

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA

FIFTEENTH GENERAL SYNOD 2010

Melbourne

18-23 September 2010

GENERAL SYNOD PAPERS

BOOK 3

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

©The Anglican Church of Australia Trust Corporation 2010

Published by:

The Standing Committee of the General Synod of The Anglican Church of Australia
General Synod Office

Level 9, 51 Druitt Street, Sydney, 2000, New South Wales, Australia

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3-001
2	MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEE AS AT 18 APRIL 2010	3-002
3	SUMMARY OF BUSINESS 2008-2010	3-006
4	ACTION TAKEN ON RESOLUTIONS OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF GENERAL SYNOD	3-013
	4.1 Professional Standards	
	4.2 Social Issues	
	4.3 Mission	
	4.4 Liturgy and Worship	
	4.5 Ministry	
	4.6 Anglican Communion, Ecumenical and Inter-Faith	
	4.7 Finance	
	4.8 Appreciation	
	4.9 Administration of Synod	
5	ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER MINISTRY	3-055
	5.1 Report of Joint Working Group of NATSIAC and Standing Committee	
	5.2 Summary of Report of Committee to Review Indigenous Ministry	
6	ANGLICAN COMMUNION COVENANT	3-069
	6.1 Introduction	
	6.2 Should Australia enter into the Anglican Communion Covenant?	
	6.3 Covenant in an Anglican Context	
	6.4 The Political Implications of signing the Covenant	
	6.5 The Covenant proposed for the Anglican Communion is not a good idea	
7	WOMEN BISHOPS – DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2007	3-083
8	GENERAL SYNOD VOTING SYSTEM	3-093

9	REVIEW OF COMMISSIONS, TASK FORCES AND NETWORKS	3-103
10	ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA TRUST CORPORATION	3-110
11	APPELLATE TRIBUNAL	3-111
12	GENERAL SYNOD LEGISLATION	3-112
	12.1 Introduction	
	12.2 Canons Passed at the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod and the Dates on which they came into Effect	
	12.3 Rules made by the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod and the dates on which they came into Effect	
	12.4 Bills and Canons altering the Constitution which have not come into effect	
	12.5 Responses of Dioceses to each Canon passed at the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod	
	12.6 Current Provisional Canons	
	12.7 Provisional Canons - Report pursuant to Section 28(3)(iii) of the Constitution	
	12.7.1 Provisional Canon P3, 2004 – Restraint on Certain Consecrations Canon 2004	
	12.7.2 Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 1981 Amendment Canon 2010 (Provisional Canon P01, 2007)	
13	CHANGES IN THE EPISCOPATE	3-132

INTRODUCTION

This Book 3 of the papers for the Fifteenth Session of General Synod gives an outline of the Standing Committee's activities since the Fourteenth Session in 2007 and contains reports requested by the General Synod or the Standing Committee.

The Summary of Business refers readers to other reports which may be found in Book 5 of the General Synod papers. On occasion, reports refer readers to other reports which are too lengthy to be printed in the General Synod papers but can be found on the General Synod website.

Financial matters are reported in Book 4 of the General Synod papers.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF GENERAL SYNOD AND ITS SUB-COMMITTEES AS AT 18 APRIL 2010

1. STANDING COMMITTEE OF GENERAL SYNOD

The Metropolitans [ex officio]

Archbishop Phillip Aspinall (Brisbane – Primate)
Archbishop Roger Herft (Perth)
Archbishop Peter Jensen (Sydney)
Archbishop Jeffrey Driver (Adelaide)
Archbishop Philip Freier (Melbourne)

Chair of Committees [ex officio]

Justice David Bleby (Adelaide)

Clerical Secretary [ex officio]

Vacant

Lay Secretary [ex officio]

Ms Ann Skamp (Grafton)

The General Secretary [ex officio]

Mr Martin Drevikovsky

Elected from the House of Bishops

Bishop Andrew Curnow (Bendigo)
Bishop Garry Weatherill (Willochra)
Bishop John Harrower (Tasmania)

Elected from House of Clergy

The Reverend Canon Dr Ray Cleary (Melbourne)
Bishop Glenn Davies (Sydney)
Bishop Robert Forsyth (Sydney)
Bishop Kay Goldsworthy (Perth)
Bishop Stephen Hale (Melbourne)
The Very Reverend Dr Sarah Macneil (Adelaide)
The Reverend Canon Dr Colleen O'Reilly (Melbourne)
Bishop Stephen Pickard (Adelaide)

Elected from House of Laity

Mr Garth Blake SC (Sydney)
Mr Robert Fordham (Melbourne)
Ms Leigh Haywood (Bathurst)
Mr John McKenzie (Melbourne)
Ms Audrey Mills (Tasmania)
Mr Brian Norris (Gippsland)
Dr Muriel Porter OA (Melbourne)
Mr Ian Walker (Brisbane)
Justice Peter Young (Sydney)

1.1 Changes in membership since the last Synod

Ex Officio

The Reverend Christopher Moroney resigned as Clerical Secretary of the General Synod on 19 November 2009. Consequently his position on the Standing Committee fell vacant. Rule II, Section 3 provides that such a vacancy shall not be filled.

House of Clergy

- Bishop John Parkes resigned as an Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Brisbane and was installed as the Bishop of the Diocese of Wangaratta on 13 December 2008, thus ceasing to be a member of the House of Clergy and, therefore, becoming ineligible to be a member of the Standing Committee elected by the House of Clergy.
- Bishop Kay Goldsworthy, an Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Perth, replaced Bishop Parkes on 15 February 2009.
- The Venerable Paul Barker resigned from the Standing Committee on 8 November 2009. Because the next meeting of the Standing Committee at which a replacement could be elected was the last meeting before the next session of the General Synod when positions fall vacant, Archdeacon Barker was not replaced.

1.2 Appointment of Officers

- Mr John McKenzie was appointed Treasurer.
- Canon Bruce McAteer resigned as General Secretary in 2008.
- Bishop Richard Appleby was Acting General Secretary until 21 July 2008.
- Mr Martin Drevikovsky became General Secretary from 22 July 2008 under a contract arrangement made by the Standing Committee Executive and the Standing Committee appointed him General Secretary on 17 October 2008.

2. COMMITTEES OF STANDING COMMITTEE

2.1 Executive Committee

The Primate
Mr Garth Blake
Bishop Andrew Curnow
Bishop Robert Forsyth
Ms Leigh Haywood
Mr John McKenzie
Dean Sarah Macneil
Ms Ann Skamp
The General Secretary

2.2 Audit Committee

Mr Ian Hammond (Chair)
Mr Michael Blaxland
Mr Adrian Scarra
Archdeacon John Southerden
Mr Robert Tong
Mr Douglas Marr (representing the Long Service Leave Board)

Changes in Membership

- Archdeacon Peter Stuart, representing the Long Service Leave Board, became Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Newcastle on 2 February 2009 and ceased to be eligible for membership of the Long Service Leave Board. He was not replaced on the Audit Committee.
- Mr David Cannings resigned as a member of the Audit Committee with effect from 14 June 2009 and was replaced by Mr Michael Blaxland with effect from that date.

2.3 Investment Committee

Mr Steve McKerihan (Chairman)
Mr David Cannings
Mr John McKenzie
Mr Colin Richardson
The General Secretary
The General Synod Business Manager

Changes in Membership

- Mr Michael Cambridge resigned with effect from 28 May 2008 and was not replaced.
- Mr David Cannings resigned with effect from 14 June 2009 and was replaced by Mr Michael Blaxland with effect from that date.

2.4 Legal Committee

Justice David Bleby was appointed Convenor of the Legal Committee which comprises the lay members of the Standing Committee who are members of the legal profession.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE TRIENNIUM 2008-2010

1. STRATEGIC ISSUES

In February 2008, pursuant to Section 3 of the Strategic Issues, Commissions, Task Forces and Networks Canon 1998, the Standing Committee identified the following strategic priorities to be addressed prior to the 15th Session of the General Synod:

1.1 Fresh Expressions of Church, including Pioneer Ministry.

A report on Pioneer Ministry was circulated to Bishops and is posted on the General Synod website.

Members of Fresh Expressions Australia Task Force will present an overview of the work of that Task Force leading to group discussion of a motion regarding mission at this session of the General Synod. Fresh Expression's report may be found in Book 5 of the General Synod papers.

1.2 Governance of General Synod Commissions, Task Forces and Networks.

Pursuant to General Synod Resolution 112/07 the Standing Committee will present recommendations to this session of the General Synod recommendations for regular review of General Synod Commissions, Task Forces and Networks. There is a report in this book.

1.3 Drought, Climate and Environment, noting the resolutions of the 14th Session of General Synod referring to the Drought Task Force and the Environment Working Group.

The Task Force on Drought, Climate and Environment has prepared a report on sustaining ministry in areas affected by climate change which has been circulated to Bishops and is posted on the General Synod website.

1.4 Developing Context Issues for the Anglican Church of Australia.

The Christian Research Association in conjunction with NCLS Research prepared a report titled "Models of Leadership and Organisation in Anglican Churches in Rural Australia" dated January 2009 which has been circulated to Bishops and is posted on the General Synod website.

The Standing Committee has appointed a Working Group to prepare a report on models of dioceses and episcopacy. That Working Group has

been requested to report to the first meeting of the Standing Committee to be held after this session of the General Synod.

1.5 Indigenous Disadvantage, focusing on a conference involving representatives of the National and Torres Strait Islander Anglican Commission, the National Church and bodies and agencies who deliver services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and on the work of the Committee for Review of Indigenous Ministry.

The Committee appointed by the Standing Committee in October 2006 to review Indigenous Ministry nationally delivered three reports between October 2008 and October 2009 concerning the position of Indigenous Bishops, the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglican Council and Indigenous Ministry initiatives. The three reports of the Committee to Review Indigenous Ministry are posted on the General Synod website. In response, the Standing Committee invited the Executive of NATSIAC and other stakeholders to a consultation on the way forward in October 2009. That consultation led to the establishment of a Joint Working Group of representatives on NATSIAC and the Standing Committee to:

- (a) develop a position description for a National Indigenous Ministry Officer as recommended by the Review Committee;
- (b) Identify priorities for ministry amongst Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples during the next triennium; and
- (c) Make recommendations for the review of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglican Council Canon 1998.

In light of the Joint Working Group's recommendations, the Standing Committee has provided in the program for the 15th Session of General Synod a session including celebration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry, consideration of the recommendations arising from this review process and consideration of a new NATSIAC Canon. A more detailed report is included in this Book and a Bill for the proposed new Canon and an Explanatory Memorandum may be found in the Book of Bills for the 15th Session of General Synod. NATSIAC reports on its activities in Book 5 of the General Synod papers.

2. ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Work on the proposed Covenant for the Anglican Communion worldwide has progressed to the point where a draft Covenant can be considered by this Session of the General Synod. There is a report in Book 5 from the Windsor Report Working Group and members of General Synod will have received a special issue of the St Mark's Review containing more extensive papers.

Archbishop Roger Herft attended the worldwide Anglican Peace Conference held in Seoul, Korea in November 2007.

Bishop Kay Goldsworthy (2008), Ms Meagan Morrison (2008), Ms Ann Skamp (2008-2010) and Ms Mandy Manggurra (2010) were members of the Anglican Consultative Council delegation to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

The Standing Committee supported the incorporation of the Anglican Consultative Council in February 2009.

The Standing Committee expressed its pastoral concern to the presiding Bishop, the House of Bishops, the Diocese of Pittsburgh and Bishop Robert Duncan in light of Bishop Duncan's deposition from office and expressed its prayer for a reconciliation among all parties to the dispute.

The Standing Committee resolved to support the International Anglican Family Network Oceania Consultation 2010 and the International Anglican Youth Network.

The Standing Committee has encouraged Australian Anglican development agencies to participate in the formation of a new body provisionally named Global Anglican Relief and Development Alliance and is investigating how the Anglican Church of Australia might usefully participate in the newly-formed Anglican Health Network.

At the request of the Anglican Communion Office and after consultation with diocesan Bishops, the Standing Committee nominated Young Anglican leaders to participate in future Anglican Communion events.

3. PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The Public Affairs Commission was re-established in 2008. Its report appears in Book 5 of the General Synod papers.

The Standing Committee considered a paper by the Public Affairs Commission on responses by the Church to climate change which has been circulated to dioceses. The Standing Committee heard from members of the Freedom of Religion and Belief Project and considered a submission to the project prepared by the Public Affairs Commission. The Standing Committee also heard from the Chairman of the Human Rights Consultation and made a submission to the Consultation based on a draft prepared by the Public Affairs Commission. At the request of the Standing Committee, the Executive of Standing Committee approved a submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Economics concerning financial disclosure by not-for-profit organisations. Copies of the relevant papers and submissions are posted on the General Synod website.

When the Australian Broadcasting Corporation announced in 2008 that it intended to terminate the Religion Report and other religious programs in 2009, the Standing Committee urged it to reconsider its decision. The General Secretary attended a meeting of Christian Churches and other faiths with the Chief Executive Officer of the ABC to express concerns at the termination of these programs.

4. MINISTRY

The Ministry Commission was re-established. Its report appears in Book 5 of the General Synod papers.

5. ENVIRONMENT WORKING GROUP

The Environment Working Group was re-established to permit implementation of resolutions of the 14th General Synod. Its charter includes liaison with dioceses on meeting the challenges of environmental issues. The Working Group's report which appears in Book 5 of the General Synod papers, covers matters to be reported by dioceses which have adopted the Protection of the Environment Canon 2007. The dioceses' participation in that process satisfied their reporting obligations under the Canon. Nevertheless, one diocese has requested that its report be published in full. The report appears in Book 5, following the report of the Working Group.

6. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

The National Register commenced formal operation in June 2009. The Professional Standards Commission has continued its work of providing guidance in the management and administration of professional standards issues. In the realm of child protection, the Standing Committee received and published on the General Synod website a report titled *Study of Reported Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church* commissioned pursuant to General Synod resolution 34/04(c)(i) and made a series of recommendations to assist dioceses. The Episcopal Standards Commission has had to navigate uncharted waters. The Standing Committee is developing protocols for the purposes of Section 5 of the Episcopal Standards Canon 2007. The Standing Committee has established a policy for determining applications for legal assistance under the Special Tribunal Canon 2007 and the Episcopal Standards Canon 2007.

7. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DIOCESES AND BISHOPS

As reported above in relation to strategic issues, the Standing Committee appointed a working group to report on models of dioceses and episcopacy.

The Standing Committee appointed a working group to report on processes for dealing with the breakdown of relationships between Diocesan Bishops and their dioceses. Proposals from the working group have been considered by the Bishops' Meeting and the Standing Committee and have been referred for further

consideration. A by-product of the working group's deliberations is a Bill to amend the Episcopal Standards Canon to be presented to this session of the General Synod.

8. NATIONAL ANGLICAN CONFERENCE III

The Standing Committee has been considering a proposal to hold the National Anglican Conference III in conjunction with the celebration of the Jubilee of the adoption of the Constitution in 2012.

9. ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

The Standing Committee resolved to support a delegation to the Christian Conference of Asia Assembly in Kuala Lumpur in April 2010 in response to a report of Deaconess Margaret Rodgers who attended the Christian Conference of Asia Round Table in March 2009, kindly sponsored by the dioceses of Perth and Sydney. A detailed report is included amongst the reports from the Ecumenical Relations Commission in Book 5.

10. CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

In October 2009, the Standing Committee resolved that it did not advise the Primate that it agreed with a declaration by the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Sydney pursuant to Section 30(c) of the Constitution that the National Register Canon 2007, the Special Tribunal Canon 2007 and the Offences Canon 2007 affect the order and good government of the Church in that diocese. Consequently the matter was referred to the Appellate Tribunal which determined that those Canons do not affect the order and good government of the church in that diocese.

Later in October 2009 the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney declared its opinion pursuant to Section 30(c) of the Constitution that the Special Tribunal Canon 2007 and the Offences Canon 2007 affect the order and good government of the church in that diocese. In April 2010, the Standing Committee resolved not to advise the Primate that it agreed with that declaration. The Primate referred the matter to the Appellate Tribunal for determination. As at the time of writing, the matter was still in its early stages.

11. FINANCE

After considerable deliberation on models for the management and administration of the assets of the General Synod over an extended period, a simplified approach is to be put to the General Synod in the form of a Bill to replace the Corporate Trustees Canon 1962. Financial management policies have been reviewed. In parallel, much work has been done to reshape the General Synod financial statements to show more transparently the net revenue derived from business arrangements which the General Synod has entered into with Telstra Corporation and the Long Service Leave Board. This is designed to show the

degree to which the General Synod relies on that net revenue to fund its activities so that appropriate judgments can be made about the level of assessments to be levied on the Dioceses, particularly when revenues from external sources fluctuate.

A Financial Protection Canon Review Group has been established as a sub-group of the Diocesan Financial Advisory Group to advise the Standing Committee on compliance with relevant financial standards by Organisations identified pursuant to the Financial Protection Canon.

The Standing Committee approved renewal of the Business Services Agreement with Telstra Corporation which provides benefits in reduced communication charges to dioceses, parishes and Anglican organisations and revenue for the General Synod. The General Synod continues to derive income pursuant to an agreement between the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Corporation and the Long Service Leave Board for the management and administration of the Long Service Leave Fund.

The day-to-day administration of the Church GST Group has been referred to the General Synod Office pending consideration of the future of National Anglican Resource Unit.

12. GENERAL SYNOD OFFICE

The General Secretary was appointed by the General Synod Standing Committee Executive Committee in late July 2008. Since that time all positions in the General Synod Office have been filled with new personnel. In addition, a part-time officer has been engaged to administer the National Register.

The information and technology systems of the General Synod Office have been upgraded to cope with the volume and complexity of workflow. The General Synod website has been renewed to:

- Enable information of relevant groups to be disseminated more easily;
- Permit communication between group members via the website;
- Facilitate enquiries by and communication with the general public;
- Re-introduce and expand the National Church calendar and simplify its administration;
- Simplify management of the website.

The research capability which served the National Church so well in the past has been reduced dramatically. It is envisaged that, over time, the General Synod website will provide much of the information which previously required research. The Standing Committee has approved on a trial basis the provision of research services to Commissions and other bodies on an ad hoc fee-for-service basis.

Security parameters and budgetary constraints require the National Register to operate as a stand-alone system which adds unavoidable complexity to the overall administration of information technology in the General Synod Office.

The General Synod Office now provides more services to the National Church and to a larger Synod than 3 years ago through fewer personnel. At the time of writing, members of the General Synod Office staff, with one exception, have been in their roles for less than 2 years and none of the staff has experience of a session of General Synod.

A central aim is to improve the quality and efficiency of services provided by the General Synod Office and to simplify the systems and infrastructure which support them. Simplification is time consuming and has thrown up some challenges. There is a need to document procedures as our environment evolves.

Martin Drevikovsky
General Secretary
28 May 2010

ACTION TAKEN ON THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF GENERAL SYNOD

INTRODUCTION

This report provides information as to the actions taken on resolutions passed at the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod in 2007.

The format of previous reports on the same subject matter has been followed, namely, each resolution is set out and to the right of it there is a note of the action taken.

The resolutions have been arranged in subject groupings as follows:

- Professional Standards
- Social Issues
- Mission
- Liturgy and Worship
- Ministry
- Anglican Communion, Ecumenical and Inter-faith
- Finance
- Appreciation
- Administration of Synod

The resolutions are numbered to reflect the order in which they were passed at General Synod.

Please note that the terms of the resolutions and the titles of movers and seconders are reproduced as they were found in the Book of Proceedings of the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod in order to be faithful to the published text.

In some cases, the descriptions of the actions taken are reconstructions from evidence in General Synod Office records where direct evidence is not available.

To reduce the bulk of the report, resolutions concerning the Administration of the Session of the Synod not requiring any further action have not been reproduced. Members wishing to know the details of those resolutions are referred to pages 63-72 of the book "Proceedings of the Fourteenth General Synod – 2007".

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>52/07 FAITHFULNESS IN SERVICE AND CODES OF PERSONAL BEHAVIOUR</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) notes resolution 33/04 of the 13th General Synod which received the 2004 Report of the Child Protection Committee and adopted <i>Faithfulness in Service</i> in that Report as the national code for personal behaviour and the practice of pastoral ministry by clergy and lay church workers, and b) in line with resolution 35/04 of the 13th General Synod, again recommends that each diocese adopts a code for personal behaviour and the practice of pastoral ministry by its clergy and church workers that includes <i>Faithfulness in Service</i> and any revisions, in particular, its standard expressed for clergy and church workers in the section on sexual conduct that "you are to be chaste and not engage in sex outside of marriage." <p>Canon Sandy Grant moved, Bishop Alan Stewart seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary referred the resolution to each Diocese.</p>
<p>65/07 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION – 1</p> <p>The General Synod recommends that each diocese:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ensures that its website contains details of its professional standards policies and procedures and includes a link to the professional standards information on the General Synod website; b) should introduce a diocesan policy for the selection and accreditation of lay parish church workers who have the opportunity to be alone with a child in their ministry, including appropriate training and storage of records, that takes into account the principles in the document entitled "Model System for the Selection and Accreditation of Lay Parish Church Workers" of the Professional Standards Commission; c) develops procedures for the disclosure of whether there is any, and if so what, Information on the National Register for the appointment of persons to professional standards roles, the election of a bishop, and the election of persons by a Church authority; d) includes on the diocesan website a list of all licensed clergy of the diocese; e) circulates the Preliminary Report from the Doctrine 	<p>The General Secretary conveyed the recommendation to each Diocese.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>Commission concerning Theological Issues Surrounding Sexual and Other Forms of Abuse to all clergy, and church workers who minister to those affected by abuse and abusers.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	
<p>66/07 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION – 2</p> <p>The General Synod:</p> <p>(a) refers to the Professional Standards Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the development of principles to be applied in undertaking risk assessments arising from information obtained from a Safe Ministry Check or equivalent, together with appropriate training for those undertaking such risk assessments; (ii) in consultation with the Church Law Commission the preparation of a motion to amend Rule III entitled “Rules for the Conduct of Elections Ordered to Be Made by the General Synod” to provide for the disclosure of any Information on the National Register in connection with the elections held at a General Synod for consideration by the next General Synod; (iii) the preparation of procedures for the disclosure of Information on the National Register in connection with the election and appointment of persons by the Standing Committee for consideration by the Standing Committee; (iv) the preparation of Faithfulness in Service in Simple English for approval by the Standing Committee; (v) the development of policies and procedures for identifying, dealing with, and preventing, abusive behaviours of and by clergy and church workers; (vi) the development of a resource for those with pastoral care responsibilities for survivors and perpetrators of domestic abuse; (vii) the development of principles for dealing with the restoration to ministry of clergy and church workers who have abused others; <p>(b) requests the Professional Standards Commission to report to the 15th General Synod as to the progress of the Church in the development and implementation of safe ministry policies and structures.</p>	<p>The General Secretary referred the subject matter and the request to the Professional Standards Commission.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	
<p>67/07 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION – 3</p> <p>The General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) commends the National Council of Churches in Australia for organising the Safe as Churches? II and III national ecumenical consultations on sexual misconduct and abuse in the Australian churches and recommends that the National Council of Churches in Australia facilitate where feasible joint action by member churches and other Australian churches to promote the physical, emotional and spiritual welfare and safety of all people within their communities; (b) recommends that the Commonwealth Government ensures that children and young people are a national priority by appointing a Children's Minister and an independent Commissioner for Children, who will provide leadership in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a co-ordinated approach to policy implementation in the best interests of children; (ii) developing a National Strategy on child abuse and neglect, in consultation with the States and Territories and community service organizations; and (iii) requests that the General Secretary conveys this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs; (c) recommends that State and Territory Governments enact uniform laws that provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the reporting of child abuse to the police and the government child protection authorities; and (ii) the screening of all persons seeking to work with children in a paid or voluntary capacity; and (iii) requests that the General Secretary conveys this resolution to the Premier or Chief Minister of each State and Territory, and to the Community Services Ministers' Advisory Council. <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary conveyed the commendation and recommendation in (a) to NCCA and the resolution in (b) and (c) as requested.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>68/07 NATIONAL REGISTER PROTOCOL 1</p> <p>That the General Synod approves the Protocol for the provision of Information for inclusion in the National Register Canon 2007.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>Protocol 1 was posted on the General Synod website.</p>
<p>69/07 NATIONAL REGISTER PROTOCOL 2</p> <p>That the General Synod approves the Protocol for access and disclosure of Information in the National Register 2007.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>Protocol 2 was posted on the General Synod Website. See also resolution 95/07.</p>
<p>70/07 NATIONAL REGISTER PROTOCOL 3</p> <p>That the General Synod approves the Protocol to ascertain details of any information and access to what information in the National Register 2007.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>Protocol 3 was posted on the General Synod website.</p>
<p>71/07 NATIONAL REGISTER PROTOCOL 4</p> <p>That the General Synod approves the Protocol for amendment of Information in the National Register 2007.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, Mrs Marilyn Redlich seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>Protocol 4 was posted on the General Synod website.</p>
<p>95/07 PROTOCOL FOR ACCESS (NATIONAL REGISTER PROTOCOL 2)</p> <p>That the protocol for access to and disclosure of information in the National Register 2007 be recommitted on 25 October to insert an additional clause dealing with consecration of a bishop as follows:</p> <p><i>“Consecration of bishop</i> <i>15. Where a person in priest’s orders is to be consecrated a bishop:</i></p> <p><i>The Director of Professional Standards of the diocese for or in respect of which the</i></p>	<p>The amended Protocol 2 was posted on the General Synod Website.</p> <p>See also Resolution 69/07.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p><i>consecration is to take place; or</i> <i>The Director of Professional Standards of the diocese of the Primate where the consecration is not to be for or in respect of a diocese;</i></p> <p><i>Is authorised to have access to any information in the National Register relating to the person. The Director of Professional Standards is authorised to disclose whether there is any such, and if so what, information to the person to be consecrated and the consecrating bishops."</i></p> <p>Mr Garth Blake moved, The Revd Dane Courtney seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	
<p>118/07 INTERNET PROGRAM FOR SAFE MINISTRY TRAINING</p> <p>That Standing Committee in consultation with the Professional Standards Commission consider using monies from the Reserve Fund or other appropriate fund to design and implement a computer based training program for safe ministry practices to be delivered over the internet.</p> <p>Mr Graeme Marks moved, Mr Philip Gerber moving, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The resolution has been referred to the Professional Standards Commission for consideration and advice.</p>
<p>119/07 NATIONAL REGISTER INFORMATION</p> <p>That this Synod requests the Standing Committee to consider the development of protocols for the storage and retrieval of information removed from the National Register in relation to deceased persons to assist the work of Professional Standards Directors in the investigation of new allegations against these deceased persons.</p> <p>Mrs Anne Hywood moving, Mrs Helen Carrig seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The resolution was referred to the Professional Standards Commission for consideration and advice.</p>

SOCIAL ISSUES

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>35/07 PRAYER FOR THE PEOPLE OF BURMA</p> <p>This Synod: mindful of the recent unrest in the nation of Myanmar (Burma), and the continuing oppression and difficulties faced by Burmese Christians, and noting lack of basic freedoms, including the right to protest peacefully, and the many injustices suffered by the people of this nation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) calls on the members of the Anglican Church of Australia to pray consistently for the peace and security of the people of Burma, for Burmese Christians and especially the members of the Anglican Church under the leadership of Archbishop Samuel San Si Htay; and b) calls on the political leadership of this nation to continue to express Australia's concern for the peace and security of the Burmese people to the military leadership of that nation, and to engage through the international community in efforts to progress principles of freedom and democracy for the Burmese people. <p>After a moment's silence, the Synod joined in a prayer for the peoples of Burma.</p> <p>Ms Margaret Rodgers moved, Archbishop Roger Herft seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>37/07 NUCLEAR TREATY</p> <p>General Synod notes with concern the lack of progress towards the elimination of nuclear weapons as required under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty; and further notes that this is in direct contradiction to the unequivocal undertaking by all governments in the year 2000 to meet their obligations under the treaty.</p> <p>Synod therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) welcomes renewed church involvement in seeking to put pressure on governments to make nuclear disarmament a reality; b) heeds the call of the World Council of Churches February 2006, urging churches to work to overcome the ignorance and complacency in society concerning the nuclear threat; c) takes up the challenge issued to the churches by the WCC Assembly; and 	<p>The General Secretary wrote letters to the Prime Minister and to the Leader of the Opposition on 7/1/08.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>d) requests the General Secretary to send a letter conveying this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.</p> <p>Mr Theo Mackaay moved, Canon Ray Cleary seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	
<p>38/07 THE REVD BERNARD SUWA</p> <p>This Synod gives thanks to Almighty God for the ministry of the Revd Bernard Suwa in the Parish of Blacktown in the Diocese of Sydney to the Sudanese Community, particularly noting his advocacy for Sudanese migrants, This Synod, noting that Mr Suwa has been appointed as the Executive Director of ACROSS Sudan, assures Bernard and his wife Esther, of our prayers for God's blessing as they work for the renewal of Southern Sudan.</p> <p>Synod asks the General Secretary of General Synod to convey our greetings to the Revd Bernard Suwa.</p> <p>Mr Graeme Marks moved, Bishop David Mulready seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary sent a letter to the Rev'd Bernard Suwa on 7/1/08.</p>
<p>39/07 KRIOL BIBLE</p> <p>General Synod commends our indigenous brothers and sisters and their associated translation teams on the successful completion of the Kriol bible, and encourages and offers our prayers to those teams who are working together on translating the Bible into other indigenous languages.</p> <p>Ms Jennifer Flower moved, Dr Muriel Porter seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>40/07 REFUGEES FROM THE MIDDLE EAST</p> <p>In light of the particularly difficult circumstances facing Christian refugees in and from Iraq this Synod welcomes the decision by the Australian Government to increase the number of refugees from the Middle East being accepted into Australia under the humanitarian and refugee programme for 2007-2008.</p> <p>Prof. Chris Bellenger moved, Dr Marcia Cameron seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>41/07 GAMBLING</p> <p>This General Synod, in the light of the problems caused by the expansion of the gambling industries in this country and, noting the dependence of most State Governments on gambling generated revenue (most of which comes from the two per cent of the population who are problem gamblers), asks the next Federal Government to work with state governments to reduce this dependency.</p> <p>Mrs Helen Carrig moved, Archdeacon Peter Stuart seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary sent letters to the Prime Minister and the Attorney General of the Commonwealth on 7/1/08.</p>
<p>45/07 MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS 1</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) notes that the adoption of the Millennium Declaration, by 188 Heads of State and/or Government at the Millennium Summit in September 2000, as a framework for building global peace and security and that within that Declaration the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) established the framework for international action to end Global Poverty by 2015; b) notes that half way to 2015, a number of the specific targets within the MDGs will not be achieved by that date; c) urges the Australian Government to adopt the MDGs as the fundamental framework for its Development Cooperation Program and to accept the specific goals as targets by which to measure the achievements of that program as one element of Australia's contribution to global poverty eradication as it works with developing countries in the Asia Pacific region as well as those in sub-Saharan Africa where the achievement of the MDGs by 2015 seems most unlikely; d) notes the commitment by the Australian Government to increase the level of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to \$4 Billion by 2010, just 0.4% of GNI, and the commitment by the ALP to increase ODA to 0.5% of GNI by 2015 but expresses its profound regret that neither major party has established a firm date for the achievement of the internationally accepted target of 0.7% of GNI as ODA; and e) encourages the Australian Government to continue to work with other like-minded nations for the 	<p>The General Secretary sent a letter to the Prime Minister on 7/1/08.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>successful conclusion of the so-called Doha Round of the WTO's multilateral trade negotiations and other measures, including initiatives which will address the causes and consequences of climate change, which together will contribute to the achievement of the MDGs.</p> <p>Canon Ray Cleary moved, Bishop Peter Tasker seconding, 22 Oct 07.</p> <p>Carried with acclamation</p>	
<p>46/07 MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS 2</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) notes the 1998 Lambeth Resolution 1.15 which encouraged each Diocese to fund international development programs recognised by their Diocese at a level of at least 0.7% of annual Diocesan income and welcomes the commitment of a significant number of the Dioceses of the Anglican Church of Australia to that target in response to the Lambeth Resolution; b) notes that the TEAM (Towards Effective Anglican Mission) Conference held at Boksburg in South Africa in March 2007 affirmed the Anglican Communion's commitment to the MDGs and challenged the Provinces of the Church to respond; c) affirms its commitment to the MDGs and calls on member Dioceses to affirm their commitment to the MDGs; d) encourages dioceses to reflect that commitment by implementing Lambeth Resolution 1.15 by providing funds to recognised international development programs particularly through the Australian Anglican mission, relief and development agencies such as Anglican Board of Mission Australia (ABM-A), AngliCORD and ORAF (the Archbishop of Sydney's Overseas Relief and Aid Fund); and e) urges the General Synod Office and the Public Affairs Commission to support Dioceses as they consider and implement these recommendations, monitor progress by Dioceses and report the steps taken to the Australian Church. <p>Canon Ray Cleary moved, Bishop Peter Tasker seconding, 22 Oct 07</p> <p>Carried with acclamation</p>	<p>The General Secretary drew the resolution to the attention of dioceses by letter</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>47/07 MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS 3</p> <p>That this General Synod encourages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the clergy and people of the Anglican Church of Australia to consider how they will respond and affirm the MDGs through their Christian stewardship by their financial support for the international development agencies commended to Dioceses as a way of fulfilling MDG imperatives; and b) the clergy and people of the Anglican Church of Australia to advocate the policies affirmed by this resolution through their involvement in the Make Poverty History and Micah Challenge campaigns giving expression to their faith and commitment to overcoming poverty and injustice. <p>Canon Ray Cleary moved, Bishop Peter Tasker seconding, 22 Oct 07 Carried with acclamation</p>	<p>No action required</p>
<p>48/07 COMMITMENT AND AFFIRMATION OF FAITH AND JUSTICE</p> <p>(as agreed by General Synod Standing Committee Resolution SC2006/2/028 & revised 2 July 2007 by teleconference)</p> <p>AS members of the Anglican Church of Australia we are called to become a people of the new covenant of Jesus the Christ and to bear witness to justice and righteousness upon this land. We come together, Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, to strive for what our ancestors were not able to do.</p> <p>TOGETHER we acknowledge with gratitude the apology given by our then Primate, Archbishop John Grindrod in 1988 for the hurt done to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (Appendix 1) and the apology of the General Synod in 1998 for the Stolen Generations (Appendix 2). We acknowledge also the ceremonies, Church services and reconciliation projects done at parish level throughout the Country. Today we are able, by the grace of God to look back on these actions as steps on the road of a reconciling life together in the Church of God. We look to a future of walking together towards the image of Christ which points to shared faith and justice among us.</p>	<p>The resolution is published on the General Synod website.</p> <p>The Standing Committee requested NATSIAC to monitor and report on developments.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>TOGETHER we commit ourselves to living out the new covenant written upon our hearts in our common faith and sharing in Word and Sacrament. In hope and prayer we look to fulfil our responsibilities to each other to share our cultures in the study and living of The Word and Sacrament, to share in our Church tradition, and to be a community of justice and righteousness.</p> <p>WE, the people of the land and seas, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, as guardians and custodians of the land and islands of Australia, seek a new day when our peoples can practise and share our culture and wisdom as partners with all who call Australia their home.</p> <p>WE, the non-Indigenous peoples of Australia recognise the people of the land and the seas, the Aboriginal and the Torres Strait Islander peoples to be the original inhabitants, the indigenous peoples of this land.</p> <p>WE, together through this shared commitment continue to seek to heal the wounds, hurts and sufferings of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of Australia.</p> <p>WE shall share with each other visions, hopes, needs and wants in constructive ways that will bring us closer together as peoples of this Church so we may better support each other.</p> <p>AS peoples of Christ's we are bound into a relationship that seeks to be the foundation of mutual trust, respect, and the sharing of power and resources to create a just and righteous Church and nation of Australia. Through this commitment our own homes, communities, parishes, dioceses and national organisations are to be sanctuaries where we will strive to live out to the fullest the tenets of this our shared faith.</p> <p>We are committed to celebrating together important Church festivals and cultural celebrations and commemorations in the life of our land and seas. This gives us the opportunity to share deeply our different ways of celebrating our faith through cultures as peoples and communities of prayer.</p> <p>WE are committed to assisting, encouraging and resourcing ministry to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.</p>	

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>WE pledge to consult and work with each other as equal partners in the development of our Church and land, in our communities, parishes, dioceses and nationally and internationally.</p> <p>We shall establish means through which we can give witness and testimony accounting for the learnings, struggles, challenges and successes of our journey.</p> <p>AND we invite all who call Australia their home to join with us as we continue the process of healing our peoples and this land and seas.</p>	
<p>49/07 NORTHERN TERRITORY INTERVENTION</p> <p>That General Synod urges the Federal Government, in relation to the intervention in Northern Territory Aboriginal communities, to ensure ongoing monitoring of the intervention process and, as part of the monitoring process;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to evaluate rigorously the effectiveness of the quarantining of welfare payments, the enforced medical examination of children, and any plans to acquire land compulsorily, and b) to listen to the concerns and advice of Aboriginal community leaders in relation to the intervention. <p>Archbishop Philip Freier moved, Bishop Greg Thompson seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary sent a letter to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on 14/12/07.</p>
<p>51/07 SUDANESE IMMIGRANTS</p> <p>The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, while pleased that Australia offers a safe haven for those fleeing violence in many parts of the world, is disturbed that recent comments by the Federal Immigration Minister about African immigration in general, and Sudanese in particular, have led to a perceived increase in hostility to Sudanese people living in Australia. This Synod therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) urges all Australia governments to set an example in heeding the command of God, originally given to the nation of Israel: "the alien living with you must be treated as one of your native-born. Love him as yourself for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord your God" (Lev 19.34); b) requests that governments provide generous assistance and support to those who come from 	<p>There is no record of the resolution being conveyed to members of the Federal, State and Territory Governments.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>other cultures to help them settle into the Australian community;</p> <p>c) asks public figures to refrain from indiscriminate comments which reflect badly upon specific groups in the community, and which may be used by others as an excuse for violence; and</p> <p>d) asks the Secretary to convey this resolution to members of the Federal, State and Territory governments.</p> <p>Mr Clive Ellis moved, Bishop Ivan Lee seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	
<p>59/07 WHITE RIBBON DAY (WOMEN'S COMMISSION)</p> <p>That this General Synod noting from both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Institute of Criminology that more than 1,000,000 Australian women experience violence during a relationship and that 57% of all Australian women will, at some point in their lifetime, be the victim of physical or sexual assault; encourages all Bishops, Dioceses and Anglican Agencies to support the White Ribbon Day campaign (marked on 25 November each year) which seeks to engage all men to take a leadership role in eliminating violence against women.</p> <p>Mrs Ann Skamp moved, Bishop John McIntyre seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary wrote to dioceses requesting them to identify ways in which Australian Anglicans can address violence against women in their local communities.</p>
<p>60/70 BRINGING THEM HOME REPORT</p> <p>General Synod noting:</p> <p>a) that 2007 marks the tenth anniversary of the report National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, Bringing Them Home, of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (National Inquiry Report), and</p> <p>b) that the Commonwealth Government in its response agreed to implement 17 of the 54 recommendations of the National Inquiry Report, calls upon the Commonwealth Government as a matter of urgency:</p> <p>c) to make a public report as to the progress in the implementation of those 17 recommendations, and to provide any further funding and resources necessary to fully implement those recommendations,</p> <p>d) to implement recommendation 5 of the National Inquiry Report by making an official apology to indigenous individuals, families and communities</p>	<p>The General Secretary conveyed the resolution to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition on 14/12/07.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>for the laws, policies and practices of their predecessors of forcible removal, and</p> <p>e) to implement the remaining recommendations of the National Inquiry Report, and to provide the funding and resources necessary to fully implement those recommendations,</p> <p>and requests the General Secretary to send a letter conveying this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.</p> <p>Mr Garth Blake SC moved, Mr Theo Mackaay seconding, 23 Oct 2007</p>	
<p>73/07 ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>That this General Synod</p> <p>a) affirms the work of the Australian Anglican Environmental Network, and the resources it has gathered;</p> <p>b) requests all organisational units within the Anglican Church of Australia to reduce their environmental footprint through best practice energy use, water use, and waste disposal.</p> <p>The Revd Cameron Venables moved, Archdeacon Gary Harch seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary wrote to dioceses communicating the resolution and details of relevant strategic issues identified by the Standing Committee.</p> <p>The General Secretary requested the Australian Anglican Environmental Network to assist the General Synod Office to devise measures to reduce the environmental footprint of the 15th General Synod.</p>
<p>77/07 ENVIRONMENT WORKING GROUP</p> <p>That this General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia:</p> <p>acknowledges God's sovereignty over His creation through the Lord Jesus Christ;</p> <p>acknowledges the Anglican Communion's 5th mark of mission "to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth"; and</p> <p>recognises that human activity contributing to Climate change is one of the most pressing ethical issues of our time;</p>	<p>The resolution was drawn to the attention of the Doctrine Commission, the Environment Working Group and the Australian Anglican Environmental Network.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>requests –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the General Synod Doctrine Commission to develop a Christian Theology for a sustainable future including a Global Ethic; b) the General Synod Standing Committee Environment Working Group to generate a Christian response to the political/economic and social impacts of Climate Change on our Pacific neighbours, our primary producers, the world's poor and the environment; c) encourages our Federal and State Governments to produce environmentally sustainable policies on – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • energy production within Australia canvassing all available options but focussing particularly on renewable energy sources; • the export of raw materials for energy production overseas cognisant of the effect of such exports on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Global warming, o international security and o the responsible processing of end products especially CO2 emissions and depleted uranium; d) calls on the Federal Government to accept Pacific Island peoples, our neighbours, seeking refuge as a result of climate change on their island homes and their livelihood; e) calls upon all Anglican Dioceses to develop and implement an environmental policy which expresses principles of good environmental stewardship and care to all Anglicans, Anglican parishes and agencies, including modelling of sustainable water and energy use; and f) requests the Australian Anglican Environmental Network to act as a clearing house for policy material developed by Dioceses for collation and dissemination nationally through the General Synod website or other means, <p>Professor David Mitchell moved, Dr Karin Sowada seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	
<p>92/07 FAIR TRADE PRODUCTS</p> <p>That this Synod, because of our commitment to implementing the Millennium Development Goals, requests that at future General Synods, Fair Trade tea and coffee should be served.</p> <p>Ms Margaret Rodgers moved, Dr Karin Sowada seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>This resolution has been drawn to the attention of the Local Arrangements Committee for the 15th Session of General Synod.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>93/07 ANNIVERSARY OF SLAVE TRADE ABOLITION</p> <p>That this Synod recognizes the two hundredth anniversary of the British Parliament passing of an act to outlaw the slave trade in its colonies on 25th March 2007.</p> <p>We give thanks for the key role played by Christians in bringing about the end of slavery, while also acknowledging that the church sometimes colluded with this injustice and drew financial profit from it.</p> <p>As Christians we commit ourselves to overcoming injustice and inequality in our society both arising from the past practices of slavery and from present practices that involve the trafficking of human beings.</p> <p>The Very Revd Andrew Sempell moving, Bishop Jonathan Holland seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>100/07 CALIFORNIAN FIRES</p> <p>That this Synod, noting the devastation of the fires in California, the loss of life and property:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> prays for God's compassion and mercy on the State of California, and for the endeavours of those engaged in rescue and recovery work, and respectfully requests the Primate sends a message of support and encouragement from this Synod to the Bishops of the affected areas, assuring them of our continuing prayers, especially for ministries provided to those who are caught up in this disaster. <p>Ms Margaret Rodgers moved, Archbishop Roger Herft seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Primate sent a message of support on 26/10/07..</p>
<p>102/07 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SUPPORT</p> <p>General Synod recognises the grave risks inherent in clergy responding to cases of family violence and the duty of care which every diocese carries to provide clergy with adequate training and support regarding domestic abuse cases. Further that this General Synod endorse and assist the Joint Churches Domestic Violence Prevention Project in providing every Australian parish with its upcoming "Not in my Church" CD providing basic training and resources for networking and support of clergy responding to domestic violence cases and that information about the project be provided</p>	<p>The Standing Committee arranged for copies of the CD to be made available to each Diocese for distribution to every parish.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>on the General Synod website.</p> <p>Mrs Lorraine Stafford moved, the Revd Canon Gary Smith seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	
<p>123/07 INDIGENOUS IDENTITY AND AUSTRALIAN LIFE</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <p>(a) is troubled by –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the Federal Parliament's promotion of any legislation that avoids the granting of human rights or that removes those rights from its own citizens or from others; ii) the use of the language of crisis and emergency in our parliaments and in the media to promote the current precipitous interventions in Aboriginal towns and camps in the Northern Territory, sidestepping blame for decades of disinterest, and avoiding the charge that Australians are not willing to bear the cost of implementing long-term strategies of justice building; iii) emerging signs of the introduction of an overt policy of "mainstreaming" in relation to Indigenous Australians, whose unique identity and rich and ancient heritage ought to be celebrated and cherished rather than extinguished; iv) the avoidance of open public debate and vigorous collaboration when introducing policy changes that are certain to disturb Indigenous peoples across our nation, altering forever their human and cultural rights, freedoms and aspirations; and <p>(b) calls on all Australians, especially our parliamentarians, media and opinion changers and all Anglicans –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to embrace and cherish in appropriate ways the unique identities of the diversity of Indigenous societies in Australia and promote rich partnerships and mutual respect and avoid the injustice of forced assimilation in its various guises; (ii) to honour public debate and the forging of strong community partnerships, and to expose and condemn deceit and all techniques of social manipulation that bypass democratic process and ignore the needs and human rights of the poor and marginalised; and <p>(c) calls on our Federal Government</p>	<p>The General Secretary wrote to the Governor General on 27/3/08.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>(i) to engage with the government of the Northern Territory to actively implement, with liberal resources, a “Generational Plan of Action for Closing the Gap of Indigenous Disadvantage” and to adopt bi-partisan generational reform across all Australia as a means of enriching the future of all Indigenous Australians;</p> <p>(ii) to promote a nationwide debate as to how to ensure the continuation of a rich Indigenous identity in Australian society; and</p> <p>(d) requests that the General Secretary takes appropriate steps to petition the Governor General to promote, as soon as possible, a national decade of Australia’s Indigenous languages as a means of making all Australians vitally aware of the enduring cultural wealth that runs alongside the mainstream of Western Society in this ancient land.</p> <p>The Revd Robert Haynes moved, Bishop Greg Thompson seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	

MISSION

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>50/07 GENERAL SYNOD COMMISSIONS</p> <p>That pursuant to Section 8A of the Strategic Issues, Commission, Task Forces & Networks Canon 1998, this General Synod ratifies the continuation of the following expert Reference Commissions established by Standing Committee:</p> <p>Ecumenical Relations Commission Public Affairs Commission Women's Commission</p> <p>The Revd Canon Bruce McAteer moved, Bishop John Parkes seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>63/07 FRESH EXPRESSIONS AUSTRALIA</p> <p>That this Synod on the recommendation of the Standing Committee, resolves that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> evangelistic mission be the strategic focus for the General Synod Standing Committee for the triennium 2008-2010; the Task Force on Mission become known as "Fresh Expressions Australia" and continue as a Task Force of General Synod, and Fresh Expressions Australia prepare a proposal for a full time National Mission Facilitator or equivalent together with options as to how the role will be funded for presentation to Standing Committee; Fresh Expressions Australia be requested to examine and develop appropriate criteria for the selection, training and deployment of ordained and lay pioneer ministers in an Australian context; and Fresh Expressions Australia be requested to consult, engage and network with Ministry Development Officers or their equivalents throughout the Anglican Church of Australia. <p>Bishop Andrew Curnow moving, Bishop Stephen Hale seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>The resolution was drawn to the attention of Fresh Expressions Australia.</p>
<p>64/07 WELCOMING THE PEOPLE</p> <p>That this General Synod encourages every Diocese during the next three years to encourage parishes, schools and agencies to reaffirm their commitment to welcoming and including people in the life of the Church by investigating the factors which may prevent people</p>	<p>The General Secretary has drawn this resolution to the attention of Dioceses.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>from participating fully (especially people with lived experience of disability) and initiating improvements which enhance accessibility and participation.</p> <p>Archdeacon Peter Stuart, Archdeacon Timothy Harris seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	
<p>101/07 NATIONAL HOME MISSION FUND</p> <p>That this Synod, recognising the large financial needs required to provide ministry in remote Australia and the 'The Bush' and the needs amongst Indigenous Communities recognises the work of the NHMF and calls upon all Dioceses, Parishes and church members to support this fund.</p> <p>Bishop David Mulready moved, Bishop Garry Weatherill seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary drew this resolution to the attention of Dioceses.</p>
<p>112/07 REVIEW OF COMMISSIONS, TASKFORCES AND NETWORKS</p> <p>Noting the deletion of subsection (3) of section 27 of the Strategic Issues, Commissions, Taskforces and Networks Canon 1998 that this General Synod requests Standing Committee to establish a procedure for the regular review of the purpose, relevance, and ongoing need for all Commissions, Taskforces and Networks and to report such review procedure to the next session of General Synod.</p> <p>Bishop David Farran moved, Mr David Parsons seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>This resolution is the subject of a report to the 15th Session of General Synod.</p>
<p>124/07 NATIONAL ANGLICAN CONFERENCE III</p> <p>That this General Synod supports, with energy, the idea of running a National Anglican Conference within the next three years, and</p> <p>Requests Standing Committee to oversee the organizing of this conference, noting recent offers of support from Grafton and Perth Dioceses.</p> <p>The Very Revd Dr Peter Catt moved, Mr Theo Mackaay seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Standing Committee is investigating holding a conference in conjunction with the Jubilee of the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia in 2012.</p>

LITURGY AND WORSHIP

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>36/07 LECTIONARY CALENDAR</p> <p>That the description attached to James Noble in the Calendar November 25 be corrected to read “pioneer Aboriginal deacon”.</p> <p>The Revd Elizabeth Smith moved, the Revd Ron Downing seconding, 21 Oct 07</p>	<p>Correction made</p>
<p>75/07 ENVIRONMENT AND LITURGY</p> <p>That this General Synod commends the work of the Liturgy Commission of the Anglican Church of Australia, and requests them to further develop, commission and disseminate worship resources that enable Australian Christians to relate well with the physical environments in which they live.</p> <p>The Revd Canon Venables moved, Bishop George Browning seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The request has been referred to the Liturgy Commission.</p>
<p>76/07 ABM-A AND THE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>That this General Synod commends the Anglican Board of Mission-Australia for its efforts to promote dialogue on environmental issues with partner churches, and requests ABM to further develop specific initiatives that respond to environmental issues faced within the Pacific Region.</p> <p>Bishop Garry Weatherill moving, Archdeacon Gary Harch seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary drew this request to the attention of ABM-A.</p>
<p>82/07 DISTRIBUTION OF “PRAYERS FOR AN ELECTION”</p> <p>That Synod gives permission for the distribution of “Prayers for an election” prepared by the Liturgy Commission.</p> <p>The Revd Ron Dowling moved, The Revd Elizabeth Smith seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>97/07 LITURGY COMMISSION</p> <p>That this Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) affirms that an ordered, public reading of the holy scriptures in their fullness is a fundamental principle of doctrine and worship in the Anglican tradition, the dilution of which should not be contemplated. b) expresses its appreciation to the Liturgy Commission for its response to the Day of Mourning following the Indian Ocean tsunami, and affirms the principle that when such resources are needed urgently, the Chair with two nominated members of the Commission be authorised to act. c) welcomes the resources issued by the Liturgy Commission on the environment, situations following the disclosure of abuse, services where children are present, and further resources related to marriage, and commends them to the Anglican Church of Australia for use and response. d) receives and welcomes the 2005 Report of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (the 'Prague Report') on 'Liturgy and Anglican Identity' as a contribution to considering worship in a mission-shaped church, and commends it to all members of the Anglican Church of Australia. e) commends the Liturgy Commission for its programme of Workshops Encouraging Liturgical Life (WELLS), and encourages it to further develop its educational role. f) encourages the Liturgy Commission to continue its work on Holy Communion services, including musical settings, new Thanksgiving Prayers, and supplementary seasonal material. <p>The Revd Elizabeth Smith moved, the Revd Canon Jill Varcoe seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>98/07 LITURGY COMMISSION & BROUGHTON PUBLICATIONS</p> <p>That this Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) expresses its appreciation to the Liturgy Commission and Broughton Publications for the publication of the APBA-based Lectionary book in 2005, 2006 and 2007, of Daily Services (in response to a request from the Defence Forces Board), and of Ministry with the Sick & Dying; b) congratulates Broughton Publications upon its inaugural publication not related to APBA, Prayer 	<p>No action required.</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>and Plays for Christmas and Holy Week, by the Revd Dr Elizabeth Smith, member of the Liturgy Commission; and</p> <p>c) notes with appreciation that LabOra Worship (known as e-pray to Australian Anglicans) has been taken up by the Roman Catholic and Uniting Church in Australia, by the Anglican Church of Aotearoa / New Zealand, and by the Australian Hymn Book Company, congratulates Broughton Publishing on its being the catalyst for this, and encourages the development of ecumenical training events.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Mr Brian Norris seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	
<p>121/07 ELECTRONIC FORM OF AN AUSTRALIAN PRAYER BOOK (AAPB)</p> <p>That given the fact that An Australian Prayer Book is now out of print, and that many congregations across Australia are continuing to use AAPB, this Synod recommends that Standing Committee arrange for Broughton Publishing to make the text of AAPB available electronically.</p> <p>The Revd Zachary Veron moved, Bishop David Mulready seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>Broughton Publishing Pty Limited has agreed to do so.</p>

MINISTRY

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>43/07 MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEE</p> <p>That:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) so much of standing orders be suspended as would prevent the recommittal of bill No. R-04 – A Rule to amend Clause 2 of rule II – at the committee stage for the purpose of amending that rule to allow the appointment of 2 members of Standing Committee nominated by NATSIAC, and b) the recommittal be made an order of the day for Tuesday 23 at 2pm. <p>The Revd Charles Loban moved, Mr Ian Walker seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>74/07 DOCTRINE AND THE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>That this General Synod requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Doctrine Commission of the Anglican Church of Australia to identify those areas of doctrine and theology that support the inter-dependent relationship between humanity and the natural world; b) that discussion material be prepared on these identified areas of doctrine and theology; and c) this material be made available for use in Parishes and theological colleges. <p>Bishop Garry Weatherill moving, the Very Revd Peter Catt seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary referred these requests to the Doctrine Commission, which have prepared a collection of essays on ecology.</p>
<p>80/07 DROUGHT TASK FORCE</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) acknowledges the harsh and transforming nature of drought across this land; b) expresses its prayerful solidarity with all who live in drought affected regions; c) recognises that as a consequence of the drought the shape and nature of many of these communities will be forever changed and the mission, ministry and pastoral care provided by and within these communities are being seriously impacted and therefore d) asks that the Standing Committee set up and resource a Task Force to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) explore ways of dealing with the effects of drought as raised in (a), (b) and (c) above to 	<p>The Task Force on Drought has reported on support of ministry in drought affected areas. See also resolution 94/07.</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>ensure ongoing ministry by church communities in those rural areas,</p> <p>(ii) identify other issues of significance relating to the impact of the drought, and further</p> <p>(iii) asks the Provincial Bishops to look at the possibility of establishing similar Task Forces in each of the provinces which will specifically tackle the issues arising out of the impact of the drought on regional churches and faith communities.</p> <p>The Revd Peter Yeats moved, The Revd David Thornton seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	
<p>81/07 THE AMALGAMATION OF DIOCESES</p> <p>That the question of the best manner to deal with amalgamation of Dioceses be referred to the Church Law Commission to provide advice and if appropriate a draft canon for the 2010 General Synod.</p> <p>The Hon Mr Justice Peter Young moved, Bishop John Parkes seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The question has been referred to the Church Law Commission and will be the subject of a report to the 15th Session of General Synod.</p>
<p>83/07 RECOGNITION OF SCHOOL OF CHRISTIAN STUDIES</p> <p>That, pursuant to the passing of An Australian College of Theology Canon 2007, this Synod requests the Standing Committee consider recognising the School of Christian Studies at Robert Menzies College, Sydney as an Anglican Theological College, pursuant to the definitions of Anglican Theological Colleges in clause 1.3 of the Schedule to the Canon.</p> <p>Prof. Chris Bellinger moved, Bishop Glenn Davies seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Standing Committee recognized the School of Christian Studies at Robert Menzies College as an Anglican Theological College by resolution SC2008/1/068 in February 2008.</p>
<p>85/07 EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN</p> <p>That this General Synod in responding to ACC Resolution 13.31 requesting member churches to work towards the goal of equal representation of women in decision making at all levels:</p> <p>a) recognises and celebrates the giftedness of women and the multitude of ministries in which they participate;</p> <p>b) requests Standing Committee of General Synod to apply the principle of equal representation of women in its appointments to Commissions, Task</p>	<p>Under active consideration by Standing Committee and referred to the dioceses.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>Forces, and Working Groups wherever legislatively and practically possible and to report progress to ACC 14 in 2009; and</p> <p>c) encourages each diocese to adopt this principle in elections and appointments and report progress to General Synod Standing Committee by the end of 2008.</p> <p>Archdeacon Kay Goldsworthy moved, Mrs Audrey Mills seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	
<p>94/07 MINISTRY AND CLIMATE CHANGE</p> <p>That this General Synod recognises that this Church has an obligation to support ministry in areas of Australia where climate change and similar forces have affected the ability of the local people to provide it to the necessary level.</p> <p>The General Synod recommends that the most appropriate way of dealing with this obligation in the short term is for each diocese to ensure that the National Home Mission Fund received proper funding.</p> <p>A Task Force of Bps Curnow, Hough, Stephens and Weatherill be appointed to report, and make recommendations to Standing Committee on how ministry can be more adequately resourced in Dioceses suffering from the impact of climate change.</p> <p>The Hon Justice Peter Young moved, Bishop Andrew Curnow seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Task Force on Drought has reported on support of ministry in drought affected areas. See resolution 80/07 above.</p>
<p>99/07 WOMEN BISHOPS</p> <p>That this Synod:</p> <p>a) notes the decision of the Appellate Tribunal and welcomes the clarity it brings to the question of the eligibility of women for admission to the order of bishop in the Anglican Church of Australia; and</p> <p>b) requests the Standing Committee to monitor developments in relation to women bishops including provisions made for those who decline to receive the ministry of a woman bishop and report to the next session of General Synod.</p> <p>Archbishop Philip Freier moved, Bishop Glenn Davies seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>A report is included in the papers for the 15th Session of General Synod.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>104/07 BISHOPS TO THE DEFENCE FORCE – PAST AND PRESENT</p> <p>That General Synod welcomes the Report of the Defence Force Board and affirms the ministry of the Anglican Church to members of the Australian Defence Force, especially through its military chaplains.</p> <p>Further, Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) notes the passing of the Third Bishop to the Defence Force (1994-2001), the Right Reverend Brian Franklin Vernon King, and gives thanks to God for his dedicated ministry whilst responsible for a large episcopal region; b) expresses its gratitude to God for the ministry of the Fourth Bishop to the Defence Force (2001-2006), the Right Reverend Dr Thomas Robert Frame, the first person to hold this position full time, who served untiringly and who introduced many initiatives which will continue to enrich this special ministry of our Church; and c) welcomes the appointment, consecration and installation of the Right Reverend Leonard Sidney Eacott AM, as the Fifth Bishop and assures him of its prayers and encouragement as he commences this ministry. <p>Mr Allan Sauer moved, The Ven Dr David Powys seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letters were sent to the Bishops Tom Frame and Len Eacott on 8/1/08.</p>
<p>105/07 DEFENCE FORCE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE</p> <p>That noting the importance of ministry to the Australian Defence Force and their families and other associated people, this Synod requests the Defence Force Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to formulate a proposal for establishing an organisational structure with authority appropriate for ministry to the Australian Defence Force and with appropriate governance arrangements, and with this end in view; b) to consult widely, including with representatives from dioceses and Defence Force Bishops within the Anglican Communion; and also c) to gain any transferable insights from the model of ministry already established for the Indigenous peoples; and also d) to bring the proposal to the next General Synod for consideration. <p>The Revd Warwick de Jersey moved, Mr Allan Sauer seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary drew the request to the attention of the Defence Force Board which will report to the 15th Session of the General Synod.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>106/07 DROUGHT COLLECTION</p> <p>That our service tomorrow morning an offering be taken and that the proceeds of that offering be directed towards ministry needs in drought affected dioceses and indigenous ministries.</p> <p>Archdeacon Stephen May moved, Bishop Andrew Curnow seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>107/07 ASSOCIATION FOR THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY</p> <p>That Synod notes the creation of An Association for the Apostolic Ministry under the initial chairmanship of Bishop Michael Hough and Archbishop Peter Jensen to promote the apostolic gospel and to assist the Church in working through the on-going consequences of the consecration of women to the Episcopate.</p> <p>Archbishop Peter Jensen moved, Bishop Michael Hough seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>111/07 CLIMATE CHANGE AND DROUGHT FUND</p> <p>This Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) requests Standing Committee to consult with the Task Force for Ministry and Climate Change and Anglicare Australia (refer Res 58/07) to resource Regional and Rural Australian Ministries by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) setting a target of \$3 million to be raised over the life of the Synod; and ii) considering the establishment of an appeal to receive funds for this purpose including seeking tax deductibility b) that Standing Committee reports back to the next Synod on the achievement of the target and the results. <p>Bishop Doug Stevens moved, Mr Peter Sandeman seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Standing Committee's report is included in the papers for the 15th Session of the General Synod.</p>
<p>113/07 MINISTRY COMMISSION REPORT</p> <p>That this General Synod notes the report of the Ministry Commission and in particular the comments and data relating to the ageing profile of Anglican clergy and the conclusion "that there is a looming crisis that will deeply affect this church within the next five years", and requests Standing Committee to communicate this report to every appropriate Diocesan officer or</p>	<p>The report was referred to the Dioceses. The request for further research and a report has been referred to the Ministry</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>committee for their serious consideration and practical response.</p> <p>Further that this General Synod request the Ministry Commission to do further research on this matter and bring its report to the next meeting of this Synod.</p> <p>The Revd Richard Trist moved, Archdeacon Peter Stuart seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>Commission.</p>
<p>116/07 SCHOOL CHAPLAINCY</p> <p>That this Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) commends the Federal Government for establishing the School Chaplains Funding Scheme. We acknowledge the support of the Leader of the Opposition for this scheme. We give thanks for this significant new opportunity to offer pastoral care and to graciously commend the Christian faith; b) urges the newly elected Federal Government to continue to offer further rounds of funding to enable more government and independent schools to establish new chaplaincy programs; c) offers its support to the state bodies that are supporting this rapid expansion of chaplaincy in our schools. <p>Bishop Stephen Hale, Bishop Andrew Curnow seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>126/07 BISHOPS' PROTOCOLS</p> <p>That this Synod refers to the Primate any protocols agreed to by the bishops of the Australian Church for a report to the Standing Committee.</p> <p>Mr Robert Tong moved, The Revd Warwick de Jersey seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>Bishops' Protocols were distributed to the Standing Committee in February 2008.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>127/07 AMOS FOUNDATION</p> <p>Noting the motion from the Defence Force Board and the Bishop to the Defence Force and acknowledging and affirming the ministry of the Defence Force chaplains; this General Synod requests Standing Committee to write to all Dioceses to encourage clergy on the occasion of conducting funerals for returned service men and women to donate in full or part the clergy offering to the Amos foundation to support the Bishop to the Defence Force and Defence Force chaplains.</p> <p>The Venerable Keith Brice moved, Mr David Parsons seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary wrote to all Dioceses as requested.</p>

ANGLICAN COMMUNION, ECUMENICAL AND INTER-FAITH

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>54/07 THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH (USA)</p> <p>That General Synod noting:</p> <p>the response of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church to matters of concern raised by the Lambeth Commission (The Windsor Report) and the subsequent clarification sought by the Primates of the Communion in their communiqué following their meeting in Dar Es Salaam,</p> <p>the report of the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council following their meeting with the House of Bishops in New Orleans, and</p> <p>the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the reaction of all provinces across the communion to the assessment of the Joint Standing Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) invites a presentation of this matter by myself and the Archbishop of Sydney of 15 minutes each b) refers the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury to a meeting of small groups to be held at a designated time during this synod meeting c) requests the small groups to record their deliberations for submission to the Primate to assist in the preparation of his response to the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the province. <p>Mr Robert Fordham moved, Archbishop Peter Jensen seconding, 22 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Primate prepared the response referred to in sub-paragraph (c) otherwise no action required. See also resolution 90/07 below.</p>
<p>61/07 PARLIAMENT OF WORLD RELIGIONS</p> <p>That this General Synod welcomes the awarding of the Parliament of the World's Religions to Melbourne in 2009 and commends Anglican participation.</p> <p>Archdeacon Philip Newman moved, Bishop Philip Huggins seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>62/07 ANGLICAN PEACE CONFERENCE</p> <p>That whereas on the initiative of the Anglican Consultative Council, and with the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury – the Anglican Church of Korea will host a world-wide Anglican Peace Conference</p>	<p>Archbishop Herft transmitted the message of goodwill to the Primate Bishop</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>in Seoul in November 2007 concerning peace initiatives and reconciliation on the Korean peninsula, this General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) sends greetings of peace in Christ to the Anglican Church of Korea and the Towards Peace in Korea Conference; b) supports the creation of a worldwide Anglican network for peace in North East Asia; c) invites all Christians to pray for the peace of the Korean peninsula and the freedom to worship of its people; and d) requests the Archbishop of Perth, the Most Reverend Roger Herft, who is attending the conference, to transmit this message of goodwill to the Primate Bishop of the Anglican Church of Korea. <p>Mr Brian McKinlay moved, Bishop George Browning seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>of the Anglican Church of Korea.</p>
<p>72/07 ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL</p> <p>That the General Synod of the Province of Australia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) supports in principle the proposed change of status of the Anglican Consultative Council to a charitable company as requested by ACC 11 and ACC 12. b) supports in principle the proposed amendment of the Constitution of the Anglican Consultative Council so as to provide for the incorporation of the members of the Primates' Standing Committee for the time being as ex-officio members of the Anglican Consultative Council. c) supports in principle the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the Anglican Consultative Council so as to provide for all of the Primates of the Anglican Communion to become additional ex-officio members of the Council. <p>The motion was put clause by clause. Clause a) CARRIED Clause b) CARRIED Clause c) LOST</p> <p>Mr Robert Fordham moved, Mr Ian Walker seconding, 23 Oct 07</p>	<p>Further drafts of the Constitution have been prepared and have been approved by the Standing Committee. The Constitution has now been finalized.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>78/07 ANGLICAN-UNITING DIALOGUE</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <p>welcomes the re-commencement of national Anglican Church of Australia - Uniting Church in Australia Dialogue;</p> <p>acknowledges that constitutional factors and theological differences are likely to prevent interchangeability of Ministers of these two churches in the near future; and</p> <p>asks the Doctrine Commission to further elaborate on its response to the report For the Sake of the Gospel (2001) by indicating which parts of sections 4-6 of that report may be used to guide ongoing dialogue in the quest to develop a preliminary Covenant of Association with The Uniting Church in Australia.</p> <p>Archdeacon Dr David Powys moved, The Revd Canon Dr Colleen O'Reilly seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>The request was referred to the Doctrine Commission which reported back to Standing Committee.</p>
<p>79/07 MOTHERS UNION FAMILY LIFE PROGRAM</p> <p>That this Synod supports MU Australia, part of the world wide Mothers' Union, in its endeavour to train facilitators and introduce "The Family Life Programme" (FLP) into disadvantaged and marginalised indigenous communities in Australia.</p> <p>This programme is based on participation, knowledge and skill gaining. It is a whole of community programme encouraging sustainability, self respect and dignity and aims at breaking dependency.</p> <p>Mrs Deane Bray moved, Bishop Paul White seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>86/07 WINDSOR REPORT</p> <p>That this General Synod</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Recognises the importance of the Windsor Report in facilitating conversations within the Communion about its unity and mission, and in particular the contribution of The Windsor Report to the proposal for a covenant for the Anglican Communion. b) Notes the Australian response to the proposal, as reported by the Windsor Report Working Group, and particularly the contribution from Australia to the development of the Covenant Design Group's 	<p>The final draft of the proposed Anglican Covenant are included in the papers for the 15th Session of the General Synod.</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>draft Anglican Covenant.</p> <p>c) Asks the Standing Committee to facilitate an ongoing participation by the Anglican Church of Australia in any further dialogue about or development of a covenant proposal.</p> <p>Archbishop Jeffery Driver moved, Mr Robert Tong seconding, 24 Oct 07</p>	
<p>90/07 THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH DISCUSSION OUTCOMES</p> <p>That synod requests the Primate to send to all General Synod representatives a copy of his summation from the small group session on Monday night and a copy of his response to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the issue of the TEC response given to the Joint Standing Committee.</p> <p>Archdeacon Paul Barker moved, Archdeacon Graham Reynolds seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary sent the Primate's response to General Synod members on 4 December 2007. See also resolution 54/07.</p>
<p>114/07 AUSTARC BOOKLET</p> <p>That in view of the widespread individualistic search for faith in our culture that often fails to lead to public, corporate commitment to the lordship of Christ, this General Synod welcomes the AUSTARC booklet "Why the Church?" published jointly by Broughton Press and St Paul's Publications and commends it for study in ecumenical groups as well as the Dioceses and parishes of our church.</p> <p>Bishop Graeme Rutherford moved, Archdeacon Philip Newman seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>115/07 INTER-RELIGIOUS DIALOGUE</p> <p>That the next General Synod Standing Committee give consideration to our Governor General's encouragement for our church to better engage in inter-religious dialogues.</p> <p>Bishop Philip Huggins moved, Bishop Paul White seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

FINANCE

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>28/07 FINANCIAL REPORTING</p> <p>That this General Synod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) recognises the importance of responsible, professional and transparent financial reporting at all levels within this church, but especially at national and diocesan level, as being essential to our stewardship and risk management processes; and b) congratulates the Diocesan Financial Advisory Group (DFAG) [chaired by Mr. Bill Shields,] for encouraging dioceses to fully adopt the Australian International Financial Reporting Standards (AIFRS), being the accepted accounting framework in Australia; and c) requests the Standing Committee of the General Synod to continue to support the ministry of DFAG by regularly reviewing progress by dioceses in implementing best practice financial reporting through the adoption of AIFRS in diocesan accounts as well as those of related entities such as their development or deposit funds. <p>The Revd Canon Bruce McAteer moved, Bishop John Harrower seconding, 20 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letter written to Mr Bill Shields.</p>
<p>30/07 FINANCIAL MATTERS</p> <p>That the motions 33.04, 33.05, 33.06 be put now with motions 33.07 and 33.08 being referred to the Finance presentation on Friday 26 October 2007.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Mr Brian Norris seconding, 20 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>31/07 AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR 2006</p> <p>That the audited financial statements of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2006, as adopted by Standing Committee, be received.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Mr Brian Norris seconding, 20 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>32/07 SUMMARY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</p> <p>That the summary financial statement of the Statutory, Special, Indigenous Endowments and Reserve Funds of General Synod for the years 2004 - 2006 be received.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Mr Brian Norris seconding, 20 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>33/07 GENERAL SYNOD FINANCIAL POSITION</p> <p>That a report from the Hon Treasurer of the financial position of the General Synod at 31 December 2006 be received.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Mr Brian Norris seconding, 20 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>108/07 FINANCE - PROJECTIONS FOR 2008-2010</p> <p>That the financial projections for the period from the year following the Synod (2008) to the year of the next expected Synod (2010) be received.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Bishop Andrew Curnow seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>109/07 2008 BUDGET</p> <p>That Synod approves the aggregate of the estimate of the costs, charges and expenses for the subsequent year (2008) in respect of matters referred to in paragraphs 32(2)(a), (b1), (c) and (e) of the Constitution.</p> <p>Mr John McKenzie moved, Bp Andrew Curnow seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>110/07 SPECIAL FUND REPORTING – DIOCESE OF SYDNEY</p> <p>That the financial estimates for 2008 be amended to provide for an assessment of \$116,000 for the Diocese of Sydney in respect of the Special Fund.</p> <p>Mr Robert Fordham moved, Mr Doug Marr seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>No record has been found of the adjustment having been made</p>

APPRECIATION

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>87/07 LISTENING PROCESS PRESENTATION</p> <p>That this Synod thanks those who were involved in the preparation of the Listening Process Presentation at this Synod and requests that our thanks be appropriately forwarded to those people, especially those who shared their stories.</p> <p>The Revd Arthur Copeman moved, Archdeacon Colvin Ford seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letters of appreciation sent 30/10/07.</p>
<p>88/07 APPRECIATION FOR MAJOR-GENERAL MICHAEL JEFFERY</p> <p>That this Synod expresses its deep appreciation for the generous hospitality of the Governor General and thanks him for his words of encouragement.</p> <p>Archdeacon Philip Newman moved, Bishop Peter Danaher seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letter of appreciation sent on 9/1/08.</p>
<p>89/07 DR LINDA KURTI</p> <p>That this Synod notes with appreciation the outstanding leadership of Dr Linda Kurti as Executive Director of ABM-A, recognises that she leave the organisation internally strong, financially sound and well connected with our mission partners.</p> <p>This Synod offers its prayers to Linda in her future ministry.</p> <p>Archbishop Roger Herft moved, Bishop Garry Weatherill seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letter of appreciation sent on 9/1/08.</p>
<p>96/07 ARCHDEACON BOB JACKSON</p> <p>That meeting of General Synod thanks Archdeacon Bob Jackson for his preaching, Bible studies and presentation to the Synod, and prays that what he has shared with us will encourage the Anglican Church of Australia to push out into deep water and let down the nets.</p> <p>Bishop Andrew Curnow moved, Archbishop Peter Jensen seconding, 25 Oct 07</p> <p>Carried by applause</p>	<p>Letter of appreciation sent on 9/1/08.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>128/07 GENERAL THANKS</p> <p>This Synod thanks:</p> <p>The President, Archbishop Phillip Aspinall and the Chaplains to the Primate,</p> <p>The Chairman of Committees, the Hon Justice David Bleby, The Deputy Chairmen, the Hon Mr Justice Peter Young and Mr Ian Walker, the Clerical Secretary The Revd Chris Moroney, the Lay Secretary, Mrs Ann Skamp.</p> <p>The Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn and Bishop-in-Council, Members of the Canberra and Goulburn Local Management Committee</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Rt Revd Allan Ewing Mr Wayne Harris Mr Allan Wilson Dr Beth Heyde The Very Revd Phillip Saunders</p> <p>And the large team of volunteers without whom this Synod would not have operated as effectively and efficiently as it has; and also the Reverend Canon Bruce McAteer and the General Synod Office Staff.</p> <p>The Rydges Lakeside Hotel and their staff,</p> <p>Mrs Hazel Davies for the stunning floral arrangements in the Synod Hall</p> <p>Radford College, Canberra Boys Grammar and Canberra Girls Grammar for the loan of their buses.</p> <p>Generous sponsorship from ActewAGL, Cantec Australasia, EIG Ansvar, Staging Connections Canon Australian, Sharp Corporation of Australia.</p> <p>We thank the media for their courtesy, cooperation and interest and the media officers drawn from several dioceses, and the General Synod media officer, Mrs Robyn Douglas; and our ecumenical guests for being with us.</p> <p>Finally, we thank the staff of the General Synod office:</p> <p>Ms Sylvia Murphy, who retires at the conclusion of this Synod; Mrs Charmazel Haslam, Mr Wayne Brighton, Mr</p>	<p>Letters of appreciation sent on 14/1/08.</p>

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>Paul Bennett, Mrs Joanne Burgess, Ms Zenda Curran, Mrs Cecilia Chan and the Revd Canon Bruce McAteer.</p> <p>The Most Revd Roger Herft moved, 26 Oct 07</p>	
<p>129/07 APPRECIATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS</p> <p>That this Synod expresses its appreciation of the President for his stimulating presidential address, and that it be distributed to the dioceses of this church and commends it to the people of our Church for further study.</p> <p>Bishop Tom Wilmot moved, Mr Tony Evans seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Presidential address has been posted on the General Synod website.</p>
<p>130/07 THE VERY REVD PHILIP SAUNDERS</p> <p>That this Synod express its hearty appreciation to the Dean, The Canon Residentiary, those responsible for the music and the whole Cathedral community for the opening Eucharist in The Cathedral Church of St Saviour, Goulburn and requests the Primate to convey the thanks of the Synod to all who contributed.</p> <p>The Very Revd G Lawrence moved, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>Letter of appreciation sent on 14/1/08.</p>
<p>131/07 APPRECIATION FOR GOULBURN RECEPTION</p> <p>That this Synod express its gratitude to the following for the organisation and presentation of the reception following the Synod Eucharist on Sunday 21st October 2007:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Jo Cooper – Coordinator St Peter's School Big Band Goulburn Conservatorium of Music Roses Catering Kingsdale Winery The Staff of St Saviour's Cathedral and Volunteers Representatives of the Goulburn Community.</p> <p>and requests the General Secretary to convey this resolution to the Dean.</p> <p>Ms Leigh Haywood moved, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The General Secretary conveyed the resolution as requested.</p>

<i>RESOLUTION</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p data-bbox="277 296 589 323">132/07 THE PRIMATE</p> <p data-bbox="407 359 1079 541">That this Synod records its deep appreciation to the Primate for his chairmanship of this session of General Synod. It gratefully acknowledges that the firmness, fairness, efficiency, sensitivity and good humour of the Primate's presidency has contributed greatly to the good spirit in which the Synod has been conducted.</p> <p data-bbox="407 573 1079 630">The Hon Justice David Bleby moved, The Hon Justice Peter Young seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p data-bbox="1141 359 1320 415">No further action required.</p>

ADMINISTRATION OF SYNOD

No further action was required on any of these resolutions other than 91/07 and 125/07. Accordingly only those two resolutions are reproduced in this report. Members wishing to know the details of those resolutions are referred to pages 63-72 of the Book "Proceedings of the Fourteenth General Synod – 2007".

RESOLUTION	ACTION
<p>91/07 CORRECTION OF WEBSITE INFORMATION</p> <p>That Synod, noting that in appendix 3 of the Report of the Professional Standards Commission containing the summary of professional standards information on diocesan websites, the information pertaining to the Anglican Diocese of Melbourne is incorrect, agrees that:</p> <p>a) The correct information is http://www.melbourne.anglican.com.au/main.php?id=983</p> <p>b) the report on the General Synod website will be updated with the correct information.</p> <p>Mrs Jane Still moved, Mr Garth Blake seconding, 25 Oct 07</p>	<p>The report will be updated when the website is re-built.</p>
<p>125/07 GENERAL SYNOD VOTING SYSTEM</p> <p>That Standing Committee appoints a committee to investigate the various voting systems that might be used in future General Synod elections, and report the merits and demerits of each to the 15th General Synod.</p> <p>Archdeacon Dr David James Powys moved, Bishop Michael Hough seconding, 26 Oct 07</p>	<p>The Committee reported in March 2010 with recommendations to be followed up.</p>

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER MINISTRY

REPORT TO GENERAL SYNOD OF THE JOINT WORKING GROUP OF THE GENERAL SYNOD STANDING COMMITTEE AND NATSIAC

1. On 17 October 2009, the GSSC and the NATSIAC Executive met for a planning day to consider the recommendations of the Committee to Review Indigenous Ministry (“the Horsburgh Report”) and their implications for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry within the Anglican Church of Australia. Also participating in the planning day were representatives of ABM-A, CMS, BCA, Associate Professor Michael Horsburgh and Bishop Arthur Malcolm. The Horsburgh Report recommendations also went to the NATSIAC National meeting held in late October 2009, as they had not been discussed by NATSIAC prior to the consultation. In response to the consultation, facilitated by Mr Greg Thompson, Standing Committee proposed the formation of a GSSC/NATSIAC Joint Working Group, with the following terms of reference:
 - (a) to compose a position description for a National Indigenous Ministry Officer;
 - (b) to make recommendations with regard to the NATSIAC Canon; and
 - (c) to establish goals for Indigenous Ministry for the next 3 years.

Although the question of funding was included in the brief for the consultation, it did not form part of the initial terms of reference for the Working Group.

The Horsburgh Report was prepared in three parts and has been posted on the General Synod website. A summary prepared by Greg Thompson is appended to this report.

2. NATSIAC met in Bendigo in the week following the Consultation and passed a number of resolutions including support for the development of an Indigenous Ministry Officer, reduction in size of NATSIAC, and encouragement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans to participate at all levels of church governance. Of particular importance was NATSIAC’s continuing commitment to the National Indigenous Bishops *in addition to* a National Indigenous Ministry Officer. While the Horsburgh Report contemplated the diversion of funds away from the Indigenous Bishops towards the Ministry Officer, NATSIAC indicated its preference for the Bishops to continue and called for the Indigenous Endowment Fund to be increased to ensure the long term sustainability of Indigenous ministry. Some inaccuracies in the Horsburgh Report were identified by NATSIAC and these have been recorded in a supplementary note posted on the General Synod website together with the Horsburgh Report.

3. The membership of the Joint Working group comprised four members of GSSC (Glenn Davies, Martin Drevikovsky, Audrey Mills, John McKenzie), four members of the NATSIAC Executive (Rose Elu, Brian Kirk, Di Langham, Lala Leftwich) and representatives of ABM (Greg Thompson), BCA (Royce Thompson) and CMS (John Thew). The group met twice, on 28 January and 26 March 2010. By the time of the second meeting, Di Langham had resigned and James Leftwich replaced her. There was general agreement about the reduction in size of NATSIAC and a new NATSIAC Bill was drafted. The Bill reduces the size of the council from an upper limit of 68 persons to a maximum of 14. The method of election of members is changed and the objects of the council are more narrowly defined. A copy of the Bill is included in Bills Book.
4. However, there was a difference of opinion within the NATSIAC Executive as to the need for an Indigenous National Ministry Officer as opposed to the need for an administrative assistant to NATSIAC. After much discussion it was agreed that the new council, as constituted under the proposed Canon, be requested to consider the nature and level of support appropriate to the leadership and administrative needs of NATSIAC and report back to Standing Committee in 2012 with a recommendation concerning the appointment of an Indigenous National Ministry Officer. Furthermore, it was recognised that the reduced size of the council would lessen the administrative burden on NATSIAC and that the General Synod office might be able to provide some administrative assistance in the meantime.
5. With regard to establishing goals for the next three years, it was noted that the NATSIAC Executive were in the process of completing the Strategic Plan for Indigenous ministry which it hoped to finalise in June 2010. It was also agreed that a one-page summary of the Strategic Plan be made available for General Synod.
6. Although Standing Committee has allocated 90 minutes for a group discussion on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry it was thought preferable to have a number of presentations on Indigenous ministry. In particular the Joint Working Group thought General Synod would benefit from:
 - education as to the cultural differences between and within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities;
 - education in the history of NATSIAC leading to a celebration of ministry among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples;
 - an outline of the origins of the Committee to Review Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry, its processes and conclusions leading to the establishment of this Joint Working Group;
 - the deliberations and proposals of this Joint Working Group including proposals for the NATSIAC Canon; and
 - an outline of NATSIAC's Strategic Plan and goals.
7. The Joint Working Group recommended an outline of the proposed presentation for the General Synod session on Aboriginal and Torres Strait

Islander Ministry on Sunday, 19 September 2010 which, after consultation with Standing Committee, will comprise the following:

- (a) Aboriginal Dancing or DVD, with explanation of culturally significant facets — Di Langham to co-ordinate (14 minutes).
Torres Strait Islander Dance, with explanation of cultural significance —Rose Elu to coordinate (12 minutes)
- (b) Brian Kirk to present a celebration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry including:
 - The origins of NATSIAC
 - The 1998 Apology by the General Synod
 - The appointment of ministries of Indigenous Bishops
 - The joint affirmation of faith and justice adopted by the 2007 General Synod
 - Other relevant matters(10 minutes)
- (c) Glenn Davies to outline the process from the commencement of the work of the Committee to Review Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry to the proposals to be put to the General Synod including:
 - The need for the Committee to be appointed
 - The Committee's processes
 - The Committee's conclusions
 - The consultation between the NATSIAC Executive and the General Synod Standing Committee in October 2009 leading to the appointment and recommendations of the Joint Working Group
 - Foreshadowing the Bill for the NATSIAC Canon 2010
 - Noting that the fruits of this process demonstrate the benefits of Indigenous people and white people working together for the advancement of the gospel.(10 minutes)
- (d) Brian Kirk to present an outline of NATSIAC's Strategic Plan (10 minutes)
- (e) Promotion of the NATSIAC Canon 2010:
 - Mover – Jim Leftwich
 - Seconder – Rose Elu
 - Speeches by Brian Kirk and Glenn Davies
 - Bishop Saibo Mabo to be encouraged to speak(30 minutes)

- (f) Concluding song of the General Synod, led by Torres Strait Islander choir
(5 minutes)
8. Under the arrangements proposed by the Joint Working Group, funding issues for the administration of NATSIAC would not be significant or pressing in the first year. However, it was recognised that the Diocese of North Queensland is under very significant pressure because of its funding of the Torres Strait Islander Bishop and the Aboriginal Bishop. It appears that the total annual cost to the Diocese of funding these Bishops is in the order of \$300,000. The feasibility of establishing a co-operative fundraising initiative involving General Synod, ABM-A, BCA, CMS and NHMF was discussed. In order to achieve this it would be necessary to:
- (a) focus on the ministries of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Bishops rather than the needs of the Diocese of North Queensland; and
 - (b) articulate the expectations for the ministries of these Bishops and relevant accountabilities.

It was recognized that the starting point would be to ascertain from each of the Indigenous Bishops a breakdown of the ministries they carry out for the Diocese of North Queensland and the ministry/work they do as National Indigenous Bishops and to quantify the time spent on each so that appropriate funding responsibilities can be identified and endorsed.

9. It is therefore recommended, with the support of the mission agencies, that the incoming Standing Committee:
- (1) identify the ministry which it would ask the National Indigenous Bishops to undertake and the desired outcomes;
 - (2) devise an appropriate accountability structure;
 - (3) allocate appropriate budgets for the ministries of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Bishops; and
 - (4) establish funding mechanisms to underpin the budget allocations.

Bishop Glenn Davies
23 April 2010

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER MINISTRY¹

This summary was originally prepared to assist the discussion of the three Reports and Recommendations to General Synod of the Committee to Review Indigenous Ministry ("the Horsburgh Reports") by a Consultation of the Standing Committee, members of the NATSIAC Executive and other invitees. That Consultation appointed a Joint Working Group comprised of members of the General Synod Standing Committee and the NATSIAC Executive and other invitees which has reported to the Fifteenth Session of the General Synod. The summary has been adapted to assist General Synod's deliberations.

The full text of the Horsburgh Reports is posted on the General Synod website.

BACKGROUND

In his address as Primate to the 1998 General Synod the Archbishop Keith Rayner cautiously recognised the significance of proposals to establish an appropriate mechanism for Aboriginal and Islander Anglicans in the governance of the Church at the national level. General Synod was to consider a proposal to give formal status to NATSIAC, confirming its role in the nomination of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Bishops, and Indigenous clerical and lay members of General Synod.

He said, "...Our hard and fast structures based on completely autonomous dioceses may not be adequate for the future well-being of the church and its mission. We need a willingness to experiment with better ways, while being careful not to jettison the real virtues of our present system. **The place of indigenous people in our national life is one of the most critical issues which Australia faces today. Their position in our history is quite unique as is their claim upon our concern. We have the opportunity at this synod not only to see that justice is done within our own church life to disadvantaged fellow Anglicans, but also to set a practical example to our nation. I hope that the synod will give enthusiastic support for the principle of the right to representation to our Aboriginal and Islander peoples....at this stage of our history, our present arrangements cannot ensure adequate representation of Aboriginal and Islander Anglicans in this synod.**"

The NATSIAC Canon, and Constitutional provisions, emerged from a process which had taken place since 1992 by which the Anglican Church of Australia sought to

¹ This summary was prepared by Greg Thompson, ABM Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Program Consultant. Mr Thompson acted as Convenor of the Consultation between the NATSIAC Executive and the Standing Committee on the issues raised in the Horsburgh Report in October 2009 and subsequently represented ABM-A in connection with the work of the Joint Working Group established to move to the next stage the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Consultation. The Standing Committee gratefully acknowledges Mr Thompson's contribution.

affirm the place of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans in the life and governance of the Church. In the Horsburgh Reports the success of those decisions and their implementation are under scrutiny.

It's useful to recall this background to the decision in 2006 to invite a Committee, chaired by Professor Michael Horsburgh, to undertake a Review of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry.

In its **Second Report** that Committee comments that in October 2006 the General Secretary had drawn the attention of the General Synod Standing Committee (GSSC) to the limitations on what had been done by 'rule and legislation.'

"It appears that the Anglican Church of Australia has created the concept of National Bishops, not by direct provision of the Constitution or the Canons, but by the Rules – which are merely intended to be rules for the conduct and management of the debate and business of the General Synod. The end result of this is that the Anglican Church of Australia has people who are titled as *National Bishops* (and are held out as such) with no underlying structure by which they have any secretariat, funding, rights or responsibilities. The criticism that it is barren tokenism is not unreasonable."

The General Secretary had also underlined the financial vulnerability of the Diocese of North Queensland, as well as the General Synod. He stressed that vulnerability to be clear from a careful consideration of the funding arrangements.

That assessment led directly to the appointment of the Horsburgh Committee. In his Address to the 2007 General Synod the Primate, Archbishop Phillip Aspinall commented on the establishment of the Horsburgh Committee in the following terms:

"The Standing Committee is supporting two important reviews related to Aboriginal and Islander Ministry. When the Diocese of Carpentaria and the Diocese of North Queensland were amalgamated some years ago it was intended that a review of the effects of the amalgamation would be conducted within five or six years. (The Diocese of North Queensland now has it under way with the assistance of the Standing Committee.)

"The second review concerns the expectations this church has of NATSIAC. When NATSIAC was originally created, amid enormous goodwill and hope, a very extensive agenda was set out for it. It is fair to say that the church has been unable to resource NATSIAC to the extent necessary for it to discharge all the functions identified under the Canon.

“Moreover, the two indigenous bishops who serve this Church nationally are Assistant Bishops in the Diocese of North Queensland. While the national church provides some financial assistance, in recognition of the wider role of these bishops, it is true nevertheless that the financial burden falls on North Queensland, itself fairly poorly resourced.² The sustainability and roles of the indigenous bishops and of NATSIAC need careful review. The Diocese of North Queensland and NATSIAC itself, with support from the Standing Committee, are looking at these related issues. I simply flag this whole area as an important one for serious consideration.”

INDIGENOUS BISHOPS

The **First Horsburgh Committee Report** describes the Constitutional arrangements through which the Anglican Church of Australia provides for National Indigenous Bishops, and the process which led to those arrangements. The Committee underlined the reality that this formal structure is not supported by any articulated policy. It makes the following sobering assessment:

- the General Synod has no power to put those provisions into effect (because)
- It is dependent on whatever bishops might be appointed as assistant bishops in the dioceses, historically in the Diocese of North Queensland, and so has no say in the selection of those bishops.
- There is no national job specification for such bishops. It could not enforce their role even if there were such a job description.
- It provides some financial support to the Diocese of North Queensland but in effect that support subsidises the diocese providing no significant support for a national Indigenous Episcopal presence.

The consequence is that the General Synod is ‘unable to give effect to its own policies.’ The Committee asks, ‘Does the General Synod wish to control those policies? If so, is the Anglican Church of Australia (ACA) ready to pursue a process to review the current formal arrangements and seek to find a way through which to see how the present tokenism can be overcome?’

The Committee’s First Report pp 16 - 19 provides a helpful analysis of the present, less than satisfactory situation, exploring options for a way forward.

While recognising the significance of the Church’s steps in the 1990s through the creation and appointment of National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Bishops, practice has demonstrated this has not been sufficient to create a ‘national presence’ for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans and the Committee

² The national Church through contributions from ABM-A, BCA and the Indigenous Bishops Endowment Fund subsidises the Diocese of North Queensland for the cost of maintaining Bishop James Leftwich (and Bishop Saibo Mabo)

urges that steps are taken to develop such a presence. It suggests that the ACA might learn from the experience and the practices in other Provinces in the Anglican Communion. In making this recommendation the Committee acknowledges that the Anglican Church of Australia has limited national capacity in all its operations.

There is no person in the national church with any direct responsibility for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry. The Committee observes that in the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, progress has been made principally through the employment of a person who has coordinated and managed the processes necessary for the development of a national view of Indigenous Anglicans and their proper place in the church as a whole.

Taking account of the lack of clear policy, commitment and limited resources, the Committee firmly recommends that the Standing Committee appoint a full-time National Indigenous Ministry Officer. In reaching that conclusion the Committee urged that the GSSC take into account the recommendations of the other two Reports.

Following discussion of the first two Reports with GSSC, the Committee suggested in its Third Report that a National Indigenous Ministry Officer's role might include the following responsibilities:

- In the first place the person would be responsible for facilitating, through NATSIAC and otherwise, the development of a national consciousness amongst Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans. This would be done by building up communication both within the Anglican Church of Australia and between it and other bodies, including ecumenical partners and secular organisations, particularly government.
- In the second place, the person would be responsible for servicing NATSIAC and giving effect to its decisions and providing administrative support to NATSIAC and its members.
- Third, the person would assist in the organisation of the meetings proposed in the second report between the Standing Committee and NATSIAC.

(In principle, the Committee suggests the position would be analogous to that held by Mr Graeme Mundine, the Executive Secretary of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ecumenical Commission of the National Council of Churches in Australia.)³

NATIONAL ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER ANGLICAN COUNCIL (NATSIAC)

The **Second Report**, on NATSIAC, noted the importance of this organisation and its contribution to the life of the Anglican Church of Australia.

³ Graham Mundine's role is supported by the NCCA in providing office space, and accompanying services.

The Committee noted that from the earliest days, as with the other denominations, the Church's responsibility for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry has been with its foreign ministry organisations. The development⁴ of what became NATSIAC sought to ensure that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans would be affirmed as full members of the Australian Church. In reality this has not been fully achieved. One of the major impediments to that change has been the less than satisfactory formal arrangements for the establishment and functioning of NATSIAC. In some ways this parallels what the Committee observed of the formal arrangements for the national Indigenous Bishops.

The Committee notes that, as currently constituted, NATSIAC is 'too large, too remote from the parish level and hampered by an impossible constitution.' Further than this, NATSIAC has insufficient resources to be effective in fulfilling its impossible list of functions and has little effective access to the ongoing national policy forum of the ACA, the GSSC. "NATSIAC is financed sufficiently for it not to fail, insufficiently for it to be successful in fulfilling its mandate".

The Committee has no hesitation in affirming that "NATSIAC is an essential part of the Anglican Church of Australia. If it didn't exist it would be necessary to create it". (Para 59 p. 19)

The Committee recognises that NATSIAC members have long sought to redress the impediments it faces. Members of NATSIAC are committed to the development of 'a new NATSIAC' reflecting a firm desire to develop this in consultation with the Church locally and nationally. It goes without saying that any new body will need to be owned by Indigenous Anglicans and by non-Indigenous Anglicans.

In moving forward, it is important to listen to the Horsburgh Committee's warnings from past experience when attempts have been made to address shortcomings in the NATSIAC Canon with its list of functions which it is impossible to exercise.

Careful work in response to an invitation by GSSC to develop a Covenant between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-Indigenous members of the ACA was frustrated by changing the proposed Covenant to an Affirmation of Faith and Justice. Such aspirations and suggestions for change are frustrated when those who manage the business of General Synod reformulate recommendations without reference to those who have developed them through a process of consultation with their fellow Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglicans. More than this, the decision to change from the language and commitment of a Covenant, while producing unanimous support for the Affirmation, led to the sacrifice of an opportunity for "a serious debate about how the Anglican Church of Australia will fulfil its commitments to its Indigenous members" (See pp 12 – 15).

It is clear that a significant impediment is the degree to which NATSIAC and General Synod operate in isolation. The Committee observes "There are, in fact, no specific and dedicated occasions for discussion, planning and evaluation. Such meetings

⁴ See Second Report Para 23,24, 25 page 8f summarising the role of ABM-A in sponsoring a conference of Anglican Aborigines which led to the formation of what is today NATSIAC.

are essential for the building up of mutual confidence and respect. **If Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry is to develop further in Australia, and if the General Synod is to have a role in that development, regular and directed consultation will be essential. In that case, it must be consciously provided for. One way for this to happen is by the Standing Committee delegating to some of its members the responsibility of meeting at least annually with the Executive of NATSIAC.**“ (My emphasis. Para 65, p 20.)

The **Second Report** also noted “the international situation with regard to the degree of autonomy exercised by Indigenous Anglicans in the Anglican Church of Canada, the Episcopal Church and Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. The Anglican Indigenous Network⁵ has also emphasised this question. It is not yet such an issue in Australia, but the Anglican Church of Australia would be short sighted if it did not anticipate its coming in some form. It has not, however, yet begun to consider this question, much less resolve it.” (Third Report Para 8 p 4)

INDIGENOUS MINISTRY

In its preliminary remarks in the **Third Report**, the Committee draws attention to international and domestic discussions of issues of autonomy, governance and representation which the ACA might find useful as it considers the reports and recommendations of the Committee. On pages 5 – 7, the Committee notes discussions in the USA and Canada, the work of Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research at the ANU on Governance in Indigenous Communities, the insights of Professor Patrick Dodson and the recommendations of Dr Tom Calma, (the then) Australian Human Rights Social Justice Commissioner on a proposed national Indigenous Representative body. These contributions, with expanded information in the Appendices, reflect a reality that the Church’s struggle with these matters has real parallels in the wider community.

This **Third Report** on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry relies largely on information provided by Dioceses and Agencies. It shows “some of the approaches and activities that are positively related to the development of such ministry”. Because the Committee relies on information from Dioceses, some activities in local parishes or agencies may well be overlooked. It is certainly the case that examples of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry are more ‘visible’ in the Northern Dioceses (particularly in North Queensland and the Northern Territory.) Until recently Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry in North West Australia was almost invisible, but there are indications that is changing.

There are many fewer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander members of Anglican urban parishes than might be inferred from levels of Church attendance and Australian Bureau of Statistics census figures. The Committee notes that “there is a way to go in bringing Indigenous ministry to the consciousness of the church at

⁵ The Anglican Indigenous Network is one of the Anglican Communion Networks bringing together Indigenous Anglicans in Aotearoa, Australia, Canada, USA and other countries who have been invited to participate. NATSIAC will host its next meeting in 2010, having hosted an earlier meeting in 2001 in Cairns.

large. Even where no such ministry exists or is likely to exist, parishes need to be aware of the presence of local Indigenous groups and act in their support.”

It is important to ask as the Committee does, “To what extent is the culture and spirituality of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons recognised in those places where they are present?” What is the place of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander spirituality in the broader life of the Australian Church? The Liturgical Commission is actively considering this challenge.

“Many dioceses have some activities in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry, (but) it is rare that they are articulated in a public and clear fashion.” Much depends on the local initiative of clergy and lay people. Except for a few Dioceses, there is a **lack of clearly articulated policies**, including in several metropolitan Dioceses where the majority of Indigenous people live. In the absence of clearly articulated policies and strategies, “accountability and the assessment of developments are not really possible.”

The Committee notes that non-Indigenous clergy need support in building their relationships with local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups. In metropolitan locations representatives of the original inhabitants may no longer be found, but they may live elsewhere in the same city. It is important that parishes understand their own history and who they have displaced. The Committee suggests this as one important focus for Diocesan policy.

It is worth noting that “much ministry in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities is done outside defined church programs. (e.g. following up family connections, meeting with community groups, conducting funerals, weddings, baptisms or naming ceremonies. Many are involved in Local Reconciliation Groups”). It is notable that Reconciliation Australia reports that there are virtually no local Parishes and no Diocese, across all denominations, which have developed Reconciliation Action Plans, and only one or two Church agencies and schools. Some Anglicans may well be involved in such plans in Local Reconciliation Groups or in the places where they work, study, play support, or are involved in other ways.

In paragraphs 22 – 25 (pp9f) the Committee looks at the wider engagement of the Church at Diocesan and local levels where **social policy and practice** respond to the needs of Indigenous Australians and their communities. The report explores this through the experience of Anglicare NT and the Bishop of the Diocese in the context of the Intervention. It notes the difficulty faced by Church leaders to ensure the experience and the voice of the Church is heard by the Federal Minister, despite the substantial role of the Diocese and its agencies in providing community services. The report affirms the role of the Church in the development and implementation of social policy. (It should be noted that the Primate and Bishop Greg Thompson have had a meeting with Indigenous Affairs Minister Jenny Macklin after this summary was first prepared.)

The report focuses on the role of Anglicare and its member agencies as an employer. This it suggests is “the most likely place in the Australian Church to have

Indigenous employees. The question is asked in this context, should the Anglican Church of Australia introduce proactive Indigenous employment?"

"The **development of Indigenous leadership** remains a continuing issue. Leadership is necessary at both the local and wider levels. A clearer approach to **education** is necessary. Future Indigenous bishops, and NATSIAC,...depend on the development of leaders who can work at the national level, as well as in local areas, not least in remote communities. Given that the majority of Indigenous clergy are local and non-stipendiary, there is a critical need for action." (from Executive Summary p1.)

The Report includes a short review of what is, or isn't, happening in each Diocese, 'where possible prepared by an Indigenous person.' The Reports are found in Paragraphs 29 -88 on pages 11 -25. There is also a Report from each of the National Agencies of the Church engaged in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Ministry. Agency reports are found at Paragraphs 89 – 123 pages 25 – 33 with, in some cases further material in the Appendix. The Agencies included are ABM-A, Australian Anglican Schools Network (AASN), Bush Church Aid, the Church Army, CMS, The Anglican Outback Fund, Nungalinga and Wontulp-Bi-Buya.

Drawing from what is reported, the Committee identifies a number of lessons learned before proceeding to its recommendations.

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry, or its absence, in each place is shaped by historical circumstances. Such is unlikely to be successful without a positive relationship with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, ministry being built on a prior relationship with that community.
- Few Dioceses have a considered policy. In the absence of positive, articulated policy little may result. There is much good will but insufficient direction and support.
- In many cases, particularly outside Northern Australia, a special provision may be necessary to ensure Indigenous people are involved in governing bodies of Dioceses. Two assumptions are confronted: The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ("Indigenous") voice is the only legitimate voice to be heard. This may result in managers of business manipulating the agenda to produce a token outcome. Alternatively some believe that it is only on Indigenous matters that an Indigenous voice is to be heard. The latter leads to Indigenous persons being regarded as special representatives, not true members of the relevant body. To avoid both, the general membership of the Church needs to be educated, and Indigenous members intentionally supported.
- The resolution of the issue of Indigenous Bishops depends on ensuring the supply of candidates, and the formation of those called and consecrated given priority.
- Various dimensions of theological education are explored including the continuing role of Nungalinga and Wontulp-Bi-Buya, the principal educational institutions for Anglican Indigenous Ministry. The importance of leadership needs urgent attention. The Committee calls for a concerted effort by all involved in Theological Education to address this urgent issue.

The Committee welcomes recent initiatives which provide examples of what must be done to develop effective policies and engagement in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Ministry.

- The recent Consultation in the Diocese of the Northern Territory with its partner agencies might well be emulated across the church.
- Reports to AASN and the Diocese of Melbourne underline the significance of such deliberate actions in focussing attention on the issues and identifying steps toward their resolution. They are also as an important means to heighten awareness. The survey undertaken in the Diocese of Melbourne confirms the general situation that might be inferred from the information gathered by the committee. It has particular relevance to those dioceses with communities of urbanised Indigenous people. Leadership, governance, education and the lack of good practice guidelines are all highlighted by this report.

The various reports from dioceses and agencies identify some important factors of successful Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ministry.

- the identification of local Indigenous communities.
- Dioceses and parishes may not be aware of the numbers of Indigenous persons within their boundaries. No ministry is possible if those populations are not identified. In essence this is a process of consciousness - raising, to overcome some popular perceptions that Indigenous Australians live only in remote and distant places and not next door.
- parishes need to consider how their resources might be made available to local Indigenous communities and groups. The sharing of such assets is an important part of the recognition of, and compensation for the dispossession of, local Indigenous populations. It is a signal of knowledge and acceptance.
- progress in ministry is not easily possible without a support person. In both parishes and dioceses it is important to have a person, preferably an Indigenous person, who takes appropriate responsibility for communication and advice.
- Dioceses need to be active in identifying and fostering local Indigenous leadership. Where appropriate, this might lead to ordination, but it is not necessary that it should do so. In urban areas starting from an exceptionally low base. It will be a long term project.
- In many locations there are already active church groups, either independent Indigenous churches or of other denominations. Competition with those groups is not necessary, but support for them may be crucial.

- Experience with international companion diocese arrangements may be appropriate models with relation to the broader support of Indigenous ministry through inter-diocesan and inter-parish links for mutual assistance and support.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION COVENANT

1. INTRODUCTION

Following the May 2009 meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council, the Standing Committee of the Anglican Communion approved for distribution the final text of the Anglican Communion Covenant in December 2009. The General Secretary of the ACC, Canon Kenneth Kearon, has asked the Provinces of the Communion formally to consider adopting the Covenant and to report on the progress of such consideration in each province. On the basis of these reports, Canon Kearon will report to ACC-15.

The following papers have been prepared to assist members of the General Synod to consider whether the Anglican Church of Australia should enter into the Covenant.

The Primate has prepared a paper outlining the recent history which led to the development of the Covenant, and outlines in brief the main arguments for and against the Covenant **(Should Australia enter into the Anglican Communion Covenant)**.

Archbishop Jeffrey Driver's paper addresses the theology behind the development of the Covenant in its final form **(Covenant in an Anglican Context)**.

Bishop Andrew Curnow's paper considers the political implications for the Anglican Church of Australia should it decide to enter into the Covenant either now or at a later date **(The Political Implications of Signing the Covenant)**.

Dr Bruce Kaye offers a more detailed consideration of the arguments against an Anglican Covenant **(The Covenant proposed for the Anglican Communion is not a good idea)**.

Following presentations on the Covenant at this session of the General Synod there will be an opportunity to discuss the issues in small groups before the plenary debate takes place.

2. SHOULD AUSTRALIA ENTER INTO THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION COVENANT?

Some material to assist consideration within the Anglican Church of Australia

BACKGROUND

Tensions in the Anglican Communion over issues of human sexuality and other matters reached a watershed in 2003 when the Episcopal Church consecrated as a bishop a man openly living in an active homosexual relationship. In fact cross jurisdictional interventions by bishops from outside TEC had occurred prior to 2003.

The Lambeth Commission, established to examine relationships within the Anglican Communion and to make 'recommendations ... for maintaining the highest degree of communion possible' (TWR, 2004, 13), recommended an Anglican Covenant. Several subsequent drafts culminated in a final text.

The Anglican Church of Australia is now asked to consider adopting the Covenant and to report progress to ACC 15 in 2012.

THE CASE FOR THE COVENANT

Three principle reasons are advanced for adopting the Covenant.

1. It implements a vision of Anglicanism that is more than just local

The Covenant would assist to implement a renewed, multifaceted, proper catholicity by:

- (a) intensifying and deepening relationships and interdependence
- (b) fostering a spirit of courtesy, respect and a quality of love
- (c) encouraging deep consultation, restraint, mutual generosity
- (d) properly expressing Anglican dispersed authority
- (e) making explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between churches of the Communion

2. It provides a mechanism to prevent and manage disputes

The Covenant requires churches to hear, read, mark, learn and inwardly digest the Scriptures in different contexts. This involves attentive and communal reading of the Scriptures by all the faithful, the teaching of bishops and synods, and the results of rigorous study by lay and ordained scholars.

Further, each covenanting church commits itself to spend time with openness and patience in matters of theological debate and reflection, to listen, pray and study

with other churches to discern God's will, to participate in mediated conversations involving face to face meetings, agreed parameters and a willingness to see such processes through.

3. *It clarifies identity and strengthens the mission of the Churches*

In addition to enhancing internal relationships within the Anglican Communion, the Covenant could also enhance external relationships and strengthen mission by enhancing Anglican self-understanding. In doing so it would also serve as a resource for our ecumenical partners in their understanding of Anglicanism. The Covenant places God's mission in the centre and strengthens our capacity to engage in God's mission.

CONCERNS AND RESPONSES

Major criticisms, fears and concerns identified include:

1. *The covenant undermines koinonia which should be the basis of relationship among Anglican churches. It is centralist and juridical rather than conciliar and relational.*

Although earlier drafts were more juridical, the final text does not create any new central structures or institutions, nor does it give any new powers to existing bodies. The Covenant does not override the autonomy of each church. Nor does it automatically affect the law of any church.

2. *There is a hidden agenda to create a more centralised kind of Anglican Communion.*

Language about becoming a genuinely global communion can give rise to suspicions about a more centralised, tightly structured, institution-focused, controlled mode of being. However no new power is given to any existing structure, nor is any new structure created. Each church remains autonomous. The Covenant maps the way interdependence can and should work.

3. *The covenant tries to minimise conflict and diversity which are essential and constructive in the life of the communion. It puts at risk inspired and prophetic initiatives.*

If consultative processes are developed and used extensively and realistic timeframes are adopted for the sometimes slow struggle of debate, discernment and discussion involved in the reception process the Covenant could provide a constructive framework for dealing with differences. However, if the covenant is used to try to stifle discussion and debate or to resolve conflict prematurely, it could have negative impacts.

4. *The covenant moves the Anglican Communion towards a narrowly defined confessional family and away from the broad, inclusive character which has been its hallmark.*

The covenant uses only existing historical documents or commitments. The substance, if not the form, has been part of Anglicanism for centuries.

5. *Signing the covenant will become a test of authentic membership of the communion designed to exclude those who don't sign.*

Diversity has reached a point where the capacity of the Anglican Communion to hold together is under threat. The covenant tries to avoid breakdown by establishing a framework for relationships. A church choosing not to sign the covenant does not thereby abandon all relationships with other Anglican churches, just as a covenanting church might remain in communion with a non-covenanting church.

6. *It may prove too restrictive or inflexible to address unforeseen future challenges.*

The covenant is as yet untested and will need fleshing out. It includes mechanisms for it to be amended and no doubt it will evolve over time. A church may withdraw from the Covenant if it proves unworkable or to have negative effects.

7. *The covenant is a response to crisis, driven negatively by fear and not by a positive spirit of mission.*

Covenants in scripture arose in contexts of failure with destructive consequences. At such times covenants represented grace and renewed hope. Anglicanism has been marked by both responsiveness to circumstances and commitment to historical principles. While the Covenant has emerged in the context of conflict and crisis, it is driven by hope.

8. *The covenant is superfluous. We have sufficient in common already including Scripture, baptism, eucharist, ministry, the marks of mission and historical formularies.*

None of these alone is specific enough to make clear the shape of our interdependence in the Anglican Communion. This shared heritage needs spelling out and to be made concrete in the particular circumstances we face today.

SHOULD AUSTRALIA SIGN?

There is a risk that the Covenant may be used to coerce a province contrary to its convictions and discernment. Further, Communion bodies might become narrowly focused on complaints and conflicts rather than on positive engagement in mission. These risks are real.

However, the potential for the Covenant to realise significant benefits is also real. Embraced in the right spirit the Covenant could be a vehicle for growing an attractive catholicity. It could provide a framework for relationships among churches that protect autonomy yet facilitate interdependence, that encourage deep consultation, mutual discernment, respectful listening and joint reflection and study of the Scriptures. And it could help to strengthen Anglican identity externally and engagement in God's mission.

Archbishop Phillip Aspinall

3. COVENANT IN AN ANGLICAN CONTEXT

As well as being fundamental to an understanding of the Scriptures, the idea of covenant has been an informing principle within Anglican discussions about the relationships between churches.

The scriptural significance of Covenant hardly needs underlining. In the biblical context the term in general signifies ‘a relationship based on commitment, which includes both promises and obligations, and which has the quality of reliability and durability’.¹ In the Old Testament covenant is the claim of God’s constant love (Hebrew: *hesed*) upon the People of God, which also implies covenant responsibility by the tribes and people of Israel to each other.²

In the New Testament the language of covenant is predominantly used to refer to the relationship between God and God’s people. The most common Greek word for covenant (*synthēkē*) is not generally used in this way in the New Testament. Instead, the stronger *diathēkē* is used, probably reflecting the view of the biblical writers that what is being referred to goes beyond mere contract or ordinance and is an expression of God’s grace and will.

The idea of covenant is not new to Anglicanism. It has had an important place within recent ecumenical dialogues. An example is the 2003 covenant between the Methodist Church and the Church of England. A proposal for an intra-Anglican Covenant, however, was first widely canvassed following the release of the 2004 *Windsor Report*, which was commissioned to address issues of communion relationships ‘both within and between the churches of the Anglican Communion’.³

Early drafts were criticised for their juridical tone and an attention to enforceability that was seen as undermining the autonomy of provinces and running contrary to Anglicanism’s commitment to ‘dispersed authority’. These criticisms led to revisions that are much more advisory and less legalistic in tone. The current text makes it clear that the mutual commitments of covenant do not represent submission to any external ecclesiastical jurisdiction:

Nothing in this Covenant of itself shall be deemed to alter any provision of the Constitution and Canons of any Church of the Communion, or to limit its autonomy of governance. The Covenant does not grant to any one Church or any agency of the Communion control or direction over any Church of the Anglican Communion.⁴

¹ Bernard Anderson, ‘Covenant’, *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, (eds) B. Metzger & M. Coogan, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1993, p. 138.

² The book Deuteronomy, for instance, takes the form of an extended covenant document, outlining the nature of covenant faithfulness to the Lord and of the People of God to each other. It includes extensive dispute resolution procedures (see Deut. 16:18 – 17:13)

³ *The Lambeth Commission on Communion – The Windsor Report*, Anglican Consultative Council, Anglican Communion Office, London UK, 2004

⁴ 4.1.3

There is a provision for the actions of a church to be declared 'incompatible' with the Covenant, but there is nothing new in the 'relational consequences' that might flow from such a declaration.⁵ In regard to the Instruments of Communion, the consequences referred to include limitation of, or suspension from, participation in the Instruments. This is not an innovation. Not every bishop was invited to the first Lambeth Conference and not every bishop was invited to the last. The North American Churches did not participate fully in ACC 13 in 2005.

The Standing Committee of the Communion (a joint standing committee of ACC and the Primates) is given a role of facilitating conversation, offering and receiving advice and making recommendations to the Instruments of Communion or the Churches of the Communion. It can hardly be argued that in functioning in this way it would be acting in a jurisdictional capacity or diminishing the autonomy of the churches.

What the Anglican Communion Covenant does offer is an articulation of Anglican identity and missional call as well as agreed relational process for dispute resolution. Most of the covenant text (Sections One to Three) is devoted to gathering together those things Anglicans believe about themselves and their mission in the world. This is not done in a narrowly confessional way, nor does it seek to innovate. Rather, it seeks to draw from 'existing documents within the public realm of the Anglican Communion, either in a longstanding fashion, or more recently'.⁶

There is great diversity in the constitutional framework of the churches of the Communion. Some, like the Anglican Church of Australia, have constitutions that articulate 'Fundamental Declarations and Ruling Principles' in a way not unlike the text of the covenant. Other churches in the Communion have very little by way of such affirmations in their constitutions. One of the first *koinonia* gifts of Pentecost was the overcoming of the Babel-like confusion of languages.⁷ One of the first gifts *The Anglican Communion Covenant* offers the churches of the Communion is the gathered language of faith and mission.

From as early as the New Testament times, the Church has found it necessary to articulate procedures for the resolution of dispute or conflict.⁸ *The Anglican Communion Covenant* seeks to provide an agreed process for consultation, and if necessary dispute resolution, about matters of difference that are seen as touching the very life of the Communion.

Conflict in community does not need to be destructive. However, there must be a shared and trusted sense of the boundaries of engagement if open debate is to be sustained and conflict is to avoid a descent into the destructive. There will always be the risk of conflict about the boundaries and processes themselves, but this hardly

⁵ 4.2.6

⁶ Radner, E 2007, Making Promises: the Proposed Anglican Covenant in the life of communion. *This article is published online at: <http://titusonene.classicalanglican.net/?p=18093from>*

⁷ Gen. 11:7, Acts 2:5-11

⁸ e.g., Matt. 18. 15-20.

supports an argument for having no agreed boundaries or no articulated process. Conflict about process will still occur even when no agreed framework of process exists, as recent events in the Communion have demonstrated.

The Anglican Communion Covenant does not present itself as a short-cut to Communion unity. It recognises that there is no substitute for a 'willingness to spend time and patience in matters of theological debate and reflection'.⁹ It does not seek to change the way authority works within Anglicanism, rather it draws deeply on the life of the Communion to strengthen the relationships of the Communion.

Archbishop Jeffrey Driver

⁹ 3.2.3

4. THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SIGNING THE COVENANT

At this coming General Synod, there will be significant debate in relation to the Anglican Covenant. Let me say from the outset that I am unashamedly pro covenant and passionately believe that the Anglican Church of Australia should place its support in favour of the Anglican Covenant for the Anglican Communion. The question of whether to sign or not to sign is about our church's relationship to the Anglican Communion and its future. I have been very fortunate to attend the last two Lambeth conferences in 1998 and 2008, and the Anglican Consultative Council in 2009, and at these meetings I have experienced first hand the deep divisions that are presently gripping the Communion. To understand the background to the development of the Covenant let me list some of the crucial issues that divides us:

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE

There is tension and debate about how we approach Scripture and understand the Bible. In the Communion views stretch from a more literal understanding to a very liberal view of Scripture.

HUMAN SEXUALITY

The wide disparities of views on human sexuality and particularly around homosexuality are related to the way we approach the Bible, but there are also divergent theological assumptions about God, creation and humanity.

CULTURE

Across the Communion there is a plethora of cultures and social expressions and when put together in the context of a world wide church, it brings a broad range of attitudes and understandings. For example, at each of the three gatherings I mentioned above the use of English as the predominant language and not enough interpretation services, has led to the view in many non English speaking parts of the Communion that they are disadvantaged at international gatherings of the Communion.

ECCLESIOLOGY

Different parts of the Anglican Communion, depending on their foundation and history have a multiplicity of views about the nature and purpose of the Church. This is reflected in a range of understandings about the role of Bishops, the place of sacraments and the organisation and governance of the church locally.

An outcome of these differences has been the evolvement of various networks and alliances that seek to bring together likeminded Anglicans from around the world on a range of issues that they agree on. However, the response of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican Consultative Council has been to develop a Covenant. A Statement that would clarify the identity and mission of the churches that are in the Anglican Communion. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams has described the Covenant as:

“Something which lays out the foundation of our faith, the language that we share and the hopes that we share, but it also – we hope and pray – sets out a path for the future, a path of mutual affection, mutual respect, the kind of obedience to one another the New Testament proposes for us”. (Address to the Global South Gathering, April 20, 2010)

Many argue that the Covenant is contrary to the spirit of Anglicanism, which prides itself in giving each of the Provinces of our Church the right to express Anglicanism as they understand it in their context. I question this assumption, because for the past fifty years at least a foundational principle of Anglicanism has been MRI: Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence. No part of our Communion should act independently or unilaterally. This principle goes back even further as Anglicans grappled with the growth and expansion of the Communion across the world. The Lambeth Quadrilateral was adopted by the Lambeth conference in 1888 as a way of:

“Stating from the Anglican standpoint the essentials for a reunited Christian Church”. (Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, P781)

What the Lambeth Quadrilateral did for the Communion in 1888, the Covenant will do for the Communion in 2010 and long into the future. It will give the Communion the rock it needs on which to build a strong, vibrant missional Church. The implications for signing are now manifested and I am in strong agreement with our own Primate who in an address to the National Bishop’s Meeting (Page 98ff from the Documents Book) this year demonstrated the benefits of the Covenant as:

1. A vision of Anglicanism that is more than just local. As Anglicans we believe that we worship locally, but are part of a global Church that is in itself an expression of the unit of the Body of Christ.
2. To provide an agreed mechanism to prevent and manage Communion disputes. We all know what damage is done to our mission and witness where there is disunity, strife, and breakdown in the local church and even diocese. More than ever as a world communion we need a process by which breakdown in our Church can be addressed.
3. To clarify the identity and strengthen the mission of the Churches. In the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Covenant:

“It’s the fruit of long, careful, prayerful discussion; the fruit of a sustained attempt on the part of so many people throughout our Communion to determine not only what it is that binds us together in terms of our faith, the authority we accord to scripture and tradition, but also what binds us as humanly and specifically to one another in our fellowship, in our Communion – what it is that makes us one body, one community, able to speak to the world in the name of Christ”. (Address to the Global South Gathering, April 20, 2010)

Another way of looking at the implications of signing the Covenant is to ask, what happens if we do not sign? In Australia the implication of not signing the Covenant

would be for us as a national church to further remove ourselves from the life of the Communion. As part of being a member of the Anglican Communion we have a responsibility for the goodwill, well being and mission of our Church and to ignore the Covenant or be so cautious about it as to not sign it is to turn our back on the Communion.

The Anglican Communion as a worldwide church is at a cross road. Are we going to be a group of local churches that share some common history, or are we going to be a church that is prepared to struggle with differences, but be committed to the mission that Christ has called us to? Are we going to be a group of loosely affiliated self determining churches, or are we going to be a Church that seeks to be a more visible expression of an incarnate Communion?

The ways in which all sides of Anglican debates are currently behaving does not do justice to the Church we are called to be. The Anglican Covenant is not intended to be an onerous clamp on debate or expression, but to be a vehicle that does give us the potential to explore our relationship as Provinces and act together with intentionality under the grace of God for the good of our Church and the world.

Bishop Andrew W. Curnow

Bishop of Bendigo

May 2010

5. THE COVENANT PROPOSED FOR THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IS NOT A GOOD IDEA

I do not think this covenant is a good idea for Anglicans for four reasons:

1. *It is against the grain of Anglican ecclesiology (what we think the church is).*

Anglicanism has historically given priority to the local and never yielded jurisdictional authority to anyone beyond the province.

Within the broad spectrum of the New Testament understanding of the church Anglicans have evolved over a long history an ecclesiology that gives priority to the local and institutions designed to provide for a disciplined ministry of word and sacraments.

In institutional terms that has meant a pattern of local parishes, dioceses and a province. That model has been sustained in the ups and downs of a very long thousand-year resistance to the more universally centralised model put in train by Pope Gregory VII in the eleventh century. This pattern has also retained a notion of proximate connection as the foundation of effective power in the church. That is to say, power and the contemporary aspects of catholicity operate appropriately where there is genuine personal connection.

The crucial issue is the ecclesiological significance of any international arrangements between provinces occasioned by the spread of Anglicanism around the world and the globalisation of human communities, including the Anglican communities. The question facing Anglicans is what kind of connection is appropriate at each horizon of parish, diocese or province (National Church) and Anglican Communion.

The 1662 BCP lays the emphasis on the provision of an ordered ministry of word and sacrament for building up the faith of the congregation. That essentially is found at the local level of the parish though it extends to the regional in the form of the diocese. There the discipline of the clergy is provided through various forms of diocesan tribunals or in the older terms the court of the bishop. In our system there is an appeal to the provincial level and at that level the diocesan bishops are held to account. In terms of the central ecclesial role of these institutions there is no need for any further level of judicature.

It is this frame of reference that has provided the shape of our canon law. It is the notion of authority growing out of proximate relationships in a faith community that lies at the heart of the ecclesial character of Anglican faith and which express the dynamics of church life visible in the New Testament.

These are the elements of an Anglican ecclesiology that need to be brought to bear on the current covenant proposals to deal with conflict in the Anglican Communion. They are also the elements that lie behind the ecclesiology of the constitution of the ACA and why there is no provision, or thought of, a judicature beyond the national church, even though there is a clear recognition and encouragement of church relationships beyond

the ACA judicature. Those wider relationships are considered in terms of fellowship or communion. Even communion with the Church of England, from whose faith tradition we have come, is dependent on congruence with the Anglican faith set out in the constitution. This is not just constitutional tidiness. It represents an underlying and important ecclesiological understanding. The core of the matter is in the local in terms of jurisdiction. The heart of the matter beyond that is in being part of a wider ecclesial fellowship with other Anglican provinces and other traditions of faith. The covenant proposal cuts across this pattern. It rushes to jurisdiction when relational forces are the appropriate way. It subverts this ecclesiology which is central to the Anglican tradition of faith. The heart of the covenant proposal is not in the constantly changing opening sections that attempt to describe current understandings of Anglican faith. Such declarations are not needed in themselves. They only become significant when they are used as criteria in carrying out the sanctions set out in the last section of the document.

2. *It is an inadequate response to the conflict in the Anglican Communion.*

There should have been facilitated engagement for those in conflict using well established conflict resolution processes.

Part of the beginning of the current problems began in 2000 when two things happened. The Episcopal Church decided to insist on the mandatory force of canons long since passed approving the ordination of women as priests. Several dioceses had stood out. Now they were to be made to conform. In the same year Moses Tay (SE Asia) and Emanuel Kolini (Rwanda) consecrated two Americans to serve as Anglican bishops in the US as members of the house of bishops of the church in Rwanda. Thus began the building of international liaisons to fight a battle internal to The Episcopal Church. This was all done in plain contravention of ancient traditions in Christianity generally and specifically in Anglicanism. It was an attack on the integrity of the almost universal Anglican constitutional view about the nature of a diocese and a province. When Canada and the Episcopal Church went on to ordain and consecrate homosexual people to public office in the church, the armies were already in place.

How we deal with conflict as a Christian community should be shaped by our understanding of the nature of the relationships involved. Dealing with this kind of conflict by jurisdictional coercion fails to appreciate the nature of the relationships appropriate at this level of church connection.

3. *In practical terms it will create immense and complicating confusion about institutional relationships and financial obligations.*

There will be various levels of acceptance of the covenant and some provinces may be in on one issue but out on another.

4. *It does not address the key fundamental issue in this conflict, how to act in a particular context which is relevant to that context and also faithful to the gospel.*

That they do things differently in Nigeria from the US calls for understanding not coercion and from that understanding can come recognition and adjustment. Love is tested not with our friends so much as with those with whom we most fundamentally disagree.

Bruce Kaye

Fuller material can be found on my Blog worldanglicanismforum.blogspot.com.

DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO WOMEN BISHOPS

In 2007, the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod passed the following resolution:

99/07 WOMEN BISHOPS

That this Synod:

- a) *notes the decision of the Appellate Tribunal and welcomes the clarity it brings to the question of the eligibility of women for admission to the order of bishop in the Anglican Church of Australia; and*
- b) *requests the Standing Committee to monitor developments in relation to women bishops including provisions made for those who decline to receive the ministry of a woman bishop and report to the next session of General Synod.*

This report responds to paragraph (b) of that resolution.

At their annual meeting in April in 2008, the Australian Anglican Bishops adopted Protocol No 12 titled *Women in the Episcopate*, which is Attachment 1 to this report.

So far, two women have been consecrated as Bishops in the church of God.

On 22 May 2008, Archdeacon Kay Goldsworthy was consecrated Bishop in Perth. A report of The Most Rev'd Roger Herft, Archbishop of Perth and Metropolitan of Western Australia, setting out the background to that consecration and some of its outworkings is Attachment 2 to this report.

On 31 May 2008, Canon Barbara Darling was consecrated Bishop in Melbourne. Attached is the text of a report by The Most Rev'd Dr Philip Freier, Archbishop of Melbourne and Metropolitan of Victoria (Attachment 3) and the Diocese of Melbourne's *Guidelines for Provision for those who are unable to accept the Episcopal Ministry of a Bishop who is a Woman* (Attachment 4).

In response to requests for information to assist with the preparation of this report, the Dioceses of Bathurst, Canberra and Goulburn, Newcastle and the Northern Territory expressed unqualified support of the ministry of women bishops. The Diocese of Adelaide recognised principled differences on the matter within that diocese. The Diocese of Bunbury noted that a small minority in the diocese is uncomfortable with the ministry of women bishops. The Dioceses of Adelaide, Canberra and Goulburn and the Northern Territory have made arrangements for pastoral care for those who feel unable to accept the ministry of women bishops. The Diocese of Bunbury has considered the question of pastoral care for those who feel unable to accept the ministry of a woman bishop and has resolved to make detailed provisions if and when the matter arises in practice.

Women Bishops

The Dioceses of Armidale, Ballarat, North West Australia and Sydney noted that they oppose the consecration of women bishops on theological grounds and, accordingly, have not needed to provide for alternative Episcopal ministry. Nevertheless, the Diocese of Ballarat described as exemplary the ministry of Bishops Goldsworthy and Darling.

ATTACHMENT 1



AUSTRALIAN ANGLICAN BISHOPS' PROTOCOL

No. 012

YEAR: 2008

WOMEN IN THE EPISCOPATE

1. As bishops of the Anglican Church of Australia, we recognise that the ministry of ordained women has been accepted in many dioceses of this Church, and also acknowledge that there are those who, for various reasons and to varying degrees, are unable to accept women in the ordained ministry.
2. We recognise the good faith of those who support the ordination and consecration of women and of those who cannot receive these developments, and pledge that those who hold either conviction will continue to have a valued and respected place in this Church.
3. We resolve to nurture the highest possible level of collegiality as bishops, seeking to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.
4. We affirm that all people are made in the image of God, and expressly reject any intolerance or unjust discrimination against any member of this Church on the grounds of gender, since all are one in Christ Jesus, while acknowledging that diverse biblical and theological views on the place of gender in the order of creation and the church are genuinely held.
5. We affirm that episcopal ministry should be available to every community of faith and every member of this Church, whatever their belief as to the acceptability of a woman holding office as a bishop, and that the diocesan bishop will ensure that pastorally sensitive and appropriate episcopal ministry is provided.
6. We affirm that every diocesan bishop and every bishop providing episcopal ministry within a diocese should be mutually accountable in collegial solidarity with his or her episcopal colleagues for ensuring that there are reasonable and appropriate arrangements for episcopal ministry. Accordingly, we encourage all dioceses who desire to appoint or elect women as bishops to make provision for reasonable and appropriate episcopal ministry, addressing matters including the following:
 - a. arrangements for episcopal visitation, confirmation and ordination;
 - b. provisions for matters of discipline and pastoral succession;

- c. procedures through which a community of faith may request the provision of this ministry; and
- d. provision about the manner in which the costs of providing this ministry are to be borne.

We also note the proposed provisions for alternative episcopal ministry in the Bill for a Church Law (Further Clarification) Canon 2004 and commend these to the dioceses for consideration in developing “reasonable and appropriate arrangements” with a degree of continuity across the Anglican Church of Australia.

- 7. We recommend that the custom of the Metropolitan or Primate acting as chief consecrator should be varied to the extent necessary when the Metropolitan or Primate is a woman or when a woman is to be consecrated.
- 8. We encourage Metropolitans, when planning consecration services, to consider that for some it will be important that three of the consecrating bishops are men, and we also pledge to act with respect for one another in the ordering of services of consecration.

ATTACHMENT 2

DIOCESE OF PERTH

REPORT FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF GENERAL SYNOD RE THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN TO THE EPISCOPATE

PREAMBLE

The Constitution of our Church and the Bills, Canons and Statutes provide a style of architecture for our corporate life. It receives authenticity through those who inhabit these structures acting in the power of the Holy Spirit who infuses believers with the seal of salvation wrought through Christ.

The Protocols agreed to by the Bishops are of a similar nature.

- The Diocese of Perth since 1988 through determinations made at its annual Synods, expressed a desire for women to be an integral part of the threefold order of ministry.
- In 1990 the Diocese of Perth at its annual Synod amended its Constitution 1971-1989 to include women in the words associated with formularies and in particular those pertaining to the office of Bishop, Priest and Deacon.
- In 2003 the Diocesan Synod called for the admission of women to the Episcopate at the earliest possible date.
- Synods in 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 invited the Archbishop to consider admitting called and gifted women to the Episcopate at the earliest possible date.
- All those who held the Archbishop's licence to function in a ministerial capacity ascribe to the following declaration:

I accept and solemnly promise to observe as for the spiritual well-being of the Diocese, the Constitution, Statutes and Regulations agreed to and adopted from time to time by the Archbishop, Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Perth in Synod assembled.

- The Synod's determinations on the integral place of women in the threefold order of ministry is therefore a given for those who seek ministerial orders in this diocese.

- The diocese has always lived in an atmosphere of generosity where those of differing views are not precluded from ministry positions, elections and appointments.
- In 2005, on my election as Archbishop of Perth, the regions of the diocese were restructured to enable any parish/agency/clergy/laity to request any of the Bishops to respond to a particular need whether they were a part of the administrative region or not.
- This change was based on my experiences in New Zealand, Newcastle and the Province of New South Wales where I found that the role I had played in the ordination of women to the priesthood and Episcopate meant that there were parishes which found it unacceptable for me to preach or preside.
- In a few cases the matter of race has played a part in terms of visitation to parishes, etc. The “One Nation” political ideology present in small pockets has meant that my liturgical engagement to such persons has been restricted. I have always sought to act with charity towards those who would find my presence and leadership unacceptable for reasons of conviction, race, etc. The restructuring of the regional model at an administrative level gives clergy and people a choice re the Episcopal Team while seeking to maintain the authority of the Diocesan Bishop.
- After the ruling of the Tribunal in September 2007 and the Bishops’ Conference Protocols were agreed to, the Diocesan Council in Perth received the name of The Venerable Kay Goldsworthy to be considered as Bishop. It was noted regretfully by Diocesan Council that Bishop Goldsworthy would not be welcome to preside/preach, etc in some of the parishes.
- In the unanimous acceptance of The Venerable Kay Goldsworthy’s nomination I noted as follows:

The Diocese of Perth is a diocese marked by clear Gospel imperatives that calls for prophetic action to be paralleled by compassionate care for those who find such imperatives hindering of their conscience.

The Episcopal Team has taken particular care to see that no Episcopal presence is offered to any priest, lay person, parish or institution who may be better served by another member of the Team.

- The Protocols have been adhered to with prayerful faithfulness. In the Episcopal Report to Synod 2009 I noted the following in respect of Bishop Kay Goldsworthy:

Bishop Kay has taken on her parish visiting with pastoral devotion and forging links with Anglicare WA and the Aboriginal Reference Group. Bishop Kay has faced the challenge of those clergy and parishes who

believe in male headship and refuse to receive her in her episcopal role as teacher and leader with amazing graciousness. Never complaining or making an issue out of it, but working at relationships demanded of Christian leaders as a Gospel imperative. Kay has been much in demand at State, national and international gathering of secular organisations which provide an opportunity for witness. Here again she has shown care that always gives priority to local commitments in the diocese.

- Bishop Goldsworthy meets on a regular basis with Area Deans, clergy and lay leaders who would have objections to her leadership role based on her gender. Bishop Kay chairs boards of nomination and other commissions with utmost fairness in respecting the particular ethos of a congregation or agency.
- At the Provincial and National Bishops' Conferences and Meetings I have respectfully sought the view of Bishops who would be inconvenienced by the presence of Bishop Kay Goldsworthy in their midst. In each of the situations thus far the Bishops concerned have reciprocated the request with grace and have welcomed Bishop Goldsworthy into their midst. At Kay's request I have not asked her to lead worship or Bible study at provincial meetings. It is interesting to observe that for the first ten years I spent as Bishop in New South Wales I was never invited to lead worship or Bible studies at the provincial meetings of the Bishops. The present Archbishop of Sydney was the first Archbishop to break this tradition!
- Bishop Kay Goldsworthy has gone out of her way to refuse invitations that could provoke and has always sought the permission of the respective Bishops prior to taking on any engagement in a diocese. This is a protocol that is sadly not adhered to amongst some of the Bishops.
- We seek to ensure that no offence will be caused while holding on to the integrity of the office of Bishop that Bishop Kay Goldsworthy has been consecrated into.

I trust this summary assists the General Synod in seeing that the Diocese of Perth seeks to inhabit the protocols agreed to with Gospel authenticity.

The Most Reverend Roger Herft
Archbishop of Perth and Metropolitan of Western Australia

January 2010

ATTACHMENT 3

DIOCESE OF MELBOURNE

**MONITORING OF DEVELOPMENTS IN
RELATION TO WOMEN BISHOPS**

On Saturday 31 May 2008 the then Reverend Canon Barbara Darling was consecrated bishop in the church of God. Since then she has fulfilled the roles of Bishop for Diocesan Ministries and now Regional Bishop of the Eastern Region.

Guidelines for Provision for those who are unable to accept the Episcopal Ministry of a Bishop who is a Woman were drawn up prior to the consecration. I have met with clergy as necessary and will continue to offer pastoral ministry. As Archbishop I have endeavoured to be present and to preside at services for clergy who are unable to accept the ministry of women priests.

My only comment in respect to the effects of having a Woman Bishop is that for most people of the diocese her consecration and subsequent ministry have been welcomed. For the small number who make known their concerns about women in ministry and particularly women in the episcopate, alternate provisions are possible and, as far as I am aware, these are generally accepted. I would be happy to provide more information, should that be helpful.

**The Most Reverend Dr Philip Freier
Archbishop of Melbourne**

ATTACHMENT 4

**GUIDELINES FOR PROVISION FOR THOSE WHO ARE UNABLE TO ACCEPT
THE EPISCOPAL MINISTRY OF A BISHOP WHO IS A WOMAN**

At all times while there is a Bishop of the Diocese of Melbourne who is a woman the Archbishop, with the support of the Council of the Diocese, will ensure that the ministry of a Bishop who is a man will be available for those who, for various reasons and varying degrees, are unable to accept the Episcopal ministry of a Bishop who is a woman.

CONFIRMATION

Where a Bishop who is a woman is the confirming Bishop, a person who as a matter of conscience cannot accept confirmation from a Bishop who is a woman will be confirmed by a Bishop who is a man.

ORDINATION

Where a Bishop who is a woman is the ordaining Bishop, a person who as a matter of conscience cannot accept ordination from a Bishop who is a woman will be ordained by a Bishop who is a man.

IN A PARISH

These arrangements will be available where the vestry, with the consent both of the Incumbent or the Priest in Charge and a two thirds majority of the electors present at a specially convened meeting in accordance with the Parishes Act and chaired by the Archdeacon, applies in writing to the Archbishop to receive Episcopal ministry only from a Bishop who is a man. The implementation of these arrangements will be available for a period of three years from the date of the request and will be renewable by the same means. The same process will be used if the decision is to be revoked within the period of three years.

COSTS

Determination of reasonable reimbursement for any expenses incurred in implementing these arrangements will be made by the Archbishop.

The Archbishop will advise the Council of the Diocese annually of the application of these arrangements. The Archbishop is the point of reference in any disputes over matters of discipline or of pastoral succession, as they relate to the ministry of a Bishop who is a woman. The Archbishop may delegate this role as the need arises.

Women Bishops

The Archbishop will initiate a review of these guidelines and report to the Council on the appropriateness of these guidelines after they have been operational for eighteen months.

16 May 2008

GENERAL SYNOD VOTING SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

By resolution 125/07, the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod resolved:

125/07 GENERAL SYNOD VOTING SYSTEM

That Standing Committee appoints a committee to investigate the various voting systems that might be used in future General Synod elections, and report the merits and demerits of each to the 15th General Synod.

Archdeacon Dr David James Powys moved, Bishop Michael Hough seconding, 26 Oct 07

A Committee was appointed by Standing Committee to undertake this task.

BEING FAITHFUL AND REMAINING UNITED BETWEEN THE TIMES

There is a fragility about the church, at every level of its existence, at least from a human perspective.

The reasons are eschatological. The church has not yet been perfected, and we struggle to discern God's will. Sometimes we struggle so much that we reach quite diverse conclusions! In such circumstances we have three options. We can either:

- agree that working together in faithful obedience to God in some matters is not possible because we cannot agree on God's will – meaning that the quest is abandoned, or
- join only with those with whom we agree about God's will and seek to impose our conviction on those who do not agree – meaning that a measure of coercion is involved, or
- together recognise that God's will has not yet been fully revealed, and God's church not yet perfected, and agree to differ, working together in all ways possible, but allowing representation and voice to each part of the church – meaning that the quest is pursued humbly, and with mutual respect.

When sections of the church become aggrieved, justifiably or not, the church's capacity for ministry and mission also becomes diminished. Most people know that they cannot expect always to 'get their own way', even though they may be convinced that 'God is on their side'. What does grieve and offend, however, is when decisions taken fail to reflect the convictions of significant proportions of the church's membership. This is deeply injurious to the health and vitality of the church. Most members of the Anglican Church of Australia have experienced this at some level of church life, despite the fact that we pride ourselves on having representative decision-making processes.

In contrast, when all sections believe that they have been valued, and that their convictions have had bearing on the decisions and directions of the whole, the church's capacity for ministry and mission is enhanced.

At the level of the national Australian Anglican Church it is arguable that the church is at its healthiest when its bishops and representative clergy and laity meet in General Synod. Though differences of conviction in General Synod are sometimes acutely apparent, the processes of meeting face to face, debating, weighing arguments and voting to produce decisions in such a representative forum, generate goodwill, corporate health and renewal of missional energy.

However it is not usually possible for the whole church to gather in such large numbers to make decisions. Necessarily much decision-making has to be assigned to smaller groups. This is unavoidable. But the way in which the wider church is represented on those smaller groups is crucial if the negative dynamics already outlined are not to come into play.

ELECTION SYSTEMS

Much depends here on the method used to elect those who will represent the wider church on the smaller groups. The alternatives are few when just one or two positions are being filled, but numerous and varied when it comes to filling multiple positions. The choice of election system when filling multiple positions is critical. Why? To take an extreme and hypothetical case, there are voting systems which can deliver 10 out of 10 available positions to a block of votes representing just 55% of the voters. There are other systems which can deliver just 5 or 6 of the available positions to the 55%, and give one or two positions to each other voting block, down to a position for a block of votes as small as 10%. It is not difficult to work out which system will more probably deliver membership for national committees that will promote harmony, health and energy in the wider church.

There are voting systems, applicable in multiple position elections, which both maximise the representativeness of election results and also minimise voters' capacity to counteract the positive support which other voters give to particular candidates. These systems are single transferable vote quota preferential systems, akin to that used in elections for the Australian Senate. They are used in some Australian Anglican synods, and have met with general approval, though with certain reservations.

These reservations have to do with administrative difficulties. Preferential systems, once mastered, are simple though laborious to administer. Difficulties tend to arise when people who have not been adequately briefed and are then not adequately supervised, are asked to administer them. A further difficulty is that filling casual vacancies under these systems may call for a partial replication of the original counting process, which is far more time-consuming than simply working down a list of unsuccessful candidates.

These difficulties are real but not insurmountable. In the end, the questions facing a body like the General Synod in determining what voting system it will use are two:

- Are there any voting systems which would serve General Synod's purposes better than its present system?
- Would the gains likely to be made in terms of national church health, satisfaction and unity by adopting another system outweigh any associated administrative inconvenience?

THE COMMITTEE AND ITS WORK

At the Standing Committee Executive Committee Meeting of 6 May 2008, the Rev'd Dr David Powys was appointed to chair the committee specified in resolution 125/07. The other members appointed were the Rev'd Chris Moroney, the Hon Robert Fordham, Dr Muriel Porter OAM and Mr Colin Reilly.

The committee did not meet until late 2009, by which time the Rev'd Chris Moroney found that changed responsibilities made his involvement difficult. Meetings were held in Melbourne, and those unable to attend were offered the facility of participation by telephone conference and were consulted at each stage of drafting.

WIDER CONTEXT

The timing of the committee's task was difficult, in view of struggles going on within the national church in 2009/10. There may need to be a wider discussion of how Australian Anglicans should maintain unity in diversity, and of constitutional changes necessary to promote this aim, such as the means by which dioceses are represented on General Synod, but the committee was agreed that this is a separate matter. It was mindful, nevertheless, that progress on the larger front may well be assisted if the Australian Church gives priority to achieving the highest possible levels of representativeness in its decision-making.

PRINCIPLES

The committee was agreed on the following principles.

- From New Testament times, the people of God have met together in representative councils so as to order their life and mission (Acts 15:6-31).
- No one person or group of persons has a monopoly on knowing the will of God.
- It is often through discussion, debate and political processes that the will of God is discerned by the larger church, though inerrancy should not be claimed (Article 21).
- When this approach is taken to discerning God's will, it is essential that as much as is possible, the total constituency is represented in reaching an outcome.

CURRENT GENERAL SYNOD ELECTION SYSTEM

The provisions for the conduct of elections by General Synod and the filling of vacancies on Standing Committee are both covered within the Rules of General Synod, and as such are able to be changed by resolution of General Synod. The most relevant rules are numbers II and III (pp 385, 389 *The Anglican Church of Australia: The Constitution Canons and Rules of General Synod 2007*).

It is instructive to reflect on the current membership and representativeness of the bodies elected by General Synod, and of those appointed by Standing Committee. Standing Committee is just one of the committees in question. The composition of Standing Committee is stipulated in Rule II section 2 (p 385). The inclusion of each of the Metropolitans ensures some measure of geographical representation. As it has transpired, the present Standing Committee does include one lay person and one cleric from each province (in part the result of Standing Committee filling a casual vacancy), and no two of its elected bishops come from the same province. However, as can be seen in the table below, dioceses are not evenly represented relative to their number of representatives. The committee does not suggest that complete evenness would be either possible or necessarily good. There are many aspects to representation, and this table concerns just one of these. Imbalances might be more evident if analysis was made in terms of other criteria.

The current method of election in General Synod is that in the most significant elections (eg Standing Committee, 3 elected bishops, 9 elected clergy and 9 elected laity, and the Panel for the Board of Electors of the Primate, 12 elected clergy and 12 elected laity) the synod votes in houses, with voters being required to express undifferentiated support for a number of candidates up to the number of positions to be filled. Potentially, this can become a 'winner takes all' system if a group commanding a bare majority organises itself effectively.

<i>2007 Membership of General Synod and of its Standing Committee</i>	Sydney	Melbourne	Brisbane	Perth	Adelaide	C & G	Newcastle	Bathurst	N Queensld	Tasmania	Armidale	Ballarat	Bendigo	Bunbury	Gippsland	Grafton	Wangaratta	Indigenous	North West	Northern T	Riverina	Rockhampt	The Murray	Willochra	Total
<i>General Synod Membership</i>																									
House of Bishops	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	25
House of Clergy	28	18	10	9	5	5	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	111
House of Laity	28	18	10	9	5	5	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	111
Total	57	37	21	19	11	11	11	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	3	3	3	3	3	3	247
<i>% of total GS membership</i>	23	15	9	8	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	98
<i>Standing Committee Membership</i>																									
<i>Ex officio</i>	2	1	1	1	2											1		2							10
House of Bishops										1			1											1	3
House of Clergy	2	4	1*		1	1																			9
House of Laity	2	3	1					1		1					1										9
Total elected members	4	7	2		1	1		1		2			1		1									1	21
<i>% of elected members</i>	19	33	10		5	5		5		10			5		5									5	102
Total members	6	8	3	1	3	1	0	1		2			1		1	1		2						1	31

* Subsequently Bishop Parkes became a diocesan bishop, and was then replaced by Standing Committee appointment by the Rt Rev'd K Goldsworthy from Perth. At the time of the election in 2007, 10 out of 23 dioceses were represented among the 21 elected diocesan bishops, clergy and laity. Since Bishop Goldsworthy's appointment, that became 11 dioceses.

ALTERNATIVE ELECTION SYSTEMS FOR MULTIPLE POSITION ELECTIONS

There are very many different ways of conducting elections in various circumstances. Most are not relevant to General Synod elections. If the field is reduced to those relevant to multi-position elections that need to be effected by a means of single ballot, the alternatives are broadly as appear in the table below.

‘POLITICS’

This table illustrates the necessary and positive role of politics in elections of this kind, under nearly every system. Proportionality is the output only when both strategic nominating and tactical voting are inputs, under most of the systems.

There are two exceptions. The first is our current system, where political organisation, no matter how sophisticated, cannot guarantee proportionality of output. Indeed political organisation under our current system could see 51% of voters securing 100% of the positions, or in a scenario where a substantial majority made no attempt to organise themselves, a small minority of voters securing the majority of positions. The second is the Quota-preferential Proportional Representation System, where with or without political organisation, proportionality is a certain output.

It is undeniable that some political activities are injurious to the life and health of the church. Any suggestion, however, that the church, the church's decision-making bodies or the church's elections for those bodies, can or should be 'free of politics', is naïve and uninformed. Political organisation, especially when people do not all know each other, is almost inevitable. The consequences can be positive or negative. Under the present system of elections for General Synod very much depends on electors organising themselves in order to

- (a) prevent electoral outcomes which no one intended, and
- (b) preserve the necessary continuity of membership within bodies from election to election.

Simplified listing of One Ballot Multiple Position Election Systems (<i>n</i> = no. of positions to be filled)			
<i>name</i>	<i>method</i>	<i>features</i>	<i>weaknesses</i>
Non-proportional			
(Plurality) Block / Plurality at Large / First Past the Post (The current General Synod method)	Each elector gives undifferentiated support to <i>n</i> candidates (though support for fewer may be permitted but without boosting the value of the support given them)	Can produce 'landslides' where electorate is finely balanced.	In a fully politicised context, a group with 51% of the votes could secure all <i>n</i> positions. In a partly politicised context a minority of electors could secure a majority of positions. No provision for countbacks.
Preferential Block	Each elector indicates their first choice, and then alternatives in order of preference. Only alternatives to eliminated candidates are counted until <i>n</i> positions are filled	May achieve proportionality if there is organization (ie strategic nominating and tactical voting) on all sides	Could give disproportionately high success to small minorities. Could prove arbitrary at the level of counting of votes. Provision for countback very crude.
Semi-proportional			
Undifferentiated Cumulative / Undifferentiated Limited	Each elector supports up to <i>n</i> candidates, and this support has the value <i>n</i> /number supported	May achieve proportionality if there is organization (ie strategic nominating and tactical voting) on all sides	No provision for countbacks. Complex to count.
Differentiated Cumulative / Differentiated Limited	Each elector has <i>n</i> points and allocates these to between 1 and <i>n</i> candidates	<i>ditto</i>	No provision for countbacks.
Single Non-transferable Vote	Each elector votes for just one candidate	<i>ditto</i>	In the absence of general organization, candidates could be elected on the basis of very few votes.
Proportional			
Party List Proportional Representation (In Australia, this is the option which most voters use in Senate elections)	Each elector indicates support for a party, and parties effectively appoint candidates according to the support each party achieves.	Requires a party-political apparatus	Not suited to church's needs and circumstances
Single Transferable Vote / Quota- preferential Proportional	Each elector indicates support for as many or few candidates (but usually <i>n</i>) as he/she	Will produce proportionality, with or without voter organisation.	Counting of votes is complex and requires considerable skill.

Representation	wishes, in preferential order. Candidates elected when they receive a quota of votes (number of valid papers / n+1). Excess value of surplus votes for successful candidates and full value of eliminated candidates used to fill quotas.	Does provide for countbacks.	
----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--

Note - terminology in this table may not always accord with usage by others, but is consistent within this report.

PROVINCIAL AND OTHER REPRESENTATION

The committee was asked, by means of a letter forwarded via Standing Committee, to consider how more adequate representation of geographically remote provinces, particularly Western Australia, might be achieved. No solution was forthcoming that would not bring its own difficulties.

The creation of additional categories would be in tension with the aim of maximising representativeness. Creating sub-constituencies of voters, or prescribing electoral outcomes in terms of special categories to be elected, would each serve to reduce the ability of individuals to influence electoral outcomes, and so reduce the representation of individual voters. This needs to be taken into account when considering other foreseeable arguments, such that there should be special categories of representation regarding gender, age, metropolitan/rural, theology, political sophistication etc. It is worth remembering that there are already sub-constituencies within General Synod – the three houses, the 23 dioceses and the provision for Indigenous representation, and that most committees have a prescribed number of members from the three houses.

OTHER FACTORS

It became clear to the committee that the nomination process is also very important in achieving representativeness, though this was beyond our brief. With the exception of nominations for Standing Committee, nominees do not need to be members of General Synod, meaning that there is a very large pool. To draw fully upon this pool, considerable notice of elections needs to be given, accompanied by information about the positions to be filled.

For cost reasons, time is of the essence in the election of Standing Committee: this committee usually meets immediately after the conclusion of the meeting of the General Synod which elects it.

COUNTBACKS

General System elections currently have no provision for countbacks to fill casual vacancies, and with the exception of the Primatial Election Board, with its supplementary list, such vacancies are filled by Standing Committee. Countbacks, if feasible, would seem a better way to honour the intention of the voters than Standing Committee appointments. Moving to a system which provided for countbacks, realising that with the passage of time and changes in individual's circumstances, countbacks may not necessarily yield an available and still qualified candidate, would seem a principled course of action. As a fallback, Standing Committee with its executive function for General Synod, could make appointments when a countback failed to produce an appointment.

COMPUTERISATION

There are software packages that could be used for counting votes in General Synod elections. However, several considerations need to be taken into account:

1. Data would need to be keyed in manually for verification purposes, meaning that only part of the voting process could be computerised.
2. Computerisation would come into its own if General Synod favoured adopting a system which required complex processing of votes, particularly if countbacks were desired.
3. Elections would normally occur only every three or more years, with possible countbacks in between, meaning that there may be problems with maintaining staff expertise in and familiarity with computer programs, and with programs being superseded without much usage.
4. It may be possible to outsource the whole or part of the processing of votes.
5. Cost issues, though sharing costs with one or more dioceses might prove feasible.

THE QUOTA-PREFERENTIAL PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION SYSTEM

Among the alternative systems that might be adopted for General Synod elections, the Quota-preferential Proportional Representation system best enshrines the principles the committee believes will promote health within our national church's decision-making bodies, and a sense of 'rightness' among the wider church constituency. It ensures that very few (and possibly no) votes are unrepresented in the outcome of elections; it is not as dependent as other systems on elector organisation; and it avoids the vagaries and deficiencies of alternatives. Its downside is its complexity, and the need for it to be administered carefully.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We make four recommendations:

1. That details of elections to be conducted at General Synod, of the positions to be filled, and of eligibility criteria, be sent as part of preliminary papers for members to enable early and careful consideration of nominations of suitable persons from across the Australian church.
2. That synod members, in making nominations for General Synod elections and in voting in those elections, be mindful of the need for representativeness in its many aspects, including representation of church members in remote dioceses.
3. That the relevant Rules be amended to specify that the election system used in General Synod in multi-position elections be the Quota-preferential Proportional Representation System, and to provide for countbacks to fill casual vacancies where possible.
4. That if recommendation three is adopted, the feasibility of computerising the vote-counting process, in house or by outsourcing, be investigated.

David Powys (chair)
Robert Fordham
Chris Moroney
Muriel Porter
Colin Reilly

REVIEW OF COMMISSIONS, TASK FORCES AND NETWORKS

SUMMARY REPORT

1. SCOPE OF THE REPORT

The General Synod's resolution 112/07 calls for a procedure for regular review to be proposed for the next session of General Synod. The Standing Committee's resolution SC2008/1/047 adds the requirement that the report to the General Synod should contain a review of the effectiveness of all Commissions and Task Forces.

The full report (available on the General Synod website) gives details of the legislative basis for the Commissions, Task Forces, and Networks. Drawing on responses from the various groups, it reviews relevant issues and proposes procedures for more intentional management and regular reporting by relevant bodies to facilitate regular review of the purpose, relevance and ongoing need for all Commissions, Task Forces and Networks.

The report also addresses some issues relating to working groups and other committees and makes some recommendations for further action.

2. COMMISSIONS

2.1 Current Commissions

Expert Reference Commissions established under the Strategic Issues Canon 1998 are:

- 2.1.1 *The Doctrine Commission***
- 2.1.2 *The Ministry Commission***
- 2.1.3 *The Liturgy Commission***
- 2.1.4 *The Church Law Commission***
- 2.1.5 *The Professional Standards Commission***
- 2.1.6 *The Women's Commission***
- 2.1.7 *The Public Affairs Commission***
- 2.1.8 *The Ecumenical Relations Commission***

In addition, there is the **Episcopal Standards Commission**, established by the Special Tribunal Canon 2007 and governed by both that Canon and the Episcopal Standards Canon 2007. Neither Canon refers to Section 35 of the Constitution or the Strategic Issues Canon and the Episcopal Standards Commission was deemed to be beyond the scope of this report.

2.2 Responses of Commissions to requests for information

The General Secretary sought information from all Commissions established under the Strategic Issues Canon. Replies were received from all Commissions except the Ministry Commission which was re-established only after the information-gathering process commenced.

A table setting out the Commissions' responses to each of the questions is attached to the full report.

It will be seen from the table that:

- (a) the alignment of the Commissions' work with strategic priorities adopted by the Standing Commission in February 2008 varies according to the nature of the Commissions' work;
- (b) common elements in the Commissions' proposals for effective assessment of their work by the Standing Committee are:
 - (i) promptness,
 - (ii) operating within budget,
 - (iii) users' satisfaction with the work produced by the Commission;
- (c) no Commission expressed a view that its work coming to an end would have no impact on the life of the church;
- (d) budgetary constraints inhibit the work of the Commissions; and
- (e) halving the membership of the Commissions would impair their work because of a lack of experience, theological diversity and numbers of people to complete the work at hand.

In relation to (d), the Public Affairs Commission makes the point that, without access to research capability, it is unable to respond at short notice to requests for reports or submissions. Government enquiries often seek responses at short notice.

3. TASK FORCES

3.1 Existing Task Forces

The following Task Forces have been established:

- 3.1.1 *Fresh Expressions Australia Task Force***
- 3.1.2 *The Drought Task Force***
- 3.1.3 *The National Anglican Resource Unit***

3.2 Responses by Task Forces

Letters were sent to current Chairs of the two Task Forces seeking information in accordance with resolution EC2008/12/6. Fresh Expressions Australia is still considering its response. Bishop Stevens' Drought Task Force has not responded, which is not surprising because it regards its work as complete.

Unfortunately, we are not in a position to report on the Task Forces' views about the process of review.

4. NETWORKS

4.1 Existing Networks

The following Networks have been established pursuant to resolution of the Standing Committee:

- Anglican Archives Network
- Anglican Religious Life Network
- Anglicare Australia
- Australian Anglican Diaconal Association
- Australian Anglican Environment Network
- Australian Anglican Schools Network
- Catechumenate Network
- Cathedral Deans Network
- C-Net and Y-Net
- Examining Chaplains Network
- Ministry Development Network
- Mission Agencies Network
- Professional Standards Network
- Registrars' Network
- Social Issues Network
- Supervised Theological Field Education Network

4.2 Responses of Networks to request for information

Substantive responses have been received from the following Networks:

- Australian Anglican Diaconal Association
- Australian Anglican Schools Network
- Anglicare Australia

A table setting out the Networks' responses to specific questions is attached to the full report.

Common themes in the responses are:

- (a) Effectiveness can be measured by reference to:
 - (i) fulfilling functions or purposes set out by the Network's Constitution,
 - (ii) sustaining levels of membership;
- (b) Cessation of the Network would deprive members of the forum for professional and spiritual development; and
- (c) Budget does not appear to be a major issue.

5. WORKING GROUPS

5.1 Current Working Groups

The following Working Groups are current:

- Environment Working Group
- Episcopal Standards Working Group
- Financial Advisory Working Group
- Financial Protection Canon Working Group
- Refugees Working Group
- Windsor Report Working Group.

5.2 Responses of Working Groups to request for information

No request was sent to the Financial Protection Canon Working Group because it is a sub-group of the Financial Advisory Group and, in any event, its functions have only just commenced.

Responses have been received from the following Working Groups:

- Environment Working Group
- Episcopal Standards Working Group
- Financial Advisory Working Group
- Windsor Report Working Group.

A table setting out the Working Groups' responses to specific questions are set out in a Table attached to the full report.

Only the Environment Working Group could say that the nature of its work enables it to align with the strategic priorities of the Standing Committee.

A common response to the request to provide a proposal as to how the effectiveness of the Working Group best be assessed is to point to external indicators such as practical effects (Environment Working Group), "client"

acceptance (Financial Advisory Group) or peer recognition (Windsor Report Working Group).

Each Working Group which responded pointed to a potential deficit in the life of the Church if its work were to come to an end.

6. HIGH LEVEL ISSUES

6.1 Previous Reviews

The effectiveness of commissions has been the subject of review in 1992, 1997/8, 2001 and 2004. It appears that the review of Commissions is a cyclical event in the life of the Church. Broadly speaking, a number of issues are recurrent. Be that as it may, it should be noted that past reviews have not recommended the abolition of the Commissions (or the Task Forces). Research has not revealed any call for the review of Working Groups or, say, the Audit Committee. It seems the approach has been inconsistent.

6.2 Practical issues for determining and achieving strategic outcomes and their relationship to assessing the effectiveness of church bodies

Repeated calls for reviews raise questions such as:

- (a) Are the functions of the General Synod's various bodies to be restricted to the minimum necessary to give effect to the Constitution or are they to give effect to a broader vision for the Church?
- (b) If the former, how are the functions to be defined?
- (c) If the latter, which body has power and responsibility for formulating and articulating such a vision and by what process should it do so?
- (d) How does the relevant body charged with responsibility to formulate and articulate a vision for the Church go about providing the resources to implement that vision?

The Constitution clearly contemplates that Commissions will be instruments of the General Synod to give effect to these functions. That, in turn, lends support to the notion of a broad national mission for the Church.

General Synod bodies are likely to function effectively and to achieve optimal outcomes if policies, strategic priorities, actions and resources are aligned. The current processes do not enable that to occur. Currently, the Standing Committee proposes a budget to the General Synod. The General Synod determines the budget. The General Synod or the Standing Committee may pass resolutions referring matters to Commissions or Task Forces without regard to the impact on the budgets of those bodies. The General Synod passes resolutions relating to policy which the Standing Committee may or may not adopt. After a session of

General Synod, the Standing Committee must determine strategic priorities for the next triennium. The Standing Committee is unfettered in determining strategic priorities because nothing requires it to have regard to any resolution of the General Synod. On the other hand the Standing Committee is fettered to a degree because the budget for the triennium has already been determined by the General Synod without necessarily having regard to strategic priorities.

A more coherent process is possible. Two alternatives are proposed:

- (a) The Standing Committee or a sub-committee could prepare a statement of actions and expected outcomes for consideration and adoption by the General Synod. Such a statement would identify the existing or new bodies or individuals who would implement actions, the resources, including money, needed to achieve the proposed outcomes and meaningful criteria and processes for reviewing the effectiveness of the work of the bodies and individuals involved. That statement, in turn, would be prepared in consultation with:

- Groups or individuals with expertise in assessing the current state of Australian society and the Church and in mapping ways forward;
- General Synod bodies including Commissions, Task Forces and Working Groups, and
- Bodies or individuals having expertise in the funding of such enterprises.

Such a process has the advantages of a planned, consultative and focused approach.

- (b) Alternatively, the first meeting of the Standing Committee immediately after a General Synod could identify particular matters it believes should be pursued and appoint a sub-committee to bring to the next meeting a report outlining directions and resources required along the lines contemplated in (a) above.

Although such a process may be more streamlined than the process in (a), it has the disadvantages that the General Synod will not have had an opportunity to participate and, consequently, the national church may not identify with the direction taken and there may be insufficient resources to achieve what the Standing Committee deems to be necessary.

6.3 Practical Issues relating to assessing effectiveness of church bodies

Until these higher level issues have been debated and resolved, criteria adopted for reviewing the effectiveness of General Synod bodies are likely to be arbitrary and processes for applying those criteria may not be meaningful and may even be regarded as unfair by the relevant bodies.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROCEDURES FOR REGULAR REVIEW

A regular reporting procedure, linked to the cycle of Standing Committee meetings and using templates to facilitate the process has been proposed. The procedure and the templates are contained in the full report.

ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA TRUST CORPORATION

The current Corporate Trustees are:

- Mr Michael Blaxland
- Mr Martin Drevikovsky
- Bishop Robert Forsyth
- Mr Douglas Marr
- Mr Steven McKerihan

Since the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod, the Corporate Trustees have passed resolutions to do the following:

29 July 2008	Executed Management Agreement between the Trust Corporation and the Long Service Leave Board.
11 December 2008	Appointed Martin Drevikovsky as proxy to attend and vote at the Annual General Meeting of Anglican Board of Mission-Australia Limited.
5 March 2009	Executed Management Agreement between the Trust Corporation and the Long Service Leave Board.
19 November 2009	Appointed Martin Drevikovsky to attend and vote at meetings of members of Anglican Board of Mission–Australia Limited until revocation of the resolution or until Martin Drevikovsky ceases to hold the office of General Secretary of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, whichever first occurs.
19 November 2009	Delegated Martin Drevikovsky to execute the Telstra Business Services Variation Agreement No 1 in accordance with General Synod Standing Committee resolution SC2009/3/058.
28 January 2010	Delegated Martin Drevikovsky to execute contracts with Cirrus Australia Pty Limited for the upgrading of the General Synod Office information technology systems pursuant to Standing Committee resolution SC2008/2/024.

The structure of the Anglican Church of Australia for the holding of assets and the disbursement of moneys has been under consideration for a good many years. This session of the General Synod has before it a Bill for the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Corporation Canon 2010 and a Bill for Rule XXIV – A Rule Relating to Administrative Services of the General Synod which may be found at page 2-055 and page 2-014 respectively in Book 2 of the General Synod papers.

APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

The Appellate Tribunal currently comprises the following members,

- Hon Mr Justice Peter W Young AO (President)
- Mr Max Horton OAM (Deputy President)
- Hon Justice David J Bleby
- Hon Keith Mason AC QC
- Most Rev Philip Aspinall, Archbishop of Brisbane
- Most Rev Roger Herft, Archbishop of Perth
- Right Rev Peter Brain, Bishop of Armidale.

The work of the Tribunal is spasmodic depending on references received from the Primate.

In the last triennium, two references have been received.

The first concerned the validity of a system of administering the Holy Communion by Deacons and lay people the subject of a resolution of the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney. This has not been concluded as at the time of writing (end of March 2010).

The second concerned the application of three canons of the 2007 synod to the Diocese of Sydney. That diocese reckoned that the three canons did not apply to it unless adopted. The Standing Committee of General Synod did not agree with this view. The Tribunal ruled that the canons did so apply.

The triennium has thrown up at least two problems connected with the Tribunal which it is understood will be considered at the next session of the General Synod.

The first is to make provision in case a reference is part heard at the time when the constitution operates to terminate the appointment of members of the tribunal. An allied problem is whether there should be alternate members appointed to sit should members of the Tribunal find themselves from sitting in any particular reference.

The second is that the Tribunal finds it difficult to deal efficiently with a reference concerning whether a diocese is correct in asserting that canons do not apply in it because it they affect the good government of a diocese if that diocese does not provide the General Synod Standing Committee nor the tribunal of the reason that it has formed that view.

Two lay members of the Tribunal will be retiring at the commencement of the 2010 General Synod having reached the retirement age specified in the constitution.

PETER YOUNG
PRESIDENT
MARCH 2010

GENERAL SYNOD LEGISLATION

1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides information on the following matters:

- Canons passed at the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod and the dates on which they came into effect.
- Rules made by the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod and the dates on which they came into effect.
- Alterations to the Constitution which have come into effect since the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod.
- Responses of dioceses to each Canon passed at the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod.
- Current Provisional Canons.
- Reports and recommendations on Provisional Canons pursuant to Section 28(3)(iii) of the Constitution.

The report on Provisional Canons will assist in deliberations on items 3.1 and 3.2 in Book 2 of the General Synod papers.

2. CANONS PASSED AT THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD AND THE DATES ON WHICH THEY CAME INTO EFFECT

CANON	TITLE	EFFECTIVE DATE
No 01, 2007	Canon to Amend the Primate Canon 1985	21 October 2007
No 03, 2007	A Canon to Amend the Strategic Issues, Commissions, Task Forces and Networks Canon 1998	21 October 2007
No 04, 2007	Financial Protection Canon Amendment Canon 2007	24 October 2007
No 05, 2007	Offences Canon Amendment Canon 2007	24 October 2007
No 07, 2007	Australian College of Theology Canon 2007	25 October 2007
No 09, 2007	Long Service Leave Canon 2007	Upon assent by all dioceses. Not in effect.
No 10, 2007	Canon Concerning Holy Orders 2004	26 October 2007
No 11, 2007	Protection of the Environment Canon 2007	26 October 2007
No 12, 2007	Special Tribunal Canon Repeal Canon 2007	26 October 2007
No 13, 2007	Special Tribunal Canon 2007	26 October 2007
No 14, 2007	Episcopal Standards Canon 2007	26 October 2007
No 15, 2007	National Register Canon 2007	26 October 2007
No 17, 2007	Holy Order (Reception into Ministry) Canon 2004	25 October 2007

3. RULES MADE BY THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD AND THE DATES ON WHICH THEY CAME INTO EFFECT

RULE	TITLE	EFFECTIVE DATE
No 1, 2007	Rule to Amend Rule I – Standing Orders	20 October 2007
No 2, 2007	Rule to Amend Clause 2 of Rule II – Rules for the appointment of a Standing Committee of General Synod and defining its powers and duties	26 October 2007
No 3, 2007	Rule to Amend Rule XVIII – a Rule under Section 63 of the Constitution	20 October 2007
No 4, 2007	Rule to Amend Clause 4 of Rule II – Rules for the appointment of a Standing Committee of General Synod and defining its powers and duties	21 October 2007

4. BILLS AND CANONS ALTERING THE CONSTITUTION WHICH HAVE NOT COME INTO EFFECT

The following Bills and Canons to alter the Constitution were passed at sessions of the General Synod up to and including the Fourteenth Session and have not come into effect:

- A Bill to alter the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia with respect to the Ordination of Women (Bill 1, 1981)
- A Bill to alter the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia with respect to the Mode of Appointment of the Appellate Tribunal (Bill 2, 1981)
- Constitution Alteration Canon 1987
Constitution Alteration Bill 1987 (Bill 1, 1987)
- Constitution Alteration (Title of the Primate) Canon 1989
Constitution Alteration (Title of the Primate) Bill 1989 (Bill 3, 1989)
- Constitution Amendment (Section 51) Canon 1992
- Constitution Amendment (Relations with other Churches) Canon 2004
- Constitution Alteration (Chapter IX) Canon 2004
- Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2007
- Constitution Alteration (Chapter IX) Canon Amendment Canon 2007
- Constitution Amendment (Section 10) Canon 2007
- Constitution Amendment (Section 54A) Canon 2007
- Constitution Amendment (Suspension of Bishops) Canon 2007
- Constitution Amendment (Provinces and Dioceses) Canon 2007

No alterations to the Constitution came into effect in the period since the Fourteenth Session of the General Synod in October 2007.

5. RESPONSES OF DIOCESES TO EACH CANON PASSED AT THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

See the following table recording:

- Canons requiring assent or adoption to have effect in a diocese
- Canons altering the Constitution.

**RESPONSES BY DIOCESES TO CANONS PASSED BY THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD
REQUIRING ASSENT OR ADOPTION TO COME INTO EFFECT IN A DIOCESE***

	Canon 09 Long Service Leave Canon 2007	Canon 10 Canon Concerning Holy Orders 2004	Canon 11 Protection of the Environment Canon 2007	Canon 14 Episcopal Standards Canon 2007	Canon 17 Holy Orders (Reception into Ministry) Canon 2004	Canon P01 Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 2007
ADELAIDE	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
ARMIDALE	Assented	Adopted		Adopted	Adopted	Assented
BALLARAT	Assented	Adopted	Adopted			Non-Assent
BATHURST	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Non-Assent
BENDIGO						Assented
BRISBANE	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
BUNBURY	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
CANBERRA & GOULBURN	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
GIPPSLAND	Assented	Adopted	Adopted		Adopted	Assented
GRAFTON	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted		Deferred
MELBOURNE	Assented	Adopted	Adopted			Assented
NEWCASTLE	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	
NORTHERN TERRITORY	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
NORTH QUEENSLAND	Assented	Adopted	Non-Assent	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
NORTH WEST AUSTRALIA	Assented	Adopted	Rejected	Adopted	Rejected	Assented
PERTH	Assented	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Non-Assent
RIVERINA	Adopted		Non-Assent	Adopted		Assented
ROCKHAMPTON	Assented			Assented	Assented	Non-Assent
SYDNEY						Assented
TASMANIA	Assented		Adopted	Adopted	Adopted	Assented
THE MURRAY	Assented					
WANGARATTA	Assented	Adopted	Adopted		Adopted	Assented
WILLOCHRA	Assented	Adopted	Non-Assent	Adopted	Adopted	Non-Assent

*** Note: A blank in the table signifies that the relevant diocese has either not considered the Canon or has not reported.**

**RESPONSES BY DIOCESES TO CANONS PASSED BY THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD
TO ALTER THE CONSTITUTION***

	Canon 02 Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2007	Canon 06 Constitution Alteration (Chapter IX) Canon Amendment Canon 2007	Canon 08 Constitution Amendment (Section 10) Canon 2007	Canon 16 Constitution Amendment (Section 54A) Canon 2007	Canon 18 Constitution Amendment (Suspension of Bishops) Canon 2007	Canon 19 Constitution Amendment (Provinces and Dioceses) Canon 2007
ADELAIDE	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
ARMIDALE	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
BALLARAT	Assented		Assented			
BATHURST	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
BENDIGO						
BRISBANE	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
BUNBURY	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
CANBERRA & GOULBURN	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
GIPPSLAND	Assented			Assented	Assented	
GRAFTON		Assented		Assented		Non Assent
MELBOURNE	Assented		Assented			
NEWCASTLE	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
NORTHERN TERRITORY	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
NORTH QUEENSLAND	Assented		Assented			Assented
NORTH WEST AUSTRALIA	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Rejected
PERTH	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
RIVERINA	Assented	Assented			Assented	Assented
ROCKHAMPTON						
SYDNEY					Assented	
TASMANIA	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented
THE MURRAY						
WANGARATTA	Assented		Assented	Assented		Assented
WILLOCHRA	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented	Assented

*** Note: A blank in the table signifies that the relevant diocese has either not considered the Canon or has not reported.**

6. CURRENT PROVISIONAL CANONS

- Provisional Canon P3, 2004 – Restraint on Certain Consecrations Canon 2004
- Provisional Canon P01, 2007 – Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 2007.

7. PROVISIONAL CANONS - REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 28(3)(iii) OF THE CONSTITUTION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This report is made pursuant to Section 28(3)(iii) of the Constitution concerning two Provisional Canons, namely:

- Provisional Canon P3, 2004 – Restraint on Certain Consecrations Canon 2004
- Provisional Canon P01, 2007 – Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 2007.

The Restraint on Certain Consecrations Canon 2004 is presented to the Fifteenth Session of the General Synod as Bill 16 – A Bill for the Restraint on Certain Consecrations Canon 2010 (Provisional Canon P3, 2004) which may be found at page 2-104 of Book 2 of the papers for the Session.

The Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 2007 is presented to the Fifteenth Session of the General Synod as Bill 17 – A Bill for the Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 1981 Amendment Canon 2010 (Provisional Canon P01, 2007) which may be found at page 2-109 of Book 2 of the papers for the Session.

A detailed report on each Provisional Canon follows.

7.2 PROVISIONAL CANON P3, 2004 – RESTRAINT ON CERTAIN CONSECRATIONS CANON 2004

7.2.1 Assent without report or recommendation

The following dioceses assented to this Provisional Canon without report or recommendation:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| • Ballarat | • Grafton | • Perth |
| • Bathurst | • Newcastle | • Rockhampton |
| • Bunbury | • North Queensland | • Tasmania |
| • Canberra & Goulburn | • North West Australia | • Willochra |
| • Gippsland | • Northern Territory | |

7.2.2 Assent with report or recommendation

The Diocese of Brisbane assented to the Provisional Canon with the following report and recommendations:

1. Section 2 and Section 3 – it is recommended that the words “of this Church” be added at the end of each section, so as to provide for increased clarity.
2. In Section 3, the words “must not participate” could be construed by a scrupulous person so as to prevent a bishop in this church from even attending the consecration of a person as a bishop otherwise than in accordance with the canon. The person being consecrated may be a family member or friend. It is assumed that the prohibition relates to the ceremonies associated with the actual consecration, such as the laying on of hands. This should be made clearer.

7.2.3 Dissent without report or recommendation

The following dioceses dissented from the Provisional Canon without report or recommendation:

- Riverina
- The Murray

7.2.4 Dissent with report or recommendation

The following dioceses dissented from the Provisional Canon with a report or recommendations:

Armidale The Synod wanted to protect the traditional autonomy of Bishops and their Dioceses.

The Synod wanted to protect the right of Bishops and their Diocese to interact with other denominations as they see fit.

Bendigo The Canon to Restrain Certain Consecrations was dissented from by the Diocese of Bendigo at its Synod in August 2006, for the reason that a priest from a Diocese who was consecrated Bishop in another Church would be acting contrary to the command of his own Bishop, and therefore in breach of discipline and subject to the Diocesan Tribunal if necessary.

It is considered that the Consecration of Bishops Canon 1966 to 1969 by implication provides that a Bishop in the Anglican Church may not participate in the consecration of a priest in another Church. However, if it is considered that there is any doubt, then an amendment to the Consecration of Bishops Canon should be made along the following lines: "A person who is a Bishop in this Church must not participate in the consecration of a person as a Bishop of this Church or of another Church or religion otherwise than in accordance with the Constitution and with this Canon and with any relevant Canon or relevant ordinance."

Melbourne The Provisional Canon was approved because:

- (i) the perceived need for this Provisional Canon has now gone;
- (ii) there may be unintended consequences in relation to the ordained ministry or ecumenical relations of the Provisional Canon were made;
- (iii) there are reservations about imposing sanctions of the kind proposed by the Provisional Canon on ordained clergy.

Wangaratta There is a provision in subsections 4(c) and (d) that the provisions restraining certain consecrations do not apply to the Primate or a Metropolitan, or a person acting with the consent of the Primate or a Metropolitan. If such consecrations are unacceptable then they should be unacceptable for all Bishops.

7.2.5 Dioceses still to consider the Provisional Canon

Adelaide The Synod has not yet considered this Provisional Canon but the Diocesan Council has affirmed its principle, noting that it would require adoption by ordinance of diocesan synod if it is to have effect in a diocese or on its bishop and for that reason it is unlikely to be adopted in a diocese whose bishop disagrees with it. The Canon is therefore unlikely to have effect in all dioceses. However, the Council considers it reflects an important principle and should be adopted at the highest level in the Australian Church and should therefore become a Canon of General Synod.

Sydney The Standing Committee of the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney recommended to the Synod in 2005 that it take no further action with respect to this Provisional Canon in the foreseeable future.

7.3 SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY CANON 1981 AMENDMENT CANON 2010 (PROVISIONAL CANON P01, 2007)

7.3.1 Assent without report or recommendation

The following dioceses have assented to this Canon without report or recommendation:

- | | | |
|------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| • Adelaide | • Canberra & Goulburn | • Northern Territory |
| • Armidale | • Gippsland | • Riverina |
| • Bendigo | • Melbourne | • Sydney |
| • Brisbane | • North Queensland | • Tasmania |
| • Bunbury | • North West Australia | • Wangaratta |

7.3.2 Assent with report or recommendation

Grafton The Canon received assent after consideration of the following matters:

1. Sacramental

The Catechism identifies that Christ has given two sacraments to the Church: baptism and Holy Communion. A sacrament is defined as “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given to us by Christ himself, as a means by which we receive that grace, and a pledge to assure us of this”.

There have also been identified by the Church what might be called “sacramental signs”: confirmation, ordination, holy unction, confession and holy matrimony. These have been seen as outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace received at the time of their administration. Whether each of these depend upon baptism is debatable. Certainly the first two are so dependant.

In relation to marriage the ministers of the sacrament have always been seen as the couple themselves. This gives some weight to marriage being a “natural” sacrament – one in which humanity engages at the

level of the natural order of creation, and thus not dependent upon baptism.

2. Evangelistic

I do not believe that the pastoral services of the Church are to be primarily about evangelism. They may well give such an opportunity but it must not be the primary ministry response to a couple who come asking for marriage.

3. Pastoral

In the social context of today, with the availability of civil marriage celebrants, there are fewer couples asking to be married in Church. Over the years I have asked couples why they have chosen to be married in Church. There have been a range of responses, but the most common response has been that they are desirous of God's blessing. At a pastoral level I would want to encourage and assist that couple to explore what is going on for them so that they might understand more fully the understanding of Christian marriage.

7.3.3 Dissent without report or recommendation

The following dioceses dissented from the Canon without report or recommendation:

- Bathurst
- Rockhampton
- Willochra

7.3.4 Dissent with report or recommendation

The following dioceses dissented from the Canon with a report or recommendation:

Ballarat Because this Canon relates to the nature of the sacrament of marriage, it is a matter which needs further debate by the whole church gathering at Synod.

Perth The Diocese of Perth dissented from the Solemnization of Matrimony Canon 2007 for the following reasons:

- 1 In support of the Canon were arguments highlighting the importance, in an increasingly secular society, of the Church presenting a

hospitable image to those who do not profess the Christian faith. These arguments appear to spring from a fear that when the Church has, on occasion, to say "No," (for example, in the current canonical situation where neither member of a couple seeking marriage has been baptised) that "No" will be delivered in a hostile, reproving or conversation-stopping manner. However, others are able to give testimony to the way a graciously-explained and conversation-inviting "No" in such a case can, in fact, open doors to genuine evangelism and thoroughly Christian pastoral care. These have often led to baptismal preparation and the joyful initiation of persons and couples into full Christian belonging and Anglican church membership.

- 2 The primary reasons for the Diocese of Perth dissenting from the Ordinance was doctrinal, theological, pastoral, liturgical and missional.
- 3 The key doctrinal and theological issues are well summarised in notes prepared by Archbishop Carnley for the Doctrine Commission when the matter was canvassed in that forum some time ago (Attachment 1). Dr Carnley's submission takes cognizance of the key doctrinal and theological issues which formed a part of the debate at the Synod.
- 4 The pastoral, liturgical and missional aspects could be outlined as follows:
 - a) In an increasingly secular society the Church must be clear and honest about what the Christian faith and Christian liturgy believe to be the truth about God and about Christian marriage. For the Church to say a too-easy "Yes" to the marriage of a couple where neither party has been baptised may result in the Church, its ministers, its liturgies and its buildings being seen merely as additional providers of commodified resources in the highly-commercialised wedding industry. Votes against the proposed Canon may be seen as a vote of confidence in the pastoral and evangelistic skills and the spiritual and theological integrity of clergy who are approached about a possible marriage celebration.

- b) Further arguments against the Canon focus on the way many Anglicans continue to value Christian marriage as a sacrament. While marriage is listed with those rites "commonly called sacraments" in the Thirty-Nine Articles, as distinct from the Dominical sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, it continues to be a rite which expresses sacramentally important truths of our faith. Marriage, as explained in the introductory remarks required to be given by the minister in the Second Order for Marriage in *A Prayer Book for Australia*, expresses profound truths about God's love and about the relationship between Christ and the Church.
- c) It is not clear how this sacramental dimension of marriage would be expressed by the marriage of persons neither of whom is in relationship by baptism with either Christ or his Church. Further, the various Orders for Marriage (BCP, AAPB, APBA) which Anglican clergy are authorised to use under Federal law may not be amended to remove such references to Christ and the Church as may be problematic for those couples where neither member professes the Christian faith. To produce an order for marriage which would exclude expressions of faith in Father, Son and Holy Spirit would be severely to damage the powerful message of God's reconciling love and indwelling holiness, which are at the heart of the sacramental character of Christian marriage.

Conclusion

Marriage as a basis for family life and as a bond of companionship between a man and a woman is provided for by civil celebrants under Commonwealth law. It is not necessary for the Anglican Church to offer services that invoke a generic "blessing" on such marriages. Instead, a vote against the proposed Canon may be seen as a vote for the continuing valuation of marriage where at least one member of the couple has been baptised as an important contributor to our identity as Anglican Christians, who name God's blessing upon marriage in fully Trinitarian terms.

7.3.5 Dioceses still to consider the Provisional Canon

The following dioceses have still to consider the Provisional Canon:

- Newcastle
- The Murray.

ATTACHMENT 1

A RESPONSE OF THE MOST REVEREND DR PETER CARNLEY AC TO A PAPER BY THE RIGHT REVEREND DR GLENN DAVIES ENTITLED 'A DRAFT REPORT OF THE DOCTRINE COMMISSION ON THE SOLEMNISATION OF MIXED MARRIAGES'¹

1. In his draft paper Bishop Davies argues that the Church should permit the marriage in Church of unbelievers, thus abandoning the present requirement that at least one party must be baptised. This requirement that at least one party should be baptised is enshrined in the General Synod Solemnization of Matrimony Canon (Canon 3 of 1981, Section 3(b)). This Canon replaced the relevant canons of 1603, which, while making no mention of the status of either party, probably simply assumed that all citizens of England at that time had been baptised as infants. Thus the question of the marriage of unbaptised people did not arise as a live issue and is therefore not addressed in the Canons of 1603.
2. The requirement of the General Synod Canon that at least one party must be baptised is almost certainly based upon St. Paul's statement in *I Corinthians* 7:13 in which he argues that this may provide an opportunity for an unbelieving spouse to be saved. (But see also a similar statement in *I Peter* 3:1). However, Dr Davies points out that the more consistent Biblical advice to Christian believers is to avoid all marriage with unbelievers (*II Corinthians* 6:14), just as under the Mosaic covenant Israelites were forbidden to marry Canaanites (*Deut.* 7:3; *cf. Genesis* 28:1-2). *I Corinthians* 7:13 is then held to apply only to an adult convert who is already married prior to coming to faith and baptism. The argument seems to be that if a person is already married and then comes to faith, then he or she may remain in the marriage (unless the unbelieving partner wishes to divorce). It is in this kind of case that it is hoped that the unbelieving spouse may eventually come to faith also and be saved. But a person who is already a believer prior to marriage should without exception not marry an unbeliever at all. For Dr Davies, it is not for some reason possible in cases where a believer cannot find another believer to marry to opt for second best as it were and marry an unbeliever and then to argue on the basis of the Pauline hope-principle of *I Corinthians* 7:13 that the unbelieving spouse might also eventually come to faith and be saved. Just why the same principle cannot apply in this case is not spelled out by Dr. Davies. Rather, it is simply asserted that it is 'against the teaching of Scripture' for a believer to marry an unbeliever because there is already an existing teaching of Scripture that counsels against Christian believers countenancing marriage to unbelievers. The conclusion is then drawn that the General Synod Canon should not require one party to be baptised, because according to Scripture both parties should be baptised. It is not clear whether the Church could solemnize marriages where one party is baptised and the other not baptised while not *requiring* one to be baptised. But if the marriage of a baptised person to an unbaptised person is 'against the teaching of Scripture' then it is hard to see that the Church could act contrary to Scripture.

¹ By 'mixed marriages' what is meant is not marriage between Christian people of mixed denomination, but marriages between baptized and unbaptised people.

3. However, the argument then is that the Church should not just solemnize marriages when both parties are baptised, but also when neither party is baptised. The reasons given by Bishop Davies in support of the view that the Church should solemnize marriages where neither party is baptised are of enormous theological interest. It is held (in section 9) that marriage is 'a creation ordinance rather than a redemptive ordinance.' Throughout the Bible marriage is 'recognised as an institution beyond the Abrahamic community.' Marriage is understood to have been instituted for all humankind as God's image bearers. This is why a recent convert to Christian faith may remain in an existing marriage; there is no suggestion that the existing marriage is illegitimate or invalid. A radical distinction is then drawn between baptism and the Lord's Supper which are said to be 'redemptive ordinances' and marriage which is said to be a 'creation ordinance.' Creation ordinances are said to be 'for all who are made in the image of God' whereas 'redemptive ordinances' apply only to the community of the redeemed. As a consequence, God's blessing bestowed on the marriage of those outside the Christian community is a matter of 'common grace' and not of 'redemptive grace.'
4. It is important to acknowledge that the desire to permit the solemnization of the marriage of unbaptised people is not driven just by a pragmatic desire to 'engage effectively with unchurched Australians', though this would be one positive advantage of permitting the solemnization of marriages between unbelievers. Dr Davies sees it as a good thing to rejoice in 'the things we have in common with unbelievers.'
5. On the other hand, the fact that unbelievers come to the Church for marriage at all suggests that there may be a spark of belief and of the knowledge of the will of God in them, and we may rightly 'invite them to receive the blessing of God in a public ceremony'. The Church would not therefore simply be accommodating itself in the manner of liberalism to the secular reality of marriage by entirely abandoning reference to God and the blessing of God. Indeed, it is assumed that while unbelieving parties might not believe in Jesus as the Christ of God, and therefore have no redemptive knowledge of God, they might nevertheless exhibit an awareness of God the Creator in whose image they are made, and whose blessing they desire on their union.
6. How are we to understand the radical and quite explicit distinction in all this between a creation ordinance and a redemptive ordinance, and between common grace and redemptive grace? How is the natural or creational revelation of God to all those made in his image, and who are able to receive God's blessing, really to be held apart from the redemptive revelation of God in Christ? Indeed, if God's blessing is bestowed on unbelieving parties, in the sense that they have not come to faith in Christ, but may have a kind of belief in God, how is this blessing not in some sense redemptive and sanctifying? How does it not effect some kind of relationship with God or effect some degree of reconciliation with God? How is God's sanctifying presence removed from the situation? Can this kind of blessing really be isolated from the redemption won by Christ?
7. I think it is fairly clear that we are here dealing with a classic example of federal theology (from *foedus* = contract) of the kind that developed in Britain and America during the late nineteenth and twentieth century under the influence of Scholastic

Calvinism.² This kind of theology operated with the Calvinist conception of a *duplex cognitio* or a twofold knowledge of God – one being mediated through the natural order to all those created in the image of God, and the other being mediated through Christ relating to the divine redemptive purposes. It has to be acknowledged that this doctrine, though generally identified as ‘Calvinist’ may not have been taught by Calvin himself, for Calvin explicitly stated that as a consequence of sin no human knowledge of God as creator is possible without first knowing Christ as redeemer. In other words, in Calvin the movement of epistemological thought is from God the Redeemer to God the Creator, even if in the historical sequence the order commences with creation.³ However, in the federal theology of Britain and the United States and the developed Westminster tradition, the idea of a twofold knowledge of God becomes unmistakably clear.

8. The originating historical paradigm of this kind of theology may be found in the writings of Zacharias Ursinus. In the *Major Catechism* of 1562, Ursinus articulated the idea of a primary natural knowledge of God on the part of those made in his image and the idea of a second knowledge of God on the part of the redeemed in Christ. Indeed, it was in this work of 1562 that Ursinus articulated the fundamental concept of a *foedus naturale* probably for the first time.⁴ The foundational doctrines of federal theology were there articulated in the following way: ‘Question x: What is taught in the divine law? Answer: What sort of covenant in creation God has entered into with humans; by which pact humans would have conducted themselves in that service, and what God would require of humans after beginning with humans in a new covenant of grace. Question xxxvi: What is the difference between Law and Gospel? Answer: The Law contains the covenant of nature initiated in the creation by God with humanity, that is known to humanity by nature and it requires from humanity perfect obedience to God, and it promises eternal life to those who keep it, and threatens eternal punishments for those who do not fulfil it. But the Gospel contains the covenant of grace, that is, existing but not known naturally: it shows to us the fulfilment in Christ of his justice, which the law requires, and its restoration in us through the Spirit of Christ: and it promises eternal life by grace because of Christ to those who believe in him.’
9. In other words, in federal theology, beginning with Ursinus, the pattern of revelation is that God's will and legal purposes are in the first instances apprehended by humankind and it is in the light of this natural or creational revelation that we can then recognize and interpret God's redemptive purposes in Christ. The concept of the *foedus naturale* is a prelapsarian covenant (or more correctly contract, since God sets conditions rather than entering into an unconditional commitment), which contrasts with the *foedus gratiae* conceived (for example by Zwingli and Bullinger) as a postlapsarian covenant made with sinners after the fall as the promise of salvation in Christ. Sometimes Scholastic Calvinism articulated further permutations on the theme of nature and grace by making additional distinctions between ‘general’ and ‘special’ grace or ‘efficient’ and ‘sufficient’ grace. Insofar as

² See David Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in 16th Century Reformation Thought*, Oxford, 1990, especially Chapter 2 ‘The Background to the Prelapsarian Covenant’, and also James B. Torrance, ‘The Concept of Federal Theology - Was Calvin a Federal Theologian?’ in *Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser, Grand Rapids, 1994, pp. 15-40.

³ T.H.L. Packer, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God: A Study in the Theology of John Calvin*, Edinburgh, 1952. The alternative view is put by Edward A. Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology*, New York, 1952.

⁴ See David Weir, *op. cit.*, pp. 104ff.

Dr Davies resorts to the use of the concepts of 'common' and 'redemptive' grace he appears to stand squarely within this federal tradition.

10. Federal theology's basic schema of the revelation of the knowledge of the will and legal requirements of God in the making of the primary contractual arrangements with humanity and a subsequent redemptive knowledge of the revelation of God in Christ distinguishes the work of the Creator from that of the Redeemer and Sanctifier. Indeed, in federal theology creation, redemption and sanctification are held apart. This is the point at which Karl Barth took issue with federal theology. Barth insisted that when God is revealed, what is revealed is not a contractual arrangement extrinsic to God's being. Rather what is revealed is intrinsic to God's being (ontological): To the questions who, how and what of revelation, Barth's answer is *God* reveals himself, God reveals himself *through himself*, and God reveals *himself*. This means that revelation is not so much a matter of communication as of communion, a matter not of the revelation of propositions outlining God's will and legal requirements, but of inter-personal knowledge.
11. Furthermore, for Barth the God who reveals is from all eternity God the Holy Trinity, not one person of the Trinity in distinction from the others. When God is revealed he is always revealed as creator, reconciler and sanctifier. The redemptive and reconciling Word of God, and the sanctifying presence of the Spirit of God cannot be deleted from the revelatory and creative activity of God. This means that when God acts creatively it is God the Holy Trinity who acts and reconciliation and sanctification are integral to that creative act.
12. To prize the Persons of the Trinity apart in the manner of federal theology is to reveal an inadequate understanding of the divine identity. Indeed, it is to take the first step towards establishing not just a distinction but a fundamental difference between the Persons of the Trinity. If the revelation of God in his creational activity involves the Father, but not the redemptive and reconciling Word of God or the sanctifying presence of the Spirit of God, then we have a real problem relating to the divine identity. But, as Alan J. Torrance says in his study of Barth's Trinitarian theology, the problem here is not just a flawed doctrine of revelation but a flawed doctrine of creation:

Revelation and reconciliation are *intrinsic*, and not *extrinsic*, to God's act of creation and their theological exposition should, therefore, be included within it. The creation of communion (as this includes epistemic at-one-ment and the *metanoia* intrinsic to the reconciling event of revelation) is not a peripheral or subordinate event but, rather, one that is central and integral to the divine creativity conceived in its totality - God's purpose here is integral to the event of *creatio ex nihilo* and not incidental to it.⁵

In other words, God does not create extrinsic to himself with no interest in entering into union and fellowship with Creation, and particularly with those created in God's image. Creation involves revelation, including God's intention to enter into reconciled union with humanity; however, the desire for union on the part of God not only invites humanity to a knowledge of God, but humanity so drawn into union with God by knowing him is changed and hallowed by God. Creation, revelation, reconciliation and sanctification are inter-woven themes. They cannot be pulled

⁵ Alan J. Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, Edinburgh, 1996, p. 64

entirely apart as in the particular version of the western *ordo salutis* of federal theology.

13. Already it will be clear that we may not wish to allow the nature-grace model of federal theology to condition our understanding of marriage. I certainly come to a number of conclusions that are at variance with those of Bishop Davies. For example, Bishop Davies believes that 'the Prayer Book's understanding of marriage bears application to marriage outside the covenant community.' This, he says, may be seen in the threefold causes for which marriage was ordained: the procreation of children, a remedy against sin so as to avoid fornication, and the companionship between a man and a woman. But these purposes of God in ordaining the institution of marriage may not just be an expression of his creational will and legal requirements for the purpose of establishing natural families and the procreation of children, with no intrinsic overtones of redemptive and sanctifying grace. Indeed, what is 'a remedy against sin' if not an instrument of human redemption and thus of redemptive grace?
14. Moreover, the purposes of marriage may really only be understood within the covenant community, where marriage is not just a *sacramentum signum* (a sign of the union between Christ and the Church; cf *Ephesians* 5:25) but a *sacramentum vinculum* (a pledge of fidelity), a sign by which the redemptive grace or help of God is conveyed both to remedy the distorting evils introduced into human sexuality by original sin and to bless and hallow the marriage relationship. This is why marriage, while not being instituted by Christ as generally necessary for the salvation of everyone, is numbered amongst those signs of grace 'commonly called sacraments'. Marriage redeems in the sense that it saves the parties from falling into the sin of fornication. The Pauline hope that one party may lead another to faith is a further dimension of the possible operation of the redemptive grace of God in marriage so as to effect the salvation of the party concerned.
15. The Prayer Book theology of marriage as an institution which saves the parties from sin of promiscuous fornication is a derivative of the medieval theology of Hugh of St Victor, the first western theologian to write a treatise on marriage, who held that marriage is not just a secular reality but a saving mystery. In articulating the second of the purposes for which marriage was ordained by God, the Anglican Reformers simply took this received understanding of marriage into the Prayer Book liturgy. Also the communion of man and woman for mutual society, help and comfort is not just a natural, secular and pragmatic reality, but a reflection in the domestic church or family of the sanctifying presence of the Spirit of God in sustaining love and fellowship in Christ. What sense would it make to unbelieving and unbaptised parties, outside of the company of the redeemed, to speak of the marriage bond in the Prayer Book language of a sign of the union of Christ and his Church?
16. In other words, we may not wish to begin with the legal and contractual presuppositions of federal theology and interpret redemptive realities in the light of a natural revelation of the will and legal purposes of God in creation, but the other way around. We understand God's true purposes in creation from a Christological perspective; they are the proleptic anticipation in creation of what we know definitively in the fulfilment of the revelation of Christ. The revelation of God being unitary not duplex, we Christians cannot view creation but in the light of God's saving, reconciling and sanctifying intentions.

17. If we do not begin by talking of a difference between a creational ordinance and a redemptive ordinance, common grace and redemptive grace, since from a Christian point of view all marriage is both creational and therefore revelatory, and because revelatory both redemptive, and sanctifying, then the Church should not think in terms of blessing marriage in a secularized form. For us marriage is always a redemptive ordinance that takes place and is lived out 'in the Lord', ie. amongst the baptised, ideally when both parties are baptised, but on occasion when only one is baptised (for this may become an opportunity for the other party also to believe and be saved). For us Christians marriage is always more than a secular reality; it is also a saving mystery (*Ephesians* 5:32). Those who are not baptised but who come to the Church for marriage because they seek the blessing of God should be introduced to the redemptive and sanctifying dimensions that are intrinsic to God's blessing so as to appreciate marriage as a saving mystery. In this case they should be called to faith and baptised into Christ in the name of God the Holy Trinity.
18. The pronouncing of a blessing of God understood to be the blessing of a God other than God the Holy Trinity, or a basic primordial Creator God somehow behind the God of Trinitarian faith, or even worse, the blessing of God the Father and Creator of all those made in *his* image, but somehow excluding the other two Persons of the Trinity, seems to me a very dangerous course. For us Christians, when God acts the Trinity acts, and when God blesses the Trinity blesses. We know no other. Secular marriage between unbelievers is best left to secular marriage celebrants.

CHANGES IN THE EPISCOPATE

APPOINTMENTS

The Rev'd Dr Christopher Jones was consecrated on 26 February 2008 to be Missioner Bishop (Stewardship) in the Diocese of Tasmania.

Archdeacon Ross Nicholson was consecrated on 26 February 2008 to be Missioner Bishop (Training and Projects) in the Diocese of Tasmania.

Archdeacon Kay Goldsworthy was consecrated on 22 May 2008 to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Perth

Canon Barbara Darling was consecrated on 31 May 2008 to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Melbourne.

Archdeacon Stuart Robinson was consecrated and installed on 31 January 2009 as Bishop of Canberra & Goulburn.

Archdeacon Peter Stuart was consecrated on 2 February 2009 to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Newcastle.

Archdeacon John Stead was consecrated on 29 August 2009 to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Bathurst.

The Right Rev'd John Parkes was installed on 13 December 2009 as Bishop of Wangaratta.

The Rev'd Peter Hayward was consecrated on 13 April 2010 to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Sydney

Bishop Allan Ewing was installed on 10 July 2010 as Bishop of Bunbury.

RETIREMENTS

Bishop Graeme Rutherford, Assistant Bishop of Newcastle, retired 7 August 2008.

Bishop George Browning, Bishop of Canberra & Goulburn, retired 7 August 2008.

Bishop Peter Tasker, Assistant Bishop of Sydney, retired 7 June 2009.

Bishop David McCall, Bishop of Bunbury, retired 12 December 2009.

RESIGNATIONS

Bishop David Farrer, Bishop of Wangaratta, resigned August 2008.

Bishop Mark Burton, Assistant Bishop of Perth, resigned November 2008

Bishop Stephen Hale, Assistant Bishop of Melbourne, resigned June 2009

Bishop Peter Danaher, Assistant Bishop of Bathurst, resigned July 2009.

Bishop Alan Stewart, Assistant Bishop of Sydney, resigned February 2010.

Bishop Stephen Pickard, Assistant Bishop of Adelaide, resigned April 2010

DEATHS

Bishop Robert Dann, a past Archbishop of Melbourne, died 11 April 2008.

Bishop Owen Dowling, a past Bishop of Canberra & Goulburn, died 8 May 2008

Bishop Max Thomas, a past Bishop of Wangaratta, died 11 October 2008.

Bishop Lionel Renfrey, a past Assistant Bishop of Adelaide, died 11 November 2008.

Bishop John Grindrod, a past Archbishop of Brisbane and Primate of Australia, died 4 January 2009.

Bishop Marcus Loane, a past Archbishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia, died 14 April 2009.

Bishop Henry Jerrim, a past Bishop of Tasmania, died 22 May 2009.

Bishop Robert Beal, a past Bishop of Wangaratta, died 24 June 2009.

Bishop Ken Leslie, a past Bishop of Bathurst, died 6 January 2010.

Bishop Ben Wright, a past Bishop of Bendigo, died 22 January 2010