

# Proposals for Consideration by the 94<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Bay of Quinte Conference

---

## **BQ 1: Maintaining the Name "General Council"**

**Originating Body:** Bay of Quinte Conference

### **1. What is the issue?**

We believe the Holy Spirit is calling us to venture forth as a denomination balancing envisioning a new future while honouring our traditions.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

In this time of profound change and embrace of new ways of being it is imperative that we do not forget who we have been as we strive to live into who we might be as God's people.

Since 1925 we have been Congregations, Presbyteries, Conferences, and a General Council – a curious combination of elements from founding denominations that over time became key components of the identity of the United Church. The current remit reimagines all this in terms of Communities of Faith, Regions, and a Denominational Council.

While there is great wisdom in describing the ground roots organizational unit of the church as a "Community of Faith", and the regional expression as a "Region", the descriptor of "Denominational Council" lacks both historical resonance and contemporary verve. The Comprehensive Review report originally offered a completely reimagined denominational governing body that had representation from every Community of Faith and ministry personnel. Such a body would have numbered in the thousands. Such a body would have required a new name because it was entirely new.

GC42 modified that vision and agreed to a denominational council which remains a representative body of delegates elected from every region of the church (remarkably similar to current practice). The Sessional Committee at GC42 described that modified version using the placeholder name “denominational council” and except for section headings always spelled those words with lower-case letters indicating it was meant to be a descriptor and not a formal name or title. Since GC42 the spelling style relaxed and morphed and eventually became capitalized.

Simply put, seeing that our national governing body has not substantively changed in composition or function, acknowledging the importance of being rooted in what is even as we leap forth into what will be, and noting that while certainly descriptive the name

“Denominational Council” lacks flare or United Church identity; there is no compelling reason to reimagine the name of our denominational body at this time.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

General Council 43 could embrace our history, identity, and popular mainstream identification and continue to name the denominational level of governance of The United Church of Canada as “General Council” and not change that body’s name to Denominational Council.

### **4. For the courts transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*As this proposal arises from the Conference Annual Meeting, it may:*

- *Agree, and pass the proposal on to the General Council “as is”.*
- *Revise the proposal, and pass the revised proposal on to the General Council”.*
- *If it does not agree, nor does not wish to revise, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 2: Steps Toward Reconciliation**

**Originating Body:** Bay of Quinte Conference (via Partners in Mission Committee)

### **1. What is the issue?**

We believe God/Jesus/Holy Spirit is calling the church to continue to live out its apologies to Indigenous peoples in Canada, and implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a framework for reconciliation to establish and maintain good relations.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

The Caretakers of our Indigenous Circle have called for indigenization and decolonization of the church: this is something that all communities of faith need to engage, as Indigenous church and as descendants of the colonizing church.

In 2008, over 90 Indigenous and non-Indigenous people from each Conference, a group which became known as the Living into Right Relations (LIRR) Network, covenanted to:

- "Explore, develop, and nurture just and respectful relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people across the church."
- "Facilitate processes to inform and engage the church and Canadians in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) process."

With the conclusion of the TRC, and its issue of 94 Calls to Action, the LIRR Network has continued to thrive, albeit with members of some Conferences being more active than others, and within a variety of models, to respond to those Calls to Action. The General Council has identified this work as a clear priority. The Network has been supported by two General Council staff (Reconciliation and Indigenous Justice Animators) as well as by some hours offered by some Conference and Presbytery staff. LIRR and Indigenous Justice Facebook pages, electronic newsletters, worship resources, webinars, and videos (all largely prepared and posted by staff) have been primary ways of sharing resources and ideas, and encouraging one another in taking steps on the journey of reconciliation nationally. The Justice and Reconciliation Fund with a current annual budget of \$100,000 is available to any United Church

group to “foster dialogue, reconciliation, and relationship-building between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.”

As we move to the 3-court model and a new financing model, we want to ensure that the LIRR Network is immediately recognized under the definition of a network *which* “links people working on specific issues (e.g., supportive housing, intercultural ministry, youth ministry) or for project work (e.g., event planning) that function through the whole church”; and as such would continue to be supported by staff and funding from the whole church in the future.

The LIRR Network was instrumental in raising the awareness of the work of the TRC across the country, and encouraging participation in TRC hearings wherever they were held. Other churches have applauded the leadership of the United Church in addressing the residential school legacy, and other Indigenous justice issues. Hundreds of members in the LIRR Network are actively engaged in drawing attention to the TRC’s 94 Calls to Action and taking steps to eliminate racism towards Indigenous peoples, to build a new relationship based on an understanding of nation-to-nation identities and appreciation of Indigenous spirituality and culture, to educate ourselves about our shared history, and to make reparations. This is the most important task before Canada and the church today. It cannot be left to people in widespread locations with limited means to search each other out, and seek resources on an ad hoc basis.

Notes from the fall 2017 General Council Executive meeting, contain these comments regarding clusters and networks.

“Clusters are defined as “local clusters of communities of faith that would provide community and support for communities of faith and their leaders, and focus on worship, mission, learning, collegiality, and strategic planning,” while networks would “link people working on specific issues (e.g., supportive housing, intercultural ministry, youth ministry) or for project work (e.g., event planning) that function through the whole church.” Before the vote on this motion was called, facilitators noted that there was a concern expressed that without financial support, clusters and network will take time to form, and that may increase the loss experienced by the loss of presbyteries. It was also suggested that there should be

encouragement for establishing clusters and networks prior to the change to the Three Council Model, with everyone sharing best practices.

Furthermore, The Executive agreed that

- those involved in clusters and networks will define their own meaning and responsibilities
- church councils will not define clusters and networks
- the church is encouraged to experiment with how clusters and networks can assist in living out the faith of The United Church of Canada
- clusters and networks are encouraged to seek support from local resources
- local bodies that wish to support clusters and networks are encouraged to do so
- church councils may support clusters and networks to their level of ability and within their areas of responsibility
- clusters and networks are encouraged to share their experiences with others in the church and the wider world through media available to the church
- following a period of experimentation, the church will learn intentionally from the experiences of clusters and networks”

*From News post Nov. 28, 2017 on Remit Implementation <http://www.united-church.ca/news/clarity-clusters-and-networks>*

The Indigenous Communities of Faith in the United Church through the report of the Caretakers of our Indigenous Circle (September 2017) in Call #8 Concerning Sustainable Support called for:

E. Relational connections between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities of faith and Regions be encouraged to continue. Local engagement and support of Indigenous work is valuable and needs to increase;

The LIRR Network functions to facilitate reconciliation throughout the whole church. It seems unreasonable and unfaithful that an existing network responding to national Calls to Action and a building nation-to-nation relationships should have to “seek support from **local** resources” only. The support of this vitally important ministry should not be left to the possibility of

no one having the responsibility to seek/provide resources, or the possibility of there being no or very limited local resources, however/wherever they might be located.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

General Council could address this issue by taking steps such as:

- 1) Immediately recognizing the establishment/existence of the Living into Right Relations (LIRR) Network when the 3-court model is implemented
- 2) Recognizing that the purpose of the LIRR Network is to assist communities of faith, clusters, and regions to:
  - implement the United Nations Declaration as a framework for reconciliation
  - indigenize and decolonize the church,
  - respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action (in particular those directed at the churches),
  - learn about the legacy of residential schools, and the history of Indigenous peoples and their contributions
  - work ecumenically, particularly with respect to promoting KAIROS (Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives) campaigns and initiatives as they pertain to truth and reconciliation, and Indigenous justice concerns
  - live out and theologically reflect on the meaning of the 1986 and 1998 apologies
  - and continue to explore, develop, and nurture just and respectful relationships including a deep appreciation of Indigenous spirituality and acts of reparation
- 3) Maintaining the Justice and Reconciliation Fund with its current purpose and a future budget for the next 5 years.
- 4) Convening a national gathering of the LIRR Network in 2019 (self-registering, all those who have been working actively to foster dialogue, learn our shared history, and implement the TRC Calls to Action or wish to do so).
- 5) Including the oversight and nurture of the LIRR Network within the work of a national working committee within the new

governance structure that would advise the General Council of the United Church on taking and animating actions on any matters relating to Indigenous justice, truth and reconciliation, and the legacy of Indian Residential Schools.

**4. For the courts transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*As this proposal arises from the a committee of Conference, Conference may:*

- *Agree, and pas the proposal on to the General Council "as is".*
- *Revise the proposal, and pass the revised proposal on to the General Council".*
- *If it does not agree, nor does not wish to revise, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 3: Equity Monitor**

**Originating body:** Bay of Quinte Conference (via Equity Committee)

### **1. What is the issue?**

The United Church of Canada and the General Council, in its commitment to be an equitable and accessible national Church is being called to establish the role of Equity Monitor and encourage all levels of the church to implement a similar role.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

The Bay of Quinte Conference, the Executive, various committees and the Presbytery's have adopted the role of Equity Monitor in all there meetings.

The role of Equity Monitor is to ensure web content, meetings, workshops, or events follow established protocols for equity, accessibility and communication related issues. As an example, the Monitor can ensure all PowerPoint slides comply with an established font size protocol.

Many sectors in Canada have established the role of Accessibility Coordinator, similarly, the Equity Monitor can act as a liaison between individuals and the various structures of The United Church of Canada to identify gaps or barriers.

The United Church of Canada has committed to be an inclusive church, should a gap be identified, there lacks a dedicated system/person who these concerns can be shared with.

The Bay of Quinte Conference Equity Committee has identified many areas of equity concerns, such as:

- Assistive listening or amplification of speakers
- Visual loss accommodations
- Scent free/nut free environments
- Gender neutral accommodations
- American Sign Language interpretation
- Accommodations for persons with various mental health concerns

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

The General Council could establish the role of Equity Monitor for future meetings, events or workshops to ensure a barrier-free, equitable opportunity for all participants.

The General Council could act to establish the role of an Equity Monitor or Coordinator to assist in identifying gaps or barriers, acting as a liaison between individuals and the General Council and its structures.

### **4. For the body transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

GC 40 referred a motion to the Executive of the General Council (GC40 New 6), which directed "all future video programming produced by or purchased for The United Church of Canada include closed or open captioning".

*As this proposal arises from the a committee of Conference, Conference may:*

- *Agree, and pas the proposal on to the General Council "as is".*
- *Revise the proposal, and pass the revised proposal on to the General Council".*
- *If it does not agree, nor does not wish to revise, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 4: Descriptive Video**

**Originating body:** Bay of Quinte Conference (via Equity Committee)

### **1. What is the issue?**

We believe that God is calling The United Church of Canada and the General Council move towards implementing a policy of inclusion for persons with visual loss.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

A previous motion referred to the Executive of the General Council (GC40 New 6), directed "all future video programming produced by or purchased for The United Church of Canada include closed or open captioning".

The Church needs to make accommodations for persons with visual loss. Through the work of the Disability Ministries of The United Church of Canada, this accommodation continues the work of becoming an inclusive church.

Many mainstream broadcasting companies recognize their duty to accommodate and are including descriptive video in their television programming.

According to the CNIB, 5.5 million Canadians have "a major eye disease the could cause vision loss" and there are approximately 1.4 million Canadians living with age-related macular degenerations (AMD) "many of whom have vision loss or are at risk." Future predictions expect a rise of vision loss to "nearly 30 per cent in the next decade." (reference: <http://www.cnib.ca/en/about/media/vision-loss/pages/default.aspx>)

The United Church of Canada has its own 'channel' on the YouTube platform and as such has invested much time/energy in developing its profile and a well-established mainstream audience. YouTube currently allows users to turn on voice recognition technology that captions a large majority of their videos, but does not allow for descriptive video technology. Such technology had previously been possible with the YouTube platform.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

The General Council could direct a program of actively advocating with social media platforms to adopt and implement descriptive video technology.

The General Council could commit staff resources to investigate and implement "text to speech" technology on The United Church of Canada's website.

### **4. For the body transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

GC 40 referred a motion to the Executive of the General Council (GC40 New 6), which directed "all future video programming produced by or purchased for The United Church of Canada include closed or open captioning".

*As this proposal arises from the a committee of Conference, Conference may:*

- *Agree, and pas the proposal on to the General Council "as is".*
- *Revise the proposal, and pass the revised proposal on to the General Council".*
- *If it does not agree, nor does not wish to revise, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 5: Integrated Accessibility/Equitable Standards**

**Originating body:** Bay of Quinte Conference (via Equity Committee)

### **1. What is the issue?**

We believe that The United Church of Canada is being called to develop a standard (policy) in the areas of customer service, employment, and information and communication and subsequent training.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

The Federal Government of Canada held 18 consultations across Canada between July 2016 and February 2017, aimed to establish legislation "to promote equality of opportunity and increase inclusion and participation of Canadians who have disabilities or functional limitations." (source: Government of Canada – Consulting with Canadians on accessibility legislation)

It is evident the Federal Government and provinces are moving towards accessibility legislation and this proposal is consistent with the commitment of The United Church of Canada to be an inclusive church.

As of 2017 three provinces in Canada that have established "Standards or Regulations", these are Ontario, Manitoba and Nova Scotia. Organizations, such as The United Church of Canada, who provide services to Canadians, need to be mindful of provincial accessibility legislation.

Ontario's Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) was the first of its kind in Canada and Ontario was "one of the first jurisdictions in the world to enact specific legislation". (source: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/about-accessibility-laws>)

The Ontario Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (IASR) became law in 2011, "enacting standards in the areas of Employment, Information and Communications, and Transportation" these "are laws that...non-profits...must follow to become more accessible." (source: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/about-accessibility-laws>)

Ontario has established a timeline for Private & Non-profit Organizations (50+ employees):

- 2012 – “customer service – train staff and volunteers and develop policy, make emergency and public safety information accessible when asked, create workplace emergency plans for employees with disabilities”
- 2014 – “create a Multi-Year Accessibility Plan, make all new and refreshed Internet websites and web content on those sites conform with WCAG 2.0 level A”
- 2015 – “Make feedback processes accessible when asked”
- 2016 – “Make publicly available information accessible when asked, make employment practices more accessible including: recruitment, employees and accommodation, performance management, career development, and redeployment”
- 2021 - “Make all Internet website and web content conform with WCAG 2.0 level AA (excluding live captioning and audio description)”

Should this not be implemented, the church will be complicit in continuing to permit systemic barriers for Persons with Disabilities.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

General Council could establish a study group to develop a policy/standard to be implemented by 2021 including appropriate video training modules tools for all Paid Accountable Ministry Personnel and Ministry Personnel Committees.

### **4. For the body transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*As this proposal arises from the a committee of Conference, Conference may:*

- *Agree, and pas the proposal on to the General Council “as is”.*
- *Revise the proposal, and pass the revised proposal on to the General Council”.*
- *If it does not agree, nor does not wish to revise, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 6: Alternative Relationships and Governance Structures**

**Originating Body:** Kawartha Highlands Presbytery

### **1. What is the issue?**

We believe the Holy Spirit is calling our communities of faith into different relationships and different relationships require differing governance structures. Our current governance structures described in the Manual presume a tradition congregation and pastoral charge. A community of faith may be as simple as a few who gather together around a kitchen table or as complex as a number of congregations/pastoral charges working together sharing a team of ministry personnel.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

We are a relational church seeking to ensure equality and justice in our relationships. Our policies and procedures have been created to ensure these principles within a Community of Faith, between Communities of Faith and in the relationships between Courts/Councils of the Church.

New forms of being church are emerging in response to contextual realities. In the absence of guidance each emerging body struggles to create structure that respects the principles outlined in the Manual but also find aspects of those principles unwieldy and inappropriate for their needs.

In the experience of engaging four pastoral charges (five congregations), each served by part-time ministry, in a formation of Regional Ministry which will share full-time ministry personnel numerous challenges have arisen. The objective is to have autonomy of the individual churches while also maintaining a unity and cooperation. At some points the Official Board of a two point Pastoral Charge was required to make a decision and sometimes the decision needed to be made by the two congregations. The viability of the Pastoral Charge and the two congregations were at risk when a position on the future of the two needed to be taken independently and without mutual discernment. The emerging governance structure struggles to ensure essential guidance is provided to congregations that remain both autonomous in some matters and unified in others. A specific concern was when to respect the required attendance of Ministry Personnel for quorum and when to give freedom in congregational actions so as not to overwhelm the Ministry Personnel with administrative duties and meeting attendance.

In the absence of denominational guidance the potential exists that differing structures will emerge that fail to protect the principles of equality

and justice and become a barrier to the common understanding and relationships that ensure that we are a united and uniting church.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

In the development and maintenance of differing Communities of Faith the Manual offers limited guidance and is often more hindrance than support. Because ministry can look so different now, Communities of Faith would benefit from:

- Guidelines that ensure created governance structure keep the spirit of our polity, or
- Governance structure alternatives that are more flexible and responsive to the contextual reality of ministry in The United Church of Canada, especially regional team ministry, at times the Manual is more hindrance than support.

The General Council can provide significant support and guidance and maintain some commonality among Communities of Faith and across the denominations by the development and sharing principles and structures that guide Communities of Faith in governance or provides addition Governance Structures corresponding to the new and emerging ministry relationships. Such guidance and alternatives could be outlined in the Manual.

### **4. For the body transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*The proposal originated with Presbytery. As the proposal is for action by the General Council, it is passed to the General Council via intermediate courts.*

*The Conference Annual Meeting decides if it agrees or does not agree with the proposal.*

- *If it agrees, it passes the proposal on to the General Council.*
- *If it does not agree, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*
- *The Conference may not revise the proposal, but could issue an alternative proposal.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*

## **BQ 7: Updating Our Theological Language**

**Originating Body:** K. G. Helson, member, Northminster United Church,  
Lakeridge Presbytery

*Note: The proposal, as received, was not in the required format. Through the Business Table, an attempt has been made to format the proposal within the required format. The original documents are included in an appendix following the proposal.*

### **1. What is the issue?**

The language we have traditionally used in our faith statements and discussions limits understanding and participation for some people.

### **2. Why is this issue important?**

Replacing all “I believe” language with the phrase “I understand/believe” in “A New Creed” and all doctrinal Statements of Faith, and in common usage offers a choice in words to accommodate: Those at the conventional level of belief who are most comfortable with Trinitarian church services.

NB: Conventional thinking is not harmed by critical understanding. Its value is enhanced by it.

The ministry and laity who appreciate, but critically interpret conventional belief and move toward universalism to become close to God, or enlightened – “Essential Agreement.”

Those who welcome fellowship within the UCC to nurture best behaviour and service, but recognize that although religious jargon is helpful to many, it does not meet the needs of everyone, and offends others.

People must learn to become comfortable with others who resolve their spiritual needs using different words, images, and means. Empathetic openness can be taught by effective teachers, but only if academic honest and evidence-based religion are allowed by open minds.

“Essential agreement” was created to promote the universal well-being of Creation – God’s work.

### **3. How might the General Council respond to the issue?**

General Council could authorize a Category 3 remit to replace all “I believe” language in all church documents and the Basis of Union with the phrase “I understand/believe...”

### **4. For the courts transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*The proposal originated with an individual church member. As the proposal is for action by the General Council, it is passed to the General Council via intermediate courts.*

- *Northminster United Church passed it to Lakeridge Presbytery, while indicating it did not agree with the proposal.*
- *Lakeridge Presbytery passed it to the Conference, while indicating it did not agree with the proposal.*

*The Conference Annual Meeting decides if it agrees or does not agree with the proposal.*

- *If it agrees, it passes the proposal on to the General Council.*
- *If it does not agree, it decides whether or not to pass the proposal on to the General Council.*
- *The Conference may not revise the proposal, but could issue an alternative proposal.*

*FYI: If the Conference does not agree with a proposal, it normally passes it on to the General Council only if there is a compelling reason.*

## **Appendix to BQ 6**















**BQ A:** Proposal For Bay Of Quinte Conference To Work With  
UNESCO's Canadian Coalition Of Municipalities Against Racism  
And Discrimination

**Originating Body:** The Equity Committee, and The Interfaith-Intercultural  
Committee, of Bay of Quinte Conference

**1. What is the issue?**

We believe God's Holy Spirit is calling us to recommend to the Bay of Quinte Conference to work with UNESCO'S Canadian Coalition of Muncipalities Against Racism and Discrimination towards eliminating Racism and Discrimination in Eastern Ontario.

**2. Why are this issue important?**

This vision and request is based on the Statement of Beliefs proclaimed by The United Church of Canada in its Anti-Racism Policy Statement *That All May Be One* adopted by the 37<sup>th</sup> General Council (2000). It declares the following:

**We believe** we are all equal before God.

**We believe** racism is a sin and violates God's desire for humanity.

**We believe** racism is present in our society and in our church, and throughout time has manifested itself in many forms in varying degrees.

**We believe** that the struggle against racism is a continuous effort. Therefore our anti-racism policy statement is only a first step. It provides the basis for the creation of a church where all are welcome, where all feel welcome, and where diversity is as natural as breathing.

**We believe** change is possible. We believe in forgiveness, reconciliation, and transformation and the potential to learn from stories and experiences.

**We believe** we are all called to work against racism and for a society in which the words of the gospel are realized among us.

Key underlying Theological understandings are:

- a) **the concept of God**, seen as universal and loving, and, therefore, would give all persons the capacity within their historical an cultural situation to relate to God such that their full human potential is realized in communities of faith, and in society.

- b) **The Incarnation** offers clarity, through its emphasis on human relating, personal and social. In its emphasis on the meeting of the divine and the human, it promotes positive religious behaviour toward our neighbours and assists towards understanding that it is through strong ethical relationships that faith and hope are kept alive. This concern with right relationship is crucial. Theological reflection on the connections between the relationship between God and humanity, God and the world, and human beings, one with another, as neighbours on planet earth, is crucial.

**Ecclesiologicaly**, the following principles emerge from the stories we have told as The United Church of Canada. Revealed in these principles are the core values that we hold as a Church – values which shape our identity and the character of our relationships. Articulated in the 41<sup>st</sup> General Council Ecclesiology Report, we believe these principles can help us to reflect on fundamental issues and make decisions related to the elimination of racism and discrimination as we live into the 21<sup>st</sup> century:

- a) A church that holds scripture as foundational remembers the wealth of stories from diverse cultural groups collected in scripture and in continuing tradition;
- b) A church that is called into being as the Body of Christ recognizes that those who come to the church, come through the invitation of Christ, and must be welcomed with the radical hospitality of the reign of God;
- c) A church seeking justice and resisting evil itself, confesses and repents its errors, serves with humility, and acts with courage;
- d) A church that lives with respect in creation asks how all of its decisions will affect the flourishing of those who are marginalized, and all of creation; (e) A church seeking equity and justice honours the diverse experiences of those who we may have seen as “other”, but who are never other to God; An interracial, intercultural church intentionally risks engagement with difference as a God-given gift, affirming the human dignity of all;

- e) A church open to transformation through relationship with others is committed to dialogue;
- f) A church which values partnership seeks collaboration with people beyond our church in areas of common concern;
- g) A church living faithfully in the midst of empire makes its decisions with the full and informed participation of all those affected.

**Missional** – A church that is part of God’s mission in the world asks how each of its decisions will promote or obstruct God’s mission. In the Canadian context, the dominant missional theme has been the Love of God for all created humanity. Living in a multicultural, pluralistic Canada, The United Church – through its interfaith/intercultural work has focused on *Mending the World* by engaging and working with all persons of goodwill. It has remained true to the dialogical imperative with an attitude of openness and reflective analysis when in discussion with members of World Religions and Cultures. This interfaith and crosscultural involvement respects cultural difference, and highlights Theologian Pannikar’s understanding that “Culture is the house, not the prison of the human being”. Regardless of skin colour, The United Church of Canada lives its vision of honouring the divine image of God within all persons by sponsoring refugees, working with global partners in mission, and executing the mandatory requirement for all Order of Ministry personnel in anti-racism training, based on its *That All May Be One* policy.

**Religious Ethics:** The ethical dimension of religion and the work of Justice, is derived from our Judaeo- Christian sources, and scriptures such as Micah 4. The application here of “act justly” has been concretized in the church’s anti-racism policy and reads as follows: “Will endeavour to act justly within its own structures, courts, policies, and practice, by:

- a) applying an anti-racist lens in practicing ethical and just financial stewardship,
- b) reviewing the candidacy, settlement, and post-settlement processes for clergy to ensure that they are supportive and non-discriminatory,
- c) developing and publicizing the availability of policies and procedures to address complaints and conflicts with respect to racism,

- d) helping those who have committed acts of racism to recognize the sin of racism and to be transformed,
- e) helping people to become aware of and support others in accessing church and public services/processes when rights are violated by acts of racism,
- f) working to create or maintain just relations with persons of racial and ethnocultural minorities, and
- g) working to create or maintain just relations with Aboriginal and First Nations peoples.

**Historical background of this issue:**

- a) First Nations history in Canada, and Settler groups;
- b) The Underground Railroad, North Buxton, Ontario;
- c) History of slavery in Canada,
- d) documented histories of racism in Canada,
- e) Black Loyalist history,
- f) Ukrainians and Italians during World War I;
- g) Japanese internment during World War II;
- h) Head Tax on the Chinese population;
- i) the story of Louis Riel;
- j) The Sikh community on Kamagata, and,
- k) Black Civil Rights during 1940 and 1950's (Hugh Burnett, Howard McCurdy, and Lyle Talbot);
- l) The Black Lives Matter movement.

The Anglican Journal, October 2017 issue states that "Today, there are about 100 white supremacist/neo-Nazi/far-right groups in Canada, and like their U.S. counterparts, they too have been coming out of the woodwork. Far-right groups like the Canadian branch of Soldiers of Odin, an anti-immigrant and anti-refugee network founded in Finland, have been making their presence felt with "park and street patrols" in Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta since last year." The Anglican Church of Canada , with other organizations has issued a joint statement of solidarity and call for action against hate. The statement urged all levels of government to review laws and policies pertaining to hate and hate crimes.

### **What are the consequences of not acting on the issue of Racism?**

The Church of Jesus Christ is rendered ineffectual. No action is destructive of the essence of the Social Gospel. Will result in the loss of respect for all citizens. Will contribute to the weakening of civic engagement. No fostering of a more mature collective life. The Church loses integrity – a moral dilemma is created. Seen also as a failure to uphold Canada's Multicultural Policy. No witness in the Public Square, and the role of faith in Canadian life is fractured. Damaging effect on social cohesion. No action helps create a climate for group violence and manipulation.

With their rich Theological and Spiritual background, United Church of Canada members would bring in depth understandings of "right relations" to Eastern Ontario. This would result in a major impact by the UCC in this region.

### **What are the benefits of joining CCMARD?**

Pastoral Charges working with Municipalities who join the program would benefit in several ways. These benefits include: increased access to a network of municipalities throughout Eastern Ontario that promote the sharing of best practices and resources to combat racism and other forms of discrimination; strengthened partnerships with local organizations, businesses and individuals concerned about discrimination; increased sustainability and documentation of anti-discrimination initiatives through the creation and implementation of a Plan of Action that is approved and adopted by Council. Bay of Quinte United Churches would have a strengthened capacity in efforts to foster equality and respect for all citizens. They would be working with a major arm of the local communities, and have the capacity to influence public opinion and bring diverse interests together for the common good.

### **3. How might the Bay of Quinte Conference respond to the issue?**

The Conference could encourage its Pastoral Charges to work with their local Municipalities toward joining UNESCO's Canadian Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination (CCMARD) program.

"CCMARD is about the people, and how a local initiative has an impact at the local, national and international level. It is also about how members of the community can influence

programmes and policies to improve the daily lives of their fellow citizens”.

**4. For the courts transmitting this proposal to the General Council:**

*As this proposal arises from a committee of Conference, the Annual Meeting may:*

- *Agree and enact the proposal.*
- *Revise the proposal and enact the revised version.*
- *Not agree with the proposal, and therefore take no action.*

*Are there comments, affirmations, suggestions you would like to make with respect to this proposal? Write your thoughts in this space.*