

Third Ordinary Session of the 45th Synod of the Diocese of Sydney: October and November 2001

Summary of Proceedings

A service was held in the Wesley Theatre at 2:30 pm on Friday 26 October 2001. The preacher was Bishop Paul Barnett, Bishop of North Sydney.

Following the service, the Synod assembled in the Wesley Theatre at 3:00 pm under the Presidency of the Most Reverend Peter Jensen, Bishop of the Diocese of Sydney and Archbishop of the Province of New South Wales. The Synod had afternoon and evening sittings on 26 October and 2 November and morning and afternoon sittings on 27 October and 3 November 2001.

Presidential Address

By the Most Reverend Peter Jensen, Archbishop of Sydney Friday 26 October 2001.

OUR CONTEXT

“Fundamentalism” is an ugly word, with a fearful significance.

Strangely, it began life well, almost a hundred years ago. Powerful forces within our culture sought to deny the orthodox Christian faith. Humanity seized the central place, demanded freedom from God and called for the end of the authority of the Bible. In the face of modernistic attacks on the Bible and orthodox Christian faith, a number of evangelicals issued booklets defending “the fundamentals”. On the whole these “fundamentalists” made sober attempts to guard the truth; perhaps they were not radical enough, given the challenge of modern thought. Certainly it became a popular movement in the sense that its booklets were often aimed at the mass market rather than the scholarly world.

Unfortunately, it was not long before fundamentalism began to be associated with irrational, sub-standard defences of Christianity, often couched in shrill language, and accompanied by a literalistic reading of the Bible. It developed a reputation for fanaticism, and was scorned by cultured people. Today, “fundamentalism” implies an anti-intellectual, backward-looking and ugly zeal in the cause of religion.

And yet, in the contemporary world, we cannot dismiss it; not when it is linked to violence and terrorism; and not when we are called “fundamentalists”. The greatest apologetic challenge at the moment is to distinguish classical, orthodox Christianity from fundamentalism. An amazing, frightening consequence of the terrorism of September 11th is that all religion is being dismissed as violent and evil. Under the heading “Damn them all”, Nick Cohen of the London Observer (October 7th) writes: “If blame is to be cast, then the world’s religions must take the major share”.

Fundamentalism is not just Christian. Something of the sort has arisen in a number of religions as a response to militant unbelief. Western secularism – sometimes abetted by the Christian missionary movement – has penetrated cultures world-wide. The temper of modernistic secular thought is aggressively imperialistic; in the form of globalisation it respects no national boundaries. It awards the glittering prizes of power, knowledge and wealth, but at a price. Fundamentalism is, in part, a self-defence against modernity. It is an attempt to inhabit the past, to rebuild the fortified castles of ancient days.

Established cultures show a two-fold response to western secularism. To some extent they capitulate to the gift of technological power and its apparently atheistic scientific foundation. They become modern. On the other hand, they also develop an antagonistic response, using the real or imagined standards of the past to judge the present. The rate of change is too rapid; the loss of power too great; the walls go up. There is an intense hostility to freedom of thought, speech and action. There is a fundamentalist Islam and Hinduism, as communities and cultures protect themselves from simply becoming western and secular. Paradoxically, the fundamentalists are often adept at using the latest technology in the cause of the pre-modern ideas. Ancient thoughts travel on the modern web.

Of course, fundamentalism is not the only religious response to modernity. Some are conservative, others radical; some make minimal adjustments to earlier theology; others recast Christianity in the light of modernity.

Some are massive intellectual constructs, like the works of the great Swiss theologian Karl Barth. Others are spirit-based revivals like the extraordinarily successful Pentecostal movement.

The strategic issue for Christians is very pressing. Is it better to join in the dance of secularism with the attendant danger of seduction; or is it better to be a wall-flower and sit coyly at a safe distance from the wicked fun? In these terms, fundamentalists are uncouth gatecrashers at life's great rave party.

The modernistic culture takes swift revenge on any claims to religious truth. For Christianity, it has proved to be an extremely dangerous dancing partner. Secularism seeks to conquer all other thought forms, especially religious ones. Some of the greatest makers of the thought of the twentieth century world were explicitly anti-Christian – people like Sigmund Freud, Jean-Paul Sartre and Karl Marx. Many of the Christians who recast their religion in radical ways have in reality become captive to secular thought. Conservatives criticise these as “liberals”, and they tend to denounce conservative Christians as “fundamentalist”. In this way, conservatism is linked with a dangerous social movement which seems anti-intellectual, fanatical, socially disruptive, racist, sexist and even politically dangerous. But this throwing of stones is a self-defeating policy.

Fundamentalists retreat from the modern world, refusing to join in the dance at all. But they are still present at the party. Their great contribution is their critique of radical Christianity and the complacency of the mainstream church. What they say to us is, that if we keep compromising with the world, the church will disappear, for no one will want to belong to it. And in this, at least, they have been proved right. Modernised Christianity is so anaemic that the denominations that embraced it are in danger of disappearing.

I am an evangelical Christian, but I am not a fundamentalist. Neither are the evangelical Christians of this Diocese. My consecration as bishop was a symbolic moment. It was incredibly moving for me to be consecrated by (among others) my honoured predecessor Harry Goodhew, and to be presented by two former Archbishops of this Diocese, Sir Marcus Loane and Bishop Donald Robinson. Here is an apostolic succession worth having – a succession in the classical apostolic faith as expressed in the reformed Anglican church. Loane, Robinson, Goodhew – who could ever pretend that such great leaders are “fundamentalist”? I want to place on public record my own profound sense of indebtedness to them. Imagine how this pygmy feels to follow such as these –let alone Barker and Mowll, the greatest of our 19th and 20th century bishops respectively. But follow them I do, and their legacy to me - and of this Diocese - is not fundamentalism.

I read the Bible literally – that is, on its own terms – but not literalistically. I read the Bible informed by the great classical expressions of our faith. My understanding of Jesus Christ impels me on to the dance floor of the world. His incarnation tells me that I must be involved in the world; I must learn its language; I must engage with – and learn from - its ideas; I must love its citizens and give myself to justice and works of compassion. But my understanding of the death of Jesus Christ also impels me to try to resist its blandishments, and to enter the world as a missionary. To love this neighbour I must also share the gospel of Jesus Christ with him or her, in all its purity and its power.

The radical Christianity represented at its most extreme by Bishop Spong is also missionary. In his case, secularism has turned him, and he has become an unwitting agent of the very forces which are attempting to destroy the gospel; in my view, a fisher of men amongst the Christians for a cause which is not Christ's. Such Christianity has compromised the purity of the gospel and therefore lost its saving power. In particular, it has undermined the authority of the Bible. Our nation needs a Christianity which is classical but not fundamentalist.

I have been trying since my election to argue the case for this intelligent Christianity in the public arena, actually to speak about God and the gospel from the Bible in a way that is clearly relevant to the world in which we live. I hope that you will be glad to be Anglican because public Anglicans stand for the gospel of Jesus. It will only be on those terms that Anglicanism will remain one of the most important elements in the Australian community. It won't do so by presenting as a pallid religious version of humanism. I want the media to report the Christian message, and not substitute a secularist twist for what we actually say. But for this to happen we must first speak Christianly, that is about Jesus, and, secondly, relevantly, that is to and about our humanity. To talk about social issues is a necessity; to talk only about social issues without God and his word is a cop-out.

So far I have portrayed modernism and secularism as extremely powerful forces, capable of destroying the church in the west. But, of course, they are nihilistic forces; they have nothing to satisfy the soul or save the lives of men and women. They are community destroying, not community affirming. Fundamentalists are not stupid. Whether in the US or in Pakistan, whether Christian or Muslim, they know emptiness when they see it. And modernism is malleable. It is subject to change, to transmogrification. To change as if by magic (Mac Uni); strange or grotesque transformation (OED). According to the analysts, modernism, with its heavy emphasis on human reason, has now become post-modernism: that is, reason has failed us and we now have an acute

attack of relativism, a sort of peritonitis of the soul. The culture is all at sea; it needs a religious harbour; it needs to know its God. Fundamentalism is a powerful witness to that enduring need.

By labelling classical Christianity “fundamentalist,” our society – and many in the Christian movement - dismiss what they should promote. Talk about God is silenced; we are tamed; we are lampooned; occasionally, we are even demonised. All very well. But in doing this the world is eroding a form of the Christian faith which is proven to be spiritually satisfying, intellectually engaged and highly active in doing good works. You may criticise fundamentalism as both intellectually disreputable and politically dangerous, but the vacuous emptiness of secularism is no alternative. This will only prove the fundamentalist case; it will provoke a fundamentalist response. The adolescent tendency to be cynical and dismissive of all religion except designer-buddhism, has become cliched, tiresome and even perilous. What is needed is the satisfying well-spring of the true and living God himself. You can shove true theology out the back door, but there will be a queue of false religions at the front door before you have time to sit down in front of the tele.

Classical Christianity is based above all in the Bible. The scriptures have priority over all the thoughts of the human heart whether in the tradition of the church or in human experience. But orthodoxy is not in an intellectual isolation ward. In the first place it acknowledges the immense debt we owe to the Christians who have gone before us. It learns to interpret the Bible in the light of the reading of the Bible down through the centuries. In particular it learns from the early centuries of the church’s reading of scripture, and it learns from the Reformation of the sixteenth century as well as the genuine advances of the more recent historical approach. And orthodox evangelicalism is also prepared to learn from contemporary thought. It recognises that current experience will always force us to ask new questions of the Bible and to discover truths of God’s revelation which may have been neglected or not understood.

Classical Christianity calls us to believe together that we may mission together. We ought to recognise the sad truth, however, that under the impact of modernity and now post-modernity, our denomination will rarely or never achieve unity of the faith. Our witness is compromised by intractable differences of faith.

There was a defining moment at this year’s General Synod which illustrates this. In the debate on homosexuality, Dr Glenn Davies said: “I hold the view that the plain teaching of Scripture is that homosexual practice is outside the purposes of God for humankind, and is against God’s laws, and therefore will exclude a person from the Kingdom of God. That, I take it, is the teaching you will find in 1 Corinthians 6”.

In the same debate, Dr Cathy Thomson, a learned theologian from Adelaide, said: “any contemporary study of how texts can be interpreted suggests that it is impossible to give precedence to the text itself, as indeed the text finds expression only in its apprehension by the human intellect; and the text can only realise meaning through its mediation within the context of a community, here – a faith tradition.”

In short, our profound differences about homosexuality owe a great deal to *how we read*, and especially *how we read the Bible*. And what makes it “impossible to give precedence to the text,” to adopt the plain or literal reading of scripture, is the person of the reader or readers, the fact that to reading we bring of necessity our personal prejudices, understandings and emotions. The reader – or even the community which reads - is integral to what is read.

It is hard to exaggerate the significance of this clash of approach. I want to assure you that we are dealing here with matters of great missionary as well as spiritual moment. It is precisely the question of how we should read which is on the agenda of the schools and universities of our nation. Teachers and students are adjudicating between the rights of the reader and the rights of the author to establish what texts mean. If we adopt Dr Thomson’s approach, there is no “plain meaning of a text” of the sort Dr Davies wishes us to believe in. I am concerned that we may become masters of the text, masters of its many possible meanings. Valid human communication seems doomed. The undoubted fact that reading requires a reader, has been turned into the determinative fact for the establishment of meaning. At the extreme – which is much further than Dr Thomson went - it says unabashedly, “the reader is the Author”; when you get to that point you are in a contest with God, to establish who owns his text, for he claims to be the ultimate Author.

I am an orthodox evangelical Christian by conviction. I am grieved by our disunity in the faith. But in this perilous moment, I join hands with classical Christians of all types, especially in the Anglican church. I am saying to you that whatever differences we have – and they are significant - we must see that the threat to foundational beliefs and standard ethical commitments is now being posed by how we read the text of scripture, and that we must not dance with the world at this point. I am saying that we have in the scriptural gospel a message of enormous significance for the whole community. I am saying that we must not allow ourselves to be dismissed as fanatics and fundamentalists, but have confidence in the integrity of our message and in the

“plain teaching of scripture”. I am saying that we should affirm and promote without embarrassment classical, orthodox Christianity; Anglican Christianity and, for many of us, Anglican evangelical Christianity.

Unbelief is profoundly unloving, because it gives our fellow citizens only husks; it reaches into their homes and weakens them; it leaves their children without an understanding of God’s law; it denies them the true knowledge of their Creator; it leaves them under the condemnation of God and not his blessing. Furthermore, secularism reaches into our homes. It is not as though we can isolate ourselves from the world. The children of Christian families may well be better equipped and better guarded against the world, but they can never be made invulnerable to it. They, too, are being taught new, subjective ways of reading texts. The state of the culture remains of high significance to us whether we like it or not. Secularism damages the nation and fills the halls of hell.

OUR MISSION

Do we care? In the face of this sort of world, what sort of Diocese do we propose to be? Most of us would identify ourselves as classical Christians, most indeed as evangelical Christians; neither fundamentalist or liberal. The question for us is, are we merely an establishment church, or do we propose also to be a missionary church? Allow me to repeat what I said at the Deep Impact rally in August:

“Church-going Anglicans in Sydney are about 1% of the population. We are becoming invisible. It is almost as unusual to have a friend who is a church-going Anglican, as it is to have one who is an animal-keeper in the zoo. We are poised to become exotic. Most people will never meet or know one of us; it is hard for our children to have sufficient friends to support them. How will our neighbours hear the gospel from us?

“If we wish to have a deep impact on our society - humanly speaking – we need to aim in the next decade to have at least 10% of the population who are committed, equipped and bold to speak in the name of Christ. Whether God will so bless us, is in his hands. But this ought to be our aim. There will need to be more of us, and the more of us will need to be more deeply committed, more constantly prayerful, more missionary-minded, more confident in God, better equipped, better educated in the Bible and more prepared to sacrifice time and money and worldly happiness than ever before.”

I do not believe that I have been brought to this position of Archbishop in order to acquiesce silently in the passing away of Anglican Christianity in this region. I cannot look out in satisfaction and complacency at our past achievements. I cannot compare us with Christians elsewhere and draw comfort. I can say that, given the events of the last decades, we have done well in various ways. I can say that there are elements of the present situation which give us cause for hope and joy. I can say that all is not lost. But we need to recognise that we live in days of crisis, in days of decision, for our Anglican Church in Australia and for the evangelical movement in this land and for our Diocese in particular. Choices lie before us - difficult choices. It is no accident that Bishop Spong says that Australia is his most fruitful mission field, that he expects his sort of Christianity to flourish here. He is right. Crowds flock to hear him and some churches even support him - they are like turkeys voting for an early Christmas.

That is the point at which we have arrived. And that is why I have proposed that we make this the mission statement for our Diocese and to follow out the consequences by acting on it:

“To glorify God by proclaiming our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ in prayerful dependence on the Holy Spirit, so that everyone will hear his call to repent, trust and serve Christ in love, and be established in the fellowship of his disciples while they await his return.”

Why have this statement? It aims to bring God’s word home to us just as and where we are. It is not intended to be a complete statement of theology – it is trinitarian in shape, but there is nothing explicit here about sin, atonement, or the scriptures, for example. It is not intended to include or justify all the valid activities which we may engage in on behalf of Christ. At another time it is possible that a different mission statement may emerge. It is not intended to be compulsory. In no way will parishes or individuals be forced to subscribe to it. I do not mind much that some will look for a more pithy and memorable statement. I am more concerned that it be recognised for what I trust it is, a prophetic application of God’s word to our present situation. And, if it is the application of God’s word, it will persuade us to make decisions, show faith and enter commitments.

What do I mean by the claim that the mission statement is the application of God’s word to our situation? It means this. We are not content to be a hobby organisation; we believe that we have a message of salvation for the world; we are bound to accept the immense challenge to share the knowledge of God. Let me now

explain why I think that this is God's challenge for us at this time. In brief, I believe it is, because what I have said is so firmly rooted in scripture.

It is precisely from within the missionary situation of his own time that the Apostle Paul speaks to us about this: "So whatever you eat or drink or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God. Do not cause anyone to stumble, whether Jews or Greeks or the church of God – even as I try to please everyone in every way, For I am not seeking my own good but the good of many, so that they may be saved. Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ." (1 Cor 10:31-11:1). What is our purpose in life? More specifically what is the purpose of our behaviour towards others? "do it all for the glory of God."

Even our love for others comes second to our love for God. We who belong to him, wish to see him receive the glory that is due to him; we wish his reputation to be high over all; we wish that every knee would bend before him; we wish that the songs of all the redeemed would echo his praise; we pray that God would hallow his own name. The glory of God and the salvation of his people are united. Salvation reveals his glory and creates a people who glorify him as their goal in life. Ezekiel teaches us that the hallowing of God's name is something which he himself does as he saves his disobedient people and restores them (Ez 36:16-23). In the end, human beings are mere creatures, and our greatest good is found when God is glorified, when he is given his rightful place as the centre of all things. That is the goal of creation; the moment is going to arrive when "the Son himself will be made subject to him...so that God may be all in all" (1 Cor 15:28).

To commit ourselves to the glory of God is an entirely fitting aim for human beings; but it is also a proper introduction for what follows. In fact, if you just wish to have as your mission statement "to glorify God", all else will follow, for the salvation of the world is his glory. That is why Paul says in this very context, "For I am not seeking my own good, but the good of many that they may be saved." And that is why the next words have to isolate the proclamation of the gospel as the way by which people are saved.

The scriptures emphasise the importance of the godly life in the process of proclaiming the gospel (eg 1 Peter 3:2). Indeed that is Paul's point in this very passage. But although the godly life adorns and commends the message, it does not take the place of the message. In God's economy of salvation, it is the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ which is the saving instrument. It is the word, but not merely any word, or indeed any word about God: it is the word that Jesus Christ is Saviour and Lord: "we preach Christ crucified...to those whom God has called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor 1:22-23).

Now let me give two provisos in saying this. The first arises because I isolate the word of God as the special means of God's saving work. I am not saying, that all of us are involved in proclaiming the word in the same way. We ought all to be prepared to "give a reason for the hope that you have" (1 Peter 3:15), but opportunities, gifts and training differ from person to person. In the body there are many gifts. Secondly, however, we all retain our responsibilities to *support* the proclamation of the word, and to give it the highest priority in our support. After all, the hallowing of God's name is the first petition of the Lord's prayer, and his name is hallowed in the salvation of his people. You do not have to be a missionary to be an extremely active supporter of missionaries.

When we see the mission statement and the goal together we may think that we are being invited to solve all the world's problems with one answer and in our own strength. But God does his own far wider work in the world without our co-operation at all, and the gospel of Jesus does not need us in order to make progress. Immediately, therefore, the mission statement goes on to say that we are to proclaim the gospel of Jesus 'in prayerful dependence on the Holy Spirit'. Salvation and the application of salvation to the human heart are the business of God; he graciously allows us to be involved, but he is the one who must do these things. All our efforts will be quite fruitless, without trust in God expressed especially in prayer. One of the immediate consequences of accepting this mission statement would be the notable multiplication of prayer for its fulfilment.

Paul told the people of Athens "God commands all people everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:31; also Mk 1:14,15). The gospel is universal, it does not discriminate between races or language groups or any other human diversities. If we wish to be involved in God's gospel ministry, we too need to be universal in our outlook and not restricted to people of our own kind, race or class. We cannot be satisfied with the penetration achieved by the gospel in this Diocese. There are too few people; we are too restricted to the professional and middle class; we are too limited to European and English speaking tribes. A commitment by us to this mission is a commitment to all people that they will at least hear the gospel in its true form. The repentance that Paul and Jesus speak of first in these texts is the repentance of faith. That is, its first action is to put trust and confidence in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the one mediator between God and humankind.

One of the most important theological truths to get right is the connection between saving faith and obedience. We are not saved by good works, by obedience. But salvation leads to good works; faith is the mother of obedience. The rest of the mission statement tells us of the powerful effects of the gospel of Jesus. By receiving him as Lord, we commit ourselves to walking with him by faith and in love. On hearing of the mission statement a number of people have expressed concern lest the good works that we do as individuals and in churches and organisations such as Anglicare and the Retirement Villages are omitted. Nothing can be further from the truth. We are to serve Christ in love; this means that we are to love our neighbours and to be involved in works of love in the community in which our lives are set. Indeed holy living itself attracts people to the Lord.

But the holiness is a fruit of the gospel, and if we fail to get the order right, we will confuse the means of salvation with its consequences. If we wish our lives to be productive with the good works of God, we must give the proclamation of the gospel a priority of place and a uniqueness of effect. That done, we must serve Christ in the community and in the home and in the church with all our hearts. Our goals as churches and Christians are multiple not single. If we fail to get this right our good works will be done for the wrong reason, they will be the wrong good works, and unregenerate people will be doing them. The very soul of our denomination is at stake in getting this matter right.

The church is not incidental to salvation. God saves individuals, but he adds them to his people, and he often saves them in the midst of his people. We cannot be content to see individuals won to Christ without also seeing them established in the Christian fellowship. In the future, that fellowship may not look much like the standard Sunday church which we may be used to. Its timing, form, location, size and membership may be very different. But the fact of fellowship around the Lord Jesus Christ cannot be different; in particular, like him, we are looking for fellowships made up of disciples, of learners who seek to obey him and walk in love. I am saying that as a missionary strategy the mission statement is calling on us to multiply Christian fellowships, not to be content with a parish-based Anglicanism alone, but to insist on a spiritually based Anglicanism in which the reality of the church is more important than its outward shape. I am saying that the quality of our churches as nurturing communities must be strong if we are to survive and grow.

The fellowship of Christ's disciples will be marked by faith and they will be marked by love. They will also be fellowships of hope. They will not be so caught up in this world as to forget the world to come and the coming Saviour. When Paul spoke of his early converts in Thessalonica, he praised them for their faith and for their love and then he refers to the fact that "you turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead – Jesus, who rescues us from the coming wrath" (1 Thess 1:9-10). This will be one of the chief ways in which these Anglican fellowships are going to differ from the world around, for the sake of the world around.

"The coming wrath" is a phrase that brings home to us the significance of the issues of which I am speaking. There is a day of judgement; there is eternal life and there is eternal condemnation; the issues of judgement are worked out in this life; there is a Saviour and his name is Jesus. That men and women are in need of salvation from the coming wrath; that this, indeed, is their most desperate need. These are so clearly, so plainly the teachings of the Bible that it is scarcely necessary to recite them. But what are we doing about them? I trust that all persons here have turned to Christ as their only hope of salvation from the coming wrath. I trust that this is your position as I speak to you. But if it is – what should you be prepared to do to forward the work of salvation for others?

I realise, of course, that in saying this I have come to one of the chief "rocks of offence" for the post-modern world: the fact that there is a coming wrath, a day of judgement. The compulsive relativism of our contemporary world cannot cope with this fixed and immovable future point, this moment of absolute truth, when the secrets of all hearts will be disclosed. And, unfortunately, this is precisely where the contemporary church has shown itself to be pitifully weak. It will not preach the coming wrath, and it will not announce Jesus as the one true Saviour of humanity.

September 11th was one of those days when the world changed. We all knew that it was possible for wicked and desperate men to do fearful damage in the great cities of the world. We knew it, and yet the fact that no such thing had ever happened made us confident that no matter how desperate and wicked men are, they would not be party to such a slaughter of the innocents. Now we know better, and without wishing to be alarmist I have to say that if such a deed can be perpetrated, there is no reason whatever why far worse and more horrible things may not be done. Indeed, the faces of the innocent in Afghanistan are beginning to haunt us also, as terror begets terror. On that day, surely, post-modernism died and we had to readmit the words "absolute evil" to the language. In the face of realistic human fears, hope, the forgotten virtue, may be one of the great distinguishing marks of the Christian fellowships. But it won't be a hope of the kingdom of God on this earth; it will be a hope of the coming of Jesus, and of his capacity to save us from the wrath to come. And yet this hope will be particularly important for the quality of life here on earth.

Let me apply this to a less apocalyptic, more mundane contemporary matter. In a short time we will be voting at a federal election. You may think that, with my strong emphasis on the future, matters like elections should be of little consequence to us. On the contrary, it is our gospel of the coming wrath which makes us intensely interested in all that goes on in our world, not least the issue of government. Our judgment in elections will be of significance in the final judgement. One of the elements of the political process which should especially concern us is the quality of candidates. I am told that there has been a very significant decline in the last thirty years in the number of people offering for pre-selection in all the major parties. The numbers have been slashed; the question now is – are there sufficient people of quality offering?

I fear that a major factor in all this is the contempt which is expressed about politicians almost universally in the community. Who would want to join the ranks of such a despised cohort? Cynicism has swallowed up intelligent political commentary; it is in danger of making the good work that our political leaders do, invisible. There is not much encouragement to be a committed servant of the people; on the contrary we have a tendency to reward politicians and parties who reflect some of the worst features of our national life, not least our selfishness and lack of generosity to those in need. I believe that the bi-partisan policy on refugees is not something of which we should be proud.

As those committed to classic Christianity we ought to think very hard about this. In the first place, our biblical view of sin should leave us with no illusions: political - and church - leaders are sinful and will often let us down. Secondly, we are right to ask for the highest standards of probity and integrity in public life and be disappointed when less is offered. Thirdly, we are also able to point the way to repentance and forgiveness through Jesus; we know what it is to admit a mistake or failing and then take appropriate action. When a political leader would admit to a false judgment or even an unworthy action, he or she is rarely forgiven. No wonder they are so inflexible and combative in public; how different things could be; would we forgive a political leader who said, for example, “my policy on tax, on education, on refugees is wrong, and I am going to change it”? In other words, the gospel of judgement is sharply relevant to key issues of political and community life.

That is the mission statement and something of its biblical basis and the reach of its application. It calls us to evangelistic mission as our chief priority. But it does not stop there; for evangelism must lead to conversion of life and heart, and to the life of justice and love in the community, and to the creation of rich and nurturing Christian fellowships, to strong churches. And this is not to pull us out of the community; on the contrary, voluntary associations such as ours are vital to the good health of the Australian community. For example, people whose lives are nourished by God in these fellowships should offer for community leadership.

Am I advancing novel ideas in saying all this? At the end of this year we farewell three of our most respected senior brothers, Ray Smith and Paul Barnett from their role as regional bishops, and Peter Smart as Registrar. There have been and will be other occasions in which more will be said by way of thanks for their service. Suffice to say that all of them lay down their tasks with our esteem and deep gratitude. As you know I am delighted that Glenn Davies, Peter Tasker and Philip Selden have agreed to succeed them. But, despite any differences in gifts and personalities between those who retire and those who succeed, there is no difference in commitment to this mission. They exemplify it in their lives. Furthermore, Ray and Paul were part of the committee that laboured hard to produce the mission statement and the document on strategic spending, and Peter and Glenn are members of the Standing Committee who present it to you for your consideration. What a great tradition we are able to unfold in this succession. I praise God for his provision!

OUR RESOLVE

Which leads us to this Synod.

The Sydney Synod is first and foremost an assembly of brothers and sisters who represent the churches (and to a much lesser extent, the organisations) of our Diocese. The churches are the true heart of the Diocese. Our business is to work harmoniously together to foster the work of the gospel through the churches of our Diocese. The work of God goes forward especially in the churches; the Diocesan structures, even the most important of them, exist to serve the churches, not the other way around. All the legislative and political work of this assembly is meant to serve the Lord Jesus Christ and his people, not be an end in itself.

This means that the churches must not see themselves as small cogs in a giant machine; not as isolated and marginal gatherings forgotten by the centre; not as struggling but despised branches of a large corporation. Each church is at the centre; each church is where the action is. In all my extensive experience of this Diocese, wherever I go I almost always find someone who has a gripe about their relation with the alleged centre, usually known as “they” or “them” or “The Diocese”. *Let me assure you that this includes the people in the alleged centre.*

Let me exaggerate to make the point: all the organisations complain; all the committees complain; all the parishes complain; all the bishops complain about isolation – and you should hear the Archdeacons! Brothers and sisters, our true centre is in heaven; we march to the beat of His drum; Lithgow is just as close to the centre as St John's Parramatta or St Andrew's Cathedral or beautiful Ulladulla or the Archbishop. We must accept our local responsibilities, and in Synod work together for the glory of God and the good of all. Synod is not the coming together into the centre; it is the assembly of the congregations whose centre is the Lord Jesus Christ. Synod should be for us a joy as we work responsibly and in unity for the cause of the gospel through the churches in the Diocese and far beyond.

You will notice some changes in the way we conduct business at this Synod. Not only are we meeting over two weekends, but in this Synod we are going to hear more from some local churches, their hopes and dreams; we are going to have slightly more time, I hope, for motions; we have taken steps to speed legislation and give Synod the in-principle debate, rather than have us all stuck discussing endless amendments; we have incorporated time for discussion and prayer with the people seated around you; missionary hour has been revamped and you will already have noticed that the venue of the Synod service has changed. In none of this have the rights to free speech and to amend legislation been curtailed.

But we do need a change of mood so that we can own together the business which is before us and see its relevance to the mission of the Diocese. I hope that in the end it will be as natural to bring your Bible to Synod as it is to bring your seventh handbook. I hope that you will come to future Synods eager to hear how the churches are developing and how the mission is progressing; eager, in fact, to fellowship together.

We will be discussing all sorts of issues at this Synod; we will be voting in elections (perhaps the most important task of all); we will be hearing reports and praying; we have legislation before us; we must decide what to do about Gilbulla. In the end, however, it must be the mission statement and its implications which will dominate our thoughts. This Synod is the primary consultation about this call to mission. Our attitude to that is what this Synod will be known for. Let no one be deceived: it is a call for sacrifice, for change, for unremitting effort in dependence on God's Spirit. To plan for its fulfilment is going to require much work and hitherto undreamed of demands. The nature of ministry may change; episcopacy may change; parish structures may change; organisations may change; regionalism may change – it may be that we will need six regions rather than five, for example. If we are going to take the challenge of this mission statement seriously, we must be ready to commit ourselves to it by this time next year.

The key question before us is this: How do we evangelise the area we know of as the Diocese of Sydney? You may be sure, by the way that we will not do it by neglecting our mission responsibilities in the rest of Australia and the world. But nor will it be done through uninterrupted drift. Let me make the following five observations.

First, the talk of 10% is a mission strategy. We must be clear that we are not talking of a 10% increase in our churches, but 10% of the 5,000,000 people who make up our region. Humanly speaking, our aim is to reach the important base point of 10%, so that we may have some hope of effectively evangelising the other 90%. It is our necessary first stage. Please note that I am not endorsing big churches as our strategy here. Big churches have their place; so, too, do small churches. We just need lots more of both.

Second, we need to acknowledge at once that the task is absolutely daunting. As you look out over your part of the work it may be hard to imagine an increase of 10% in those going to church let alone 10% of the whole area. You may feel that you are already working to your limit; indeed you may be exhausted. But that is why this needs to be an aim of the Diocese as a whole. That is why we need to gear up all our resources to the mission; that is why we need to come to encourage innovation and permission giving. Sydney cannot be reached merely by the parochial system; the threefold ministry on its own is not enough; the world has utterly changed. History tells us that our nineteenth century Sydney Anglicans were far more innovative, far more daring than we are. We are stultified; we are jealous of one another; we are spiritually arthritic and emotionally crotchety. We need to think, what would a pioneer missionary do here? We have to applaud those who have the new ideas of parishes without property, of church planting in schools, of specialist ministries to professional or hobby groups, of church during the week, of camping, Internet and TAFE ministries, of crossing the cultures. In short, we need to encourage innovation and effort.

Third, we need to adjust our approach to money. Tonight we are going to be debating the document *Strategy Driven Spending*. It is the result of hard work by the Diocesan Executive Board, and was virtually all complete before I joined it in July. My own chief contribution was the mission statement, and various editorial changes. I would not describe it as a radical proposal, but it is a significant one. It is going to invite us as a Synod to commit ourselves to preparing our next budget in a principled way – and the principles are going to be those

enshrined in this mission statement. In effect, it gives us the next year to analyse, to consult, to plan, to pray before we come back to Synod and decide not merely on the budget, but on the mission. I am proposing that at the Synod next year we deliberate on both these connected issues. Next year is when we enter the race and respond to the starter's gun - or we decide that this is not the race we want to enter.

Frankly, after such a process of consultation we may decide not to get involved as a Diocese, not to accept the budget, not to agree to such goals. That is permissible; it may be wisdom. But passing the motion tonight commits us to real consultation, with real decision in view. I am not talking about an endless inconclusive process. To that end, I am going to suggest to the Standing Committee that it renames the Diocesan Executive Board something like the Diocesan Mission Board and tells it to get on with the job of planning. For my part, if you pass the resolution tonight, consultation, prayer, analysis and planning will dominate my own life for the next twelve months to start with. But I will not give up sharing the gospel, no matter how busy we become.

Fourth, I would like to introduce you to the activity of mission planning and ask you to practise it here and now. The Diocesan Executive Board endorsed the mission statement. I am glad to say that the members instantly saw the implications and began to ask themselves what would happen if we took this seriously. *They began to plan for mission before my very eyes.* Let me share some of those initial thoughts; they have no special status. I am not announcing new policies or initiatives. However, as we began our analysis, three necessary elements of mission planning became clear. We must:

- *Look at the end-point*

If we did see very significant increase in numbers of people, what changes would we need to make in order to cope? How many ministers? How many in training? How many buildings? How many regions? What would happen to Synod? What about Diocesan services?

- *Look the process*

In the first place we are going to have to consult our people, motivate and train them. What steps need to be taken now to accomplish this? Who is going to do this? What about the organisations? We began to look at some tough propositions; for example "For the mission to succeed it will have to become the all consuming feature of diocesan life involving a top down change in diocesan organisation as each relevant part reviews and adjusts to fit into the mission strategy". We began to isolate six phases that need to be passed through by this time next year.

- *Look to the strategies*

Here is the making of a list (may I stress again that this list has no status – it serves us here as a way of getting you involved in mission planning):

We intend to multiply congregations, not merely grow big churches.

Therefore...

We intend to encourage specialist churches, not merely concentrate on generalist ones.

Therefore...

We intend to make church attendance consistent and faithful, not episodic and uncommitted.

Therefore...

We intend to recruit and train as many as possible skilled persons for mission and ministry and not wait passively for candidates to identify themselves.

Therefore...

We intend to put in place spiritual, legal and theological foundations so the new believers will be secure and not allow the diocese to lose its way.

Therefore...

But you do not have to wait for me or depend upon the mythical centre for direction. Can I challenge you as representatives of our churches and organisations to set to work at once? Here are some pointers: have you given up on Sunday evenings? Then the Sunday morning church has taken a step towards extinction within ten years. Why not at least meet with two or three for prayer? Start something at five o'clock. Can you tithe your membership and send at least ten percent in for training? What about training of the congregation in evangelism? Can everyone handle *What is a Christian?* Or *Two Ways to Live?* Is there any adult education in your church? Can you plant a new church? Can ministers improve our preaching? Can we at least make sure

that our churches are physically and relationally inviting and friendly places? Have a stock-take and get ready for mission.

I was delighted recently to discover that the Western Regional Council has already begun this process. Here is a selection of its strategic goals for the next few years. Perhaps other Regional Councils have done the same thing.

I am now going to pause in my presentation and consult by inviting Synod members to ask questions about what I have been saying to this point. To facilitate this I have invited Mr Riley Warren to be ready with a couple of questions. As he puts his questions you may like to formulate your own.

After the question time there are a few more remarks to make before I conclude.

I believe that two of the principled stands of this Synod in previous years are going to make much sense as we mission together if that is what we decide to do. The first is our belief that the ministry of women does not include the ministry of eldership of the congregations. Here is a point at which as a whole we have deliberately but painfully resisted the call of many brothers and sisters whom we respect and admire, but also the call of the community in which we live. We have all begun to see that what is at stake here is far more than proper employment practices. We have been forced to discuss the nature of God and the whole matter of the relationship between men and women. In doing so I think that our position has been biblically and theologically vindicated. It is my conviction – and I know that in saying this I differ from many whom I respect highly – that we have been called upon in our time to bear witness to the need for men and women to have overlapping but different roles in home and church, for the sake of the good health of families. I think that the ministry of women has been aided by the stand we have taken; certainly there is a gratifying and significant increase in the number of women entering and involved in the ministry of the word. I believe that the day will come when the community itself will recognise that we have stood for principles of high importance for the good of all. I believe, furthermore, that for this mission to achieve its goal, godly women are going to be fully involved at the cutting edge.

The second is the commitment of this Synod to lay administration. I have been astonished at the suggestions that have been made in various quarters that we wish to adopt this course as a sort of adolescent pay back aimed at the National Church for ordaining women. We have been talking about this for over twenty years. The theology of lay administration is linked to lay ministry and especially lay preaching, and flows naturally and properly from the theology of the Bible and our reformed heritage as it applies to the contemporary world. But more than that. The theological importance of the congregation and its significance as an agent for mission also calls for this development. In this Diocese we expect lay people to minister and to offer spiritual leadership in the congregation. It is strange not to allow for this ministry in an ordered way. Other dioceses have developed novelties such as local priests and extended communion to help with ministry. Lay administration, should it be legal, would be a contribution to the common task of bringing the gospel to Australia.

In 1959, the churches responded magnificently to the challenge of the city-wide Billy Graham Crusade, with incalculable results for good. I am putting before you something as momentous; but the days have changed and we are not now thinking merely of a month, but of a decade. This is the first opportunity I have had to face the Synod which elected me as the Archbishop of this Diocese. I thank you with all my heart for the honour you have done me. I take it that it was not in your minds that I would be an idle or backward-looking prelate; or one content to enjoy the office with its powers and to pass them on untouched to my successor. I take it that you knew that you were appointing a minister of the word of God, who has given his life to that service and intends to continue in that way. You do not have to agree that this is the path we should take. That is why we have allowed time to talk and pray in the next year. I am offering to give you the best leadership I can in a mission as bold and yet as necessary as I can imagine. My question is, will you join me?

IN THE DIOCESE

The agenda of Synod awaits us. I place on record the appreciation of the Diocese to those who have retired and to those who have died in the past twelve months.

We thank God for the ministries of all those who have devoted themselves to the Lord's service and who have faithfully ministered to God's people over the years.

The retirees were: the Rev Lance A Johnston, Rector of Strathfield and Homebush; the Rev Noel J Pilcher, Rector of Richmond; the Rev John H Adams, Rector of Granville; the Rev Graham L Harrison, Chaplain of Wollongong, Port Kembla and Shellharbour Hospitals; the Rev Dr John R Bunyan, Rector of Chester Hill with Sefton; the Rev Ian E Fauchon, Assistant Minister of St John's Park with Canley Heights; the Rev David C

Proceedings of the 2001 Ordinary Session of the 45th Synod

Woodbridge, Rector of Nowra; the Rev Brian J Seers, Rector of Millers Point; the Rev Canon Warren D Croft, Rector of St George (Kogarah); the Rev Dr Victor W Roberts, Rector of Darling Point.

Those who died were: the Rev Lloyd F Newton; the Rev Harry Robertson; the Rev Bruce L Smith; the Rev Canon Allan H Funnell; the Rev W T (Bill) Gregory; the Rev W V (Bill) Payne; the Rev Canon Roy F Gray; the Rev Geoffrey S Clarke; the Rev Frederick J Camroux; the Rev Daryl J Robinson; the Rev Reg N Langshaw and Deaconess Gwyneth Hall.

We remember them with thankfulness to God and express our sympathy to their loved ones. We do so in keen anticipation of the resurrection to eternal life and the fulfilment of Christ's eternal kingdom.

Grace, mercy and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ be with us all.

Peter F Jensen
Archbishop

Proceedings

Officers and Committees Appointed

1. Clerical Secretary and Lay Secretary of the Synod: The Rev Chris Moroney and Mr Mark Payne
2. Chairman of Committees: Mr Neil Cameron
3. Deputy Chairmen of Committees: Mr Peter Kell, Mr Robert Tong and Justice Peter Young
4. Elections and Qualifications Committee: Archdeacon Ken Allen, Mr Ian Miller, Miss Evonne Paddison, Archdeacon Peter Smart
5. Order of Business Committee: The Rev Dane Courtney, Archdeacon Trevor Edwards, Mrs Irene Marshall, the Rev Chris Moroney, Mr Mark Payne, Mr Robert Tong and Dr Ann Young
6. Minute Reading Committee: Archdeacon Ernie Carnaby, Assoc Prof Michael Horsburgh, Dr Grant Maple, the Rev Ian Mears, Archdeacon Dianne Nicolios
7. Committee re Matters Referred to in Presidential Address: Bishop Robert Forsyth, Archdeacon Geoff Huard, the Rev Narelle Jarrett, the Rev Greg Olliffe and Deaconess Margaret Rodgers

Documents Tabled

1. List of clergy summoned to the Synod and list of representatives
2. Copy of a document appointing a Commissary
3. Minute book of the Standing Committee

Accounts and Reports etc Tabled

Diocesan Organisations - Annual Reports, Accounts and Other Documents

1. Abbotsleigh, The Council of
2. Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney (various accounts)
3. Anglican Counselling Centre Council
4. Anglican Media Council
5. Anglican Provident Fund (Sydney), Board of
6. Anglican Retirement Villages: Diocese of Sydney, Board of
7. Anglican Youth and Education Division
8. Arden Anglican School Council
9. Arundel House Council
10. Barker College, The Council of
11. Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council
12. Continuing Education for Ministers, Council of
13. College of Preachers

Proceedings of the 2001 Ordinary Session of the 45th Synod

14. Department of Evangelism
15. Georges River Regional Council
16. "Gilbulla" Memorial Conference Centre Board of
17. Glebe Administration Board
18. Illawarra Grammar School, Council of The
19. King's School (The Council of The)
20. Macarthur Region Anglican Church School Council (The)
21. Moore Theological College Council
22. North Sydney Regional Council
23. St Andrew's Cathedral Chapter
24. St Andrew's Cathedral School Council
25. St Andrew's House Corporation
26. St Catherine's School Waverley, Council of
27. St John's Provisional Cathedral Chapter Parramatta
28. St Michael's Provisional Cathedral Chapter Wollongong
29. South Sydney Regional Council
30. Sydney Anglican Car and Insurance Fund, Board of
31. Sydney Anglican Church Investment Trust
32. Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society Council
33. Sydney Anglican Pre-School Council
34. Sydney Anglican Property Fund
35. Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation
36. Sydney Church of England Finance and Loans Board
37. Sydney Church of England Grammar School Council
38. Sydney Diocesan Educational and Book Committee
39. Sydney Diocesan Secretariat
40. Sydney Diocesan Superannuation Fund, Board of
41. Tara Anglican School for Girls, Council of
42. Trinity Grammar School Council
43. Western Sydney Regional Council
44. William Branwhite Clarke College Council
45. Wollongong Regional Council

Standing Committee and Synod-Committee Reports and Accounts etc

46. 2001 Annual Report
47. 2001 Supplementary Report
48. Synod Fund Audited Accounts for 2000
49. Focussing resources for the Gospel/strategy church pending
50. Freedom of religion in New South Wales and proposals for reform of the Anti Discrimination Act 1977
51. General Synod Session 2001
52. Ordinances passed by the Standing Committee
53. Parochial Cost Recoveries for 2002
54. Professional Standards Board, Establishment of the
55. Stipends, Allowances and Benefits (5/00)
56. Georges River Regional Council - Annual Report for 2001
57. North Sydney Regional Council - Annual Report for 2001
58. South Sydney Regional Council - Annual Report for 2001
59. Western Sydney Regional Council - Annual Report for 2001
60. Wollongong Regional Council - Annual Report for 2001
61. Harbord, Proposal to reclassify as a Parish
62. Lavender Bay, Proposal to reclassify as a Parish
63. Leichhardt, Proposal to reclassify as a Parish
64. Quakers Hill, Proposal to reclassify as a Parish
65. Seven Hills, Proposal to reclassify as a Parish

66. Explanatory Statements and reports on Bills

Other Reports

- 67. Archbishop's Overseas Relief & Aid Fund
- 68. Archbishop's Discretionary Trust
- 69. The Mothers' Union Diocese of Sydney

Actions taken Under the Parishes Ordinance 1979

The Synod assented to the following -

- (a) reclassification of Harbord as a parish
- (b) reclassification of Lavender Bay as a parish
- (c) reclassification of Leichhardt as a parish
- (d) reclassification of Quakers Hill as a parish
- (e) reclassification of Seven Hills as a parish.

Questions under business rule 6.3

(Question 1 was asked at the Special Session of Synod to Appoint an Archbishop on 4 June 2001.)

1. Support for St John's Darlinghurst

Mr Doug Pearson asked –

- (a) What financial and other resources has the Diocese provided to the Parish of St John's Darlinghurst, during the last year, to assist that Parish in meeting the unique and extremely heavy pastoral care demands made upon it by the mentally ill, the drug addicted and the dispossessed of the area?
- (b) Will the Archbishop undertake to place the very real needs of the people of this area before the Standing Committee to ensure that the staff of the Parish have the resources necessary for them to care for these people in need?

To which the President replied –

I am informed the answers are as follows –

- (a) In 2000, a grant of \$25,000 for a parish outreach worker was provided by the South Sydney Regional Council from funds made available by the Synod. A similar grant has been made in 2001 and is proposed to be made in 2002.

During 2001 the parish has also received a further \$17,000 from the Archbishop's Community Care and Development Program being \$15,000 towards funding a community assistance worker and \$2,000 for emergency relief.
- (b) I recognise the special needs of the parish of East Sydney. Nonetheless, the proper course of action for the parish is to approach their regional council for additional financial assistance if this is necessary.

2. Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre (2)

Canon David Mulready asked –

- (a) In their deliberations over the sale of Gilbulla, did the Standing Committee confer with any other Dioceses, in particular, the Dioceses which contributed to the purchase of Gilbulla, such as the Dioceses of Brisbane, Perth and New Guinea?

- (b) Is it the intention of the Standing Committee to share the proceeds of the sale of Gilbulla with those Dioceses? If not, why not?
- (c) Is it the intention of the Standing Committee to share the proceeds of the sale of Gilbulla with other significant benefactors, such as St John's Parramatta whose gift of £25,000 in 1954 was used to pay out in full, the entire loan taken out to purchase Gilbulla?
- (d) If the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre is sold, how does the Standing Committee propose to perpetuate the memory of Anglican Chaplains who served in the Armed Forces during the war years, seeing that Gilbulla exists as such a memorial?
- (e) As of 26 October 2001, how many letters have been received by the Diocesan Secretary concerning the current move to sell Gilbulla? How many of these support the sale of Gilbulla?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) No. Other dioceses were not required to be consulted because the Gilbulla property is church trust property for the Diocese of Sydney.
- (b) & (c) The application of the proceeds of sale is for the Synod to determine. The proposed ordinance contemplates that the proceeds of sale will be applied for the same purposes as the trusts on which the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre is currently held.
- (d) This matter has not yet been considered.
- (e) Approximately 100 letters had been received as of 26 October 2001. 2 of those letters support the sale of Gilbulla.

3. Synod Service

Ms Naomi Spencer asked –

What are the reasons for moving the welcoming communion service from St Andrew's Cathedral to evening prayer at the Wesley Centre?

To which the President replied -

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The tradition of commencing Synod with a service of Holy Communion is relatively recent. Up until the last few years it was traditional to hold a Communion service every 3rd year with Evening Prayer on the other 2.

The move to the Wesley Centre was an experiment to see if a wider group would be able to attend. It was also an attempt to make a more organic connection to the proceedings of Synod.

4. Motions on Synod business paper

Canon James McPherson asked –

- (a) For the ordinary sessions of Synod from 1996 to 2000 inclusive, how many notices of motion were listed on the business paper for the first day, under the heading "Motions Received by the Standing Committee"?
- (b) Of those notices of motion, how many -
 - (i) Were withdrawn by the Mover?
 - (ii) Were passed by the Synod, with or without amendment?
 - (iii) Were defeated by the Synod, with or without amendment?
 - (iv) Were referred by Synod to the Standing Committee?

Proceedings of the 2001 Ordinary Session of the 45th Synod

- (v) Were not discussed at all by the Synod?
- (c) For the ordinary sessions of Synod from 1996 to 2000 inclusive, how many of the motions received by the Standing Committee and listed on the business paper for the first day were similar or identical in substance to a motion received by the Standing Committee for the immediately previous Ordinary Session of the Synod?
- (d) Of those notices of motion previously presented, how many had been so listed for two or more successive Ordinary Sessions of the Synod?
- (e) Statistically, what were the mean, the modal, and the median number of listings for such notices of motion?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers to these questions are set out in a page of statistical information circulated to Synod members today entitled “Answers to Questions asked by Canon James McPherson on 26 October 2001” [*see below*].

Answers to Questions asked by Canon James McPherson on 26 October 2001

- (a) Number of motions listed under the heading “Motions received by the Standing Committee” on the first day of the session.

Year of session	No. of motions listed
1996	16
1997	9
1998	22
1999	23
2000	17

- (b) Results of motions listed under the heading “Motions received by the Standing Committee” on the first day of the session.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Withdrawn	2	3	1	2	-
Passed by Synod	8	4	7	7	8
Defeated by Synod/previous question	-	2	1	-	-
Not discussed but referred to Standing Committee	-	1	13	-	-
Not discussed or referred to the Standing Committee	6	-	-	14	9
Total	16	9	22	23	17

- (c) Number of motions listed under the heading “Motions received by the Standing Committee” on the first day of a session which were in substance the same as motions listed under the heading “Motions received by the Standing Committee” on the first day of the session in the previous year.

Year of session	No. of motions listed
1996	1
1997	1
1998	2
1999	4
2000	9

- (d) Number of motions listed under the heading “Motions received by the Standing Committee” on the first day of a session which had been similarly listed for 2 or more preceding ordinary sessions of the Synod.

Year of session	No. of motions listed for the 2nd consecutive time	No. of motions listed for the 3rd consecutive time	No. of motions listed for the 4th consecutive time	Total
1996	1	-	-	1
1997	1	-	-	1
1998	2	-	-	2
1999	3	1	-	4
2000	6	2	1	9
Total	13	3	1	17

- (e) From 1996 to 2000 inclusive –
- (i) the average number of motions referred to in (d) per year is 3.4 (being 17/5),
 - (ii) the commonest frequency of such motions is 1, in 1996 and 1997, and
 - (iii) the median number of such motions so listed is 2, in 1998.

5. Ministry training at Moore College

Canon Jim Ramsay asked –

With respect to people offering for ministry training -

- (a) How many people applied to enter 1st year at Moore College in 2001?
- (b) How many people were accepted into 1st year at Moore College in 2001?
- (c) How many people have applied for 1st year at Moore College in 2002?
- (d) Approximately how many students are anticipated in 1st year in 2002?
- (e) What were the total student numbers, across all years, in 1991, 1996, 2001?
- (f) With respect to questions (a) to (d) what percentages are women?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers to these questions are set out in a page of statistical information circulated to Synod members today entitled “Answers to Questions asked by Canon Jim Ramsay on 26 October 2001”.

6. Use of the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre

The Rev Stephen Semenchuk asked –

- (a) For each of the last 5 years and the first 9 months of 2001, how many Sydney Anglican parishes have used Gilbulla for a weekend or a midweek retreat?
- (b) Overall in the last 5 years, how many different Sydney Anglican parishes have used Gilbulla's facilities?
- (c) Which non-parish Sydney Anglican organisations have used Gilbulla during the last 3 years?
- (d) How many weekends has Gilbulla been vacant during the last 3 years?
- (e) What is the present fee structure for a weekend houseparty at Gilbulla, and at Rathane?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers to these questions are set out on a page of information circulated to Synod members today entitled "Answers to Questions asked by the Rev Stephen Semenchuk on 26 October 2001" although I draw your attention to the following. [*See below*]

Gilbulla was used by 25 Sydney Anglican parishes in 1998, not 14 as is referred to in paragraph (a) on the page circulated to members.

Gilbulla was vacant for only 17 weekends in 2000, not 21 weekends as is referred to in paragraph (d).

Answers to Questions asked by the Rev Stephen Semenchuk on 26 October 2001

- (a) The number of Sydney Anglican parishes that have used Gilbulla over the last 5 years is as follows –

1997	28
1998	14
1999	25
2000	25
2001	29

(There are approximately 100 mid-week and weekend time slots per year, and 260 parochial units in the diocese).

- (b) From 1997 to 2001 inclusive a total of 59 different Sydney Anglican parishes have used Gilbulla.
- (c) From 1999 to 2001 inclusive the non-parish Anglican organisations that have used Gilbulla were –

Anglican Retirement Villages	GFS
Anglicare	Lalor Park Anglican School
Beach Mission Team Sawtell	Moore College
Bishops	Mothers Union
Broughton College	Ordinands
Camp Howard Study	SCEGGS Redlands
Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council	South Sydney Regional Council
Church Army	South Sydney Regional Clergy
Continuing Education for Ministers	Wollongong Clergy
Cursillo	Wollongong Clergy Wives
Deacons & Ordinands	Year 3 Candidates Retreat
Diocesan Clergy Wives	Youthworks Staff Conference
FOSLS	

- (d) Gilbulla has been vacant for 17 weekends in 1999, 21 weekends in 2000 and 13 weekends in 2001.
- (e) The present fee structure for a weekend is –

	<i>Gilbulla (= 2 days less 1 meal)</i>	<i>Rathane (2 x daily rate)</i>
Adults/high school	\$109	\$ 98
7-12 yrs	\$ 63	\$ 80
4-6 yrs	\$ 30	-
3-5 yrs	-	\$ 52
3 & under	free	free
Family	\$346	\$352

7. Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney - Taber Park land

The Rev Peter Stavert asked –

- (a) Has the Board of Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney considered the presence of the Taber Park land at Menangle Park given to ARV almost 40 years ago for the development of a retirement village in the Campbelltown area?
- (b) Has the Board plans for the development of this land in an area of large population and negligible aged care facilities?

To which the President replied –

I am informed the answers are as follows –

- (a) Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney (“ARV”) continually researches the need for aged care facilities throughout the Diocese. Research to date indicates that, relative to other areas within the Diocese, Campbelltown is not yet a high priority area for the provision of residential aged care services.
- (b) ARV will continue to research aged care needs within the Diocese. Given the general population growth in the Campbelltown region it is probable that in future the need for aged care services, relative to other areas in the Diocese, will warrant the establishment of a residential aged care facility. With this in mind, ARV intends retaining the Taber Park land for potential future use.

In the meantime, ARV will continue to pursue opportunities to initiate and develop community based aged care services in the Campbelltown area.

8. Actions under the Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999

Mr Malcolm Rennie asked –

- (a) How many if any actions have been instigated under the Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999?
- (b) If so have any been resolved and what was the outcome?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) None.
- (b) Not applicable.

9. Trustees of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore

The Rev Brian Telfer asked –

- (a) Who were the trustees of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore at the time of the last session of Synod?
- (b) Who has subsequently resigned as a trustee and when?
- (c) Were others appointed to fill these vacancies?
- (d) Who?
- (e) By whom?
- (f) And when?

To which the President replied –

I am advised that this question is out of order under business rule 6.3(3) since it is not connected with any business before the Synod and is not connected with any committee, board or commission of the Synod.

Nevertheless, it can be said that the trustees of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore at the time of the Synod meeting in 2000 were Archbishop Goodhew, Bishop Paul Barnett and Mr Roderick West. Currently, the trustees are Messrs Roderick West and Peter Kell, the Rev Dr Roger Chilton and me.

10. Moore College and the trustees of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore

The Rev Alan Hamilton asked -

In the advertisement for the Moore College Principal there is reference to “Trustees”:

- (a) Who are the Trustees?
- (b) What role do the Trustees have in the appointment of a Principal for Moore College?
- (c) Does the Synod have any say in the appointment of the Trustees and if not, who appoints them?
- (d) Are there any specific Christian qualities required in the office of Trustee?
- (e) At the time of the retirement of Archbishop Goodhew, who were the Trustees?
- (f) If there have been changes to the membership of the Trustees since the retirement of Archbishop Goodhew, on what date did each change take place, who retired or resigned and who appointed the replacement Trustee or Trustees?

To which the President replied –

I am advised that the answers are as follows.

- (a) The “trustees” referred to in the advertisement are the trustees of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore. Currently the trustees are Messrs Roderick West and Peter Kell, the Rev Dr Roger Chilton and me.
- (b) Under clause 16(1) of the Moore Theological College Ordinance 1984 the trustees appoint the person who is to be the principal of Moore College. However, any appointment is to be made in consultation with the other members of the Moore College Council, and needs the concurrence of a majority of those other members.
- (c) No, the Synod does not have any role in the appointment of a trustee. The appointment of a new trustee is made by the other trustees under the Trustee Act 1925.
- (d) to (f) These questions are out of order under business rule 6.3(3) since they are not connected with any business before the Synod and are not connected with any committee, board or commission of the Synod.

11. Afghan Refugees

The Rev Greg Burke asked –

Can the Archbishop please advise –

- (a) What steps has the Diocese, through its agencies, taken to provide material aid to refugees and potential refugees from the current conflict in Afghanistan?
- (b) What places are being considered to provide such aid in the future?
- (c) Should Australia have the opportunity to shelter large numbers of temporary Afghani refugees - what possibilities exist for the Diocese to use its facilities to offer shelter?
- (d) What representations has the Diocese made to the Federal Government to increase its relief aid to support Afghani refugees?
- (e) What representations has the Diocese made to the Federal Government to increase its Overseas Aid budget toward the UN recommendation of 0.7% of GDP?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) The Archbishop of Sydney's Overseas Relief and Aid Fund (ORAF) has e-mailed parishes for help in promoting an appeal for the needs of Afghan refugees. Anglican Media has also assisted in promoting the appeal. To date ORAF has received \$3,600 in donations. Assistance will probably be channelled through refugee camps in Pakistan.

Anglicare has been actively involved in responding to the needs of refugees in recent times, particularly those from Kosovo and East Timor. This involvement has arisen from the Federal Government's use of the National Emergency Management Arrangements to see that people in desperate circumstances had their needs met. Anglicare has an active role in the NSW Disaster Welfare Plan, which is the formal machinery used to manage matters of this kind in recent years.

People escaping from the present conflict in Afghanistan are required by the Australian Government to satisfy the existing UNHCR criteria for formal recognition as "refugees".

Anglicare maintains close liaison with the Department of Community Services, the lead welfare agency in this field in NSW. High level discussions have emphasised our readiness to respond in appropriate ways when the need arises.

Anglicare is also involved in the provision of support services to those who enter Australia on humanitarian grounds. The Humanitarian Settlement Program is funded by the Commonwealth and reaches both families and individuals in special circumstances. The program provides settlement orientation, information and case management services to around 1,000 approved entrants annually. During the last 3 months, 39 Iraqi, 7 Afghani and 7 Iranian families have been assisted.

- (b) No approach has yet been made for the provision of direct material aid and/or accommodation services by Anglicare or any other diocesan organisation. The Federal Government has, according to the media, made arrangements with some Pacific island nations for the initial processing of people in this situation though it is by no means clear whether the "boat people" reaching Australian waters are from Afghanistan.

The situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan may develop into something like that faced by the Kosovars and East Timorese. Anglicare is keeping a close watch on developments.

- (c) If such an approach is made, our response will be influenced by the legal status of those who are brought into Australia and the role which we are asked to undertake. It is unlikely that Diocesan residential facilities are appropriate for "secure" accommodation, if that is the requirement at the time.

- (d) ORAF is a member of the Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA) and is listed on their web-site as one of the member agencies receiving donations for the Afghan refugees. ORAF shared in the ACFOA's media release of 25 October welcoming the Australian Government's contribution of \$23.3 million for humanitarian assistance to displaced and refugee populations in and around Afghanistan.

No direct representations have been made to the Federal Government to increase its relief aid.

- (e) No direct representations from the Diocese have been made to the Federal Government about this matter. However, ORAF was a signatory to a comprehensive federal budget submission made by the Australian Council for Overseas Aid which called for an increase in Australia's aid budget to 0.28% of GNP (from the present 0.25%). ACFOA also produced a lobby kit and a postcard campaign addressed to the Prime Minister, and organised meetings with over 30 parliamentarians, including government ministers, to promote a greater commitment to aid.

Petitions

There were no petitions.

Elections

Uncontested Elections

In accordance with clause 4.1 of the Schedule to the Synod Elections Ordinance 2000, we hereby certify that the following nominations of persons are not in excess of the number of persons required to be elected.

1. Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney

(Ordinance 1965)

*Note: At least 1 of the persons selected must be a person in Holy Orders.
2 persons elected for 6 years*

Mr G J Bridge
Mr R Neal

1 person elected for 3 years

The Rev G M Bell

2. Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society Council (Anglicare)

(Ordinance 1971)

3 persons elected for 3 years

Mr D Barnsdall
Mr D R Lewarne
Mr G Willinge

3. Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney

(Ordinance 1961)

1 person elected for 1 year

Prof J Yeo

4. Anglican Youth and Education Division: Diocese of Sydney

(Ordinance 1997)

1 member of the clergy elected for 3 years

The Rev C R Bale

1 member of the clergy elected for 2 years

The Rev P Edney

1 member of the clergy elected for 1 year

The Rev A Katay

1 person elected for 3 years

Mr R S Dredge

5. Arden Anglican School Council

(Ordinance 1962)

Note: At least 3 persons elected must be clergymen

4 persons elected for 3 years

Mr C Burton

The Rev G N Collison

Mr A Harper

The Rev R McDonald

1 person elected for 2 years

The Rev M Charleston

1 person elected for 1 year

Mr A P Bryson

6. Arundel House Council

(Ordinance 1977)

3 persons elected for 3 years

Dr M Myerscough

Mrs R Pidgeon

Mrs M Wesley

2 persons elected for 2 years

Mr A Longhurst

Mrs E Lovell

1 person elected for 1 year

Ms D Mills

7. Barker College, The Council of

(Ordinance 1978)

2 clergymen elected for 3 years

The Rev R Chilton

The Rev M J Crichton

2 laypersons elected for 3 years

Mrs A M Judd

Mr I C Miller

1 layperson elected for 2 years

Mr M Tooker

8. Continuing Education for Ministers

(Ordinance 1989)

1 layperson elected for 3 years

Mr N Hatton

- 9. Diocesan Representatives on Council of Churches in NSW**
(Constitution of the Council)
2 persons elected for 1 year
2 Vacancies to be filled
- 10. Department of Evangelism, Board of Management**
(Ordinance 1978)
3 persons elected for 1 year
Mr J Barnes
The Rev S M King
Mr G Middleton
- 11. Diocesan Representatives on General Synod**
(Ordinance 1986)
5 members of the clergy elected for 1 year
The Rev C R Bale
Canon T K Dein
The Rev B J Hall
The Rev N Jarrett
The Rev S C Semenchuk
2 laypersons elected for 1 year
Mr R S Dredge
Mr Justice P W Young
- 12. “Gilbulla” Board of Management**
(Ordinance 1962)
4 persons elected for 1 year
Mr J Cross
Mr R S Dredge
The Rev Dr L M Stoddart
Mr M R Thearle
- 13. Illawarra Grammar School, The Council of The**
(Ordinance 1958)
2 laypersons elected for 4 years
Mrs J Starky
Mr R Summerill
1 layperson elected for 2 years
Mr R Oxley
- 14. King’s School, The Council of The**
(Ordinance 1922)
1 clergyman elected for 1 year
Vacancy to be filled
- 15. Macarthur Region Anglican Church School, Council of The**
(Ordinance 1982)
2 persons elected for 3 years
Dr A K Bevis
Mr G R S Kyngdon

16. Mission to Seafarers, Sydney Port Committee, The

(Synod Resolution 10/63)

2 persons elected for 1 year

2 Vacancies to be filled

17. Moore Theological College Council

(Ordinance 1984)

2 clergymen elected for 3 years

The Rev Dr G N Davies

The Rev Dr R N Mirrington

2 laypersons elected for 3 years

Mr J E Creelman

Dr W J Hurditch

18. Presentation Board

(Ordinance 1988)

1 layperson elected for 1 year

Mr J E Creelman

19. St Catherine's School, Waverley, Council of

(Ordinance 1922)

1 clergyman elected for 4 years

The Rev J H L Johnstone

1 clergyman elected for 3 years

The Rev R Lane

2 laymen elected for 4 years

Mr I C Walker

Mr A J Willis

1 woman elected for 4 years

Mrs J Guy

1 woman elected for 2 years

Mrs M Forsyth

**20. Sydney Anglican Car and Insurance Fund Board
Sydney Church of England Finance and Loans Board**

3 members of the clergy, 1 elected for 1, 2 and 3 years

The Rev P A S Cohen

The Rev T J Halls

The Rev B G Roberts

6 laypersons elected for 1, 2 and 3 years

Mr P Burgess

Mr J R Dale

Mr C Lees

Mr J Pascoe

Mr B Robinson

Mr K Thomas

21. Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation

(Ordinance 1947)

8 persons elected for 3 years

Mr C Cornick
The Rev D H Courtney
Archdeacon A F Donohoo
Mr D Harwin
Mrs L C Ramsay
Mrs E Selleck
Mr R J Stevens
Mr L Thewlis

1 person elected for 1 year

Mrs R Corbett

22. Sydney Church of England Grammar School Council

(Ordinance 1923)

1 licensed clergyman in priests orders elected for 4 years

The Rev S G E Smith

1 licensed clergyman in priests orders elected for 1 year

The Rev W M France

23. Tara Anglican School for Girls, Council of

(Ordinance 1956)

1 member of the clergy elected for 3 years

The Rev N Macken

1 layperson elected for 3 years

Mrs G Akers

1 layperson elected for 1 year

Mrs B Hubbard

24. Trinity Grammar School, Council of

(Ordinance 1928)

2 clergymen elected for 3 years

The Rev D J West
The Rev J W Wise

2 laypersons elected for 3 years

Mr D Cheetham
Mr P M Meldrum

25. William Branwhite Clarke College Council

(Ordinance 1987)

1 clergyman elected for 3 years

The Rev J Barrett

1 layperson elected for 3 years

Mr T Moon

C J MORONEY
M A PAYNE
Secretaries of Synod

17 September 2001

I HEREBY declare the persons concerned elected.

PETER F JENSEN
Archbishop of Sydney
 26 October 2001

Contested Elections

Under clause 5.4(6)(b) of the Schedule to the Synod Elections Ordinance 2000, I hereby report as follows –

- (a) The number of formal and informal ballot papers in each election.
- (b) The following is a complete list of names of the nominees for each office, together with the number of votes recorded for each nominee. The names have been arranged in the order of the number of votes recorded, beginning with the highest with an indication of the name(s) of the persons to be declared elected.

	<i>Ballot Papers</i>	<i>Votes Recorded</i>
1. Standing Committee - Persons Elected by Synod		
Formal	527	
Informal	<u>14</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>1 person in Holy Orders who is a member of Synod elected for 1 year</i>		
Ramsay, J		337
<i>Not elected</i>		
Oakley, T J W		190
2. Standing Committee - Persons Elected by Synod		
Formal	524	
Informal	<u>17</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>1 layperson who is a member of Synod elected for 1 year</i>		
Scandrett, L A		334
<i>Not elected</i>		
Boyce, E A		190
3. St Andrew's Cathedral Chapter		
Formal	526	
Informal	<u>15</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>3 lay canons elected for 6 years</i>		
Rodgers, M A		475
Cole, A		466
Kalder, P		425
<i>1 lay canon elected for 5 years</i>		
Lambert, R H Y		420
<i>1 lay canon elected for 1 year</i>		
Bishop, J B		369
<i>Not elected</i>		
Gerber, P C		351

Proceedings of the 2001 Ordinary Session of the 45th Synod

4. Continuing Education for Ministers		
Formal	508	
Informal	<u>33</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>1 clergyman elected for 3 years</i>		
Taylor, G C		234
<i>Not elected</i>		
Robinson, P K B		174
Morgan, B K		100
5. The Illawarra Grammar School, The Council of		
Formal	515	
Informal	<u>26</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>1 clergyman elected for 4 years</i>		
Duchesne, D G		349
<i>Not elected</i>		
Lee, B J		166
6. Sydney Diocesan Superannuation Fund Board		
Formal	517	
Informal	<u>24</u>	
Total	<u>541</u>	
<i>2 persons as employer directors elected for 1 year</i>		
Dredge, R S		472
Flavin, J		324
<i>Not elected</i>		
Poucher, S		203

M R THEARLE
Returning Officer

30 October 2001

I declare these persons elected

PETER F JENSEN
Archbishop of Sydney

2 November 2001

Resolutions Passed

Resolutions 1/01 to 4/01 were passed at the special session of the Synod in June 2001.

5/01 Ministry Ordinance 2001: withdrawal

Synod grants leave for the mover to withdraw the bill for the *Ministry Ordinance 2001*.

(Dr Barry Newman 26/10/2001)

6/01 Reappointment of the Stipends and Allowances Committee

Synod hereby reappoints the Stipends and Allowances Committee, with power to co-opt and directs that it report its findings and recommendations to the Standing Committee for action.

(Mr Philip Gerber 26/10/2001)

7/01 Sabbatical leave for assistant bishops

Synod respectively requests that the Archbishop, from the beginning of 2002, grant to his Regional and/or assistant bishops a period of "sabbatical" leave of at least 6 months during any 6 year period of their Episcopal service to be taken in two parts, namely –

- (a) a period of up to 3 months working with a senior clergyman in a parish assisting in the parochial ministry in a "hands on" way, and
- (b) 3 months in study at College, Institution or University as may be approved by the Archbishop in consultation with his colleague, so as to improve his effectiveness in his ongoing episcopal oversight and ministry.

(The Rev Neil Flower 26/10/2001)

8/01 Archbishop's power to withhold assent

Synod requests that the Standing Committee –

- (a) examine the nature, basis, origin, history and development of the Archbishop's power to withhold his assent to the making of ordinances duly passed by the Synod,
- (b) prepare a report detailing its findings, and
- (c) if thought appropriate, consider the preparation of legislation relating to this matter to the next session of the Synod.

(Mr Neil Ingham 26/10/2001)

9/01 Weekend Synod meetings

Synod appreciates the opportunity to trial a weekend Synod in 2001, acknowledges that Synod in 2002 will be a weekday Synod, and requests that a debate on when Synod should normally meet (weekdays or weekends) be scheduled for the second day of the 2nd Session of the 46th Synod in 2003 so that appropriate notice and arrangements may be made for the 1st Session of the 47th Synod in 2005.

(The Rev Zac Veron 26/10/2001)

10/01 Homosexual "marriage" and ordination

Synod –

- (a) appreciates the work done by the Faculty of Moore College in publishing a volume of *Explorations* entitled *Theological and Pastoral responses to Homosexuality* (1994), and
- (b) since this matter will be frequently before the Church in the next decade - requests that the Faculty of Moore College, through the Principal, keep the Christian public informed of the matters under debate and, in particular, brief the General Synod members on the issues before the next meeting of that body.

(The Rev Stephen Gibson 26/10/2001)

11/01 Anglican schools in the Diocese of Sydney

Synod –

- (a) affirms the role of Anglican Schools in the Diocese in their significant contribution to the Church's service of the community and their participation in the proclamation of Christ,
- (b) expresses deep appreciation and gratitude to God for the service of members of Governing Bodies, Heads of Schools, and dedicated members of staff, who effect this work, and
- (c) acknowledges the growing outstanding influence for the Gospel of Chaplains and assistant Chaplains in these schools.

(The Rev Greg Burke 26/10/2001)

12/01 Australian Christian Racing Industry Ministry

Synod –

- (a) commends the work of Australian Christian Racing Industry Ministry (ACRIM) in seeking to bring the gospel to people in the thoroughbred racing industry, and
- (b) commends the work of ACRIM to the prayers of Synod members, and especially to those parishes with elements of the racing industry within geographical proximity, and
- (c) urges these parishes to develop strategies to reach the racing industry in association with ACRIM, and
- (d) prays for God's blessing on ACRIM's efforts to raise money for a full time racing industry chaplain, and for the generosity of parishes and Christians in financially supporting this ministry.

(Bishop Brian King 26/10/2001)

13/01 Chaplain to the Maori Community

Synod requests that the Standing Committee clarify the relationship to the Diocese of the Chaplain to the Maori Community (the Rev Malcolm Karipa) and the Maori Church (Te Wairua Tapu) in Redfern, and seek their advice on how they may be drawn more closely into the life of the Diocese.

(Mrs Patricia Judge 26/10/2001)

14/01 Diocesan Insurances

Synod requests that Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney review the extent and levels of insurance cover arranged by the Diocese for the liabilities that –

- (a) members of the Standing Committee,
- (b) members of the Property Trust,
- (c) members or executives of other bodies established by the Synod,
- (d) parish clergy,
- (e) members of parish councils and church committees, and
- (f) members of the Councils or Boards of schools established under individual ordinance or the Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation

may incur on account of allegations of –

- (i) negligence,
- (ii) breach of trust,
- (iii) breach of statutory duty (such as under taxation, child protection or heritage legislation),
- (iv) breach of other duties or responsibilities,

on account of their undertaking those responsibilities on behalf of the church, and asks that the Property Trust report to the session of the Synod in 2002 about –

- (i) the extent of any (residual) personal liability that such people may currently incur, and
- (ii) any recommendations as to changes to insurance or to risk management procedures that should be implemented to minimise the likelihood of such claims.

(Mr David Minty 26/10/2001)

15/01 Term of office of assistant bishops

Synod requests that the Archbishop and Standing Committee review the role of assistant bishops with the view to –

- (a) appointing assistant bishops to a fixed term of office subject thereafter to extensions, and
- (b) appointing some younger bishops to the episcopal team, and
- (c) developing a more flexible diocesan culture which facilitates the opportunity for bishops to return to parish ministry after serving their episcopal term of office within the Diocese.

(Canon Terry Dein 26/10/2001)

16/01 Focussing resources for the Gospel

Synod –

- (a) endorses the principle of moving to a strategy driven spending model, and
- (b) requests that the funding strategies and principles that arise out of consultation with the parishes and other bodies of the Diocese based on the Standing Committee's report to the Synod be used as the basis for preparing the proposed ordinance to be brought before the Synod in 2002 to authorise distributions in 2003, 2004 and 2005.

(Canon Peter Tasker 26/10/2001)

17/01 Mrs Irene Harney

Synod acknowledges with thankfulness to God the faithful, prayerful and Godly presence of Irene Harney among us for many years as the lay representative for the parish of Manly Vale and offers her our prayers and best wishes for the future.

(Dr Laurie Scandrett 26/10/2001)

18/01 Rouse Hill Anglican College

Synod gives thanks to God for the establishment of Rouse Hill Anglican College in the north-west sector of Sydney and assures the foundation Principal, Mr Peter Fowler, and the School Council of its encouragement.

(Dr Laurie Scandrett 27/10/2001)

19/01 Reclassification of Harbord as a parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Harbord as a parish with effect from 1 August 2001.

(The Rev Mark Dickens 27/10/2001)

20/01 Reclassification of Lavender Bay as a parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Lavender Bay as a parish with effect from 1 January 2002.

(Archdeacon Ernie Carnaby 27/10/2001)

21/01 Reclassification of Leichhardt as a parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Leichhardt as a parish with effect from 1 January 2002.

(The Rev David Crain 27/10/2001)

22/01 Reclassification of Quakers Hill as a parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Quakers Hill as a parish with effect from 1 January 2002.

(Mr Philip Gerber 27/10/2001)

23/01 Reclassification of Seven Hills as a parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Seven Hills as a parish with effect from 1 January 2002.

(Mr David Horne 27/10/2001)

24/01 Anglicare chaplaincies

Synod –

- (a) acknowledges the important core ministry being undertaken by Anglican chaplains in general and psychiatric hospitals, prisons and juvenile justice centres and the Life After Prison Ministry, and
- (b) encourages Anglicare to maintain those core ministries and to develop them as resources permit, and
- (c) notes with concern the financial difficulties facing the Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society Council (Anglicare) by the end of 2004 in providing this ministry without the financial support of Synod, and
- (d) notes that the AHMS council will be requesting that the Synod Estimates Ordinance for the triennium 2003-2004-2005 include a provision to support Anglican chaplaincy in general and psychiatric hospitals, juvenile justice centres, prisons and the Life After Prison Ministry, on a dollar for dollar basis with Anglicare up to an amount of \$800,000 p.a.

(Canon Howard Dillon 27/10/2001)

25/01 Lay and diaconal administration of Holy Communion

Synod noting its own frequently expressed desire for lay and diaconal administration of holy communion and the Archbishop's comments that he wishes to find a constitutionally legal way to proceed, requests that the Standing Committee appoint a committee to investigate the options, if any, consistent with law, that are available and report back to the next ordinary session of the Synod together with any appropriate legislation.

(The Rev Dr Glenn Davies 27/10/2001)

26/01 General Synod - promotion of canon concerning administration of Holy Communion by deacons

Synod requests that our representatives on General Synod, at the next session of the General Synod, promote a bill for a canon to permit a deacon to administer Holy Communion.

(Miss Linda Hughes 27/10/2001)

27/01 Diocesan files on clergy

Synod requests that the Archbishop-in-Council prepare a protocol under which proper provisions may be made for the keeping of material about members of the clergy and stipendiary lay workers in the Diocese and to allow a member of clergy or lay worker to inspect all material held on file about them including provision for the correction of apparent errors.

(The Rev Phillip Jensen 27/10/2001)

28/ Tribunal Ordinance 1962 Amendment Ordinance 2001

Synod refers the bill for the *Tribunal Ordinance 1962 Amendment Ordinance 2001* to the next ordinary session of the Synod and requests that the Standing Committee –

- (a) redraft the bill in plain English, and
- (b) identify issues of principle which can be dealt with by the Synod separately from the text of the bill, and
- (c) advise the Synod on the merits of amendments of which notice has been given to the Diocesan Secretary during the course of this session.

(Mr Neil Cameron 2/11/2001)

29/01 Refugees

Synod –

- (a) notes the existence of an estimated 22.3 million refugees and people of concern to the UNHCR throughout the world and the particular issue for our own nation with hundreds of asylum seekers, especially from Afghanistan and Iraq, arriving by boat in Australian water,
- (b) calls on our political leaders to show wise and just leadership by calming fear, by facilitating a speedier process of assessing the claims of asylum seekers, by providing a more humanitarian detention system, by urging our community to respect cultural and religious differences and reach out in care and concern to all those traumatised by social, religious and racial discrimination, and
- (c) calls on our church members to make this a matter of ongoing prayer and Christian concern.

(Archdeacon Geoff Huard 2/11/2001)

30/01 Jubilee 2000

Remembering –

- (a) that Synod as part of its *Jubilee 2000* resolution overwhelmingly voted that 1% of appropriations be directed to needy overseas dioceses, and
- (b) that this allocation was one of the 4 top priorities in forming the *Synod Estimates Ordinance 1999* for the present triennium, and
- (c) our new Archbishop's emphasis in his Presidential Address that we have a message of salvation for the world, and that "the salvation of the world is God's glory",

Synod resolves that the principle of allocating at least 1% of Diocesan appropriations to partnership in gospel work with needy overseas dioceses be maintained in the next Synod Estimates Ordinance.

(The Rev Frank Gee 3/11/2001)

31/01 Amendment of the business rules

Synod requests that the Standing Committee amend the business rules so that -

- (a) oral votes in the affirmative can be made by saying 'Aye', and
- (b) notices of motion given at the beginning of each day be read to the Synod so that early notice may be had of the motion.

(Mr Robert Tong 3/11/2001)

32/01 Meetings about amendments to bills

Synod encourages the Diocesan Secretary to convene either before Synod, or during Synod, meetings of members who wish to propose amendments to bills so that the time of Synod as a whole is used more effectively.

(Mr Robert Tong 3/11/2001)

33/01 Committee to review the Conduct of the Business of Synod Ordinance 2000

Synod requests that the Standing Committee appoint a committee to review the *Conduct of the Business of Synod Ordinance 2000* and to bring to the next session of the Synod an amending ordinance to implement changes it thinks are appropriate.

(Mr Graeme Marks 3/11/2001)

34/01 Voting for regional council elections

Synod, noting –

- (a) that the election process for regional council members requires that at least one lay member and one clerical member be from each area deanery, but that
- (b) nonetheless, where only one such lay and/or clerical nomination is received for a Deanery, this person is still included on the ballot paper, and so

(c) Synod members still need to vote for some nominees who will in any event be 'automatically' elected, requests that the Standing Committee consider reviewing the appropriate election ordinance(s) so that in these (and any similar circumstances) such nominees would be declared elected and would so not need to be included on the ballot paper.

(Mr Brian Gaetjens 3/11/2001)

35/01 Use of word processing and projection technology during debates

Synod, noting the problems that some members have following the debate and voting on amendments to motions and proposed ordinances, requests that the Diocesan Secretariat consider a further trial, during debates and voting, of the projection onto screen of –

- (a) the wording of each motion (or clause of a proposed ordinance) being considered, and
- (b) for each amendment, what would be the changed wording if that amendment were passed.

(Mr Brian Gaetjens 3/11/2001)

36/01 Bishops Paul Barnett and Ray Smith and Archdeacon Peter Smart

Synod records its gratitude to God for the ministries of Bishops Paul Barnett and Ray Smith and Archdeacon Peter Smart noting particularly their contribution to the Synod, its committees and processes and wishes them and their wives Anita, Shirley and Elizabeth God's continued blessing in their retirement ministries.

(Archdeacon Geoff Huard 3/11/2001)

37/01 Church Discipline Ordinance 1996 Amendment Ordinance 2001: approval in principle

That further consideration of this ordinance be referred to the 1st session of the 46th Synod and that the Standing Committee give this matter a high priority on the agenda of the Synod.

(The Rev Phillip Jensen 3/11/2001)

38/01 Procedural Motions

(1) Synod records its appreciation of the leadership of Bishop Paul Barnett through the devotions during this session.

(The President 3/11/2001)

(2) Synod records its appreciation of –

- (a) the President for his chairmanship,
- (b) the Chairman and Deputy Chairmen of Committees for their work in the Committee stages of bills for ordinances,
- (c) the members who helped during the session by giving advice and serving on committees,
- (d) the services given by the Secretaries, the Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer, the staff of the Secretariat and Anglican Media, the pianists and all those who have helped with the arrangements for sittings.

(Mr Richard Lambert 3/11/2001)

(3) Synod refers to the next session of this Synod the bills for ordinances remaining on the business paper and asks that the Standing Committee continue to consult with parishes which have heritage buildings about the issues raised by the *Church Administration (Heritage Property) Amendment Ordinance 2001*.

(Archdeacon Peter Smart 3/11/2001)

(4) Synod requests that the movers of proposed ordinances referred to the 1st session of the 46th Synod liaise with those who have given notice of amendments and authorises the printing of bills for that session incorporating those amendments which are acceptable to the movers.

(Mr Mark Payne 3/11/2001)

(5) Synod authorises the President to sign the minutes of 3 November upon the production to the Standing Committee of the certificate of any 2 members of the Minute Reading Committee.

(Mr Mark Payne 3/11/2001)

(6) Synod hereby adjourns without appointing another day of meeting.

(The Rev Chris Moroney 3/11/2001)

Ordinances Considered

Passed

Diocesan Officers (Retirement) Repeal Ordinance 2001

Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001

Parish Development Review Ordinance 2001

Parish Relationships Ordinance 2001

Parish Review (Monitoring Panel) Ordinance 2001

Not passed

Synod Membership (Election of Parochial Representatives) Amendment Ordinance 2001

Referred to the 1st session of the 46th Synod

Church Administration (Heritage Property) Amendment Ordinance 2001

Church Discipline Ordinance 1996 Amendment Ordinance 2001

General Synod - Constitution of A Diocese Alteration Canon 1995 Adopting Ordinance 2001

Incapacity Ordinance 2001

Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 Amendment Ordinance 2001

Tribunal Ordinance 1962 Amendment Ordinance 2001