



COUNCIL OF GENERAL SYNOD, MISSISSAUGA, ONT., NOV. 7 -9, 2003



**Saturday, Nov. 8, 2003**

Members of the council gathered at 8:55 a.m. for **Bible study**.

\*

The primate welcomed Sonja Free, a **partner from ELCIC**, who joins the council for the morning. Ms Free introduced herself. She said she was appointed to represent ELCIC only this week.

\*

Eric Beresford reported on a process to gather information in order to develop a **process for the discussion of the blessing of same-sex unions** at General Synod. He provided a summary of information gathered so far and the methodology whereby this information was gathered. There is a wide diversity of opinion. Mr. Beresford presented a number of themes that have emerged in this process. Not everyone wishes a clear question to GS or a clear decision. Many people want more time for conversation.

Mr. Beresford answered questions. \* Concern for the health of the church is quite broad. \* The consultations will cover different cultural groups.

\*

The report of the **Financial Management and Development Committee** and the **Budget for 2004** were introduced. (Budget decisions will come later in the meeting.) **Jim Cullen** presented an overview of the Budget for 2004. He noted that Council approved a balanced budget last

year. The forecast for 2003 is for a surplus despite the fact some dioceses pulled back from their commitment to proportional giving. The individual appeals are performing strongly. The Anglican Appeal is running 26% ahead of last year. The expense budgets for the departments were realistic last year and are being controlled.

A surplus of \$226,000 is forecast for this year and will be carried to 2004.

There are uncertainties about revenue for next year and we expect it to be marginally lower. There will be a reduction in total gifts from the dioceses. Next year is "hold the line" as much as possible, but it is a year of change, with a General Synod and the election of a new primate, which will result in additional costs (moving and housing expenses.)

In summary, if the 2003 surplus is carried to next year, there should be a small surplus of about \$20,000 at the end of 2004 – in effect a balanced budget. There are uncertainties over next year but this is the best estimate right now. If circumstances change, FMD asks for the continuation of a committee to review the budget in the event changes must be made.

\*

*Table groups*

\*

Mr. Cullen answered questions from **table groups** on the 2004 budget. Members also offered comments on the budget and its implications to General Synod and to dioceses.

\*

*Break*

\*

**Framework:** Consultant Jonathan Bays summarized yesterday's session and comments heard from table groups. Two main messages: 1) There was a general consensus that the framework is moving in the right direction. 2) There are several areas to consider in the next draft: a) the document needs to "sing" more; b) we need to "connect the dots" between input and the priorities so the logic of the document is more explicit; c) concerns about implementation need to be expressed more clearly.

Today's discussion will focus more on implementation. *What should the committee be thinking of in its next draft?* There are seven priorities and eight groups. Each group will consider one priority in the context of implementation.

Questions: What are the key success factors for this priority? What are the obstacles that must



be overcome? What are the solutions to overcoming these obstacles? How should resources be allocated? How do we prioritize priorities in the context of available resources?

\*

*Table groups*

\*

***Table groups reported back.***

1. *Nurturing and strengthening Christian communities for local witness:* \* How will youth and young adult ministries be supported? We need to fill ministry needs in communities. \*Communication between cultures: middle age, old, young. There was strong support for this goal and making it happen.

2. *(Same priority):* Obstacles: new work and reviving work done in the past. Money is an obstacle. People in the parish must want youth and new members, which means change. Need to appeal to youth not in the church. Youth ministry must be constantly reinvented because what works today might not work down the road. National/regional gatherings are a good idea. Equipping local leaders is key. Gatherings could be cost-shared with dioceses. General Synod could have a resource person to evaluate resources and programs and to spread the ideas around.

\*

The priorities were discussed in **plenary**. In some areas, staffing needs might be shared with dioceses or ELCIC. Resources can be made more widely available through the Internet. Electronic relationships are good opportunities for individuals to network. Gatherings can't just affect the people who attend. Those who do attend must be equipped to engage others. We must not forget indigenous young people.

\*

***Lunch break 12 p.m.***

\*

*Council reconvened at 1:30.*

The table group reports on the **Framework** continued.

*Building stewardship and financial capacity:* Resource management must be done in a way that gets to every Anglican in the pew and must be intimately connected to the other priorities. Obstacles include our structures and our existing culture of giving. (Anglicans tend to be very generous but not always to support the church.) Must avoid easy and quick fixes. Must convince

people that this work is our work. Resource mobilization is an important part of all the priorities.

*Communications and story-telling:* Success factor would be to persuade dioceses to become part of a communications strategy. Should identify diocesan communications personnel. How would a communications management group coordinate this group? Need a strategy to get people's attention. Collecting the best practice from around the country. Need a road map on using resources rather than new resources.

*MinistryMatters* might have to change to impart information rather than just provide inspiration.

*Sustaining international partnerships:* Should be higher in the list of priorities (if the order means anything.) PWRDF should be mentioned. Some of the language in this section is weak and indicates we are satisfied with the status quo.

It is hard to assess importance because all the work is important. The question that might be asked is 'what work cannot be done anywhere else?'

*Deepening Anglican identity:* Some areas will be hard for General Synod to address. There is a need to focus on leadership; theological college does not make leaders and many leaders have not been to theological college. A lot of what we do militates against the ministry of the baptized. The challenges are largely challenges to our imagination.

There was a suggestion the dates of the plan should be 2005-2011 rather than 2004-2010. There are not enough resources for immediate implementation.

*Envisioning the New Agape:* Dioceses are at different places; resources should be updated for the binder; attention must be paid to collecting stories from across the country. Good stories must go with the stories of pain. There must be strong connections between national and diocesan staff. There must be cooperation between different bodies involved in this work. The introduction should be re-written using gospel language.

*Strengthening partnerships in Canada:* A re-introduction of passed work? A lot about this work is happening at the local level where it is



done very well. Requires greater clarity. Is this about feedback? We have to find a language to describe vision without deflating people, who tend to think most issues are about money. This is work that was set aside before and now we are reintroducing it, so we must be careful about how we do that.

Pension and Continuing Education plans may belong under stewardship.

\*

Council heard a report from the **Eco Justice Committee**. The report included a number of items for information.

\*

Council heard a report from the president of the **Anglican Journal Corporation**. A motion was presented asking council to appoint Ernst & Young as auditors for the Journal for 2003. **Carried.**

The **primate** commented that the Anglican Journal is the only newspaper that goes to every Anglican bishop in the world, which makes it a major and unique source of news, internationally.

\*

*Break*

\*

Jim Boyles gave an update on **ADR** in the context of residential schools. Council received information on a release form proposed by the government and considered the form in a workshop.

\*

*Council adjourned for supper at 5:40*

\*

*Council resumed at 7 p.m.*

\*

#### **Committee Reports**

Council heard a brief interim report from the **Taskforce on the Primacy**. Council heard that a full report would be presented in March and then sent to General Synod.

\*

Council received a report from the **Partners in Mission Committee** containing a number of items for information. Council heard that after a prolonged slump, interest in the Volunteers in Mission program is increasing.

\*

Council received a report from the **Faith, Worship and Ministry Committee**. Council also received a 'Statement to the Council of General Synod', and article entitled 'An Angli-

can Understanding of Authority,' by Chancellor Ronald Stevenson and a list of tasks before the committee.

The committee presented, for information, a proposal from ABC Publishing on Liturgical Licensing, which would make material available electronically.

Council received Interim Guidelines for Same-Sex Marriages / Blessing of a Relationship, a document prepared by the Chaplain Branch of the Armed Forces.

A number of questions were asked.

\*

Council heard a report from the **Information Resources Committee**. The report asks for a change of the committee's name to match the name of the department (Communications and Information Resources.) Jim Sweeny, presenting the report, noted that this request must go the General Synod.

\*

#### **Members' Concerns**

Helena-Rose Houldcroft brought to Council's attention a resource on reconciliation prepared by Stephen Charleston of ECUSA. The resource is available from Episcopal Divinity School.

Jim Sweeny asked "Who speaks for ACIP and who does ACIP speak for?"

The General Secretary brought Council's attention to ACIP's terms of reference as stated in the Handbook.

Robert Dickson expressed concern about notes from this afternoon's discussion on ADR being made public.

\*

#### **Partners' Reflections**

*Andrew Wesley and Charlie Bobbish* offered reflections on the *Framework* and on *Letting Down the Nets*. Mr. Wesley urged caution in the development of the *framework* document.

Mr. Bobbish noted that this is the second Council meeting he attends and that he is getting more and more confused. He said he is hearing a lot of new things both here and at ACIP. Mr. Bobbish said he hopes council members are learning from him and that he is learning from them.

**Council adjourned at 8:30 p.m.**