

50th Synod of the Diocese of Sydney

3rd Ordinary Session

Minutes of Proceedings of the Synod for Tuesday 11 October 2016

1. Assembly

The Synod assembled in the Wesley Theatre at 3.15 pm.

2. Bible study

The Rev Gary Koo led the Bible study.

3. Minutes

The President signed the minutes for Monday 10 October 2016.

4. Answers to Questions

4.1 **Distribution of funds raised by Anglicare in the Syrian and Iraqi Refugee appeal**

The Rev David Clarke asked the following question –

How much of the \$746,000 raised by Anglicare in the Syrian and Iraqi Refugee appeal has so far been distributed to parishes currently engaged in ministering to Syrian and Iraqi people?

To which the President replied –

In September 2015, I called upon the Sydney Diocese to come together to mount a prayerful, practical, sustained and effective response to assist refugees coming to Australia fleeing the Syrian conflict.

As the lead organisation for this response, Anglicare launched the Archbishop's Syrian Refugee Appeal and designed a program that addressed current gaps in service delivery, and which would involve wherever possible the involvement of parishes and individual Sydney Anglicans.

Between September 2015 and May 2016, the appeal raised \$746,000, enough to fully fund the program until July 2018. Parishes do not receive direct funding through this program, however resources are directed toward parish-based programs.

The program involves –

- Parish-based English as a Second Language (ESL) classes;
- Community and parish-based Early Learning Through Play courses to prepare pre-school aged refugee children for kindergarten;
- Family support and trauma counselling through Anglicare's Hope Counselling program;
- Training for parish volunteers in assisting refugees; and
- Assistance with material needs and transitional accommodation.

To date –

- ESL groups are expanding with an additional four parishes in the Georges River Region establishing this ministry in addition to the 16 already in operation;

- The first of several parish-based Early Learning Through Play programs will be launched next week in the Bankstown Parish;
- Hope Counselling is currently serving 25 refugees from the additional cohort of 12,000;
- 236 people have completed the first module of parish refugee volunteer training, with the second module having commenced last weekend; and
- A number of transitional accommodation options for Syrian and Iraqi refugees are in development.

As members of Synod are no doubt aware, there was a significant delay from the Australian government in the processing and approval of Syrian and Iraqi refugees forming part of the additional cohort of 12,000.

These refugees have finally begun to arrive in Australia, and we remain committed to serving these people in Jesus' name for as long as it takes to ensure they receive the warm and generous welcome we committed to provide them

4.2 Numbers of nominators in previous elections of the Archbishop

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

What were the numbers (only) of the nominators for each nominee of all elections of the Archbishop in this Diocese since 1966 referred to in paragraph 5(d) of the Standing Committee's Explanatory Report (dated 21 June 2016) for the proposed Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1928 Amendment Ordinance 2016?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

1966

H. ARROWSMITH: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 S. BABBAGE: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 R. DAVIES: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 F. HULME-MOIR: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 M. LOANE: 18 movers, 18 seconders.
 L. MORRIS: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 T. REED: 1 mover, 1 seconder.

1982

E. CAMERON: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 D. HEWETSON: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 J. REID: 4 movers, 4 seconders.
 D. ROBINSON: 9 movers, 9 seconders.
 K. SHORT: 1 mover, 1 seconder.

1993

P. BARNETT: 9 movers, 9 seconders.
 D. CLAYDON: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 R. GOODHEW: 24 movers, 24 seconders.
 H. JAMIESON: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 P. D. JENSEN: 68 movers, 68 seconders.
 B. KING: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 W. LAWTON: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 M. NAZIR: 1 mover, 1 seconder.
 J. REID: 28 movers, 28 seconders.

2001

T. EDWARDS: 24 nominators

R. FORSYTH: 45 nominators.

G. HUARD: 31 nominators.

P.F. JENSEN: 138 nominators.

R. PIPER: 31 nominators.

2014

G. DAVIES: 182

R. SMITH: 195

4.3 Revisiting the Diocesan Doctrine Commission report “A Theology of Christian Assembly”

Dr David Oakenfull asked the following question –

What steps have been taken to implement Resolution 16 passed at the 2015 Session of Synod requesting the Diocesan Doctrine Commission to revisit its report “A theology of Christian assembly” (4 September 2008), noting that this report makes no reference to prayer or worship?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Diocesan Doctrine Commission has three other prior tasks that it is working on at present and as a result has not yet been able to revisit its report on “A theology of Christian assembly”.

4.4 Apologetics in the curricula of Moore Theological College and Youthworks College.

Dr Barry Newman asked the following question –

- (a) Do any sections of the curricula of Moore Theological College, Youthworks College and Ministry Training Strategy include material on the importance and nature of apologetics as an adjunct to the proclamation of the gospel in our modern western world?
- (b) If so, what topics are dealt with and in what context – that is, what are the specific units or parts of other units in which the material is presented?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Moore Theological College

Moore Theological College currently teaches apologetics at both the first year diploma level and in the fourth year of the degree program.

Youthworks College

The importance and nature of apologetics as an adjunct to the proclamation of the gospel is specifically addressed in the context of a specialised unit on evangelism in Youthworks’ vocational diploma program; and in a unit on Christian Apologetics in the Year 13 program.

- (b) Moore Theological College

CM151 Evangelistic Apologetics is a diploma subject which looks at a basic Christian apologetic stance and addresses key apologetic issues.

CT451 Contemporary Apologetics is BD4 subject which investigates the theology of apologetics as well as how a richly theological approach to apologetics might address particular contemporary apologetic concerns.

Youthworks College

Both Youthworks' programs address contemporary apologetic issues in relation to creation, the authority of Scripture, the exclusive claims of Jesus Christ, the providence of God, and the meaning of the atonement.

In Youthworks' vocational specialist units several areas are addressed in order to equip the students to engage with a variety of contemporary issues that arises as the gospel is proclaimed in our modern western world, including identity, sexual morality, mental health, enrichment and other social issues.

In the vocational informal program, Youthworks also run regular after dinner seminars where topics include understanding our culture with a view to engaging evangelically and apologetically, including through movies, TV shows, books, commercials and other fragments of popular culture so as to learn to 'read' our culture better for the proclamation and application of the gospel.

The answer does not provide information regarding the Ministry Training Strategy as it is not a diocesan organisation. It not an organisation about which questions can be asked under business rule 6.3(3).

4.5 **Membership of Standing Committee**

Mr Thomas Mayne asked the following question –

- (a) How many persons are currently members of Standing Committee?
- (b) Of that number –
 - (i) How many are blue-collar workers or equivalent?
 - (ii) How many are women?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 55
- (b) (i) We don't keep information regarding the occupational background of members of the Standing Committee. So far as we know, no member would easily fit the description 'blue collar worker or equivalent'.
- (ii) 9

4.6 **Authority to Officiate for the Rev Dr Keith Mascord**

The Rev Dr Andrew Ford asked the following question –

In light of recent media reports, could the Archbishop explain why he declined to grant an Authority to Officiate to the Rev Dr Keith Mascord?

To which the President replied –

A licence to preach and teach, under the auspices of the Anglican Church, carries with it a responsibility to teach the doctrines of the Church and not against those doctrines.

The Reverend Dr Mascord has not been engaged as a priest in the Diocese since 2008. In 2008 he was given a three year authority to officiate in a voluntary capacity. In July 2010 Dr Mascord applied for and was granted a further three year licence, which expired in August 2013. Dr Mascord is not currently licensed in the Sydney Diocese since his licence expired three years ago.

I met with Dr Mascord on 15 June this year and we discussed a number of issues including the views he expressed in his latest book. Dr Mascord made it clear to me that his thinking had moved away from the established doctrines of the Anglican Church. I said that I would read his book so that I knew exactly where his views had diverged.

At his ordination, Dr Mascord vowed that he was “ready to drive away all false and strange doctrines that are contrary to God’s word”. Dr Mascord has since come to believe that the Bible contains “erroneous ... theological ideas”. He now describes himself as a “dissenting Christian”, holding that the Bible “is an ancient text, pregnant with ancient assumptions and beliefs, many of which we no longer reasonably hold” and on this basis calls on Christians to re-think, among other things “the assumptions and beliefs which underlie Biblical discomfort with same sex activity”.

Because of his rejection of the authority of the Bible and the doctrine of Christ (as received by the Anglican Church), I formed the view that it was not appropriate for any clergyman who held such views to hold a general licence in our Diocese.

Dr Mascord was offered a licence to exercise a ministry in his parish as long as he was willing to conform to his ordination vows to teach only what is in accord with Anglican doctrine.

The accusation in the media that the Archbishop of Sydney has sought to restrict Dr Mascord’s freedom of speech is a misrepresentation of the facts. My letter to Dr Mascord differentiates between the Anglican ministry for which he would hold my licence in his local parish, and his public teaching in other contexts. With respect to the former, I required that Dr Mascord “desist from teaching in that parish any doctrine which is contrary to that which has been received by the Anglican Church of Australia”. With respect to the latter I made no stipulations, and merely expressed my personal preference, informing Dr Mascord: “I would, of course, prefer you not to teach contrary to our received doctrine whenever and wherever you teach in non-Anglican settings, as you will still be perceived as an Anglican clergyman.”

I understand Dr Mascord has declined to take up the licence for ministry in his parish as offered by me. However, the offer still stands.

4.7 **Workload on regional bishops since the discontinuation of regional archdeacons**

The Rev Bruce Stanley asked the following question –

Can the Archbishop advise Synod as to any work increases upon our regional bishops since the discontinuation of regional archdeacon positions in the Diocese, with particular reference to parish building works?

To which the President replied –

I have asked the Regional Bishops for their responses to this question and their answers are as follows –

Bishop Ivan Lee

When I was first consecrated, Archdeacon Ken Allen was the Archdeacon for the Western Region. In the years thereafter when I had no Archdeacon or Executive Assistant, there was significant increase in workload, both pastoral and property. Since the appointment of the Rev Neil Atwood as Executive Assistant, this workload has reduced as he now handles the majority of property issues, although I still am involved as Neil is part time. But I would say that compared to when I had a full time Archdeacon, my present workload, even with a part time Executive Assistant, is still an increase.

Bishop Peter Hayward

I have no prior experience of life with an Archdeacon so I cannot give an answer. All I can say is that I am involved in some property matters but the majority of the issues are dealt with by my Executive Assistant, the wonderful Tony Willis.

Bishop Chris Edwards

There are presently 12 parish building projects underway in the Northern Region that I am involved with. My Executive Assistant, the Rev Chris Burgess, also assists with these projects.

Bishop Peter Lin

I've not been around when there were Archdeacons. For me I have spent a fair bit of time on building/property issues. Lack of expertise in the area and given the huge amounts of money

means I double check everything so may spend more time than other Bishops who have more experience. It would be difficult to express in hours. I would be pleased to do less of it.

Having said all that, I'm hoping to share a lot of this work with my new Executive Assistant, the Rev James Davidson.

Bishop Michael Stead

The South Sydney Region has 10 significant property matters on the go at the moment. The Rev Hugh Cox and I are looking after half each. A fulltime Archdeacon could have looked after all 10 matters.

4.8 Parish Loans

The Rev Andrew Katay asked the following question –

- (a) How many parishes currently have loans with the Finance and Loans Board?
- (b) How many parishes currently have loans with another lending agency?
- (c) What is the total original loan value of all parish loans currently outstanding?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

It is assumed by referring to 'lending agencies' the question is seeking information regarding loans that are secured against real property, and not other loans such as loans from parishioners or loans for the purchase of office equipment, motor vehicles or the like. It is difficult to compile such data due to inconsistencies in the way loans are recorded in the balance sheets of parishes.

The Property Trust has examined its records for the 5 years to 1 July 2016 in regards to the parish loans for which it has acted as the contracting party. These reveal that 20 parishes obtained loans from external lenders during that period.

Approximately \$47 million (based on the 59 FLB loans and the 20 parishes referred to in the answer to part (b)).

It should be noted that statements and associated loan correspondence are sent directly to parishes by external lenders. A full answer to the question would require each of these parishes to be contacted. This is not feasible in the time available.

4.9 Greenfield Land Acquisitions Levy

The Rev James Warren asked the following question –

In answer to a question (4.7) asked last year about whether the greenfields Land Acquisition Levy is set high enough at 2% per annum, producing an annual income of approximately \$2 million, part of the President's informed answer was:

- The MPC estimates that \$17.5 million in greenfield land acquisitions is required over the next 5 years.
- This answer excludes the needs for new churches in brownfield areas of the Diocese.
- The MPC acknowledges that the need for new churches is greater than funds available.

- (a) Is there now an even greater case for the 2% greenfields Land Acquisition Levy to be raised?
- (b) Due to limited funding, what greenfields have we so far missed out on that we would have otherwise purchased?
- (c) When do such delays, make it a brownfield purchase, and to what extent do the costs to acquire church property then increase?

- (d) Why has brownfields funding (with 70% of new houses in Sydney) been considered separately and subsequently to the greenfields funding?
- (e) What amount (percentage-wise) would MPC find useful if they could request an amount for their brief?
- (f) What are the main reasons holding us back in increasing this figure?
- (g) Who is best placed to reconsider whether the Land Acquisition Levy is set high enough, and if not, to put the wheels in motion to have the levy increased?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The case for the land acquisition levy remains strong. The MPC has identified the need to acquire land in at least 6 areas sites at \$3 million each, totalling \$18 million, including: Box Hill, Bringelly North/Badgers Creek, Ingleside, Llandilo / St Marys ADI, West Dapto and Wilton Junction.

All other things being equal, any delays in the acquisition of land are generally likely to result in an increase in acquisition costs well above the general property market as land is rezoned and infrastructure such as roads and sewer services are provided. Examples of historical price increases include the MPC land acquisition at Austral for \$1.75 million in 2009. The value of this land at Austral, which is still located within a greenfield area that is yet to see housing development, has now tripled to over \$6 million. Similarly, land acquired in 2011 for \$3.3 million at Stanhope Gardens, now a brownfields area strategically next to greenfield development areas, has tripled in value to \$10 million.

In 2016 the Greenfield price for an area in the South West growth corridor may be approximately \$200 per square metre. Based on the above examples, over the next 5 years costs may triple to \$600 per square metre.

Brownfields and Greenfields funding sources were considered in conjunction with one another and in 2007 \$10 million was allocated towards both Brownfield and Greenfield projects (total \$20 million). In approving the land acquisition levy in 2012, the Synod took the view that in the context of limited funding availability, the higher priority was to acquire land in greenfield areas where there were no diocesan land holdings and no church plants. This was an act of fellowship by all parishes to acquire land for to plant the seed for a future parish whilst it is available and relatively affordable.

The MPC is a grateful recipient for all funding allocations. With approximately \$2 million pa raised by the land acquisition levy, 1 new site is able to be acquired every 1½ years. If funding for such an acquisition program were increased the provision of sites would be realised sooner to facilitate the commencement of a greater number of ministries.

The Archbishop's NCNC is raising funds to complete new church building projects on greenfield lands acquired by MPC. In comparison, new church building projects on existing parish sites in brownfield areas are self-funded by those parishes.

The Diocesan Resources Committee is responsible for providing recommendations to Standing Committee and Synod regarding the future funding of MPC projects which are required to be balanced with other competing funding priorities.

4.10 Capacity increase resulting from church building projects

The Rev Jason Ramsay asked the following question –

With reference to the table on page 63 of the Synod book which outlines the funding of the major church building projects since 2008, what was the capacity increase (defined as the seating capacity of the main auditorium as in paragraph (b) on page 60) of each project listed?

To which the President replied –

An answer to this question will be given tomorrow as there has not been sufficient time to compile an answer in time for today.

4.11 The impact of rectory standards on the right of nomination to parishes

The Ven Deryck Howell asked the following question –

- (a) In the last ten years, how many parishes have been declined the right of nomination because their rectory did not conform to Diocesan standards?
- (b) What are those standards?
- (c) Where a parish is able to provide appropriate office space for the rector at the church or other site rather than the rectory is that taken into account as being an adequate replacement where a study or office is not able to be provided in the rectory? If not, on what grounds?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The right of nomination of a parish is determined by the Nomination Ordinance 2006. Clause 5 of the ordinance sets out multiple preconditions to obtain benefits under this ordinance. Clause 5(1)(b)(iii) requires that the previous Rector was “provided with the free use of a residence or otherwise housed in accommodation approved as suitable by the Archbishop”.

- (a) None. In the last ten years, 13 parishes had their right of nomination considered by the Archbishop-in-Council. Eleven of those parishes lost their right of nomination due to failure of local revenues. The other two parishes were granted right of nomination.
- (b) Not applicable. There are no fixed standards required for rectories but the Regional Bishop, acting as the Regional Archdeacon, liaises with parishes to encourage parishes to make appropriate arrangements to house their Rector.
- (c) Yes, this is an example of the type of factors which are considered when determining whether a rectory is suitable.

4.12 Survey of rectors in the Funding for Urban Renewal report

The Rev Anthony Douglas asked the following question –

Regarding the survey of rectors referred to in paragraph 20 of the Funding for Urban Renewal Report –

- (a) What criteria were used to select the rectors to be included in the survey?
- (b) What was the spread of regional representation of those surveyed?
- (c) What was the spread of parish sizes of those surveyed, using the brackets of 0-100, 101-150, 151-200, 201-250 and greater than 250?
- (d) What information was provided to them?
- (e) What questions were they asked, and how much time were they given to consider their answers?
- (f) Why did the committee include the tabulated results in this paragraph while giving no indication of the response from the Strategic Research Group (paragraph 23)?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The FUR committee members conducted a “straw poll” of the proposal by speaking to a range of parish Rectors based on those they knew and ensuring there was a spread of regions and church sizes.

(b) and (c)

The spread of regional representation and parish sizes are shown in tabular form and will be posted on the notice board in the foyer. In summary, the numbers by region were: Northern, 14; Western, 11; South, 6; Georges River, 6 and Wollongong, 14. There was a relatively even spread among the attendance brackets specified in the question.

Region	Parish Attendance						Total
	0 - 100	101 - 150	151 - 200	201 - 250	251 - 400	> 400	
Northern	2	2	3	4	3		14
Western	1	2		2	1	5	11
South	1	3		1		1	6
Georges River	2	1		2		1	6
Wollongong	2	4	3		2	3	14
	8	12	6	9	6	10	51

- (d) Discussions with Rectors included either verbal or email contact, and the following information was discussed:
- A reminder of the “Brownfields report” presented to Synod in 2015
 - A summary of the work undertaken by the FUR committee to date
 - The range of options that have been considered for raising capital for the proposed fund
 - Detail of the current proposal, including the levy on parishes and the \$3.5m drawdown from the DE
 - A discussion of the criteria that would be used for assessing applications.
- (e) Rectors were asked for their initial reaction as to whether they would be in favour of such a proposal, should it be brought to Synod. Generally, there was a phone discussion including answering questions Rectors had on the proposal and Rectors provided their response in the context of that conversation. Others were contacted by email. If they desired time to consider a response, this was provided.
- (f) The proposal was discussed at the meeting of the Strategic Research Group held on 27 July 2016. No formal response to the proposal was provided by the Strategic Research Group.

4.13 Threshold for significant building projects in the Funding for Urban Renewal report

The Rev Anthony Douglas asked the following question –

- (a) On what basis did the Funding for Urban Renewal Committee determine that a threshold of \$1.5m was a suitable minimum value for “significant parish building projects” (Funding for Urban Renewal Report, paragraph 8)?
- (b) What would the table in Appendix A look like if the threshold was revised downwards to a minimum of \$500,000?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Representatives of the Funding for Urban Renewal committee met with representatives of the Finance and Loans Board. It was agreed that, while there are variations, a typical significant expansionary church development could be expected to cost in the order of \$3 million. Appendix A was extracted from the “Brownfields Report” presented to Synod in 2015, using 50% of this number.

- (b) The “Brownfields report” contained an Appendix that extended this analysis to all building projects above \$1 million. The detailed work required to extend this using a threshold of \$500,000 has not been done.

4.14 Funding renewal through charitable and government grants

Mr Jonathan Stavert asked the following question –

What consideration was given to the use of charitable and government grants to fund renewal of parishes?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

It is assumed that the form of “renewal” intended in the question is property renewal.

The Funding for Urban Renewal committee is aware of smaller grant programs that are available, primarily the Community Building Partnership Grants. However, these are insufficient in size to fund larger developments.

Some foundations exist that do provide larger grants from time to time. However, such sources are more exceptional in nature and cannot be relied on to provide ongoing revitalisation of the scale and ongoing nature envisaged in the Funding for Urban Renewal proposal. Furthermore, this would detract from other Diocesan funding initiatives, such as New Churches for New Communities.

4.15 Clergy Assistance Program

The Rev Antony Barraclough asked the following question –

Noting that the Clergy Assistance Program commenced on 11 April 2016, could the Archbishop advise –

- (a) How well or otherwise the program has been received?
- (b) How many clergy have made use of the program to date?
- (c) Who provides the counselling for clergy?
- (d) Whether the program is restricted to ordained clergy or unordained parish staff members?
- (e) If the program is restricted to ordained clergy whether there are any plans to expand the service to all ministry staff?
- (f) What the projected cost per clergy/staff member is expected to be in 2016?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Our agreement with Anglicare in relation to the Clergy Assistance Program (“CAP”) calls for de-identified calendar quarterly reporting. The first of those reports was received in July relating to the period 11 April to 30 June this year. The 2nd quarter’s reports (for 1 July to 30 September) due later this month will be the first opportunity to assess feedback from clergy who have completed 6 sessions of counselling. Accordingly, at this stage the amount of information available in relation to the operation of the CAP is limited.

In response the specific matters raised in the question –

- (a) Anecdotally, a number of clergy have indicated they considered the CAP to be a valuable initiative, but at this stage we don’t have any meaningful data on how well or otherwise the Program has been received.
- (b) In the period to 11 April to 30 June 2016, 24 clergy accessed the CAP (4 of those attending with their spouse, taking the total number of persons to 28).

- (c) Wherever practical the counselling is provided by one of the approved Anglicare counsellors. However –
- (i) where the distance or availability meant that was impractical, the member of clergy was referred to an external counsellor chosen from a list approved by Anglicare and the Diocese,
 - (ii) where specifically requested, the member of clergy may be funded through the CAP to see another professional with whom they have an existing relationship or who they request by reputation, or
 - (iii) where either the member of clergy or Anglicare consider the situation warrants it, the person may be referred to an external mental health professional chosen from a list approved by Anglicare and the Diocese.
- (d) At this stage access to the CAP is restricted to clergy licensed to parishes in the Diocese, although the spouse of the member of clergy can be included where it is felt that would be helpful. The question of whether the scope of the program should be broadened to include parish lay ministry staff will be considered as part of a broader review of the operation of the whole program to be undertaken later this year.
- (e) As noted above, the question of the categories of person to whom assistance is provided will be considered as part of that broader review of the CAP.
- (f) In December 2015, Standing Committee approve an additional amount of \$133 per minister being added to the Stipend Continuance Insurance component of the ministry costs recovered from all parishes in 2016 pursuant to the *Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015* as a contribution to the expected cost of a Clergy Assistance Program.

It is expected that in November this year Standing Committee will approve the continuation of the CAP, and set the amount to be recovered in 2017, based on the results of a review of the program after the first 6 months of its operation. A key part of that review will involve an assessment of the data from the 2nd set of quarterly reports due later this month.

4.16 Standing Committee policy on minimum stipend

Mrs Alison Woof asked the following question –

- (a) What consultation process did the Standing Committee go through before changing its policy on having a Minimum Stipend?
- (b) What protections have been put in place to protect Youth and Children Ministers, some of whom currently receive a 65% stipend, from being paid an even lower stipend in the future?
- (c) What recourse does a member of the clergy have if their stipend is reduced to an unsustainable level?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The concept of a minimum stipend for a minister recommended by the Standing Committee or, in some cases, the Synod has been enshrined in the *Parishes Ordinance 1979*, the *Nomination Ordinance 2006* and in that ordinance's predecessor, the *Presentation and Exchange Ordinance 1988*, for many decades. There has been no change in policy. The minimum stipend for a minister continues to be recommended by the Standing Committee for the purposes of these ordinances.
- (b) A Youth or Children's Minister who is an employee has the same protections as any other employee.
- (c) My expectation is that rectors will, whenever possible, be paid a stipend which is no less than the minimum recommended by the Standing Committee, and that other parish clergy will be paid in accordance with the scales in the Remuneration Guidelines published by the Standing Committee. Where this is not possible and clergy find that their level of stipend is unsustainable, I would encourage them to speak with their wardens at first instance and, as necessary, their regional bishop.

4.17 Non-ordained chaplains in extra-parochial schools

Mr Mark Boyd asked the following question –

- (a) Are there currently any non-ordained chaplains in extra-parochial schools?
- (b) If so, how many?
- (c) What ordinance were they appointed under?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Diocese does not have centralised records of staff employed in schools, and from time to time chaplains or other ministry staff are appointed to work in a school but no authority is sought from the Archbishop.

Also, there is no way of determining whether a person who has a licence issued for other ministry is also involved in school chaplaincy.

The best information which could be obtained in the time available is that there are 2 lay people who have an authority from the Archbishop and are serving as a lay ministry worker in extra-parochial schools. We understand that at least four other lay people are employed as chaplains in extra-parochial schools but they do not have any authority from the Archbishop for this role.

The two people who have authorities received their authority under the *Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981*.

5. Questions

Questions were asked by the following members –

- (1) Mr Peter M G Young
- (2) Mrs Jennifer Pelster
- (3) Miss Florence Price
- (4) The Rev Peter Tong
- (5) The Rev Simon Flinders
- (6) The Rev Craig Schafer
- (7) Miss Jenny Flower
- (8) Mrs Pamela Shaw
- (9) The Rev Dr Roger Chilton
- (10) The Rev Bruce Stanley
- (11) The Rev Jason Ramsay

6. Procedural motions from members

6.1 Arrangements for a motion concerning the retirement of Mr Paul Willis

Mr James Flavin moved –

“Synod agrees to the following arrangements for considering the motion concerning the retirement of Mr Paul Willis –

- (a) the motion be considered immediately following the calling of motions on the business paper on Wednesday 12 October 2016, and
- (b) the mover will speak to the motion for up to 2 minutes, and
- (c) the seconder will not speak to the motion but will lead the Synod in prayer for Mr Willis after the motion is put,

and suspends so many of the business rules as would prevent these arrangements.”

Seconded and carried

6.2 Mover of the motion concerning Domestic Violence

Canon Sandy Grant moved –

“Synod agrees to Canon Sandy Grant moving the motion at item 8.12 on today’s business paper (incorporating in marked form amendments agreed by the mover) in place of the Rev Nigel Fortescue.”

Seconded and carried

7. Notices of Motions

Notices of motions were given by the following members –

- (1) The Rev Brian Heath
- (2) The Rev Craig Roberts
- (3) Dr Karin Sowada
- (4) The Rev Dr Michael Jensen
- (5) The Rev David Mears
- (6) The Rev Philip Wheeler
- (7) The Rev Stephen Semenchuk

8. Motions

8.1 Submission of annual report by the Council of the King’s School

Having been granted leave, Mr Robert Wicks moved –

“Synod notes that the Council of the King’s School has now submitted its annual report and a copy of its audited accounts for 2015 as requested.”

Seconded and Carried

9. Calling of motions on the business paper

The President called the motions in order in which they appeared on the business paper, except those motions about a proposed ordinance or those motions to be considered at a time fixed by the Synod.

9.1 Truth and Unity in the Anglican Church regarding Marriage

Canon Sandy Grant moved –

‘Synod trusts the teaching of Scripture about marriage, above all the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said of marriage that –

“From the beginning of creation God made them male and female. ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.’ So they are no longer two but one. What therefore God has joined together, let no one separate.” [Mark 10:6-9]

Synod also recalls with gratitude the teaching of our Prayer Books that one of marriage’s key purposes is that in it –

“... a new family is established in accordance with God’s purpose, so that children may be born and nurtured in secure and loving care, for their

wellbeing and instruction, and for the good order of society, to the glory of God.” [An Australian Prayer Book, p561, Common Prayer, p117]

Synod also notes Resolution I.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference which, among other things, in view of the teaching of Scripture –

- upheld faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believed that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage;
- while rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture, called on all our people to minister pastorally and sensitively to all irrespective of sexual orientation and to condemn irrational fear of homosexuals, violence within marriage and any trivialisation and commercialisation of sex; and
- could not advise the legitimising or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions.

And Synod notes the consistent pattern of resolutions of our General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia in regards to marriage, for example, in 2004, where General Synod welcomed the initiative of the Federal Parliament in clarifying that marriage, at law in this country, is the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life (64/04; reaffirmed in 56/10 of 2010), and where General Synod also did not condone the liturgical blessing of same sex relationships (62/04), nor the ordination of people in open committed same sex relationships (63/04).

Synod therefore gives thanks to God for bishops in our diocese and other Australian dioceses who faithfully uphold the teachings of Scripture regarding marriage, even when to do so is unpopular. By contrast, Synod is grieved by the suggestions from some bishops in other dioceses which undermine both the teaching of Scripture about marriage and also the unity of our Church by promoting a departure from our agreed Scriptural and Anglican position in regards to the definition of marriage at law in our country.

Synod calls on all bishops and other leaders in our church to make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace, not least by only speaking the truth in love.’

Seconded and carried

10. Motions

10.1 Restricting the length of sermons

Dr David Oakenfull moved –

“Synod notes that –

- (a) research suggests that while listening to sermons most adults can focus for only 15-20 minutes before starting to lose attention, and
- (b) while we may remember about 70% of what was presented in the *first* ten minutes of a twenty-minute sermon, we are unlikely to retain more than about 20% of what was presented in the *last* ten minutes.

Therefore to promote more effective teaching of God’s word, Synod urges ministers and other preachers to restrict the length of their sermons to twenty minutes or less.”

Seconded

The Rev Craig Roberts moved as an amendment to Dr Oakenfull’s motion –

‘In the final paragraph, omit the matter following “Synod urges” and insert instead –

“_

- (i) the Archbishop to confer with the Principal of Moore Theological College and the Director of Ministry Training and Development to ensure that the training of our diocesan ministers and preachers in oratory skills is in accord with best practice, and

- (ii) ministers and other preachers to think of themselves and their preaching abilities with sober judgment (Romans 12:3-8).”.

Seconded

Mr Roberts' amendment to Dr Oakenfull's motion was carried.

Dr Oakenfull's motion, as amended, was put but was not carried with 233 votes for and 241 votes against the motion.

10.2 Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2016

Bishop Chris Edwards moved –

“That the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2016 pass as an ordinance of the Synod.”

Seconded and carried

10.3 Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982 Amendment Ordinance 2016

Dr Laurie Scandrett moved –

“That Synod permit the introduction of the Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982 Amendment Ordinance 2016.”

Seconded and carried

Dr Scandrett moved –

“That Synod agree to consider forthwith a motion that the Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982 Amendment Ordinance 2016 be approved in principle.”

Seconded and carried

Dr Scandrett moved –

“That the Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982 Amendment Ordinance 2016 be approved in principle.”

Seconded

The President asked –

“Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?”

There was a time for questions.

The President asked –

“Does any member wish to speak against the motion, or move an amendment to it?”

A member wished to speak against the motion.

There was debate on the motion.

The motion that the ordinance be approved in principle was put but was not carried.

11. Mission Property Committee and New Churches for New Communities presentation

Mr Geoff Kyngdon and the Rev Glenn Gardner AM gave a presentation regarding the work of the Archbishop's New Churches for New Communities and the Mission Property Committee.

Mr Kyngdon led the Synod in prayer for the work of the Mission Property Committee and New Churches for New Communities.

Adjournment

At 5:40 pm, Mr Doug Marr moved –

“That the Synod adjourn and resume at 7.00 pm tonight.”

Seconded and carried

Resumption

The Synod resumed at 7.00 pm.

12. Motions

12.1 Funding for Urban Renewal

The Rev Raj Gupta moved –

'Synod, noting the report "Funding for Urban Renewal" –

- (a) notes –
 - (i) that 70% of the growth in new housing in Sydney is anticipated to be in Brownfields areas, and
 - (ii) the urgent desire to introduce more people to Jesus,
- (b) requests that Standing Committee –
 - (i) re-badge the existing "Land Levy" to be the "Diocesan Development Levy", and that this Levy increase from the current 2% to 3% in 2018, then to 3.5% in 2019, and then to 4% in 2020 and subsequent years, with the excess over 2% being used to establish and replenish a new "Expanding Churches for Expanding Communities" ("ECEC") Fund,
 - (ii) appropriate from the Diocesan Endowment \$2.5m in 2018, and a further \$1m in 2019, to be used for the ECEC Fund,
 - (iii) establish the "Expanding Churches for Expanding Communities" Committee, to be comprised of 7 persons (1 Archbishop's appointment, 3 clergy elected by Synod, and 3 lay people elected by Synod), having a term of 3 years, with one clergy and one lay member retiring each year, but being eligible for re-appointment for up to three consecutive terms,
 - (iv) inform all parishes annually of the availability of the ECEC grant scheme and process by which applications can be received,
 - (v) adopt the process, criteria and weightings outlined in the schedule to this report for the selection of successful grant applicants,
 - (vi) establish and resource (including the ability to engage appropriate consultants) a separate group that supports parishes in managing their property in order to rejuvenate the Diocese,
 - (vii) amend the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance for all relevant years so as to reflect the resolutions of the Synod,
- (c) requests the Large Receipts Policy Committee to –

- (i) consider a model for the proposed Large Receipts Levy (due for consideration by 2020) which provides additional funds for ECEC, and
- (ii) bring a proposal to Synod by 2018.'

Seconded

The mover and seconder combined in a joint presentation in support of the motion.

There was a time for questions about the motion.

The Rev Gavin Poole and Bishop Michael Stead combined in a presentation opposing the motion.

Canon Phillip Colgan moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta's motion –

“Delete paragraphs (b) and (c) and replace with –

- (b) also notes –
 - (i) that the Synod has already approved triennium funding ordinances for 2016-2018;
 - (ii) is due to consider its “Statement of Funding Principles” for the 2019-2021 triennium at the 2017 Synod; and
 - (iii) approved its “Mission 2020” priorities at the 2014 Synod,
- (c) requests that Standing Committee consider the recommendations of the “Funding for Urban Renewal” report against other funding needs and opportunities in the preparation of the “Statement of Funding Principles” report for the 2017 Synod for potential inclusion in the triennium funding ordinances for 2019-2021.”

Seconded

Mr Geoff Kyngdon moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta's motion –

‘Amend the motion as follows –

- (a) in paragraph (b)(i) omit “establish and replenish” and insert instead “fund”,
- (b) in paragraphs (b)(i) and (ii) omit “Fund” and insert instead “grant scheme”,
- (c) omit paragraph (b)(iii) and insert instead –
 - “(iii) arrange for the funding referred to in (i) and (ii) to be paid as an addition to the Mission Property Fund and applied by the Mission Property Committee towards projects approved under the ECEC grant scheme,”
- (d) In paragraph (c)(i) omit “ECEC” and insert “the ECEC grant scheme”.’

Seconded

The Rev Geoff Bates moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta's motion –

‘Insert the following as a new paragraph (b)(iv) (with consequential renumbering) –

- “(iv) request the Standing Committee to reconstitute the Mission Property Committee to include three members of the clergy.”’

Seconded

Bishop Ivan Lee moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta's motion –

‘Insert the following as a new paragraph (b)(iv) (with consequential renumbering) –

- “(iv) request the Standing Committee to review the membership structure of the Mission Property Committee.”.

Seconded

The Rev Richard Blight moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘Amend the motion as follows –

- (a) delete paragraph (b)(i) and insert instead –

‘(i) establish a new “Expanding Churches for Expanding Communities (“ECEC”) Fund and take steps to raise support for this fund through voluntary giving by churches, individuals and organisations.’

- (b) delete paragraph (vii).’

Seconded

The Rev James Warren moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘In paragraph (b)(i), omit the matter “then to 3.5% in 2019, and then to 4% in 2020” and insert instead “then to 4% in 2019, and then to 5% in 2020”.’

Seconded

The Rev Stuart Milne moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘In paragraph (b)(i), omit the matter “3% in 2018, then to 3.5% in 2019, and then to 4% in 2020” and insert instead “4% in 2018”.’

Seconded

The Rev Zac Veron moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘In paragraphs (b)(i) and b(ii) –

- (a) replace “2018” with “2017”,
 (b) replace “2019” with “2018”, and
 (c) replace “2020” with “2019”.’

Seconded

The Rev John Chappell moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘Delete paragraph (b)(ii) and insert instead –

“appropriate from the Diocesan Endowment \$5m in 2018, and a further \$2m in 2019, to be used for the ECEC Fund.”.

Seconded

The Rev Craig Roberts moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘Delete paragraph (b)(ii) and insert instead –

- “(ii) permanently appropriate from the Diocesan Endowment \$2.5m in 2018, and a further \$1m in 2019, to be used for the ECEC Fund, with \$0.5m of that permanent appropriation to be quarantined to provide for a top-up to Synod distributions –
 (A) in the event that the permanent appropriation of \$3.5m from the Diocesan Endowment causes a reduction in distributions to the Synod, and

- (B) to the extent to which distributions to Synod are reduced, up to a limit of \$0.5m.”.

Seconded

The Rev Archie Poulos moved as an amendment to Mr Gupta’s motion –

‘Delete everything after “(b) requests that Standing Committee –” and insert instead –

- “(i) assess factors other than building grants that may induce growth in established areas, and
- (iii) establish a priority list for the disbursement of funds for the purpose of growing evangelistic ministry in urban areas.”

Seconded

Mr Robert Wicks moved as a procedural motion –

“Synod agrees to limit further speeches in this debate to three minutes, except the mover in exercising his right of reply.”

Seconded

Having been granted leave, Mr Wicks withdrew his motion.

Canon Colgan’s amendment was carried.

The amendments of Mr Kyngdon, Mr Bates, Bishop Lee, Mr Blight, Mr Warren, Mr Milne, Mr Veron, Mr Chappell and Mr Roberts lapsed.

Mr Poulos’ amendment was put and carried in the following form –

‘Insert as a new paragraph (d) –

- “(d) requests that Standing Committee –
 - (i) assess factors other than building grants that may induce growth in established areas, and
 - (ii) establish a priority list for the disbursement of funds for the purpose of growing evangelistic ministry in urban areas.”

Mr Gupta’s motion, as amended, was carried in the following form –

‘Synod, noting the report “Funding for Urban Renewal” –

- (a) notes –
 - (i) that 70% of the growth in new housing in Sydney is anticipated to be in Brownfields areas, and
 - (ii) the urgent desire to introduce more people to Jesus,
- (b) also notes –
 - (i) that the Synod has already approved triennium funding ordinances for 2016-2018;
 - (ii) is due to consider its “Statement of Funding Principles” for the 2019-2021 triennium at the 2017 Synod; and
 - (iii) approved its “Mission 2020” priorities at the 2014 Synod,
- (c) requests that Standing Committee consider the recommendations of the “Funding for Urban Renewal” report against other funding needs and opportunities in the preparation of the “Statement of Funding Principles” report for the 2017 Synod for potential inclusion in the triennium funding ordinances for 2019-2021,
- (d) requests that Standing Committee –
 - (i) assess factors other than building grants that may induce growth in established areas, and

- (ii) establish a priority list for the disbursement of funds for the purpose of growing evangelistic ministry in urban areas.'

Having been granted leave, Canon Colgan moved –

“Synod expresses its thanks to God for the work of the Rev Raj Gupta and the FUR Committee in bringing this important issue to the attention of the Synod and commits to pray for wisdom in determining means to fund Urban Renewal in our Diocese.”

Seconded and carried

Having been granted leave, the Rev Joe Wiltshire moved –

“That the substance of Bishop Lee’s amendment be moved by the Rev Joseph Wiltshire and considered as a separate motion on tomorrow’s business paper and that so many of the business rules be suspended as would prevent this from happening.”

Seconded and carried

Adjournment

At 9:45 pm, Mr Doug Marr moved –

“That the Synod adjourn and resume at 3.15 pm tomorrow.”

We certify that, to the best of our recollection, these minutes are a correct record of the Synod’s proceedings.

Two Members of the
Minute Reading Committee)

Signed by the President

12 October 2016