

## **Second Ordinary Session of the 46<sup>th</sup> Synod of the Diocese of Sydney: October 2003**

### **Summary of Proceedings**

*The 2nd session of the 46th Synod was held on 13, 14, 15, 20 and 21 October 2003 at the Wesley Theatre, 220 Pitt Street Sydney. Afternoon and evening sittings were held on each of those 5 days. The President was Dr Peter Jensen, the Archbishop of Sydney.*

*The Synod Service was held in the Wesley Theatre at 4:45 pm on Monday 13 October. The preacher was the Rev Ray Galea.*

### **Presidential Address**

Delivered by Dr Peter Jensen, Archbishop of Sydney, on Monday 13 October 2003.

### **Weddings**

I grow to like weddings more and more. I love the happiness of them; I love the customs about them; I love the way in which the new generation is having such creative fun with the traditions. I even love the speeches, especially the utterly predictable ones: like the uncle who knows the bride well because he used to nurse her when she was a baby (though he has not seen much of her since then) and the bridegroom he has never met until now, but he is sure he must be an excellent man because Julie would only choose a good man.

### **Marriage**

I love weddings because I love marriages. Whether we like it or not, marriages create networks; quite effortlessly, we acquire a string of extra relations, in old fashioned language, kinsfolk. We may never see each other, or even acknowledge the relationship, but the network is there, and is part of the complex and resilient web which makes for community. If we are fortunate, this new family alliance can come alive and provide amazing mutual support and nurture and satisfaction.

I love marriages because of the exciting paradox of them: the fundamental human unit of one person joined with another to become another fundamental unit of two persons but one flesh. You do not have to be an expert to be married; you do not have to be good-looking, or rich or to be a stand-out person - as usual God has reserved the best things for ordinary people. But every precious individual has come forth from the union of two other individuals. Every individual has the right to expect that the two who have parented him or her did so out of love for one another. They should have had the fixed intention of providing not only life, but nurture and guidance and love. An individual conception may have been an 'accident', but this matters not at all if the home is purpose-built.

### **Family**

The fact is that human persons flourish best in the context of stable and loving family relationships. It is part of the goodness of God's provision, that in the normal course of events those home relationships provide not just one who is the same as me in my sex, but one who is different; the daughter must relate to a man, as the son must relate to a woman, as they learn what it is to be human. Sex education is not merely a matter of talks about reproduction and safety; it is an education in the sexes, a matter of producing men and women who care for each other with insight. Good sex is a matter of understanding, of character, not mere technique.

That determination to love and to provide a loving home is given proper and public expression in the exchange of promises at the wedding. Passionate affection needs the long-sightedness of a sacred and solemn covenant, or exchange of promises. It is a moment both romantic and risky when an inexperienced young couple vow to be true to each other 'for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health'; it is a moment when lovers vow to be mates through whatever adventures may come; a moment when the grandparents smile inwardly at the innocence of those who may make such a commitment. The whole extraordinary business of cultivating human children depends upon the promises of two flawed and inexperienced human beings.

Strangely, it is a covenant which the State itself seems to care little about or to support in any meaningful way. On the contrary, the laws of the State reflect a culture in which individualism is the ruling ethos. Getting my

own way is what matters, and morality is personal not communal. Thus, if we have never been taught to keep our word as a matter of honour and of obedience to God, our marriages are put at risk. Even the churches seem to care little whether we honour our word or not. Divorce and even adultery cause as little comment among us as they do in the community as a whole.

### **Co-habitation**

In our generation, co-habitation has become a widespread option to marriage. It is marriage without promises; union without commitment, a shadow of the real thing. It matches the deep-seated individualism of contemporary western society, suiting the mood of autonomy or self-legislation. By its very logic, it is not successful in creating long-term satisfying relationships; it also inhibits the development of kinship between families in society. In fact, the evidence is that those who marry after first co-habiting have less successful marriages than those who approach their unions in the time-honoured public way. The satisfactions gained from the informal setting up of domestic arrangements are short-term. They do not work in favour of either of the participants. That women in particular have acquiesced in this widespread fashion is puzzling: genuine feminism would certainly have counselled them to hold out for marriage. Even more importantly, children have been disadvantaged. The philosophy of individualism creates a serious love-deficit in the community.

### **The Love-deficit**

Of course, not all marry or stay married. For some, singleness is a choice; for others it is a fact of life which they would prefer to change if the opportunity arises; there are many for whom marriage has been a personal disaster and a source of great pain; there are those for whom sexual union with a member of the opposite sex is something which they find impossible to contemplate. The single person, the individual, is precious in the sight of God. Marriage may or may not be their current experience, but they still have deep need for love, for relationships which yield joy and satisfaction. Increasingly, however, the philosophy of individualism denies them that opportunity. We are starved of righteousness and love.

The single Christian person, whether a teenager or a mature adult, is called to live not merely chastely - we are all bound to do that - but without giving physical expression to their sexual natures. This in a society which idolises sex and offers frequent persuasions to immorality. We are constantly being told that the yielding of our body to another is the same as the unity of one's self with another; that it will lead to intimacy. But sexual freedom yields recreation rather than relationship. In these circumstances many single Christians exhibit laudable self-discipline over their sexual lives in loyalty to Christ; but the lack of understanding and the selfishness of others can be painful. Among their needs, they may rightly long for profound friendship, perhaps even 'mateship', a safe intimacy, both pure and satisfying in its own way.

The love-deficit of our society makes such friendship hard to find and to sustain. But they should surely be found among the fellowship of believers; it is no accident that the New Testament calls us by the family names of brother and sister, describes the church as a family and as a household, and calls upon us to love and nurture one another. Single people need the recognition and support of the brothers and sisters in Christ if they are to be true to their Lord. They should be honoured amongst us; indeed the pure love of the brothers and sisters is immensely precious for the single person. It is especially so for those who have been bruised by the relationship whirlpool which is so typical of modern life. In turn, they have a responsibility to build up love in the congregation and to encourage those who are married.

### **The Marriage of the Lamb**

But there is a deeper mystery here: we marry because the Lord himself is the husband of his people; our marriages are the short-term anticipations of that eternal marriage. Marriage is a reflection of God's ultimate purposes, in which we will all be corporately married, whether now married, or single or unable to be married or divorced or widowed. Our real marriage is with Christ: that is what the book of Revelation describes as 'the wedding of the Lamb' for which 'his bride has made herself ready' with the righteous deeds of the saints (Rev 19:7-8). Christ is our true covenant partner. Here is the ultimate relationship for single or married persons: our relationship with each other and with the Father through the Son and the Spirit. The Church is not only to be described as God's flock, temple and the vine, but even the body and the bride of Christ (Eph 5:22ff).

### **Multiplying Christian Fellowships**

Twelve months ago as a Synod we solemnly set our hands to the Diocesan Mission. In doing so, we accepted this fundamental aim: 'To multiply Bible-based Christian fellowships, congregations and churches which equip and nurture their members and expand themselves, both in the Diocese and in all the world'.

This, then, is a Mission which stresses not so much the multiplication of converts, but the multiplication of Christian churches, congregations and fellowships. Of course we trust that the fellowships contain converts. But why have we chosen this emphasis? For two chief reasons. First, because our strategy arises from the nature and purpose of church as revealed in the New Testament. Second, because the New Testament doctrine is a great aid to mission. It is especially true in the post-modern world in which we are called to commend and to live the gospel. The Christian church both has, and is, the answer to the love-starvation induced by individualism.

At this Synod we will together refocus on the Mission. In my address last year, I introduced the goal, strategy and policies of the Mission. Today I will explain how the Bible's teaching on the church helps us to mission effectively in our culture - and some of the things we need to do about it.

Here are three natures of the Church:

### **The One Bride of Christ**

First, we see that there is only one bride of Christ. She is beloved by him and he has purchased her with his own blood. When we reach the end of days we do not see a situation of polygamy, with different churches being married to the Lamb; we see no ultimate future here for the denominations as they vie with one another on earth; we see only one pure bride 'coming down out of heaven from God, as a bride beautifully dressed for her husband' (Rev 21:2). No doubt this is John's way of saying what Paul says, when he tells us that it is the intention of Christ to present the church to himself, 'as a radiant church, without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish, but holy and blameless' (Eph 5:27).

### **The Bride is One**

Second, we see that the Bride is One, that she is a unity already. We do not create her oneness; that is a gift of God from the beginning. When Jesus prayed that his believers may be one, his prayer was answered and continues to be answered. Not least was it answered when the Gentiles were invited into the church on exactly the same terms and conditions as the Jews. The church belongs to the Bridegroom; it is not the possession of any one group or denomination or church structure here on earth. The visible church is necessarily divided by time and space; it also shows forth confusions and divisions over doctrine and practice. But none of this removes the fundamental unity of believers through the Holy Spirit, a unity which reflects the fact that we are even now united with Christ. To use an older language, the saved, whether alive or dead, are all members of the church invisible.

### **The Local Church as the Bride of Christ**

Third, local assemblies of Christians here and now, with all their faults and sins are manifestations of the one true church the Bride of Christ. They may rightly be called by the titles, names and honours of the church. When Paul wrote to the church at Thessalonica, he did not address his letter to part of the church, or a branch of the church; he gave it the full title: 'the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Thess 1:1). Thus it is precisely theologically correct that we say to the congregation, 'You are the body of Christ'; not that we are part of the body, or that we resemble the body, but that we are the body. It is a title fit for the gathering of Christians, small or large. So, too, we may say, you are the flock of Christ; you are the vine; you are the household; you are the bride.

Which assemblies deserve this name? Some popular possibilities and emphases we may at once exclude. There is nothing in the New Testament to support the idea that it is only those who meet in a certain style of building; there is nothing to say that they have to meet only on Sundays, or Saturdays; there is nothing which makes them link to a certain style of liturgy or even of ministry; we do not have to presuppose membership of a certain association of churches; nor that a church is coterminous with a nation, or even that it is another name for all the Christians spread throughout the world.

All these things - our buildings, our ministry, our liturgy, our associations, our communities - can be legitimate. There is no doubt, furthermore, that there is a profound network of communion with our fellow Christians worldwide, what Peter calls, 'your brotherhood throughout the world' (1 Peter 5:9). But the essence of the matter is the purpose of the gathering, a purpose I would summarise as being to meet Christ by the power of his Spirit in his word and sacrament and in loving fellowship with one another. We meet Christ in order to obey him, to manifest the holiness which is his gift, our destiny and our duty.

In particular, I will stress the significance of the word of God in this. The sacraments themselves are 'visible words' depending for their meaning and efficacy on the word; they are actions in which the word of God's grace

is given and received by faith. Christ is the head of the church, and he rules it by his word. It is the word which summons the church, the word which guides and governs the church, the word which nourishes its life. The American Bishop who famously said, 'The church gave us the Bible and it can re-write the Bible' got the whole matter exactly wrong. The church is the product of the word of God, a temple founded on the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus being the chief cornerstone.

### **Experiencing Church**

How do we experience the church? Others may look for such markers as buildings or particular liturgy or clergy; some will demand certain experiential signs. But the Church of Jesus Christ will be marked by the preaching of his word and the administration of the sacraments in the midst of a faithful people. They call on God the Father and Jesus the Lord in the power of the Spirit. Clearly it seeks to obey Christ, and so it manifests godliness in unifying love and purity and mutual care.

In Ephesians, Paul spells out what that obedience will look like in the experience of the churches here and now. He gives a list of commands they are to keep: they are not to lie, not to steal, not to use obscenities. But when we examine these more closely, we see that they are all linked with our fellowship in the body of Christ, our unity in the bride. Our behaviour is especially geared to building up the church until it becomes what Christ has already made it. 'Live a life of love,' he says, 'just as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us ...' (Eph 5:2); also, 'Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ' (5:21). Our sanctification, our growth into the likeness of Christ is not merely an individual matter: it is a corporate responsibility and joy. We are so to love one another that we are all together to become like the Saviour who redeemed us. In this context, our unity with one another is a vital part of the expression of our love.

I think that we can now begin to sense the reason why this is a mission which emphasises fellowship and the multiplication of fellowships and why this understanding of the church is so helpful to us. Here are five reasons:

#### *Word and Church*

First, because of the connection between the word of God and the church. Since each church is summoned into existence and lives by the word of God, it is the most natural context for the unbeliever to hear God's word and be saved. Furthermore, the unbeliever should not just hear the word of God, they should see it in action in the love, faith and hope of the church. Without doubt, many are saved through the faithful work of individuals, and there is much scope for personal evangelism. But the fellowship of the church is the fruit of the gospel and its life confirms the truth of the gospel.

#### *Church and Nurture*

Second, because of the nurture that each church provides for new Christians. When an unbeliever is brought to faith in the context of a fellowship, follow-up has already begun. They do not need to be drawn to a church as a separate step; they are already in the place where it is good for them to be. The church which is being obedient to its Lord will already be nurturing them and building them up in love. Furthermore, the church which understands itself correctly will have moved from outward formality to meeting, from priest to minister, from parish to church, from church to congregation, from temple to facility, from regional to local. All these moves reflect both better theology and a precious missionary characteristic, reality.

#### *Fellowship and Flexibility*

Third, because of the flexibility of this doctrine of the church. The sort of church of which I have been speaking may well be the ordinary suburban congregation - I hope that this is going on all the time in our congregations. But the suburban church on its own is not going to be able to reach out and attract all. For many people, such churches meet at the wrong time in places which are uninviting. Their meetings are too large for comfort and too sophisticated for the beginner. We are going to have to supplement our churches with fellowship groups and congregations which will give access to the experience of church in far more welcoming forms. This doctrine of the church shows how flexible we can be as we preach the gospel and try to win 10% of the population. 'Church' is a big turn off for many; and yet they desperately need the Christian meeting as the place where over time they will find Christ, and where they will be 'taught Christ'.

The small independent Christian group which gathers on a Tuesday night on a hill-side in China in order to meet Christ by the power of his Spirit in his word and in fellowship with one another is essentially 'church'. It is essentially the church, with the full status of the body and bride of Christ. I am not suggesting that a person with a choice should be satisfied merely with the small group; that would impoverish your Christian experience and deny the longing of God's Spirit to unite you where possible with other Christians. I would hope that the fellowship group will be a bridge to the larger experience of the usual local church; but for many, even in our community, it may be their spiritual home, for good reason. Such a group is going to be the only way in which

they will have access to Christian fellowship for some considerable time for some, it will ever be their only means of access, and we ought not to say that they have no experience of the body of Christ, that they are not part of the bride.

This flexibility can help the strategies of the big church and the small church alike. Large or small, each church, congregation or fellowship can be thinking of starting a new fellowship or congregation or church all the time. 'Church-planting' may sound daunting and beyond the resources of a small church. But a new cell-group trying to plant the gospel in a certain street or shopping centre is not. Individuals can be looking at their own environment to see what opportunities exist, how networks can be exploited to plant fellowships; how fellowships can be expanded by inviting new people to join them. Planning to do so should be a fixed item on the agenda. After all, our aim is to share the gospel and the good fruit of the gospel in righteous, loving community with as many people as we can. The growth of fellowships is a good way to accomplish this.

#### *The Priority of the Local*

Fourth, because in this understanding of church, priority is given to the local church over the denominational, and great responsibility is given to the ordinary church members. The denomination is seen to be a structure aimed at helping the local churches in their ministry. It is not a 'church' as such; it is not in itself the body or the bride of Christ. This approach reverses the usual way we think, puts the local churches in the front of our planning, and turns the denominational structures into mission support. The local is where the action is; you must be global in your concerns, but local in your chief action. Furthermore, we become open to co-operation with Bible-based churches of other denominations; this way of thinking is genuinely ecumenical.

#### *Fellowship and the Love-deficit*

There is a fifth reason why this understanding of church is so helpful for the Mission. The creation of such churches, whether they be mega-churches with thousands of members or small churches with only a few score, provides a key alternative to the individualism and lovelessness of post-modernism. Whether by strengthening the family of the married, or by being the family of the single, the church is to show how we can live in a world where we accept the authority of Jesus Christ and so our true humanity. That is why it is so important to see the church as local; the large, institutional denomination which goes by the name 'church' cannot be the personal place where gospel work is done. The local church is where lonely and love-starved and righteousness-starved people are incorporated into the body of Christ and placed under his headship.

The encounter with fellowships, islands of love and righteousness, is precisely relevant to the needs of post-modern society, a society in which love and righteousness are in short supply. Paul writes: 'But among you there must not be even a hint of sexual immorality, or of any kind of impurity, or of greed, because these are improper for God's holy people' (Eph 5:3). In a world like ours, the mere existence of people who live to that standard is very good, liberating news. In a society which has lost the family and the art of love, providing access to small or large voluntary groups of loving relationships helps people to be healed. In the end, of course, it is only the marriage of the Lamb which satisfies and endures.

#### **The Church Actual**

Of course there is theory and then there is reality. It is all very well for me to speak thus about the church, but what we have and what we represent here are the traditional local churches, the street-corner churches of our great city, burdened with stipends, wardens, Sunday schools, property, and ordinances. At a space removed, and yet as watchful as a canine constabulary, we have archdeacons and bishops, the one to bark, the other to bite. And then we have the Synod as the Church's Parliament, a vaguely-heard-of General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia and beyond that at an unimaginable distance removed from what actually occurs, the Anglican Communion, the Archbishop of Canterbury and even, somehow, the Queen.

There is nothing in what I have said which suggests that we should ignore or disconnect ourselves from any of this. On the contrary, our wider links constitute highly valuable ways of associating ourselves with large numbers of 'the brotherhood throughout the world.' Our links with fellow Christians, especially those whose history is much the same as ours, should give us great pleasure, and we should be glad to have the association, even to bear the same name. It can save us from insularity and make us helpfully accountable to others. It would be foolish and ridiculous to dispense with these things as if we could somehow go back to the beginning again and start afresh. The point of looking to the Bible is to check that what we have is actually unbiblical and to see it in perspective and to see whether we may legitimately innovate.

There is nothing quite like a denomination in scripture, but it is certain that the churches regarded themselves as part of a network and checked their doctrine against one another (eg 1 Cor 11:16). The ministry of the bishop had not yet developed, but there were ministers whose activities spanned different congregations.

There was nothing corresponding to our Synod, and yet the churches had a responsibility for their own lives. There was at least one assembly in Jerusalem at which the Christians met to sort out issues of joint concern and even issued rules of behaviour for the peace and well-being of the churches.

Our problem is not the accretions to the original, but whether they have become a burden and involve us through our connections in clear ungodliness.

### **The Diocese and the Synod**

Let us start with ourselves. I love the Diocese of Sydney, though I do not imagine that we should call it 'the church', or the bride of Christ. Rather it is a network of churches and Christian organisations intended to serve the gospel of Jesus Christ and to support the churches. Because we belong to each other, we impact on one another; my good name belongs to you; my concerns are your concerns; we are well fitted to extend the reach of the gospel by engaging in joint actions, such as the Diocesan Mission.

How will our Synod advance the cause of the church, the bride of Christ? I think that it is time to abandon the idea that we are the parliament of the church. Often we have behaved as though that is exactly what we are, and tedious and inefficient has been the result. Certainly elections, ordinances and the distribution of money are key elements of our life together; they make our association work. But the true framework is not parliamentary.

It is far healthier for us to think of the Synod as an assembly of the representatives of the churches which go to make up our network, for the purposes of our mutual life. Given last year's overwhelming Mission commitment, the key question is how we are going to best help each other fulfil our goal. For a number of us it will be quite in order to be critical, or to dissent from the Mission. Nonetheless, I hope that our discussions in the next few days will advance the cause of multiplying bible-based churches, congregations and fellowships in our region and beyond with the initial goal of seeing 10% of the region in such churches in the next 9 years.

### **The Anglican Communion**

As you are well aware, however, we are not on our own, isolated from anyone else. This year has shown that some of our other networks and connections are more important than we imagined. We are indeed part of the Anglican Church of Australia and have historically been pleased to take our membership of this denomination with great seriousness. Our Constitution also makes us part of the world-wide Anglican Communion. It is a fellowship of mainly autonomous Dioceses whose origins go back to England and the historical expansion of the English-speaking people and English missionaries from the seventeenth century onwards. Admittedly these associations appear to have little bearing on the daily life of the local churches. Yet by the mass of custom, of good will, of history and of law they do impinge on us. Without doubt we are in an association with our fellow Anglicans which is not the same as, say, the one we have with the Lutherans. We are identified with each other because we bear the same name. It is an association often accompanied by such good things as prayer and mutual assistance.

What does this mean? When I was thinking of studying in the US in 1976, Archbishop Loane wrote on my behalf to the local ECUSA Bishop, certifying that I was in good standing and enquiring whether a part-time place may be found for me. It was assumed that we were in communion with the Episcopal Church and that as a result a courtesy could be extended to me; I did not have to be re-ordained or retrained; it was assumed that there would be a relatively common approach to ministry and that my good standing included my moral and doctrinal probity. In fact, I went to England and was accepted on the same sort of terms in the Diocese of Oxford. I never felt that I was serving in a different denomination. For me, it was merely a different Diocese of the same world-wide communion. You may have the same experience by joining an Anglican congregation all around the world, sometimes in surprising places. It is a privilege not to be scorned.

On the other hand, it is a privilege which can be overstated. After all, as we look to what God is doing, there is only one Bride of Christ, as we have seen. Membership is not via membership of an ancient denomination, but via faith in Christ. Our brothers and sisters include faithful Anglicans, of course, but not only faithful Anglicans; we must include the faithful of all denominations and none. We can be so in love with our denomination that we exclude others from full fellowship with Christ, and fail to co-operate with other believers or to discern great movements of God which do not have the right 'brand-name'. One of the joys of my life as a Christian has been to take part in interdenominational work through Scripture Union or Crusaders, or to attend the Katoomba Convention, with its great text 'All one in Christ Jesus'. As far as I can see, my communion with my Presbyterian colleagues or my Baptist friends is barely hindered at all by denominational considerations.

## **Women Bishops and Communion**

It is also a privilege which may cause grief. We can cause grief to others, and they to us. Although ten years have passed since the first women were ordained priest in the Anglican Church of Australia, and at a level of friendship there is more peace than there was in those tumultuous years, we have to acknowledge that the denomination has never been the same since. I know that some of you grieve deeply and sincerely about my unwillingness to adopt this development. For my part, and I too am saddened, on that day for the first time my denomination wrote into its charter-documents a practice which is contrary to the bible's teaching. Necessarily, sadly, our communion has been impaired. We can no longer exactly accept each other's ministry as we once, in principle, did.

At the moment, the Australian Church is discussing the issue of women bishops. If the priesting of women was wrong on scriptural grounds, it cannot be right to accept women bishops. The difficulty is exacerbated because a bishop at some level represents a whole Diocese and has to minister to every church in the Diocese. What happens if her ministry is not received, for conscience sake by a parish, or by another Diocese? Nor is this merely symbolic. Various elements of a bishop's role as we have it in our denomination, matters such as jurisdiction, training of clergy, the succession of ministers in a parish and the safeguarding of property make this development perilous for those who do not accept it.

To meet this problem, some people talk of alternative episcopal oversight. At present the legislation being proposed will encourage the Diocesan bishop to provide for a rather minimalist alternative episcopal ministry (rather than oversight) by a male bishop where wanted by a parish. But a bishop provides more than liturgical acts and pastoral care. Is a system such as the one proposed going to be strong enough to offer protection to those with conscientious objections to women bishops? For that matter, how will any self-respecting woman bishop allow for it? Is there not going to need to be deeper structural change? We are confronted with one of the agonising difficulties of modern Anglicanism. It still seems to me that should the General Synod legislate for women bishops, we will only be able to restore a measure of unity with a formal, structural realignment of some sort.

## **Sexual Immorality and Communion**

The problems raised for many of us by women in the role of priests and bishops is significant. But they are of a different order than the blessing of same sex unions and the active practice of homosexuality by those in the ministry. We ought always to obey scripture. We cannot set it aside as I believe has been done with the priesting of women, without unfortunate consequences. But the warnings against same sex practices create a fresh level of concern; they put the practitioners at deadly spiritual risk: 'they will not inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor 6:9,10). Certainly this is part of a list of other gross public sins; certainly we do condemn practices of swindling, lying and greed; certainly the problem is not homosexuality as such; it is the disregard for the scriptural teaching on chastity for us all which is the problem. Heterosexual immorality disqualifies a person from active ministry as much as homosexual immorality does. These are salvation issues, and we cannot falter in making our opposition clear, even if it were to cost us everything we hold dear.

I have already referred to the fact that there are Christians - sometimes including those in ministry - who struggle with same-sex attraction. Sometimes they fail in the struggle. I want to say clearly and emphatically that all are welcome in our churches, and especially all who struggle and fail. Where else can any of us turn than to the Lord Jesus Christ, the friend of sinners? Which one of us can judge another in this area with perfect heart? I want to say that I hope that they find their pastors knowledgeable and caring and their Christian brothers and sisters supportive and encouraging. I want to say that in this struggle we admire them and honour those who seek to live godly lives in Christ Jesus. One thing that angers me is the little acknowledgement that is given to those who live chastely, whether men or women, whatever their inner dispositions may be. To them I say - remember that the fine linen of the bride of Christ 'stands for the righteous deeds of the saints' (Rev 19:8); certainly you are helping to adorn the bride.

## **The Test of Communion**

The reality of the Anglican Communion has been put to its severest test this year over the issue of the blessing of same sex unions and the endorsement of unrepentant homosexual ministry. But it is not only the world-wide Anglican Communion; it is also our own Australian Uniting Church which is involved in a debate over the same issue. Indeed it is no exaggeration to suggest that parts of western Christianity are at an acute phase of the struggle to survive as Christians in our sort of culture, and that this issue is a turning point.

When the Anglicans of New Westminster, in Canada were faced with this, a number of parishes left the Synod, and effectively declared themselves to be out of fellowship with their own Diocese and its bishop. Amongst

those who left were the Reverend David Short and Professor Jim Packer - hardly revolutionaries. The nine dissenting parishes have called themselves, 'The Anglican Communion in New Westminster', and have gained the episcopal protection and support of Bishop Terence Buckle, Bishop of the Yukon. They have risked, and continue to risk, the loss of their property and their identity as Anglicans, but they have done the right thing. They have obeyed the Head of the Church.

Many people talked with me when I was in London during the controversy over the appointment of Dr Jeffrey John as the Bishop of Reading. Subsequently I also visited Vancouver, Washington and Nairobi at the invitation of those who are seeking the support of our Diocese in the struggle to remain in the Anglican Church. I have also had discussions with a number of Uniting Church leaders.

These invitations are a recognition of the important role played by Archbishop Goodhew and the other Sydney bishops at Lambeth. The Diocese is able to make a key theological contribution in giving evangelical and orthodox leadership. Whether we like it or not, we are involved. I have been advised by some to say and do nothing, that these matters do not concern us. I cannot accept that suggestion, especially having heard and prayed with those who are suffering deeply over what they see to be the apostasy of their churches. For them, the imagery of Ezekiel 16, where the Lord's bride has become defiled by her capitulation to the gods and moral practices of the nations is the present reality of their denomination.

### **Authentic Anglicans**

We must ask, why is the action of the orthodox in New Westminster at all a risk? The danger is, of course, that they will lose their parish rights, their property, their ministry. That is why the recognition of other bishops national and international is useful to them. It does not solve their legal problems, but it is a start.

Why, then, have they not been instantly recognised as authentic Anglicans by the rest of the Canadian church and by the Archbishop of Canterbury? After all, it is not they who initiated change; it is not they who are dissenting from the Lambeth Conference; it is not they who have deserted the teaching of the Bible as understood for two thousand years and is still understood by the vast majority of Christians around the world. This exposes the difficulties in the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, not least the present Archbishop, whose theological views are supportive of the Diocese rather than the parishes.

Surely the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot be out of fellowship with the dissenting parishes; and yet he remains in fellowship with the Bishop of New Westminster. His choice is a painful one. He can either abide by the general rules of episcopal behaviour and maintain fellowship with Bishop Ingham; or he can accept that the Bishop has introduced an innovation against the wishes of the vast majority in the communion and many in his own Diocese, and recognise that only the dissenting Anglicans are faithful; or he can recognise both.

At the very least he must relate himself to both sides, or he will see the moral authority which adheres to his office ebb away. Indeed if he continues to relate to New Westminster and ECUSA without rebuke on moral and spiritual grounds, that authority may be at risk in any case. For my part, and I say it with sorrow, I am no longer in such fellowship with the bishop of New Westminster as to welcome him here or indeed to have any dealings with him, while this situation persists and while there is no repentance.

Mine is a moderate statement compared to others; in fact we are facing a future in which the Communion will be in disarray, with parts not recognising other parts. Realignment and even dismemberment is possible, with effective leadership for large parts of the Communion passing to hands other than those of Canterbury. It is not a welcome thought; but those who created the situation by innovation must bear some of the responsibility. Please continue to pray for Dr Williams.

### **The Significance of this Dispute**

The Anglican Communion as such is not the bride of Christ, but all of us who belong to it should aspire to the holiness of the bride. Where that holiness is put at such risk as it has been in the UK, the USA and in Canada, it will be absolutely inevitable that major divisive consequences will follow. In their activities our good name is at stake; our capacity to preach the gospel is imperilled.

Already there are those who have expressed the view that the fuss will die down, that the dissenters will either leave or become quiet as they have over the ordination of women. I can understand why they may think this, given that many of the arguments that have justified one innovation have now been used to justify the other. But, nonetheless, let me say with all seriousness, that this is a massive miscalculation. For a start, those of us who have opposed the ordination of women have not disappeared. Second, the rejection of these developments on this occasion has been widespread and powerful. They are particularly strongly voiced in the

global south, where the numerical strength of the Anglican Communion is now found. Wherever it happens it is bound to lead to sustained opposition and a major and costly realignment of the churches.

Our hearts go out to the brothers and sisters of the Uniting Church, who have found this issue so painful. We pray that the Assembly will reverse the decision which has led to this sorrow. If you ask, by what right do I comment on the affairs of the Uniting Church, I reply that the decision of the Assembly has impacted for ill on all Christians in Australia as we try to witness to the standards of the Bible. The bible-based churches must be able to count on our support; I hope that that support will be forthcoming from all Anglicans if needed, and that this will be made clear at the General Synod next year. Certainly as a Diocese we cannot even contemplate being party to an ecumenical covenant with a denomination which has taken this step. I quote the decisive words of the distinguished German theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg:

*Here lies the boundary of a Christian Church which knows itself to be bound by the authority of Scripture. Those who urge the church to change the norm of its teaching on this matter must know that they are promoting schism. If a church were to let itself be pushed to the point where it ceased to treat homosexual activity as a departure from the biblical norm, and recognised homosexual unions as a personal partnership of love equivalent to marriage, such a church would stand no longer on biblical ground but against the unequivocal witness of Scripture. A church that took this step would cease to be the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church. (Christianity Today, Nov 11th, 1996).*

### **The Health of the Local Church**

These large affairs may seem remote from the local church. But the opinions of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the doings of the American Church are instant news here. They affect our presentation of the gospel, especially as we bear the same name and are structurally connected. Far more deadly, of course, is the local endorsement of Bishop Spong, who in the name of the Anglican Church attacks the evangelical presentation of the gospel. He thus gives comfort to the unbelievers who reject it. For myself, I engage in these disputes unwillingly, but I am bound to do so for the sake of the people of God in the local churches. In the end the success or failure of our Mission under God depends on the capacity of the local church to commend the gospel. It is not helped in this task by connections with a denomination which in some parts has compromised so blatantly with the culture of individualism. This has to be publicly challenged.

The good health of these local churches is basic to our Mission strategy. We need churches of quality, whatever the size, whatever their ethos or their churchmanship. Our churches need to be places where you may hear the biblical gospel taught faithfully, from the pulpit to the kindergarten Sunday School class. They need to be places where that gospel is lived: where there is a manifest righteous love, the holy love that you would expect of the bride of Christ. They need to be places of prayer; they need to have a world vision and a clear local mission; in terms of our Mission they need to have the multiplication of churches and ministries always on the agenda.

Our diocese has always been blessed by strong lay leadership, and we are going to continue to need men and women of sterling spiritual maturity. But the good health of the churches depends mainly on one key factor. The local church rarely rises above the character and skills of its own Rector. Under God, he is the most important single element in the situation. He above all is charged with the weighty responsibility of preaching the word of God which is the basis and regulative principle of the church.

### **The Quality of the Rector**

The quality of the pastorate has always been a great concern to the Archbishops of Sydney. We have wanted to know about the godliness, personal maturity and skills for ministry of those being ordained. No doubt we have had our failures; indeed the ministry is a calling which often remorselessly exposes the failures of those who enter it. No doubt every lay person here would have his or her criticisms of members of clergy: after all it is from the lay people that we recruit them! But on the whole, standards have been maintained, and the Lord has blessed us with clergy whose personal lives will bear scrutiny, whose grasp of the scriptures is sound and whose capacity for pastoral ministry is proven.

The need for this quality is going to be felt more keenly in the next decade. First we need ministers who are godly, not given to greed, or scandal, or gossip, or sexual failure. As ever, they must manage their own families well. This at a time when the culture is making it all too easy to fall into sin at these and other points. Second, they need to lead the churches in the preaching of God's word and in prayer. Of course they will need to love those outside of Christ and be concerned to win them to him. As the churches multiply, if the Lord blesses us in that way, the Rectors are going to need to be all the more excellent pastor/teachers, because more people

will be looking to them for help. They will need to explain why we need to believe and to live counter-culturally. Third, if we follow our strategy, the Rectors we need are going to have to be able to lead churches through change, in the multiplication of fellowships and in taking responsibility for several congregations. They will need to be those who can lead leaders in the multiplication of nurturing congregations. There will be much more lay leadership, for example, and the professionally trained minister is the central resource person in this area.

We can only look to the Lord to continue to raise up such men. But they will need to be shaped and resourced and prepared by the very best education which we can give them. In a world where the faith is under intellectual and moral assault they have to be clear and strong in belief, mighty in the scriptures, like Apollos of old, able ministers of the new covenant.

### **Ministers of Congregations**

Rectors are like the anchor-men of the ministry. But they are going to be called upon to multiply their ministries through others; to train people, to recruit others for the work. Inevitably we are going to develop new patterns of ministry. One such ministry is going to be that of the person who has pastoral responsibility for a specialist congregation. They will, for example be church-planters or evangelists, bringing together a new group of people; they may be pastors of ethnic congregations. Such workers may not need the same qualifications of those whom I am calling Rectors (though it would be good if they possessed them!). But they may need the recognition that ordination brings. We need the flexibility to ordain ministers for service in specific congregations. This development would enable us to recruit, recognise and employ numbers of men and women whose theological training was different from that of the Rector. But they need to have the skills and graces to do pastoral work in congregations.

### **Moore College**

Let me say with all solemnity that integral to the provision of such pastoral leadership is Moore College with its sister, Mary Andrews College. It is our College, manifestly blessed by God through its 147 year history; far beyond anything else it has made this Diocese what it is. It has been, and promises to be even more so, a mighty instrument in the hand of God for the defence and confirmation of the faith. Its present faculty is illustrious; its library is the best in Australia; its student body is impressive. It stands - it has always stood-for godliness; it stands for the intellect captive to the word of God; it stands for the gospel. Speaking strategically we have never been at a more important moment to see the influence of the College through its faculty and its graduates do great things for Christ in Sydney, and beyond. The experiences I have had overseas this year have reinforced at every point the duty we owe to play a part in the defence of the gospel far beyond our own shores. Frankly, in many places biblical theological education is at a low ebb. Moore College is at the centre of the contribution that we are being summoned to make.

Humanly speaking the success of our Mission is going to depend on the health of the College. Whatever we do we must support it; whatever we do we must keep sending men and women to it; it is our single most important diocesan activity beyond the local churches. Indeed the more we diversify our training for lay and stipendiary ministries - if for example we develop ordained ministers such as the ones of whom I have spoken - the more important is the College.

The present and immediate needs of the College are the needs caused by growth and life. The Council has refused to set a limit on its growth. It believes that if God raises up men and women we must take them and train them now. This is an astonishing act of faith, for the facilities are already stretched and those who work at the College are heroic. Please take an interest in the College; be affectionately critical of its endeavours; please support its work in prayer; please support its work with your gifts; pray for the supply of very significant sums of money so that the work will not be hindered. Make it your College and a natural part of your Christian duty to be concerned for its fortunes and interested in its progress.

### **Marriage and the Love-deficit**

The Marriage of the Lamb of God to his Church is part of our great hope; and yet its fulfilment is part of our Christian experience in church here and now. We have a distinctly other-worldly hope. Better, we have a hope for a new world in which dwells righteousness. Our hope drives us forward to share the gospel of Jesus with others, so that they too may be saved through him and spend eternity with God.

But - against all human wisdom - this other-worldly faith of ours is also very worldly. It has powerful consequences for life here and now. Not least can we see this through the experience of church, of fellowships of people dedicated to obeying Christ and building one another up in love. In this context we may see that God

was always right to give us his law to live by; that the life of obedience is the good life; that being centred on other persons is actually for the best.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the Christian doctrine of marriage. The life of a married person is no easy calling; but there is no more honourable title in all the world than that of Husband, that of Wife. That a Christian man is prepared to devote himself utterly and with self-sacrifice to the one woman; that he is prepared to say so, solemnly and in public; that she is prepared to do the same and to honour the responsibility which he takes for their home; this is one of the most remarkable and wonderful things that human beings can do - far, far more significant and even heroic than the efforts of those sporting celebrities whose doings fill our brains with trivia. And in the doing of it, the Christian man and the Christian woman have the honour to reflect the glory of Christ and his church.

This is one of the greatest of the gifts which the gospel gives to the world; our culture's individualistic abandonment of it is a painful disaster. Here is purity and holiness; when we break our vows we bring dishonour to our own name and to the name of Christ. And yet, very strangely, marriage, even the best and most committed marriage, is broken eventually by death, the last enemy; indeed, the better the marriage the greater the pain of the separation of two who have grown to be one. In the end, however, our tears will be wiped away, for our earthly marriages will be transcended, and we will find each other again, but this time within another marriage, one that fulfils and transcends our-earthly union; one that will last forever. This is the marriage of which we are all a part, even those who labour with their singleness: 'I speak of Christ and the church' (Eph 5:32).

My main point is this, that one of the very best things we can do for our society, is to demonstrate true and holy community; for each local church, for each fellowship group to be the pure and obedient bride of Christ. Even when our moral or doctrinal standards are criticised, if they are biblical we have no option but to stand for them. And we will see that, in the multiplication of Christian churches, the pivotal strategy of our Mission to bring the gospel to our generation, we are ourselves simply part of God's great work, in preparing the bride for her marriage to the Lamb.

To the Church of God, to those sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be holy, together with all those everywhere who call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ - their Lord and ours: Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

### **In the Diocese**

I would like to pay tribute, on behalf of all of us, to those ministers of the gospel who have retired from active ministry during the year, wishing them a blessed and fruitful retirement.

The retirees were: the Rev Robert Alexander, Assistant Minister of Cremorne; the Rev David E Firmage, Rector of Kellyville; the Rev Martin W Hunnybun, Rector of Glebe; the Right Rev Brian F V King, Bishop of Western Sydney; the Rev Jim R Le Huray, Rector of Kingsford; the Rev Robert K Luscombe, Assistant Minister of Camden; the Rev Trevor Middleton, Rector of Oak Flats; the Rev Jeffrey M L Parsons, Rector of Lakemba; the Rev R Brian Telfer, Rector of Gladesville; the Rev Don K Wilson, Rector of Padstow and Rev Ken G Yapp, Rector of Neutral Bay.

In addition, those who died were: the Rev A Peter B Bennie; the Rev Bert L Bovis; the Rev Canon R Alan Cole; the Rev E Doug O Crawford; the Rev David G Davis; the Rev Don M Douglass; the Rev Canon Stanley W Giltrap; the Rev Jim W Holmes; the Rev Canon J Roderic L Johnstone and the Rev Robin P Muers, Rector of Katoomba.

As we thank God for their life and ministry, we also send our sympathy to their families, as we with them look forward to that final heavenly marriage feast of which I have spoken.

**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 Peter Kell
3. Deputy Chairmen of Committees: Mr Robert Tong and Mr Justice Peter Young
4. Elections and Qualifications Committee: Archdeacon Ken Allen, Mr Ian Miller, Dr Karin Sowada and Dr Philip Selden
5. Order of Business Committee: The Rev Dane Courtney, Archdeacon Deryck Howell, the Rev Chris Moroney, Mr Mark Payne and Mr Robert Tong
6. Minute Reading Committee: Assoc Prof Michael Horsburgh, Archdeacon Deryck Howell, Archdeacon Geoff Huard and Dr Grant Maple

### 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
3. Anglican Media Council
4. Anglican Provident Fund (Sydney), Board of
5. Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney
6. Anglican Youth and Education Division
7. Arden Anglican School Council
8. Arundel House Council
9. Barker College, The Council of
10. Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council
11. Continuing Education for Ministers, Council of
12. College of Preachers
13. Department of Evangelism
14. Georges River Regional Council
15. Glebe Administration Board
16. Illawarra Grammar School, Council of The
17. Macarthur Region Anglican Church School Council (The)
18. Moore Theological College Council
19. Northern Region Regional Council
20. St Andrew's Cathedral School Council
21. St Andrew's House Corporation
22. St Catherine's School Waverley, Council of
23. St John's Provisional Cathedral Chapter Parramatta
24. St Michael's Provisional Cathedral Chapter Wollongong
25. South Sydney Regional Council
26. Sydney Anglican Car and Insurance Fund, Board of
27. Sydney Anglican Church Investment Trust
28. Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society Council
29. Sydney Anglican Indigenous People's Ministry Committee
30. Sydney Anglican Pre-School Council

31. Sydney Anglican Property Fund
32. Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation
33. Sydney Church of England Finance and Loans Board
34. Sydney Church of England Grammar School Council
35. Sydney Diocesan Secretariat
36. Sydney Diocesan Superannuation Fund, Board of
37. Tara Anglican School for Girls, Council of
38. Trinity Grammar School Council
39. Western Sydney Regional Council
40. William Branwhite Clarke College Council
41. Wollongong Regional Council

*Standing Committee Reports and Accounts etc*

42. 2003 Annual Report
43. 2003 Supplementary Report
44. Synod Fund Audited Accounts for 2002
45. Child Protection Matters
46. Oakhurst - Reclassification as a Parish
47. Ordinances passed since last report
48. Parochial Cost Recoveries for 2004
49. Rooty Hill - Reclassification as a parish
50. Stem Cell Research (5/02)
51. Stipends, Allowances and Benefits (2/02)
52. Georges River Regional Council - Annual Report for 2002
53. St John's Park - Reclassification as a parish
54. Northern Region Regional Council - Annual Report for 2002
55. South Sydney Regional Council - Annual Report for 2002
56. Western Sydney Regional Council - Annual Report for 2002
57. West Ryde - Reclassification as a Parish
58. Wollongong Regional Council - Annual Report for 2002
59. Explanatory Statements and reports on Bills

### **Actions taken under the Parishes Ordinance 1979**

The Synod assented to the following -

- (a) reclassification of Oakhurst as a parish
- (b) reclassification of Rooty Hill as a parish
- (c) reclassification of St John's park as a parish
- (d) reclassification of West Ryde as a parish.

### **Questions under business rule 6.3**

#### **1. Diocesan Mission Policy**

Mr Keith Smith asked –

In view of the need to assess growth with regard to our Diocesan Mission Policy and in view of the large number of parishes that have not returned complete information regarding average Sunday attendances and the number of baptisms and confirmations, what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure that a more accurate picture of annual surveys will result?

To which the President replied –

Mr Smith's question is prefaced by 2 assertions. Although a question containing an assertion is strictly out of order, both assertions made in Mr Smith's question raise important matters for our mission. I therefore make the following observations.

Although number counting is not our primary concern in undertaking the mission, it is nonetheless important that appropriate information is collected as one means of assessing how we are faring, particularly in respect of our initial 10% goal. It is true that a substantial number of parishes have not returned the necessary information to make this assessment. The parochial statistics for 2001, summarised on page 128 of the 2003 Year Book, show that 52 churches did not submit a return in respect of average Sunday attendances, baptisms, confirmations, marriages and funerals.

I will be asking the Archdeacons to follow up those parishes which did not submit an annual return for this information as a necessary imperative to Mission. We are also revising the form to make completion of the return easier.

In addition, the Registrar and I have been in regular communication with Anglicare's Research and Planning Department and the National Church Life Survey, seeking to obtain accurate figures of church attendance.

We are aiming to develop a more adequate method of assessing growth and to put this in place in the next 12 months.

## 2. Church Plants

Dr Rod James asked –

- (a) What is the status of a church plant in a building other than a licensed building in relation to –
  - (i) the involvement of members in a vestry meeting (clauses 7, 11 and 12 of the Church Administration Ordinance 1990) - do they hold a separate meeting or take part in the vestry meeting of the principal church?
  - (ii) clauses 11, 12 and 23 of the Church Administration Ordinance 1990 – is such a church entitled to churchwardens, and if not, who performs their functions?
  - (iii) clauses 6 and 7 of the Church Grounds and Buildings Ordinance 1990 – what activities are permitted, and who is allowed to conduct services and preach in such a church?
  - (iv) any other ordinances which may affect such a church and of which the questioner may be unaware.
- (b) Is it the intention of the Policy 4 committee to bring legislation before this Synod to deal with such matter?

To which the President replied –

- (a) This question seeks a legal opinion and is therefore strictly out of order. However, Dr James' question raises important issues for our mission which require a response. I make the following observations –

Firstly, it is true that a building which has not been licensed as a church is not generally regarded as a church for the purposes of our ordinances. One of the particular difficulties associated with licensing a building being used for an "off-site" church plant is that in general our ordinances require that no building is to be licensed as a church until the land on which the building is erected has been vested in the Property Trust. However there is some flexibility given to the Archbishop to license other types of buildings as churches and it would be my intention to do so wherever appropriate.

Secondly, I am informed that special provisions apply to a group which has been recognised as a church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000. These provisions make it unnecessary for me to license a building in which that group meets in order for that building to be regarded as a church for the purposes of our ordinances.

Finally, I think it is important to note that the Diocesan Mission requires innovative practice which of its nature challenges the rules and structures we currently have in place. By and large this is a healthy thing provided innovation is also accompanied with reforms to those rules and structures to allow us to move ahead in an orderly way.

- (b) The issues raised in Dr James' question need to be further considered and in due course amending legislation may be required to be brought to the Synod.

### 3. Circular to parishes on Mission Property

Mr Graeme Marks asked –

In relation to the circular to parishes on Mission Property – availability of community buildings for use by parishes issued on behalf of the Mission Property Committee in May 2003 to “encourage churches to consider how they can use community buildings for church planting and other and other ministry purposes in fulfillment of the 2nd of the Mission policies recently adopted by the Synod” –

- (a) How many copies of this circular were issued?
- (b) What comments and feedback, as requested by the Mission Property Committee in the circular, have been provided?
- (c) How many churches have requested information from the database referred to in the circular containing information about 516 community facilities controlled by local councils in the Diocese in order to assess the suitability of such facilities for church planting purposes?
- (d) How can churches obtain access to the database?
- (e) Are the modifications, set out in the circular, to the Department of Education's standard “Community Use Agreement” procured by the Mission Property Committee to facilitate Anglican use of school buildings still current, and if not, what has changed?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows -

- (a) 276
- (b) There have been a number of responses to the circular although no comments and feedback have been provided.
- (c) One church has initiated a request for information from the database.
- (d) An electronic copy of the database can be provided to any church by email on request. In addition, a search on the database can be undertaken on request as indicated in the circular.
- (e) The circular sets out 2 types of modifications that can be made to the Department of Education's standard “Community Use Agreement”. While one of the modifications is no longer relevant given recent changes to the Department's policies, the remaining modification is still current and should be used where appropriate.

### 4. List of names of persons licensed

Mr Graeme Marks asked –

In relation to Synod resolution 10/02 which is reproduced on page 397 of the 2003 Year Book –

- (a) what has happened in making available information that –
  - (i) is publicly available in the Year Book, and
  - (ii) is not publicly available such as non-ordained licensed but employed persons and
- (b) when is it expected that this information will be available?

To which the President replied –

- (a) I am informed that the answer is as follows –
  - (i) In view of the requirements of privacy legislation, all clergy have been asked to consent to their personal information being published, both in the Year Book and on the internet. To date, of the 286 who have replied, 14 are unwilling for their information to appear on the internet. Of those 14, 8 are currently incumbents.
  - (ii) A new software program has been installed, and it is expected that persons in the category referred to in Mr Marks' question will be incorporated, hopefully in 2004.
- (b) In view of the unwillingness of a significant number of clergy to have their details published on the internet, it is not anticipated that such information will be made publicly available on the internet. However, the possibility of a secure internet site protected by password which would be available to ministers and churches, is currently being explored.

## 5. Funding for indigenous people's ministry

Mr Richard Lambert asked –

In relation to resolution 25/02 of this Synod which in part reads –

“Synod recommends to the Standing Committee that priority be given.....to resourcing Indigenous Peoples' Ministry by directing that a percentage of the proceeds from all sales of church trust property be added to the Indigenous Peoples' Trust Fund...”

can the President please inform the Synod in respect of the period 1 January 2003 to 30 September 2003 –

- (a) How many ordinances did the Standing Committee pass to enable the sale of church trust property?
- (b) How many of those ordinances provided for a percentage of the proceeds to be paid to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund?
- (c) How many such ordinances did not make any such provision?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 10
- (b) and (c) One sale ordinance passed during the period in question provided for a percentage of the proceeds to be paid to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund. The other 9 ordinances did not. This reflects the decision of the Standing Committee to recommend that 1% of the total income available to Synod be added to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund each year from 2006 as a line item under the Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance.

## 6. Funding for indigenous people's ministry (2)

Mr Richard Lambert asked -

In relation to resolution 25/02 of this Synod which in part read –

“Synod...urges each parish of the diocese to generously support Indigenous ministry in the diocese any way it can, for example by giving a percentage of any land sales to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund or by giving 1% of their income to the fund....”

can the President please inform the Synod in respect of the period 1 January 2003 to 30 September 2003 –

- (a) How many parishes are there in this diocese?
- (b) How many ordinances for sale of property held in trust for a parish contained a provision for a percentage of a land sale to be paid to the trust fund?
- (c) How many ordinances for sale of property held in trust for a parish did not contain such provision?
- (d) How many parishes have made donations to the trust fund?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 265
- (b) 1
- (c) 7
- (d) I am informed 2 parishes have made direct donations to the trust fund.

**7. General Synod - Holy Communion Canon 2001 Adopting Ordinance 2003**

Mr Donald McPhail asked –

Noting item 14 on the Business Paper for Monday 13 October 2003 concerning the bill for the General Synod – Holy Communion Canon 2001 Adopting Ordinance 2003, what are the current circumstances under which an Anglican Minister can refuse Holy Communion to a confirmed member of any Anglican Church and, in particular, to a member of the minister's own church?

If that minister does so refuse, what steps can be taken to direct that minister to give Holy Communion to all confirmed members of the Anglican Church?

To which the President replied –

This question seeks a legal opinion and is therefore out of order. However I draw Mr McPhail's attention to Canons 26, 27 and 28 of the Canons of 1603.

**8. Moore Theological College**

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

- (a) How many students are currently enrolled in Moore College?
- (b) How many of the students in Question 1 are currently Anglican candidates?
- (c) Of the Anglican candidates in Question 2, how many are catechists in churches within a 20km radius of Moore College?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 283
- (b) 93
- (c) 74

**9. Glebe Income Accounts**

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

- (a) How many parishes in the Diocese now have cheque accounts with the Glebe Income Accounts? How does this compare with 12 months ago?

- (b) How much is invested with the Glebe Board, in any accounts, by parishes within this Diocese? What percentage of the total funds of the Glebe Board is this? How do both these figures compare with 12 months ago?

To which the President replied -

I am advised that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 42 parishes now have cheque accounts with GIA. GIA cheque accounts were not offered to parishes 12 months ago.
- (b) \$16.5 million is currently invested with the Glebe Board by parishes representing 12.5% of total GIA funds. This compares with \$11.3 million representing 8.5% of total funds 12 months ago.

**10. Special Session of Synod for the Archbishop's Election Synod**

The Rev Ross Nicholson asked –

- (a) How many meetings did the Special Session of Synod of June 2001 sit for the Archbishop's Election?
- (b) How many hours did each of those sittings run for?
- (c) How many members of Synod attended each of those sittings?
- (d) Was there a call by Standing Committee, the regional councils or regional bishops before this Synod for the diocese and parishes to pray for the decisions of that Special Synod?
- (e) Did the movers of motion 17.3 on the Synod papers call their regions to pray for the decision to be made by the Standing Committee which extended the retirement age of the Archbishop?
- (f) Did any bishops call their regions to pray for the decision to be made by the Standing Committee?
- (g) Was a motion moved at that Standing Committee that requested debate on the extension of the retirement age of the Archbishop be adjourned until the parishes of the Diocese could be called together to pray for those deliberations?

To which the President replied -

By the "Special Session" for the "Archbishop's Election" I take it you mean the special session held on 4 and 5 June 2001 in which I was elected Archbishop. On that basis I am informed the answers are as follows –

- (a) and (b) The Special Session commenced at 4.30pm on Monday 4 June 2001, adjourned for dinner at 5.45pm, resumed at 7.15pm and adjourned for the night at 10.28pm. The second day of the session on Tuesday 5 June 2001 commenced at 6.30pm and ended at 10.50pm.
- (c) On the first day of the session a count during the pre-dinner session indicated there were 624 members present. At the count during the evening session there were 698 members present. On the second day of the session, a count taken during the session showed there were 703 members present.
- (d) Yes. A call to pray was issued to Synod members by the Administrator, Bishop Paul Barnett on 20 March 2001.
- (e) Not specifically. However the movers have been calling for prayer for the Mission of which they consider the Archbishop to form an integral part.
- (f) No.
- (g) No.

**11. Prohibited Persons (Church Administration) Ordinance 2003**

Having been granted leave, the Rev Graham Fairburn asked the following question on behalf of Ms Alik Darlow –

- (a) What were the circumstances which prevailed upon the Standing Committee to pass the Prohibited Persons (Church Administration) Ordinance 2003 which disqualified Prohibited Persons from holding positions as wardens or parish councillors?
- (b) How many prohibited persons were wardens or parish councillors before the legislation was passed?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) In 2002 a parish sought the advice of the Professional Standards Unit because of concern that a prohibited person had been nominated for a parish council. Following this, the Professional Standards Board recommended to the Standing Committee that an ordinance be passed preventing prohibited persons (those convicted of a serious sexual offence or other serious offence against a child) from holding positions of parish councillor or church warden. These positions are not “child related positions” under State legislation.

The Professional Standards Board recognised that there was a question of balance in the issue. However in its opinion the question of the protection of minors and the good name of the church as the body of Christ outweighed the issues of repentance, rehabilitation and restoration at least as applied to positions of leadership such as churchwarden and parish councillor. In recommending the passing of an ordinance, the Professional Standards Board acknowledged that there was a need for sensitive and careful pastoral care and support for disqualified persons.

Standing Committee passed the Ordinance at its March 2003 meeting and it received the Archbishop’s assent. At its April 2003 meeting Standing Committee reconsidered the matter, but decided not to amend the Ordinance.

- (b) It is not known how many prohibited persons were wardens or parish councillors before the ordinance was passed. However, the Director of the Professional Standards Unit is aware of one situation, mentioned already, where a prohibited person was nominated to a parish council but not elected and of another parish where a prohibited person was a member of parish council.

**12. Indigenous ministry**

Dr Laurie Scandrett asked –

In the light of the statement made to last year’s Synod that the total budget for all 23 Anglican dioceses for indigenous ministry was \$196,000, would the President please inform us of what was contributed by the Diocese of Sydney in the year 2002 for indigenous ministry both within the Diocese and outside it?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that actual expenditure on Indigenous ministry from the Indigenous Ministry Fund and regional grants totalled \$170,673 in 2002. To this can be added housing supplied by the Western Sydney Regional Council during this period notionally valued at \$20,000. I also understand that a number of parishes in the Diocese independently contribute to Indigenous work (in 2003 this is at least \$20,000 so far).

For the following groups, precise contributions to Indigenous work in 2002 could not readily be obtained. However I am informed as to the following –

- (a) The National Home Mission Fund will provide \$31,000 in the next year to support Indigenous work in Cairns, Northern Territory and North West Australia. Approximately

40% of the budget of the National Home Mission Fund is contributed by the Diocese of Sydney.

- (b) The Church Missionary Society spends in the order of \$314,000 annually on Indigenous work, a significant percentage of which is contributed by churches and CMS members in this Diocese.
- (c) The Australian Board of Missions partners Indigenous work costing in the order of \$300,000 annually. However it is not possible to ascertain what percentage of that is contributed by churches and members in this Diocese.

It is a matter of great encouragement to note that apart from the three Indigenous ministry centres in this Diocese, there are two assistant Indigenous bishops in Australia and a total of 32 Indigenous clergy.

### **13. Standing Committee Elections**

The Rev Stephen Semenchuk asked –

During the last 6 years, how many elected Standing Committee positions were filled through contested elections and how many through uncontested elections?

To which the President replied –

I take it that the reference to “elected Standing Committee positions” is not intended to include the filling of casual vacancies by the Standing Committee. On that basis I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Synod Session	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Contested	nil	2	nil	2	6	nil
Uncontested	nil	28	nil	nil	36	1

### **14. Archbishop’s Election**

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

Given the concerns that were widely expressed with the presentations made in our Synod meeting to elect an Archbishop in 2001, are there any plans now made to review the standards and processes that apply, so as to increase the probability that all future candidates proposed for consideration to that office would be treated with more respect, and fairness in future meetings?

To which the President replied –

This question contains an assertion and makes an inference and as such is out of order. However it is customary for the rules for the election of an Archbishop to be reviewed after each election Synod. As such a proposal to review the rules has been raised with the Standing Committee and will be considered in due course.

### **15. Support for churches and parishes without a minister**

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

Noting Synod resolution 23/02 “Support for churches and parishes without a minister” and the recent diocesan website reference to a review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance 1988, which advises readers that there is a committee looking at the review of this ordinance and that they are also seeking submissions on resolution 23/02 and, given the differences between the resolution and the stated task of the Ordinance Review Committee, could the President advise what has been planned in relation to the matters specified in the resolution?

To which the President replied –

While it is true that there are differences between the terms of Synod resolution 23/02 and the committee's task in reviewing the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance, there is an inter-relatedness between these 2 matters. The referral of resolution 23/02 to the committee is aimed at ensuring that these matters are considered in a coordinated way, although each on their own terms.

In reviewing the ordinance, I understand that the committee is considering the areas of human relationship involved in the process of a parish looking for a new incumbent. It is considering guidelines for parishes, Archdeacons and the Presentation Board which may assist all parties in the process.

Nevertheless Mr Mitchell's question has alerted me to the need to ensure the committee gives proper consideration to Synod's resolution in its own terms.

## **16. Review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance**

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

In relation to the questionnaire on the diocesan website seeking submissions for the review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance –

- (a) Could Synod members be advised of the processes involved in its preparation/design, publication, availability and possible use, that would ensure it yields statistically accurate, representative and significant results, that can be relied on when considering the results obtained to best alter our processes in appointing rectors to parishes?
- (b) Is it planned to make available a report on the results of this "survey" to Synod members?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) The questionnaires set up on the diocesan website were produced by the committee appointed to review the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance in conjunction with staff from the I.T. department in St Andrew's House. It was first trialed by a sample of people who were familiar with the Presentation Board process.

Its purpose is to elicit responses that would be helpful in the process of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. The committee was concerned to allow opportunity for people who have been associated with the presentation process to make comments from personal experience.

The primary aim was not that of gathering statistics. The committee wanted to gain quick and reliable access to the attitudes, comments and suggestions from a wide range of people regarding the operation of the ordinance.

- (b) No. There will be no report, as such, specifically centred on the survey. The committee is using the responses from the questionnaires as one of a number of inputs as to the operation of the current Presentation Board. The results from the survey, along with individual comments, will be used in making suggestions as to changes to the ordinance and guidelines for its operation.

## **17. Principal of Mary Andrews College**

Miss Elaine Peterson asked –

- (a) Under what rule or rules does the Principal of Mary Andrews College have membership of –
  - (i) the Synod, and
  - (ii) the Standing Committee?
- (b) Does this person have voting rights in these bodies?

- (c) Is it true that the current Principal of Mary Andrews College, who also holds the position as Archdeacon of Women's Ministry, has thus lost her voting rights as Principal?
- (d) If so, under what rule has this been authorised?

To which the President replied –

- (a) The Principal of Mary Andrews College does not by virtue of that office have membership of the Synod or the Standing Committee. However the current holder of this office, Archdeacon Narelle Jarrett, is a member of the Synod because I have appointed her as a Nominated Minister under Part 7 of the Synod Membership Ordinance 1995. Archdeacon Jarrett is a member of the Standing Committee in her capacity as Archdeacon under clause 1A(1)(f) of the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897.
- (b) Archdeacon Jarrett is able to vote at Synod and the Mission Taskforce but not at the Standing Committee.
- (c) Archdeacon Jarrett's status as principal of Mary Andrews College is irrelevant to her right to vote on either the Synod or the Standing Committee. Ms Jarrett was a member of the Standing Committee elected by the whole Synod and, in that capacity, was able to vote at meetings of the Standing Committee. Upon becoming an Archdeacon she became an ex-officio member of the Standing Committee. Archdeacons can participate fully in the work of the Standing Committee except they cannot vote.
- (d) Clause 1A(2) of the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897.

## 18. Anglican Communion

Associate Professor Michael Horsburgh asked –

- (a) In the light of the current discussions in the Anglican Communion, what consideration has the Archbishop, the Standing Committee or any other part of the Diocesan administration given to the following matters –
  - (i) the way in which the Diocese of Sydney is in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury;
  - (ii) the way in which the Anglican Church of Australia is in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury,
  - (iii) the way in which the Diocese of Sydney might move out of communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury,
  - (iv) the effect of any such move on the Diocese of Sydney's membership in the Anglican Church of Australia, and
  - (v) the effect of any such move on the Diocese of Sydney's trust property; and
- (b) If any such consideration has been given, what was the results?

To which the President replied –

- (a) The questions raised by Professor Horsburgh have gained particular significance because of the statement by the Primates of the Anglican Communion meeting in Lambeth Palace and released 15 October 2003 which addressed these issues at length. They stated "the ministry of this one bishop (the proposed Bishop of New Hampshire) will not be recognised by most of the Anglican world, and many provinces are likely to consider themselves out of communion with the Episcopal Church of the United States of America. This will tear the fabric of our communion at its deepest level, and may lead to further division on this and further issues as provinces have to decide in consequence whether they can remain in communion with provinces which choose not to break communion with ECUSA. Similar considerations apply to the situation pertaining in the Diocese of New Westminster". It went on to say that "the Lambeth Conference 1998 requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to establish a commission to consider his own role in maintaining communion within and between provinces when grave difficulties arise. We ask him now to establish such a commission". In addition the network of legal advisors established by the Anglican Consultative Council in 2002 has been asked to advise further.

In specific answer to his questions the person and bodies mentioned have given no formal consideration to these matters other than that at the Standing Committee meeting on 30 June 2003 where a motion was passed requesting “that the Chancellor and the persons who until recently were the members of the Legal Committee consider and advise it as to the legal implications of the concept of ‘communion’, with particular reference to the 1961 Constitution and the constitution of the organisation known as the ‘Anglican Communion’”.

At this stage that committee has not convened but is planning to do so.

- (b) Not applicable.

Although not directly raised by Professor Horsburgh’s question, I draw his attention to sections 6 and 69(3) of the Schedule to the Anglican Church of Australia Constitution Act 1961 (NSW).

## **19. Lay and diaconal presidency at the Holy Communion**

Associate Professor Michael Horsburgh asked –

Given that the Archbishop has undertaken to consult with the bishops of the Anglican Communion prior to the adoption of lay and diaconal presidency at the Holy Communion, sometimes call “administration”.

- (a) What consultations have already taken place?
- (b) With what results?
- (c) When is it expected that a final report on the consultations will be available to the Synod?

To which the President replied –

I believe that, strictly speaking, I have not undertaken to consult with the bishops of the Anglican Communion. The media release referring to this was based on a report to the Standing Committee which the Standing Committee has not, in fact, endorsed at this stage. Nonetheless I have already been consulting widely, and it is in fact my intention to continue the process. Thus as far as specific answers are concerned –

- (a) As well as correspondence with Archbishop Carey, I have consulted with Bishops from South America, the United States of America, England, South East Asia, Papua New Guinea and many parts of Africa, across a range of churchmanship. In addition, I have spoken with the Bishops of the Australian Church at the General Synod in 2001, and listened to their concerns. In accordance with an understanding I have made with the Australian Bishops, I have arranged to have further discussions on this matter with the Bishops of the Province.
- (b) The results have been varied. Most have been opposed to lay and diaconal administration, but for different reasons. On two continents I have evidence that lay and/or diaconal administration may already be in operation.
- (c) I have not undertaken to deliver a final report in a formal way to the Synod. No doubt I will convey the results of the consultations to the Synod at the appropriate time.

## **20. Occupational health and safety legislation**

The Rev Rick Miller asked –

Regarding the Government’s Occupational Health and Safety legislation –

- (a) By what date must parishes comply with this legislation?
- (b) How many parishes complied with the legislation by that date?
- (c) What are the penalties for not complying with the legislation?
- (d) Has the Diocese sent information about its relevance and its details to parishes, and if so when?
- (e) Will parishes be receiving further information from the Diocese about its application to them in the near future, and if so when?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) Occupational Health and Safety legislation has been in place for many years and as such parishes have been required to comply with the legislation to the extent it applies. I take it however that the “date” referred to in Mr Miller’s question is a reference to 1 September 2003, being the date on which certain recently introduced obligations under the legislation started to apply to employers with 20 or fewer employees.
- (b) Parishes have not been asked to provide information regarding their compliance with the legislation and, as such, the information sought by the question is not available.
- (c) There are a range of monetary and other penalties for not complying with the legislation. Serious offences under the legislation attract substantial penalties
- (d) Yes. Information regarding the obligations under the legislation was sent to all parishes in 2002 as part of the Employment Relations Guidelines issued by the Secretariat. .
- (e) A significant amount of work has been undertaken in preparing further information for parishes. The Secretariat hopes to be in a position to issue such information shortly.

## **21. Administration of confirmation by presbyters**

The Rev Rod Harding asked –

Noting that –

- (a) Synod resolution 14/00 requesting the appointment of a committee to examine certain aspects of the practice of confirmation and report to the next session of Synod was passed 3 years ago, and
- (b) in October 2001, the Standing Committee reported that it was still considering the appointment of the committee (Annual Report 2001, 7.21, pages 31-32),
- (c) after another year the Standing Committee reported that a committee has been appointed to consider and report on the matters raised, but that it had not yet reported (Annual Report 2002, 8.11, page 32),
- (d) after another year, the Standing Committee had been appointed, but the committee has still not reported on the matters raised by the resolution,

I therefore ask –

- (i) Who are the members of the appointed committee, and when was it appointed?
- (ii) How many times has the committee met since its appointment?
- (iii) Have submissions from interested persons been invited, and if so, how many have been received?
- (iv) When is it likely that the Synod will be able to receive and consider the report of the committee, which was originally requested to be completed by October 2001?

To which the President replied –

I am informed the answers are as follows –

- (i) Bishop Glenn Davies, the Rev Dr Robert Doyle, the Revs Neil Flower and Bruce Hall, Mr Bill Nicholson and Deaconess Margaret Rodgers.
- (ii) Twice.
- (iii) Yes. 13 submissions have been received.
- (iv) It is anticipated that the committee will report to the next session of this Synod.

## **22. “Gilbulla” Memorial Conference Centre**

Mr Peter Yates asked –

- (a) (i) Has the sale of Gilbulla, permitted by the “Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001” been completed?
- (ii) If so, who was the purchaser, what was the amount paid and how was that amount paid?

- (iii) If the sale is still in progress by way of part payments, what is the status of the sale and has the purchasing party honoured its contractual obligations to make payments by specified dates. If not, have extensions of time been given by the Diocese of for the purchasing party to make its payments? What is the nature of those extensions and why have they been given?
  - (iv) Where are the payment funds, or part payment funds, found in the Diocesan financial income and expenditure statements?
  - (v) Have those funds been set aside for the purchase of a new Diocesan conference centre?
- (b) What is the status of the search for a new Diocesan Conference Centre to replace Gilbulla?
- (c) What is the status of the “Gilbulla” Menangle Memorial Chapel to the clergy of the Diocese? Is the Chapel to be demolished and/or removed and relocated?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a)
- (i) Yes
  - (ii) The purchaser was Ellel Ministries Australia Ltd. The amount paid for the property was \$1,900,000. Under the terms of the sale a deposit of \$300,000 was paid on exchange of contracts on 19 April 2002 and the balance of \$1,600,000 was paid on settlement of the sale on 22 November 2002.
  - (iii) Not applicable.
  - (iv) Under the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 the net funds (approximately \$1,800,000 after paying the costs of the sale) are being held in a separate trust fund administered by the Church Property Trust. As such these funds do not form part of the general Diocesan financial statements of income and expenditure.
  - (v) Yes. Under the terms of clause 4(e) of the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 the funds are to be applied “towards the cost of acquiring, constructing, adapting and/or renovating a property or building to be used as a conference centre and retreat house in connection with the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Sydney and for purposes incidental thereto.”
- (b) The search for a new Diocesan Conference Centre is continuing. With the completion of the new development at Waterslea on the Shoalhaven River greater attention will now be given to finding a new conference centre site.
- (c) The Gilbulla Memorial Chapel was part of the property sold to Ellel Ministries Australia Ltd, a Christian organisation with links to the Anglican Church. As such it was considered appropriate that the Chapel remain and be available for use in conjunction with the ministry being developed by the new owners.

Clause 5 of the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 provides that “any new Anglican conference facility acquired from the proceeds of this sale is to be named and maintained in memory of Navy, Army and Air Force Chaplains.”

## Petitions

There were no petitions.

## Elections

*Note: There were no contested elections at the session.*

### 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. STANDING COMMITTEE - Persons elected by Synod**  
(Ordinance 1897)  
*1 qualified minister elected for 2 years*  
The Rev A J Stewart
  
- 2. ANGLICAN CHURCH PROPERTY TRUST DIOCESE OF SYDNEY**  
(Ordinance 1965)  
*2 persons, at least 1 of whom must be in Holy Orders, elected for 6 years*  
The Rev C J Moroney  
Mr P J Rusbourne
  
- 3. SYDNEY ANGLICAN HOME MISSION SOCIETY (ANGLICARE)**  
(Ordinance 1981)  
*3 persons elected for 3 years*  
Mr M J Beard  
The Hon R W Gee  
Ms R Hobbs
  
- 4. ANGLICAN PROVIDENT FUND**  
(Ordinance 1990)  
*2 employer representatives elected for 4 years*  
Mr J Conti  
Mr E P Groombridge  
  
*2 member representatives elected for 4 years*  
Mr A McDonald  
The Rev J A Pettigrew
  
- 5. ANGLICAN RETIREMENT VILLAGES DIOCESE OF SYDNEY**  
(Ordinance 1961)  
*2 persons elected for 3 years*  
Mr P Driscoll  
Mrs A Hewetson
  
- 6. ANGLICAN YOUTH AND EDUCATION DIOCESE OF SYDNEY**  
(Ordinance 1919)  
*1 member of the clergy elected for 3 years*  
The Rev M R Yeo  
  
*1 member of the clergy elected for 1 year*  
The Rev M P Jensen  
  
*1 layperson elected for 3 years*  
Mrs K Collier

**7. ARDEN ANGLICAN SCHOOL COUNCIL**

*(Ordinance 1962)*

*4 persons, at least 2 of whom are to be clergymen, elected for 3 years*

The Rev M Charleston  
The Rev W France  
Mr K W Hayward  
Mr D P Stanton

**8. ARUNDEL HOUSE COUNCIL**

*(Ordinance 1977)*

*3 persons elected for 3 years*

Mr A Longhurst  
Ms J Robertson  
Vacancy (ex Mrs E Lovell resigned 30/06/03)

*1 person elected for 2 years*

Mr J Reilly

*1 person elected for 1 year*

Mrs J Condie

**9. BARKER COLLEGE, THE COUNCIL OF**

*(Ordinance 1978)*

*1 clergyman elected for 3 years*

The Rev G C M Boughton

*1 layperson elected for 3 years*

Mr M Tooker

*1 layperson elected for 2 years*

Mr J L Grainger

**10. CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MINISTERS, COUNCIL FOR**

*(Ordinance 1989)*

*1 clergyman, being an incumbent of an ecclesiastical unit, elected for 3 years*

The Rev J R Gray

*1 layperson elected for 3 years*

Mr G S Maple

*1 clergyman, being an incumbent of an ecclesiastical unit, elected for 1 year*

The Rev P L Hayward

**11. DIOCESAN REPRESENTATIVES ON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN NSW**

*(Constitution of the Council)*

*2 persons elected for 2 years*

Mrs R Kurle  
The Rev C J Moroney

**12. DIOCESAN TRIBUNAL - SUPPLEMENTAL LIST**

*(Ordinance 1962)*

*1 layperson elected for 2 years*

Miss S M Cole

- 13. THE ILLAWARRA GRAMMAR SCHOOL, THE COUNCIL OF**  
*(Ordinance 1958)*  
*1 clergyman elected for 4 years*  
The Rev A J Glover  
*2 laypersons elected for 4 years*  
Prof. D E Lewis  
Mrs V Pym
- 14. MACARTHUR ANGLICAN SCHOOL, THE COUNCIL OF THE**  
*(Ordinance 1982)*  
*2 persons elected for 3 years*  
Mr M Bell  
Mrs M Thomas
- 15. THE MISSION TO SEAFARERS, SYDNEY PORT COMMITTEE**  
*(Synod Resolution 10/63)*  
*1 person elected for 3 years*  
Mr B Douglas
- 16. MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE COUNCIL**  
*(Ordinance 1984)*  
*1 clergyman, who is an incumbent, elected for 3 years*  
The Rev N E Prott  
*2 laypersons elected for 3 years*  
Mr K M Chapman  
Dr K Sowada
- 17. PARISH RELATIONSHIPS ORDINANCE**  
*(Ordinance 2001)*  
**Appeal Group**  
*1 member of the clergy, who is or has been an incumbent, elected for 2 years*  
The Rev N A Flower
- 18. PRESENTATION BOARD**  
*(Ordinance 1988)*  
*1 clergyman elected for 2 years*  
The Rev C J Moroney
- 19. DIOCESAN REPRESENTATIVES ON PROVINCIAL SYNOD**  
*(Ordinance 1986)*  
*1 member of the clergy elected for 2 years*  
The Rev C Chardon
- 20. ST CATHERINE'S SCHOOL WAVERLEY, COUNCIL OF**  
*(Ordinance 1922)*  
*1 clergyman elected for 4 years*  
The Rev G W Job  
*2 laymen elected for 4 years*  
Mr G Morrison  
Mr M Wormell

*1 woman elected for 4 years*

Mrs M Forsyth

*1 clergyman elected for 3 years*

The Rev J P Tonks

*1 layman elected for 3 years*

Mr S Angus

**21. SYDNEY ANGLICAN CAR AND INSURANCE FUND BOARD**

*(Ordinance 1978)*

*1 member of the clergy elected for 3 years*

The Rev T J Halls

*2 laypersons elected for 3 years*

Mr P Burgess

Mr J Pascoe

**22. SYDNEY ANGLICAN SCHOOLS CORPORATION**

*(Ordinance 1947)*

*4 persons elected for 3 years*

Dr A Cole

Archdeacon G R Huard

Mr R W Salier

Mr W B Nicholson

*1 person elected for 2 years*

The Rev I Rienits

*1 person elected for 1 year*

Mr D Minty

**23. SYDNEY DIOCESAN SUPERANNUATION FUND BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

*(Ordinance 1961)*

*1 person, being a representative of members, elected for 2 years*

Mr D S Marr

**24. SYNOD POOL**

*(Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999)*

*12 clergy, at least 9 of whom are incumbents, elected for 3 years*

The Rev R C Barrie

The Rev Dr R H Chilton

Canon I W Cox

The Rev D L Crain

The Rev B J Dudding

The Rev N A Flower

Canon J R Livingstone

The Rev M B Robinson

The Rev R G Robinson

Canon J W South

The Rev D W Wallace

Vacancy to be filled

*12 laypersons elected for 3 years*

Mrs W Colquhoun

Mr D Francis

Mr A Frank

Ms F Hansen

Dr K Hawtrey

Mr G J Marks

Mr D S Marr  
Mrs L McCoy  
Mr M Purvis  
Dr K Sowada  
Miss J K Warren  
Ms A Watson

**25. TARA ANGLICAN SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, THE COUNCIL OF**

*(Ordinance 1956)*

*2 members of the clergy elected for 3 years*

Canon G R Begbie  
Bishop I Y Lee

*2 laypersons elected for 3 years*

Mr M Jones  
Mr A C Locke

*1 layperson elected for 2 years*

Miss J Furniss

*1 member of the clergy elected for 1 year*

The Rev A J Heron

**26. TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL, THE COUNCIL OF**

*(Ordinance 1928)*

*2 clergymen elected for 3 years*

The Rev D H Courtney  
The Rev T J W Oakley

*2 laypersons elected for 3 years*

Mr J E Mills  
Mr R Pegg

*1 clergyman elected for 2 years*

The Rev H R J Scott

*1 clergyman elected for 1 year*

The Rev A Katay

**27. WILLIAM BRANWHITE CLARKE COLLEGE COUNCIL**

*(Ordinance 1987)*

*1 clergyman elected for 3 years*

The Rev W D Orpwood

*1 layperson elected for 3 years*

Mr B G Jones

CHRIS MORONEY  
MARK PAYNE  
*Secretaries of the Synod*

I HEREBY declare the persons concerned elected.

PETER F JENSEN  
*Archbishop of Sydney*

14 October 2003

## Resolutions Passed

### 1/03 Review of Church ordinances and abuse matters

Synod appoints a committee consisting of Mr Michael Orpwood QC, Mr Garth Blake SC, Mr Neil Cameron, Mr Philip Gerber and Mr Robert Wicks to –

- (a) review the *Tribunal Ordinance 1962*, the *Church Discipline Ordinance 2002* and the *Relinquishment of Holy Orders Ordinance 1994* in light of recent experience and the basic principles contained in the proposed national model legislation for dealing with abuse matters, and consistent with biblical teaching, and
- (b) prepare any draft amending ordinances for consideration by the Synod in 2004.

(Mr Philip Gerber – 13/10/2003)

### 2/03 Congregations of other churches joining the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Sydney

Synod, in view of the alarming developments in other Protestant Churches and the possibility of some congregations wishing to associate with or join the Anglican Church in this Diocese, requests that the Standing Committee appoint a committee to consult with the Archbishop on any changes in ordinances, necessary or desirable, to facilitate such moves and to bring any necessary ordinances to affect such changes to the next ordinary session of the Synod.

(Mr Neil Cameron 13/10/2003)

### 3/03 Formation of the College of Church Planters

Synod approves the formation of a diocesan College of Church Planters to facilitate and stimulate the growth and development of new Anglican congregations and fellowships and to specifically work on the following –

- (a) sponsoring and organising local, regional and national church planting conferences and 'schools' in concert with local leaders, parishes and dioceses, and
- (b) assisting and stimulating local and regional church planting initiatives through 'roundtables', consultations and coaching, and
- (c) researching, evaluating and reporting trends in church planting here and overseas,

and appoints the following persons under the presidency of the Archbishop -

The Rev Stuart Robinson (EM) - Chair

The Rev Stefan Bull - Secretary

and a committee comprising the following people -

Bishop Dudley Foord

Ms Rosie Pidgeon

Ms Kara Gilbert

The Rev Peter Sholl

Mr David Green

Bishop Ray Smith

Mr Greg Middleton

Mr Tony Willis

Dr George May

and the mover, with the power to co-opt.

(Dean Phillip Jensen 13/10/2003)

### 4/03 Church Planting Taskforce

Synod requests that the Archbishop establish a church planting taskforce funded from the policy 2A budget with representation from each of the regions, Evangelism ministries and other suitable people with the following functions -

- (a) to encourage church planting across the regions, and
- (b) to research and develop effective models of church planting, and

- (c) to encourage and fund strategic pilot projects, and
- (d) to train and encourage church planters, and

to monitor and report progress in church planting across the diocese through Southern Cross and the Anglican Media Web site.

(Mr Andrew Mitchell 13/10/2003)

### **5/03 New Anglican Schools**

Synod –

- (a) gives thanks to God for the establishment of two new Anglican schools in the Diocese of Sydney – Shellharbour Anglican College in the Illawarra and Wollondilly Anglican College in the Southern Highlands, and
- (b) assures the respective foundation principals of the schools, Mr Stuart Quarmby and Mr Tony Cummings, and their school councils, of its prayers and encouragement as they prepare for their opening in January 2004.

(The Rev Ian Mears 13/10/2003)

### **6/03 Election of Canon David Mulready as the Bishop of North West Australia**

Synod congratulates Canon David Mulready on his election to be the next Bishop of North West Australia, gives thanks to God for his ministry in the Diocese of Sydney and assures David and Maureen of its prayers and best wishes for their new ministry.

(Bishop Ivan Lee 13/10/2003)

### **7/03 Protocol regarding inheritances from parishioners**

Synod requests that the regional archdeacons draft a protocol regarding the propriety of clergy, employees of parishes, Diocesan officials, and employees of Diocesan organisations, receiving inheritances from parishioners.

(Dean Phillip Jensen 14/10/2003)

### **8/03 The Rev Howard Dillon**

In view of the projected retirement of the Rev Howard Frederick Dillon in August 2004, Synod gives profound thanks to Almighty God for the public ministry of Howard Dillon in this Diocese and beyond over the past 40 years, and especially for his leadership of the Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society (Anglicare Diocese of Sydney) since his appointment as Executive Director from the beginning of 1996.

Synod expresses its appreciation of his service and ministry and prays for Howard and Aileen a satisfying and fruitful retirement.

(The Rev Martin Robinson 14/10/2003)

### **9/03 Reclassification of West Ryde as a parish**

Synod assents to the reclassification of West Ryde as a parish with effect from 1 January 2004.

(The Rev Richard Mills 14/10/2003)

### **10/03 Reclassification of Oakhurst as a parish**

Synod assents to the reclassification of Oakhurst as a parish with effect from 1 January 2004.

(The Rev Trevor Ackman 14/10/2003)

**11/03 Reclassification of Rooty Hill as a parish**

Synod assents to the reclassification of Rooty Hill as a parish with effect from 1 January 2004.

(The Rev Ray Galea 14/10/2003)

**12/03 Reclassification of St John's Park as a parish**

Synod assents to the reclassification of St John's Park as a parish with effect from 1 January 2004.

(Archdeacon Geoff Huard 14/10/2003)

**13/03 Moore Theological College**

Synod requests that the Standing Committee –

- (a) appoint a committee to prepare in consultation with the College Council, recommendations concerning ways in which the Diocese as a whole and individual churches may support the work of Moore College in its training of lay and stipendiary ministers, and
- (b) report to the next ordinary session of Synod.

(Mr Rodney Dredge 15/10/2003)

**14/03 Funding of the Mission**

In light of this Synod's commitment to the Mission, and the need to increase funds available for the Mission, Synod hereby requests –

- (a) every parish, provisional parish, Anglican School and Diocesan organisation within the Sydney Diocese to transfer their main cheque account facility and deposits to the Glebe Income Accounts, by 31 March 2004, and
- (b) all Sydney Anglicans consider investing their own term deposits and other funds into Glebe Income Accounts.

(The Rev Ian Millican 15/10/2003)

**15/03 Archbishop of Sydney's Overseas Relief and Aid Fund**

Synod commends the ministry of the Archbishop of Sydney's Overseas Relief and Aid Fund especially under the leadership of Mrs Kim Vanden Hengel who has brought new impetus to the work as well as a new emphasis on partnership with CMS missionaries such as Mark and Annette Bennett in Cairo and Max and Hanna Collison in Nairobi and with churches planted by CMS missionaries such as at Katoke in Tanzania led by Canon Samuel Habimana.

We thank God for the renewed energy and growth this work has promoted in the churches and communities concerned, and we pray that the leaders in each place may have wisdom and grace to use this provision faithfully and well.

As a materially wealthy church in a wealthy society we affirm our commitment to stand with our brothers and sisters throughout the world especially those in churches begotten by Australian CMS missionaries located in areas of deep poverty and great physical need - need for improved education, health provision and food security.

We ask the Archbishop and his officers, as an expression of the Diocesan mission 'in all the world', to ensure there is a vigorous expansion of work such as that of ORAF which we note has attracted increasing numbers of donors in recent times and higher total donations.

(Assoc Professor Alan Watson 15/10/2003)

**16/03 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. Synod further requests that the Standing Committee, in making any future appointments to fill vacancies arising on the Committee, should seek to ensure that there is always a significant majority of lay membership

(Mr Philip Gerber 15/10/2003)

**17/03 Mission property strategic plan**

Synod endorses in general terms the Mission Property Committee's strategic plan and encourages parishes and organisations to consider how they can support the implementation of that plan.

(Mr Peter Kell 15/10/2003)

**18/03 Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane**

Synod notes that on Tuesday 14 October Archbishop Marcus Loane celebrated his 92nd birthday. Synod respectfully requests that the Archbishop write to Sir Marcus and convey to him the best wishes and warm Christian greetings of the Synod.

(Deaconess Margaret Rodgers 20/10/2003)

**19/03 Ministry of Mrs Lois Rabey**

Synod thanks God for the effective ministry of Mrs Lois Rabey of the USA to the women of our Diocese and urges all Synod members to encourage the women in their parish to attend the remaining meetings this week. Synod also wishes to commend the initiative of MU Australia, the Wollongong Regional Council and the Archbishop for providing this evangelistic opportunity in our Diocese.

(The Rev John Livingstone 20/10/2003)

**20/03 Proclamation of the word of God**

Enthusiastically accepting the mission of our Lord Jesus Christ to make disciples of all nations, acknowledging the Diocesan Mission to be one expression of that mission and noting the Archbishop's reference in his Presidential Address to each church being a "context of the unbeliever to hear God's word and be saved", this Synod recognises that from the earliest times, as recorded in Scripture, and throughout history, the word of God, by the will of God, is often proclaimed to the unbeliever outside of the context of church and urges Christian people to proclaim this message from God and about God in many different contexts, including the "market places" of our world.

(Dr Barry Newman 20/10/2003)

**21/03 Act to amend the Anglican Clergy Provident Fund Act**

Synod requests that the board of the Anglican Provident Fund (Sydney) consider seeking from the New South Wales Parliament an appropriate amendment or amendments to the Anglican Clergy Provident Fund Act 1908 and the Anglican Clergy Provident Fund (Sydney) (Amendment) Act 1941 to enable the Standing Committee to exercise delegated powers of the Sydney Synod in passing any ordinance in respect of the Fund.

(Mr Richard Lambert 20/10/2003)

**22/03 Australian Racing Christian Chaplaincy**

Noting the Diocesan Mission of seeing at least 10% of the population of the Diocese in Bible-based churches in the next ten years and particularly noting policy 2, '...to take further initiatives to create fellowships by penetrating structures of society beyond the reach of the parish church ...', Synod –

- (a) gives thanks to God for the continued progress of the Australian Racing Christian Chaplaincy (ARCC) in seeking to establish a gospel ministry to people working in the thoroughbred horse-racing industry, and
- (b) urges members to pray for harmonious relationships with racing clubs, administrators and individuals, so that the gospel may not be hindered in any way, and

urges members to pray that a suitable candidate with a licence to officiate will be found for the position of chaplain.

(The Rev Jeremy Tonks 20/10/2003)

### **23/03 Listing of children's workers in the Diocesan year book**

Synod requests that, in the 2004 and subsequent Diocesan Year Books, provision be made for a separate listing of children's workers, in addition to, but separate from the youth workers' listing.

(Miss Jennifer Flower 20/10/2003)

### **24/03 Prohibited persons**

Synod requests that the Standing Committee have the Professional Standards Board review clauses 22(6) and 32(2) of the *Church Administration Ordinance 1990* which state respectively –

'A person who is a prohibited person within the meaning of the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1988 may not be appointed or elected as a churchwarden of a church.'

and

'A person who is a prohibited person within the meaning of the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1988 may not be elected or appointed as a member of a parish council or a committee established under clause 29A of a parish.'

and report to the 2004 session of the Synod on –

- (a) the operation of those clauses and their effect on parish councils and the administration of parishes, and
- (b) the inclusion of an appropriate diocesan review and decision process to allow a church member with prohibited person status to apply for conditional or full exemption from the exclusions to be elected or appointed as a churchwarden or parish councillor.

(Ms Alik Darlow 20/10/2003)

### **25/03 Freemasonry**

Synod, noting the 1988 Report to Synod entitled "Freemasonry Examined" and subsequent resolution 9/88 of that Synod –

- (a) affirms that Freemasonry and Christianity are fundamentally and irreconcilably incompatible, and
- (b) affirms that Freemasonry teaches and upholds a system of false religious and spiritual beliefs that are contrary to biblical Christianity.

Synod encourages ministers and other Christians to take every opportunity to reach out in love to all Freemasons and share with them the gospel of Christ.

Synod encourages all Christians who are members of a Masonic Lodge to demonstrate their commitment to Jesus Christ as the divine Son of God and as the sole way of salvation, by withdrawing from the Lodge.

Synod encourages ministers not to participate in, nor allow in their church buildings, any religious services or activities that uphold, condone, promote or encourage adherence to Freemasonry.

Synod requests the Councils of all Anglican Schools to consider any association that their school may have with any Masonic Lodge, and to withdraw from any such association. Synod further requests that Anglican Schools neither participate in any activity that may uphold, condone, promote or encourage adherence to Freemasonry, nor give publicity to any such activity, nor allow the name of the school to be used in association with any such activity.

Synod requests Standing Committee to undertake the preparation, production and distribution of a clear and unambiguous booklet suitable for wide distribution, examining the key rites, teachings and beliefs of Freemasonry and explaining why they differ from Biblical Christianity, and explaining why it is wrong for a Christian to belong to the Lodge.

(The Rev Bill Winthrop 20/10/2003)

### **26/03 Lay and diaconal administration of Holy Communion**

Synod requests that the Standing Committee –

- (a) bring to the next session a bill which incorporates the recommendations of its sub-committee for consideration by the Synod at that session, and
  - (b) arrange for a formal debate on the bill at that session, and
- report to that session as to the possible consequences of the passing of an ordinance which authorises diaconal and lay administration and as to how any adverse consequences can be avoided.

(Bishop Glenn Davies 20/10/2003)

### **27/03 Creation of a mission partnership fund**

Synod requests that the Standing Committee, in calculating the cost recoveries charges payable by parochial units in 2005, consider providing for the creation in that year of a mission partnership fund to be funded by such charges and applied between the regional councils in such manner as the Standing Committee may determine.

(The Rev Andrew Monk 21/10/2003)

### **28/03 Church of England on Norfolk Island**

Synod sends its greetings to the Church of England on Norfolk Island, and assures the Church of our prayers and best wishes.

(Bishop Robert Forsyth 21/10/2003)

### **29/03 Future shape of ministry**

Synod encourages the Standing Committee and its Mission Taskforce to continue to consider proposals for the future shape of ministry in the Diocese and, in relation thereto, encourages consideration of the following specific matters –

- (a) the funding of proposals,
- (b) what will happen to lay stipendiary workers,
- (c) the permanence of ministry (including whether 'ordination' as a minister is temporary or permanent),
- (d) the ministry of deacons, in reality and in theory,
- (e) de-centralisation of the delivery of training,
- (f) ecumenical movements with other bible based churches,
- (g) recognition of previous study and a wider range of study and experience, and
- (h) and other items.

(Dean Phillip Jensen 21/10/2003)

### **30/03 Anglican Communion**

Synod reaffirms its commitment to the authority of Scripture and recognises that the Anglican Communion has traditionally maintained its adherence to that authority and that of the 39 articles of religion.

It notes the departure from biblical authority in the actions of –

- (a) the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster by agreeing to bless same-sex unions, and
- (b) the Diocese of New Hampshire, endorsed by the Convention of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, in electing as bishop a person engaged in homosexual activity.

Synod therefore dissociates itself from these actions which are contrary to biblical teaching, and as an expression of Christian fellowship and love calls on those involved to repent, and to reverse their decisions.

Synod also commends our Archbishop for his public comments on these issues and for standing with other leaders of like mind in their desire to maintain the truths of Scripture.

(Bishop Glenn Davies 21/10/2003)

### **31/03 Support for churches adhering to biblical teaching on human sexuality**

Synod sends Christian greetings to the Rev David Short, to the congregation of St John's Shaughnessy, and to the other clergy and laity of the Diocese of New Westminster who have stood firm on the teaching of scripture concerning human sexuality.

We commit ourselves to pray for your witness to the truth, for the deepening of your fellowship in the proclamation of the gospel and for your continued confidence in our Father's sovereign purposes.

Synod also supports the proposal that members of the Diocese of New Westminster who cannot in conscience accept the Episcopal leadership of Bishop Ingham should have access to alternative Episcopal ministry.

Synod also expresses its support for those sections of ECUSA who are struggling to preserve biblical standards in their denomination and encourages them to stand firm in the face of pressure to conform to policies that are contrary to biblical teaching.

(Canon Bruce Ballantine-Jones 21/10/2003)

## **Ordinances Considered**

### *Passed*

Synod Elections Amendment Ordinance No 44, 2003

Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance No 45, 2003

Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 Amendment Ordinance No 46, 2003

Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance No 47, 2003

Anglican Provident Fund Ordinance 1990 Amendment Ordinance No 48, 2003

Act of Uniformity (Section 10) Repeal Ordinance No 49, 2003

Church Administration (Heritage Property) Amendment Ordinance No 50, 2003

General Synod - Constitution of a Diocese Alteration Canon 1995 Adopting Ordinance No 51, 2003

### *Referred to the 3rd session of the 46th Synod*

General Synod - Holy Communion Canon 2001 Adopting Ordinance 2003