority of those present and voting. In the case of a motion emanating from a Diocesan Synod or from a Board or Committee of the General Synod, the mover of that motion shall have the power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the motion has emanated, to accept the amendment to that motion, thus altering the text of the motion on which the Synod is asked to vote.

(d) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the seconder of the motion or amendment, but the Synod shall have power by simple majority of those present and voting to refuse to allow such withdrawal, in which case the motion shall stand.

(e) Motions or amendments which are not seconded shall not be discussed or inserted in the minutes.

(f) If, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, more than one motion deals with the same subject matter, only the motion first lodged with the Secretary General (whether by hand delivery or by post) shall be considered and if, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, any motion deals with a matter already under consideration by a Board or Committee, that motion shall not be considered.

(g) If a member who has submitted a notice of motion is not present to move the motion, the motion shall fall, unless Synod agrees that another member may move the motion.
(h) No motion of any kind which involves a grant of money shall be competent unless it is printed in the programme of business with the observations of the Board or Committee within whose budget the grant would fall, with power to the Chair on special occasions to take the sense of the meeting with reference to matters appearing in the programme of business and, if satisfied, to dispense with the necessity of observations by the appropriate Board or Committee. Except as above provided, no motion (other than votes of thanks) shall be entertained unless notice has been given to the Secretary General in reasonable time to enable it to be entered in the programme of business, unless the person occupying the Chair sees fit to put the question to the meeting that want of notice shall be dispensed with and interprets it as the evident sense of the meeting that this be allowed. There shall be no poll on the question, but a show of hands may be taken to assist in coming to a decision.

10 Rule 10 Motions

(a) Notice of Rule 10 motions should normally be given in writing (to the Secretary General) before Synod starts.

(b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by the signatures of twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who are present at the meeting.

(c) The mover of a motion under this Rule shall be given the opportunity to address Synod briefly (maximum of two minutes) as to why the Synod should consider the motion at that time before a vote is taken on whether the Motion should be considered.

(d) Subject to any contrary provision in the Code of Canons, in order for a Rule 10 motion to be considered by Synod, a two thirds majority of those present and voting shall vote in favour of its being considered.

11 Motion: “That the Question be now put”.

(a) The amendment called “The previous question” shall not be allowed.

(b) It shall be competent for any member who has not spoken on the question before the meeting to move “that the question be now put”. On this being seconded, if it seems to the person occupying the chair that the question before the meeting has been sufficiently discussed, a vote shall be taken, without amendment or discussion. If the motion is carried, the mover of the original motion shall have a right to reply, and the question under discussion shall then be put to the meeting. If the motion “that the question be now put” is not carried, a similar motion may be made after every three additional members have spoken.
12 Voting

(a) After the question on which the vote is to be taken has been announced, and voting has commenced, no member shall be permitted to offer an opinion, or ask a question, except on a point of order, or otherwise interrupt the proceedings until the result of the vote has been intimated.

(b) Save as otherwise provided, all motions and amendments shall be passed by a majority of the members of the Synod present and voting.

(c) The person occupying the chair shall have a deliberative but not a casting vote. Where the matter which is the subject of the vote relates to the appointment of a member of the Synod to any particular office or committee, voting shall be by ballot.

(d) When the question is put to the vote, tellers shall be named from the Chair and shall give in their report of each division taken. Except where otherwise stated in these Rules of Order, the vote may be taken in the first instance on a show of hands, the result, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, being declared therefrom. In all cases of doubt the vote shall be taken by counting the hands held up. On any question, if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wish, voting shall be by ballot.

(e) When voting by Houses, the Houses must meet separately if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wishes. When the Synod votes by Houses, the numbers of the vote in each House shall be recorded, and a majority of those present and voting shall be required in each House for the passing of the motion.

(f) A challenge to the accuracy of the minutes shall be made by way of amendment to the motion that the minutes be approved. Only those members who were present at the previous meeting to which the minutes relate shall be entitled to vote on the said amendment.

13 Election, Selection or Appointment of Members to Office

In the case of election, selection or appointment by Synod of a member of the Synod or of any other person to any office where the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies, the member or person to be elected, selected or appointed as the case may be shall be determined by a vote (or votes) by ballot in (each of) which members will be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. No member may record in the ballot more than one vote for any candidate. The candidate or candidates having the highest number of votes shall be declared duly elected. If there is equality of votes for the last vacancy, this shall be resolved by ballot or by a show of hands.
14 Assessor

The Standing Committee of the General Synod shall nominate an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, but the assessor shall intervene as assessor only on the call of the Chair, without prejudice to the right of the assessor when a member of the Synod to speak and vote as such.

15 Suspension of Rules

The application of any or all of these Rules of Order may be temporarily suspended or amended by a majority amounting to two-thirds of those present and voting. Voting shall be as one House.

RULE 10 MOTIONS: PRACTICE NOTE

Before considering presenting a motion Synod members are encouraged to liaise with the Secretary General in order to consult with the Board to whom the matter will be delegated if the motion is passed. It is expected that in a majority of cases this will result in a co-operative response where the matter is taken on to the Board's agenda, and the need for a Rule 10 Motion will pass. Most matters can be dealt with using this process during the year through consultation with the relevant diocesan representative.
GENERAL SYNOD: A REFLECTION ON MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER

You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy (Psalm 65.8)

Within the daily rhythm of life, we become aware, when day breaks and when night falls, of moments of significance. A day begins and a day ends, never to return. Time has moved on during that day, and we have drawn a little nearer to whatever our end will be. Tomorrow will be another day, with a significance of its own. It will not be merely a repeat of today, no matter how many similarities there may be. Each day thus comes to us as a distinctive gift. We do not make it. We can only receive it. We may learn to receive it with gratitude and to return thanks for it to the God of creation, the giver of life.

Every day will I bless you and praise your name for ever and ever. (Psalm 145.2)

Thus it is that human beings, whatever their religious persuasion, have instinctively offered prayer at each day’s beginning and ending. At daybreak, prayer expresses gratitude for the passing of the night and for the gift of the new day. It offers to God all that is to be done and experienced as the day runs its course. At nightfall, prayer again expresses gratitude for what the day has brought and invites reflection on our use or perhaps misuse of it, entrusting our lives once again to God’s care during the hours of darkness.

Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come. (Luke 11.2)

Prayer becomes part of the rhythm of life, of waking and sleeping, of working and resting. The sun and the moon, as time’s markers, bring the further seasonal rhythms of winter and spring, summer and autumn. All these rhythms lead us to celebrate and reflect on the mystery of life itself, of our waking to life and of the coming sleep of death. Faith leads us further, to see in the passage from light to darkness and from night to morning an image of Christ’s surrender to death and, with his being raised from death, the promise of a new creation, the goal towards which all our labours, as people of faith, are directed.

Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, give thanks in all circumstances, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus. (1 Thessalonians 5.16f)

Morning and Evening prayer thus form the frame within which the activities of each day take place. They are the beginning and the ending of each day’s work. When, for example, the General Synod of our Church meets, Morning Prayer begins the day’s business and Evening Prayer brings it to a conclusion. Both express the context of faith which informs the entire work of Synod. Both offer us the opportunity to draw deeply on the words of the sacred writings (psalms, canticles, readings and prayers) and allow them to become the voice of our own prayer.

“[The Psalms] are the bright mirror in which we become more deeply conscious of what is happening to us”. (Cassian, conferences X,11)

Both Morning and Evening Prayer are there, not as optional extras for the piously inclined, but as the means by which we are reminded, as we begin and as we end the business of Synod, of the heart of the matter: the God through whom, in whom and for whom we exist.

“He prays unceasingly who combines prayer with necessary duties and duties with prayer. Only in this way can we find it practicable to fulfil the commandment to pray always. It consists in regarding the whole of Christian existence as a single great prayer. What we are accustomed to call prayer is only a part of it.” (Origen, On Prayer)

Note: Copies of the most recent edition of Daily Prayer (which includes Morning and Evening Prayer, Night Prayer (Compline) and the Psalter) are available from the General Synod Office, Price £9.00.
GENERAL SYNOD MEMBERS 2010

Most Rev David R Chillingworth
Rt Rev Dr Gregor D Duncan
Rt Rev Dr Robert A Gillies
Rt Rev Dr John A C Mantle
Rt Rev Brian A Smith
Rt Rev Mark J Strange

Prof Patricia Peattie
Mr David Palmer
Mr J (Ian) C Stewart

Aberdeen Clergy
Rev Prof David Atkinson
Rev Lisa Eunson
Rev Canon Ian Ferguson
Very Rev Richard Kilgour
Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo
Rev Canon Isaac Poobalan
Rev Canon Graham Taylor
Rev Canon John Walker  Not attending 2010

Aberdeen Clergy Alternates
Rev Samantha Ferguson  Attending 2010
Rev Canon Peter Mander
Rev Paul Watson

Aberdeen Laity
Miss Mary Allardyce
Dr Ian Findlay
Mrs Susan Kinsey
Dr Alistair Mason
Dr Nicola Mills
Ms Lesley Platford
Mrs Ruth Salthouse
Mr John Whittall

Aberdeen Laity Alternates
Mr Jeremy Burchill
Dr Hugh Dawson
Mr Stuart Donald
Argyll Clergy
Rev Daniel Davies Not attending 2010
Rev Adrian Fallows
Rev Canon Roy Ferguson Flatt
Rev Alexander Guinness
Rev Kenneth Skipper
Rev Charles Tongue

Argyll Clergy Alternates
Rev Donald Davidson
Rev Dr David James
Rev Sister Clare Lockhart SC Attending 2010

Argyll Laity
Mrs Lesley Barford
Ms Catriona Beel
Mr Alastair Chisholm Not attending
Mr David Fuller
Brig John Macfarlane
Mrs Christine McIntosh

Argyll Laity Alternates
Mrs Sarah Campbell Attending
Mrs Val Corey
Miss Maureen MacGlashan

Brechin Clergy
Rev Jonathan Bower
Rev Canon Steve Collis
Rev Angela Hughes
Rev Canon Fay Lamont
Very Rev David Mumford
Rev David Shepherd
Rev Dr Annalu Waller Not attending 2010

Brechin Clergy Alternates
Very Rev Jeremy Auld Attending 2010
Rev Canon Dr John Cuthbert Attending 2010
Rev Kirrilee A Reid

Brechin Laity
Mrs Mary Bowker Not attending 2010
Miss Hilary Gibson
Mrs Maggie Powell
Mrs Jane Shearer
Mrs Vina Strachan
Miss Lisbeth Thom
Dr Stephen Woodward
Brechin Laity Alternates
Mr George Masson
Mrs Judith Robinson
Mrs Elizabeth Whitson

Edinburgh Clergy
Rev Canon Dr John Armes
Rev David Bunyan
Rev Dean Fostekew
Rev Ian Hopkins
Rev Maurice Houston
Rev Ruth Innes
Rev Canon John Lindsay
Rev Susan Macdonald
Rev Canon Allan Maclean
Rev Stephen Parsons
Rev Canon Ian Paton
Very Rev Kevin Pearson
Rev David Richards
Rev Tembu Rongong
Rev Canon Malcolm Round
Rev Eileen Thompson
Rev Robert Warren

Edinburgh Laity
Mrs Nancy Adams
Mr Nick Bowry
Mrs Andrea Brewster
Mrs Morag Buxel
Mrs Margaret Deas
Mrs Pat Gordon
Mrs Quetta Johnston
Mr Ian Kerry
Mrs Ruth McGrath
Mrs Anne McLaren
Ms Mary Moffett
Dr Anne Pankhurst
Mrs Sari Salvesen
Mr Alex Stewart
Mrs Elspeth Strachan
Dr Ray Wiseman

Glasgow Clergy
Rev Canon David Bayne
Rev Kirstin Freeman
Rev Dan Gafvert
Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth
Rev Canon Jeanette Jenkins
Rev Shona Lillie
Rev David McCarthy
Rev Canon James Milne
Rev Canon Robin Paisley
Rev Dr Eamonn Rodgers
Rev Andrew Sheridan
Rev Canon Kenneth Stephen Not Attending 2010
Rev David Wostenholm

Glasgow Clergy Alternates
Rev Peter Douglas
Rev Dr Donald Orr
Rev Andrew Richardson
Rev Dr Scott Robertson Attending 2010

Glasgow Laity
Mrs Anthea Clarke
Mr Nick Cox
Mr Clem Gault
Mrs Margaret Hanley
Dr Jamie Hill
Mr Richard Horrell
Mrs Anne Jones
Miss Wilma Keenan
Professor Barbara Parfitt
Mr Tim Rhead
Mr George Taggart
Mrs Valerie Vahey
Mrs Jan Whiteside
Mr Chris Zochowski

Glasgow Laity Alternates
Mr Martin Axford
Mr Kennedy Fraser
Miss Trudy Hill
Mr Nigel Rayner
Mrs Gill Young

Moray Clergy
Very Rev Canon Alexander Gordon Not attending 2010
Rev Canon Michael Hickford Not attending 2010
Rev Canon Melvin Langille
Rev Canon Ian Pallett
Rev Jennifer Sclater
Rev Roderick Shaw
Rev Canon Alison Simpson
Moray Clergy Alternates
Rev Tim Daplyn  Attending 2010
Rev Pam Shinkins  Attending 2010

Moray Laity
Mr Ian Bonner-Evans  Not attending 2010
Mrs Norma Higgott
Mrs Winnifred MacDonald
Mrs Jenna Shaw
Mr Anthony Shinkins
Mrs Jill Stoner
Mr Grant Swain

Moray Laity Alternate
Mrs Sarah Murray  Attending 2010

St Andrews Clergy
Rev Dr Andrew Barton
Rev Kimberly Bohan
Rev Richard Grosse
Rev Canon Dr Robert Harley
Rev Anne Haselhurst
Rev Canon Dominic Ind
Rev Canon Jonathan Mason
Rev Ann Mazur  Not attending 2010
Rev Canon Valerie Nellist
Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden
Very Rev Kenneth Rathband

St Andrews Clergy Alternates
Rev Timothy Bennison  Attending 2010

St Andrews Laity
Mr Brendan Grimley
Mrs Nan Kennedy
Mrs Catherine Meikle
Mr Michael Partridge
Mrs Kate Sainsbury
Mr Larry Scrimgeour
Mr Colin Sibley
Mr David Stacey
Mr Alan Thornton
Prof Alan Werritty
Mrs Sue White

St Andrews Laity Alternates
Mr David Meikle
Mrs Jennifer Smith
SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS

There follows a list of current representatives appointed to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on a variety of other bodies and organisations.

Most positions are held by volunteers but in a few cases the SEC is represented by staff members and the list is annotated to show this.

Vacancies arise from time to time in the positions in question and if you have an interest in serving in any of the areas in question, please make your interest known to the General Synod Office.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
April 2010
**REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Term of Office Start date (*no fixed term)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABERLOUR CHILDCARE TRUST</strong></td>
<td>Tom Ogilvie</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>2010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Adams</td>
<td>(Appointed independently)</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLICAN COMMUNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>John Stuart (^1)</td>
<td>Standing Cttee</td>
<td>3 meetings of ACC from 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>John Rea</td>
<td>Mission &amp; Ministry Board</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Network</td>
<td>Alan Werritty +St Andrews (Episcopal Rep)</td>
<td>Mission &amp; Ministry Board College of Bishops</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Evangelism Co-ordinators</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Refugee and Migrant Network</td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Interfaith Concerns for the Anglican Communion</td>
<td>Rev Andrew Richardson</td>
<td>Ctte for Relations with People of Other Faiths</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Justice Network</td>
<td>Angela Daye</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>2010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Network</td>
<td>Elaine Cameron</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Network</td>
<td>Sarah Tomlinson</td>
<td>Provincial Youth Network</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Board</td>
<td>Helen Hood</td>
<td>Faith &amp; Order Board</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Standing Committee appointed the Secretary General on the recommendation of the previous representative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Term of Office Start date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Faith &amp; Order Board</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norma Higgott (Alternate)</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elspeth Davey</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Life</td>
<td>Andrew Barr</td>
<td>Faith &amp; Order Bd</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Society</td>
<td>Rev Ian Barcroft</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society Cttee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Formation Group</td>
<td>Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller</td>
<td>Ministry Development Cttee</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pat Boyd</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Adams (Alternate)</td>
<td>Cttee</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Studies</td>
<td>Rev Canon Dr Michael Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>Guy Crawford</td>
<td>Administration Board</td>
<td>2006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Network</td>
<td>Rev Dean Fostekew</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Justice Reference Group</td>
<td>Rev Timothy Njuguna</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Anderson Jeremiah</td>
<td>Cttee</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Focus Group</td>
<td>Rev Prof David Atkinson</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veronica Burbidge</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Robb</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Children in the Community Care Group</td>
<td>Ian Findlay</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Church Relations Officer appointed as third SEC Representative. The position is non-voting. Officer presence helpful because of general overview of ecumenical relations.
3 The Group comprises practitioners in the denominations who are responsible for curriculum content for ordination training.
4 The appointment was made as a result of Michael Fuller’s position as Pantonian Professor. Since it concerns consideration essentially of matters of doctrine, Dr Fuller would be happy for this to be taken over by someone appointed by the Doctrine Committee.
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**REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Term of Office Start date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAIRS</strong> (Churches Agency for Interfaith Relations in Scotland)</td>
<td>Vanessa Stark</td>
<td>Cttee for Relations with People of Other Faiths</td>
<td>2009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEAS</strong> (formerly Scottish Sunday School Union)</td>
<td>Sue Pollard</td>
<td>Home Mission Cttee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHURCH OF ENGLAND/ METHODIST CHURCH</strong></td>
<td>Rev Canon Prof John Richardson</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Implementation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTIAN AID SCOTTISH COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td>Anne Pankhurst</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHURCH OF SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Art and Architecture</td>
<td>Rebecca Cadie</td>
<td>Buildings Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Stewart (Alternate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society Council</td>
<td>Rev Ian Barcroft</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRN (Churches Inter-Religious Network)</td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJN (Churches Racial Justice Network)</td>
<td>Rev Timothy Njuguna</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Anderson Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Society</td>
<td>Rev Ian Barcroft</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body/Organisation</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Appointing Body</td>
<td>Term of Office Start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*no fixed term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Representatives Forum</td>
<td>John Stuart⁵</td>
<td>ex officio Secretary General</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENALMOND COUNCIL</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>ex Officio Bishop of Moray, Ross</td>
<td>2009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Caithness</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT FAITHS ADVISORY BOARD ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td>Rev Paul Romano</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Dominic Ind</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUBILEE SCOTLAND</td>
<td>Anne Pankhurst</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEISSEN CONTACT</td>
<td>Currently held by Ireland</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Cttee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION TO SEAFARERS</td>
<td>Bishop of St Andrews</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS SPIRITUAL CARE DEVELOPMENT CTTEE</td>
<td>Carrie Upton</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Clare Lockhart (Alternate) Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERSHIP FOR WORLD MISSION</td>
<td>Gill Young</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORVOO CONTACT GROUP</td>
<td>Elspeth Davey⁶</td>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REUILLY CONTACT GROUP</td>
<td>Very Rev Alexander Gordon</td>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTLAND’S FOR PEACE STEERING GROUP</td>
<td>Very Rev David Mumford</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ The Forum comprises senior denominational officers ex officio
⁶ Officer appointed on the recommendation of previous Contact Group representative. Officer well placed within the denomination to act as liaison point with the Porvoo Communion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Term of Office Start date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Hilary Gibson</td>
<td>Admin Board</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Stuart&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Admin Board</td>
<td>1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE CHAPLAINCY</td>
<td>Rev Michael Hickford</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES CTTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP</td>
<td>Leo Lanahan/&lt;br&gt; Daphne Audsley</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMUNITY TRUST</td>
<td>Rev Canon Fay Lamont</td>
<td>Church in Society&lt;br&gt; (annual reappointment)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES HERITAGE RESEARCH</td>
<td>Richard Fawcett</td>
<td>Buildings Advisory Cttee</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES INDUSTRIAL MISSION</td>
<td>Rev Tim Tunley</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES HOUSING ACTION</td>
<td>Joe Cassidy&lt;br&gt; Alt: Rev Lewis Smith</td>
<td>Church in Society&lt;br&gt; Church in Society</td>
<td>2009*&lt;br&gt; 2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHA Affordable Housing Gp</td>
<td>John Gerrard</td>
<td>Bldings Advisory</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES’ NATIONAL SPONSORING BODY</td>
<td>Norma Higgott&lt;br&gt; Elspeth Davey&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt; John Stuart&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Faith and Order&lt;br&gt; Board</td>
<td>2007&lt;br&gt; 2004*&lt;br&gt; 2004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>7</sup> Much of the agenda of the Committee issues of a legal/regulatory nature. The two SEC representatives have traditionally comprised one officer and one other.

<sup>8</sup> & <sup>9</sup> The constitutional arrangements for the NSB envisage it including general secretaries or equivalent. Since the body oversees LEPs, throughout Scotland, it is appropriate that the Church Relations Officer, as the ecumenical officer for the SEC, should also participate in this. This is mirrored in appointments from other denominations.

<sup>10</sup> The Group exists to support the Parliamentary Officer and act as liaison with the denominations. As Secretary to the Church in Society Committee, the Church Relations Officer is well placed to do this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Term of Office Start date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE</td>
<td>Elspeth Davey(^{10})</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion Network</td>
<td>Rev Marion Chatterley</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Ashley Cummins</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Ian Barcroft</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH JOINT COMMITTEE FOR RELIGIOUS AND MORAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>Jean Mainland</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Boyd</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH INTER-FAITH COUNCIL</td>
<td>Rev Donald Reid</td>
<td>CRPOF</td>
<td>2009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH STAINED GLASS SYMPOSIUM</td>
<td>Rev Fergus Harris</td>
<td>Buildings Advisory Cttee</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY ENTERPISE</td>
<td>Rev Dominic Ind</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPG COUNCIL</td>
<td>Rev Eileen Thompson</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Rea</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Elspeth Davey(^{11})</td>
<td>Faith &amp; Order Bd</td>
<td>for 2006 Assembly only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)</td>
<td>Helen Stephen</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD EXCHANGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES</td>
<td>Rev Robin Lee</td>
<td>Overseas Cttee</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) The Church Relations Officer was appointed by the Faith and Order Board to be the SEC representative at the 2006 WCC Assembly. The Assembly meets every 8 years and the Board will make an appointment at the next Assembly.