

DIOCESE OF SYDNEY

**PRESIDENTIAL
ADDRESS
TO SYNOD
1984**

**by The Most Reverend Donald William Bradley Robinson,
A.O., M.A., Th.D., Archbishop of Sydney**

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1984

**MOORE COLLEGE
LIBRARY**

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10103247 6

Brothers of the Clergy, Brothers and Sisters of the Laity,

I welcome you to the First Ordinary Session of the Fortieth Synod of this Diocese. Some of you are taking your seat for the first time, especially among the lay representatives of the parishes. You should be aware that the Synod meets in accordance with Constitutions drawn up by the Provincial Synod of New South Wales and given effect by the Church of England Constitutions Act Amendment Act 1902 of the New South Wales Parliament. These Constitutions are a revision of those originally drawn up by a general conference of the bishops and clerical and lay representatives of all the NSW dioceses and enacted by Parliament in 1866. They govern all the dioceses of the Province, and they give to the Synod of each power to "make ordinances upon and in respect of all matters concerning the order and good government of the Church and the regulation of its affairs within that diocese". The primary business of Synod therefore is the making of ordinances. Synod is not a general debating forum, nor is it a convention for the deepening of the spiritual life. Our power to legislate for ourselves is not unlimited. It is subject to the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia, especially to the Fundamental Declarations and Ruling Principles of the Constitution. All we do must be subject to the faith and order of the one holy catholic and apostolic church, and in particular to the doctrine and principles embodied in the Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles of Religion. The Constitution endorses the diocese as the unit of organisation in our Church and as being the See of a Bishop.

It is within our own hands to determine how the Synod will be composed. The Constitutions laid down how it was to be composed to start with, but Synod itself may regulate the number of clergy and lay representatives to be summoned. The very first Constitutions in 1866 envisaged that the number might need to be restricted in future synods. Numbers went down when the Diocese of Goulburn was formed in 1869, but the only changes since then have resulted in increased representation. However, I do not believe we can responsibly continue the way we are going. Our first Synod in 1866 had a total of 146 members. By 1902 there were 300 members. Fifty years ago the total had grown to 506. When Archbishop Loane raised the question of the size of Synod in his Presidential Address eleven years ago, he pointed out that the total membership of that Synod was 784. The potential total attendance at this 40th Synod is about 840. If our Diocese continues to grow in the way we hope it will, we could easily be contemplating 1,000 members of Synod by the end of the century. And, almost alone among the synods of Australian dioceses, we do not summon any of the 60 or so curates, or other licensed but unbeneficed clergymen, even a number who hold distinct official positions in the Diocese. This year I have summoned 31 clergymen in this latter category (and the Standing Committee has elected a corresponding number of lay representatives). At this Synod we

will be considering an ordinance to approve an approach by Provincial Synod to the State Parliament to alter the provision about summoning those who hold a distinct official position in favour of enabling the Synod itself to determine which clergymen, other than those having a separate cure of souls, should be summoned to Synod. It would be surprising, however, if the Synod were to decide to summon fewer under this new arrangement than are summoned at present in the "official position" category.

Eleven years ago Archbishop Loane expressed the view that "the present size and structure of our Synod is much too large and that it will develop yet further out of proportion if the present system continues. It is too large as a body whose members are involved in debate on issues which entail legal, constitutional, financial or theological considerations, and whose voting should be judicious, far-sighted, and for the welfare of the whole church". Following this, Synod considered a proposal to reduce the lay representation from the parishes from two to one, but rejected it. Yet we cannot be content with the status quo. Nearly a third of the members of Synod could not get into the Chapter House, even if they turned up. No satisfactory alternative meeting place has been discovered. Those who are used to the ways of Synod and know how to seek out the chief seats in this synagogue probably don't notice the steady expansion very much, but it is a situation for which I feel bound to apologise to new members. I hope Synod will consider setting up some group to consider this problem and that some steps may be taken in the course of this 40th Synod to reform the system of representation.

IN THE DIOCESE

Since last Synod I have, after much consultation, appointed a full-time Archdeacon in the Northern and Wollongong regions of the Diocese. Archdeacon Richardson therefore has moved from part-time to full-time Archdeacon of North Sydney, and the Reverend Victor Roberts has become Archdeacon of Wollongong and Camden. As it happens, the Reverend Denis Wann, who was part-time Archdeacon in the South, has succeeded Brian Richardson as Rector of Turramurra. I am thankful for his very conscientious service. Archdeacon Richardson will also assist me in matters relating to curates and the implementation of the Ministry Commission's report to which I will refer later.

Two regional evangelistic missions have been held this year under the leadership of Canon Chapman, South West Outreach, organised by our churches in the Liverpool and Fairfield areas and Goodspeak based at Hurstville, and we are looking forward to the visit of Dr. Leighton Ford in September next year for "Sydney Celebration". Every part of our city needs the preaching of the Gospel, and the mission

next year will use both the Cathedral and the Entertainment Centre for its meetings.

Last month saw the completion of arrangements for the amalgamation of the Church of England Homes with the Home Mission Society. This was carefully planned and seems a satisfactory move. The work of the Homes has developed over about a century and continues to fulfil an effective ministry in a changing social scene. But now the administration and the assets of the Homes and of the Home Mission Society have been combined, and the work of the Homes has been combined with Careforce to form the Welfare Division of the H.M.S.

H.M.S. has also accepted responsibility for the establishment of a chaplaincy for the Maori Anglican Fellowship, and thus I have been able to invite Archdeacon Kingi Ihaka of Auckland to come to this Diocese to take charge of the Maori congregation at St. John's Glebe and to work among the 16,000 Maoris who live in Sydney. He will be commissioned in the Cathedral on October 21, and I am informed that a plane load of a hundred Maoris will be coming from New Zealand to get him off to a good start and to join in a three-day marae with our own Maoris. This appointment is the culmination of discussions which Bishop Reid and I and Canon Whitham have had over some years with Archbishop Reeves, Bishop Verco of Aotearoa and other leaders of the Maori work here and in New Zealand.

It is just 25 years since the Mowll Memorial Village was opened at Castle Hill, on October 24, 1959, the first anniversary of the death of Archbishop Mowll. It has been a remarkable venture and a huge development from the modest "Church Veterans Village" which was Mrs. Mowll's dream. Seventy-eight retired clergy, deaconesses and missionaries have been accommodated and 62 wives or widows of clergyman. The administrative headquarters of the Anglican Retirement Villages is still in Mowll Village, but we now have 16 villages and 5 Nursing Homes providing for 3,350 residents in various parts of Sydney. Just on 7,000 people in all have been accommodated over the 25 years. The Board of Management's next project is St. Stephen's Village in the heart of new development in the City of Penrith on church land carefully retained by St. Stephen's Parish and made available to the Villages. The retirement villages have been skilfully managed and have not been financially dependent on the Diocese in any way. New ventures, however, are becoming increasingly difficult to finance, and the Standing Committee is recommending to Synod this year that a grant of \$25,000 be made in our special grants category to assist in the establishment of a Nursing Home attached to St. Stephen's Village in recognition of the completion of 25 years of the life of the Villages and to aid the Board in the care of the frail aged. The foundation is to be laid on Saturday next by the Minister for Health and Deputy Premier, Mr. R. J. Mulock, who is also the Local Member.

Last year I reported the opening of a new diocesan school, the Peninsular Anglican Boys' School at Warriewood, and I am glad to be able to report this year the opening of the Macarthur Anglican School at Narellan under the Headmastership of Mr. David Lloyd. This is a co-educational school, on a fine site adjoining St. Thomas' Church, Narellan, and in the midst of what is fast becoming one of the great new centres of population in this growing Diocese. The Peninsular School is under our Council for the Promotion of Anglican Diocesan Schools. The Macarthur School has its own Council under the Chairmanship of Canon Alan Patrick of Camden, and I warmly congratulate all concerned on their initiative and hard work.

At Shore, Mr. Robert Grant, formerly Senior Master at Canberra Grammar School, has succeeded Mr. B. H. Travers as Headmaster, and at The King's School Mr. Jonathan Wickham, formerly Senior Master, has succeeded Dr. Alan Acheson. Mrs. Richardson has retired from Roseville College. The Principals of three other Anglican Schools are soon to retire: Mr. Mark Bishop from Cranbrook, Miss Joyce Gibbons from Kambala, and Miss S. Morton from Meriden. We thank them all for what they have done over many years in the service of Christian education. The Synod may be interested to know that I have been meeting regularly with the chaplains of all our church schools for some time now and that these meetings have proved very valuable. The Board of Education also continues to convene conferences for councillors and principals of the schools. In these ways we are seeking to encourage the schools in their common task.

The Reverend Peter Bennie will retire from the Warden-ship of St. Paul's College in the University of Sydney in February, after 22 years in that position. Mr. Bennie is a member of this Synod under the 15th Constitution, and I take this opportunity to thank him and wish him well. The Fellows of the College have appointed the Right Reverend M. M. Thomas, Bishop of Wangaratta, to succeed him. Bishop Thomas is Chairman of the Doctrine Commission of our Church and also Chairman of the Delegates of the Australian College of Theology. He and I were fellow undergraduates at Sydney University, and I am glad to welcome him to the Diocese. (He will be the twelfth Anglican Bishop resident in the Diocese!)

During the year the death occurred of Archdeacon Emeritus R. J. Hewett, the greater part of whose active ministry was with the home base of C.M.S., and who helped to establish our early links with the Diocese of Central Tanganyika. We have lost also, after their retirement from parish ministry, the Revs. T. P. Eglinton and A. M. McLaughlin, and also the Reverends W. A. G. Hoare, David Rien, A. W. Bosser and John Bootle. Deaconess Edith Lowenstein died, full of faith, in her 100th year. We note the death of Mrs. H. C. Dunstan and Mrs. S. Barton Babbage

and among the widows of clergymen, Mrs. H. W. Baker, Mrs. W. G. Coughlan, Mrs. R. B. Robinson, Mrs. R. S. Chapple, Mrs. J. S. Moyes, and at the age of 97 Mrs. D. J. Davies, nearly 50 years after the death of her husband Archdeacon Davies of Moore College. Miss Maisie Jones, daughter of Archdeacon Davies' predecessor at Moore College, Canon Nathaniel Jones, also died in her 90s. Bishop Chandu Ray, well known to many in Sydney, died late last year while on a visit to Singapore. To the relatives of all these faithful people we extend our prayerful sympathy.

IN THE PROVINCE

The Right Reverend Owen Dowling was enthroned as eighth Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn in December last and he has now appointed the Reverend Bruce Wilson to be his assistant bishop. Mr. Wilson was ordained in this Diocese and was the second chaplain at the University of New South Wales before becoming Rector of Paddington. Early this year he moved to Canberra to become Principal of the College of Ministry, and he will retain this position. I expect to consecrate him in St. Saviour's Cathedral on October 27. The Bishop of Grafton, the Right Reverend Donald Shearman, who celebrated the 20th anniversary of his consecration in February and is now the senior diocesan bishop of the Australian church by consecration, has announced that he will retire at the end of this year. He was Bishop of Rockhampton and also Chairman of the Australian Board of Missions before coming to Grafton. I was able to visit Grafton last month for the Synod and for the completion of the centenary celebrations of the Cathedral. We should congratulate Newcastle on the completion and consecration of its noble Cathedral, and congratulate the Diocese of Riverina on its centenary, for which the Bishop of Bath and Wells came out as the special guest. Each of our four assistant bishops has visited some part of Riverina in connection with its centenary, and I hope to be there early next year. Mrs. Doreen Witt, the wife of the Bishop of Bathurst, died suddenly a few days after Christmas, and we offer our sympathy to Bishop Howell Witt. I was able to go to Bathurst for the funeral service. I have also been to Bathurst recently for a service in connection with All Saints' College. In February last our Provincial Synod met here in the Chapter House, and certain matters from that Synod will be coming before us in this session. I may also mention that all the bishops of the Province were able to spend a day in May in friendly consultation with the Roman Catholic Bishops of New South Wales. I think this is the first time such a consultation on a Provincial basis has occurred in New South Wales.

In recording matters relating to the Province I should include my consecrating of Canon Dudley Foord in February, since this was an act by me as Metropolitan of New South Wales. I explained the background and reasons for the con-

secration in Southern Cross. In November last year Canon Foord was elected to be a bishop of the Church of England in South Africa with a view to his succeeding Bishop S. C. Bradley as Presiding Bishop. As Canon Foord was a priest in this Diocese, I was asked by Bishop Bradley if I would consecrate him here under letters dimissory before he took up his duties. There are no specific provisions in our Constitution for consecrations under letters dimissory, but there is ample precedent for such action. Last year the President Bishop of the Episcopal Church of Jerusalem and the Middle East requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate under letters dimissory a clergyman who had been elected Bishop of Cyprus and the Gulf. The request was made because the clergyman was a priest of the Province of Canterbury and it was considered to be "most convenient" for the consecration to take place in that Province. It will be remembered that in 1960 the Rev. A. W. Goodwin Hudson, then a Vicar in England, was consecrated in England under letters dimissory from the Archbishop of Sydney before he took up his duties as assistant bishop in this Diocese. Because the status of the CESA has been a matter of debate for many years, I decided I should only accede to Bishop Bradley's request if it had the goodwill of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa, and also of our own Primate and a reasonable number of Australian bishops. I found that the Archbishop of Cape Town and the Episcopal Synod of the Church of the Province were agreeable to the proposal and Archbishop Russell indicated his willingness to come to Sydney to take part. (In the event he was represented by the Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman and by Bishop Inman, a former Bishop of Natal.) When I notified all the bishops of Australia of my intention, some questions were asked but only four diocesan bishops indicated their disapproval. The majority of bishops of this Province of N.S.W. expressed their goodwill and two of the Diocesans assisted me, together with ten other bishops, including the Primate, in the consecration. I do indeed believe that Bishop Foord's consecration marks the beginning of a new and hopeful phase in the relation of the two Anglican churches in Southern Africa separated since 1870, and I earnestly commend both churches, and especially Dudley and Elizabeth Foord in their demanding ministry, to your prayers in these difficult times for South Africa.

BEYOND THE PROVINCE

Beyond the Province there have been a number of changes in the Australian episcopate. Bishop Hamish Jamieson has been translated from Carpentaria to Bunbury. Archdeacon Tony Hall-Matthews has become Bishop of Carpentaria. The Very Reverend Clyde Wood, Dean of Darwin, has become Bishop of Northern Territory in succession to Bishop Mason. On July 28 the Right Reverend David

Penman was enthroned as the tenth Bishop and seventh Archbishop of Melbourne, and it is a particular pleasure to have him with us in this Synod today. The Archbishop brings a valuable breadth of experience to us in the Australian church: first by being a clergyman of the Church in New Zealand and second by his extensive service with the Church in Pakistan, in Israel, and in Lebanon. I was glad to be able to represent this Diocese, along with Bishop Reid and Bishop Short, at his enthronement, and I now ask him to convey the greetings of this Synod to the Diocese and Synod of Melbourne. I have a personal interest in the Diocese of Melbourne in that one of my sons is now one of Archbishop Penman's curates and I greatly appreciated the invitation of Bishop Grant to share in his ordination to the priesthood in St. Paul's Cathedral in February last. On that occasion Bishop Grant took the opportunity to publicly thank the Diocese of Sydney, through me, for the response from church people here to the bushfire ap-*peal* last year when \$113,855.56 was given to the Diocese of Melbourne through my Relief and Aid Fund.

Two events next year should be mentioned. I am glad to announce that the Archbishop of Canterbury will be making a visit to the Australian Church in April. He will be in this Diocese from April 18 to 22, but part of that time he will be at the Bishops' Conference at Gilbulla. Only tentative plans have been made so far for his visit here, but it is expected that he will preach in the Cathedral on Sunday evening, April 20, when it is hoped that most of the Australian Bishops will also be present. Later in the year, in August, the General Synod will meet in Sydney and the Primus of Scotland, the Most Reverend Alistair Haggart, will be with us for that.

VISION FOR GROWTH

In Synod last year I spoke of the need for planned development of the Diocese in the major growth areas and foreshadowed the launching of an appeal to support this Vision for Growth. Synod expressed "enthusiastic support" for this proposal and requested me to begin to implement the programme I outlined, and at the same time undertook to support it with "sustained prayer, financial resources and active interest". Synod also allocated \$200,000 to initiate the programme. Much has happened in the twelve months since then. A Ministry Committee has worked continuously examining the specific needs and planning the best method of fostering church growth in the designated areas. The bishops and archdeacons of Parramatta and Wollongong have been the key people on this committee, together with the New Areas Director who has co-ordinated their planning. An Appeal Committee has also been hard at work preparing our approach to the parishes. I appointed the Reverend Stuart Abrahams, recently Rector of Nowra, as full-time Director of the Vision for Growth Appeal from May 1. A working party

of representatives of the Home Mission Society and the New Areas Committee has been examining the possibility of closer liaison and co-operation. It is proposed that the New Sites Committee, which is responsible to the Standing Committee, will continue to be the body responsible for the purchase of sites with funds made available through the Appeal Committee, and as far as possible the existing agencies of the Diocese will be used for the necessary machinery of administration.

It has become clear that an enterprise of this magnitude necessarily calls for a review of the whole way in which the Diocese is geared for growth and expansion and for the deployment of its resources. The problem with our large and complex diocesan structure is a kind of hardening of the arteries. We have really no regular machinery for reviewing or co-ordinating the policies of the bodies we are supposed to control through Synod. No one really knows whether we are using our resources in the best way. This is not a criticism of any of the organisations concerned. They are getting on with the job given to them and in most cases building up their own support systems. That is fine. But if we are to be truly a fellowship of churches, with a common concern for a whole range of needs beyond the capacity of individual congregations to meet on their own — and the Vision for Growth is just such an area of need — then we must try to find a way of co-ordinating much that at present is unco-ordinated in the Diocese, and of releasing and deploying resources which could be used to better advantage. Vision for Growth is already proving a catalyst for examining the way our Diocese works.

If this is successfully achieved, our Vision for Growth will not be restricted to the fulfilment of a particular goal of establishing a certain number of new centres of ministry in a given period of time; it will — and this is my earnest hope — open up a new impetus for growth and expansion in every part of the Diocese, affecting every aspect of our responsibilities as Christians. We are not just making another appeal; we are looking for a new commitment to the whole ministry of fellowship in the Gospel. The appeal for a particular sum for a particular set of projects will only be successful if it produces support over and above our existing commitments, and in this I include our missionary commitment. All our missionary societies are lifting their sights and I hope they will continue to be backed to the full. Let our Vision for Growth be a total vision for total growth. Both individual church members and parishes will need to think carefully about the manner and extent of their giving. A fresh examination of our stewardship of personal and parochial resources is called for.

Our emphasis in the Vision for Growth is on ministry. Already the Diocese is financially helping ten full-time and four part-time workers in the proposed new development areas. But these ministries are restricted. Research has shown

that we must necessarily allocate a large proportion of our funds to the purchase of land and buildings if we are to establish continuity of ministry and church life, as well as provide more ministers of the Gospel. This burden is too heavy on newly founded congregations, and in any case we want to encourage them to accept support of their own ministry as their first responsibility. Hence, we should be willing to assume a large part of the responsibility for the material needs, as the necessary undergirding of the ministry of the word and sacraments. In addition to what we hope the Synod will be willing to allocate from Glebe surpluses over the next six years, I hope that other diocesan resources can be explored. I have asked the Endowment of the See Committee to examine the possibility of a substantial contribution from that source.

Already many of you here will have been introduced to the concept of Vision for Growth. I have written to all the clergy and a number of the laity, and almost all the clergy have attended one or other of the nine regional meetings at which the plan was explained. I am most grateful for the response already received to this forward move. Tomorrow night I will formally launch the appeal here in the Chapter House at 7 o'clock. I hope every synodsman who can possibly squeeze in will be present. It will take about half an hour. There will be an interesting presentation — and I will explain how we hope to approach the parishes in the coming months. Above all else we are seeking to bring the word of life to the men, women and children of this city and the regions within the boundaries of the Diocese. This is a spiritual task and requires spiritual methods and spiritual resources. We wish to be sensitive to the leading of God's Spirit and I ask you to pray that all of us may have the wisdom God promises to give to those who trust Him without wavering.

PREPARATION FOR MINISTRY

Two years ago I informed Synod of my intention to appoint a small commission to assist me in investigating the various stages of ministerial formation so as to improve, if possible, the preparation and education of the clergy for the demands of ministry in the local church. I distinguished four stages in the preparation and training of a minister: his training in basic Christian faith and conduct, the special training of the theological course, the diaconal stage taken here to include all aspects of apprenticeship in a parish, and in-service training after receiving an independent charge. Bishop Goodhew, the Rev. Dr. Paul Barnett and the Rev. Geoff Huard duly made their report to me in July. I am grateful to them and to the large number of interested people who made submissions to them. I have started to digest this report in conference with my assistant bishops. The most important of its recommendations is that I should appoint a full-time

Director of Practical Ministry Training to plan and develop a more thorough programme covering the period of a man's parochial experience, both before and after ordination to the diaconate and the priesthood. At present we have a Director of Field Work at Moore College who has a limited supervision of students in their catechist duties. We also have a Post-Ordination Training Course under the direction of a senior parish clergyman; the latter consists of a number of sessions over the period of a year. But we have nothing which is designed to monitor what either a catechist or a curate actually does in his parish. Models do exist of the kind of position we are thinking of. The Diocese of Melbourne, for instance, has a full-time Director of Theological Field Education and an Instep Course in which all candidates participate, both before and after ordination. Here in Sydney we have about sixty candidates in training who have catechist positions and about sixty curates. All of these are licensed to incumbents whose individual role of oversight and direction within their parishes must be taken into account. But a Director of Practical Ministry Training could plan and co-ordinate the whole period of apprenticeship in collaboration with the parishes where the men are licensed.

The Commission also makes recommendations about the selection process for candidates for the ministry and about the need for regular close consultation between the Archbishop, the Principal of the College, the Director of Practical Ministry Training and the Examining Chaplains in relation not only to the actual supervision of candidates but also to the consideration of all issues bearing on the equipping of men for ordained ministry. The Commission has set all its recommendations in the light of our need for an effective ministry of the Gospel in the tradition of the Anglican Church and in the social context of Australian culture.

There is a clear link between this review of ministerial preparation and our Vision for Growth in the expanding Diocese. Most important is that we call on God for the supply of fit men to serve him in this ministry. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers are the gifts to mankind of the ascended Lord of the church, and we should pray regularly that the Master will furnish the abundant harvest with labourers. Our Prayer Book provides four weeks in each year when prayer is offered daily for those who are to be ordained. These "Ember days at the four seasons" originally marked occasions of gratitude to and dependence on God for the benefits of the earth; summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, and prayer for their continuance. The parallel is appropriate. We know what it is to have drought. Pray earnestly that nowhere in this growing Diocese there may be a famine of hearing the word of the Lord.

It is an encouragement to us all that there are good numbers of both men and women presently in training. I know it is a satisfaction to Canon Knox that when he lays

down the principalship of Moore College in February, he will leave the College in such a healthy condition. We thank him warmly for his long and effective service. We thank also Dr. W. D. Dumbrell who has recently concluded 22 years on the staff of the College, the last ten as Vice-Principal, to take up an appointment at Regent College, Vancouver. The Trustees have appointed the Rev. Dr. Peter Jensen to succeed Canon Knox, and the Rev. Dr. Peter O'Brien is to be Vice-Principal.

I am one who holds that the ordination of women to the priesthood, as that priesthood is presently expressed in our formularies, would be contrary to the apostolic tradition of the New Testament on which the constitution of our church is based, and that the same apostolic order places restraints on women preaching in the congregation, although I have licensed some to do so where a congregation has requested it in accordance with The Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance passed by Synod in 1981. But outside these restraints I would like to see a much more extensive ministry of women in parochial work, especially the ministry of deaconesses, and I am looking forward to ordaining three women as deaconesses later this year. I have also appointed a group of men and women under the chairmanship of Archdeacon Oliver, who is chaplain to Deaconess House, to inquire into the present opportunities which exist for women to minister in the Diocese, the difficulties that are encountered and the ways in which the opportunities can be extended. I agree with the observation of Archbishop Wright made many years ago that "the deaconess is the type of trained woman worker that especially suits our Diocese", and I would be glad to see a deaconess in every parish. It seems to me that there was more opportunity for women's pastoral ministry in parishes, and more recognition of it, sixty or seventy years ago than there is today.

We note in passing that the General Synod will have before it next year, at the instance of this Diocese as well as of others, the proposal that women should be included in the order of deacons. The order of deaconesses has been declared by our General Synod to be not one of the three orders to the continuance of which our Church is committed, and if women were to be admitted as deacons this would not necessarily mean that deaconesses would become deacons. My only comment at this stage is if women are admitted to the order of deacons, it would be desirable for the purpose and function of the diaconate to be much more clearly understood than is the case at present when most deacons are little more than birds of passage, anxious to migrate as quickly as possible from a dependent to an independent role. There are practical problems to be overcome in the idea of a permanent diaconate but they should be tackled. The Standing Committee is giving consideration to the nature of a distinctive and permanent diaconate, but has not been able to report to this session.

USE OF THE SURPLICE

Among the matters before us at this session is a bill for an ordinance whose purpose is to provide relief for a clergyman from wearing the surplice in divine service. Questions about clerical dress, while certainly secondary, are far from trivial. In relation to spiritual realities, dress is a matter of indifference. But we cannot escape our culture or the significance of roles and relationships. Nor can we easily discard aspects of our church tradition which have given us our distinctiveness. Nothing is more distinctive of our tradition than our liturgy, and the vesture of the minister is intimately related to the liturgy. We also have to consider our relationship with all our brethren who share our tradition.

Let me say at once that I would welcome some ordinance which would permit a clergyman to dispense with wearing the surplice on certain exceptional occasions. The present requirement seems to me too absolute in view of the much wider range of "ministrations" which have become a minister's lot than was the case when our formularies were devised. At the same time I think it would be a mistake to allow this liberty to become simply a general congregational option, or a minister's own option, uncontrolled by clear principles.

There are certain difficulties in approaching this question. I do not think we have an adequate understanding at the present time of the purpose of public worship or of the role of the minister in the conduct of it. There has been a welcome emphasis on the relationship that should exist between those who come together, but "fellowship" is inadequate as a definition of worship. Fellowship in what? is the question. The Prayer Book concept of the worship of the congregation has been impaired by our multiplication of services to suit the convenience of groups of parishioners, and by the introduction of services, or the use of existing services, aimed at the uninstructed and uninitiated, at the catechumens rather than communicants. I support such initiatives. The evangelistic imperative, and the need to instruct, are unquestionable. But the relation of these obligations to the purposes of Christian worship as our Prayer Book orders it is not always thought out. I believe it is in connection with evangelism and instruction that queries arise about the manner in which a minister communicates his message. But until we understand the rationale of our Prayer Book services we shall continue to be confused as to the minister's role in the conduct of public worship and consequently as to his appropriate dress. The committee which is bringing forward the ordinance expresses the view that "the reasons for wishing to dispense with the wearing of the surplice should be related to the occasion and the people present rather than to the service being used". But this seems to me to beg the question I have raised. In our Prayer Book, "the service being used" presupposes a certain occasion and also something about the people present. It might help us if

we could arrive at a clearer distinction between those occasions which constitute the public liturgy of the church, designed to bring together the whole congregation of faithful people, and those occasions which are designed for special groups or groups of fringe people and for which special orders of service may need to be prepared. This session of Synod will also be considering an amendment to the Sydney Church Ordinance under which it would be possible to use a church for "other purposes, being similar to or different from" the celebration of divine service, the administration of the sacraments and the performance of the rites and ordinances of the Anglican Church of Australia. It may be that this distinction would provide us with a more objective criterion for deciding when a surplice need not be worn than the intuition of a particular clergyman as to whether his surplice is a barrier to the effectiveness of what he is meant to be doing when leading the congregation in public worship.

There is another aspect of this matter which I should mention. There are occasions when the minister shares his liturgical functions with the bishop, or when the bishop fulfils his own proper functions in the congregation. The ordinance should take account of this.

Reference was made in Synod last year to the undertaking given by clergymen to the Archbishop before being licensed in this Diocese. This requirement long preceded the passing of the Clerical Vestures Ordinance in 1949.

When Archbishop Wright arrived in Sydney in November 1909, he found that there were two parishes in which the wearing of eucharistic vestments had been introduced during the time but without the approval of his predecessor, Archbishop Saumarez Smith. One of those parishes was vacant and the other became vacant within a short time of Wright's arrival. In his first Synod charge in December 1909, the Archbishop spoke of the Church of England as comprehending High and Broad Church as well as Evangelical traditions, but indicated that there were clear limits to this comprehensiveness. This was a position he had publicly espoused in the Convocation of York before coming to Australia. In accordance with this position the Archbishop believed it was reasonable not to appoint a man to an incumbency unless that man was willing to observe the law of the church in regard to clerical vesture. From then on Archbishop Wright required all clergymen to give the following undertaking before receiving his licence in the Diocese:

"I, N, undertake, so long as I hold a licence to officiate as a Minister in the Diocese of Sydney, that I will not wear the chasuble nor the other eucharistic vestments, neither will I permit others to wear them in any church over which I may have charge; but that I will wear the surplice at all times of ministrations until such time as in the judgement of the Archbishop of Sydney for the time being, declared in writing, the eucharistic vestments are legal."

This undertaking, with verbal changes, has been required by successive Archbishops of Sydney since then, before any clergyman receives a licence in this Diocese.

The Clerical Vestures Ordinance of 1949 came forty years after Wright's action and was promoted quite independently of the then Archbishop. The ordinance, which is still in force, makes no reference to a special undertaking by a clergyman, but declares the law of the church in regard to a clergyman's obligation to wear the surplice and not to wear the vestments. It is important to observe that neither the Archbishop's requirement nor the Synod ordinance purports to fashion a new law or impose a new obligation on a minister, or to create a law peculiar to the Diocese of Sydney. The undertaking and the ordinance are each a declaration of the law of the church as upheld by the Court of Final Appeal. In June 1910 Archbishop Wright stated: "When a different verdict is arrived at by the Court of Final Appeal I shall of necessity be bound to reconsider my position, but not till then".

The law in the Church of England regulating the vesture of the clergy was changed by the passing of The Clerical Vestures Measure in 1964. But this change did not affect the law in the Anglican Church of Australia because by then all such matters came under our new Constitution of 1961. That Constitution specifically provided that "the law of the Church of England including the law relating to faith ritual ceremonial and discipline applicable to and in force in the several dioceses of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania at the date upon which this Constitution takes effect shall apply and be in force in such dioceses unless and until the same be varied or dealt with in accordance with this Constitution".

Only one change has been made under our Constitution relating to the vesture of clergy, and that is the *Use of the Surplice Canon 1977*. Under this canon "a minister of the Anglican Church of Australia may be relieved of his obligation to use a surplice during his ministrations in such cases as aforesaid as and to the extent to which such obligation is dispensed with by an ordinance of the synod of the diocese in which he is licensed to minister". The "cases aforesaid" appear to be "the cases decided in each diocese by the synod of such diocese", though they may have been intended to refer to the cases cited in the preamble, namely private ministrations or ministrations in unlicensed premises.

This canon was adopted by our own Diocesan Synod in 1977 and under it our Synod ruled that a minister need not wear a surplice in a hospital, in a private house, or in a place not licensed for public worship, "on such occasions as the Archbishop may approve generally or specifically from time to time". However, no occasions were approved, either generally or specifically, by Archbishop Loane, and I have not approved any; nor has any minister requested that any ap-

proval be given. In fact there is legal opinion that this part of the ordinance is *ultra vires* and that the extent to which the minister's obligation is dispensed with must be specified in the ordinance itself. So at the moment it is possible that no relief at all exists from the use of the surplice in this Diocese.

However, it is my intention to modify the wording of the minister's undertaking so as to make it subject to whatever change in the vesture requirement is or becomes part of the law in this Diocese. I also take this occasion to inform the licensed clergy of this Diocese that undertakings they have given in the past should now be regarded as modified where appropriate by any liberty which the law of the church in this Diocese may allow. At the same time I remind both clergy and laity that the clergy are not at liberty to take the law into their own hands. This would be a breach of our church law and of their undertaking and can only cause confusion.

MARRIAGE OF DIVORCED PERSONS

This session will have before it the report of a committee appointed last year to consider a number of questions regarding the marriage of divorced persons. The report contains four recommendations. The Synod's response to these recommendations will constitute, in effect, the response of this Diocese to the General Synod which next year will have to decide what to do with the Provisional "Marriage of Divorced Persons Canon 1981" to which three dioceses, including our own, have declined to give their assent. The Synod's response will also provide the basis on which any independent legislation by this Synod may be prepared. I do not wish in any way to inhibit discussion of the report and its recommendations, but I need to make my own position clear beyond doubt.

In my last two Presidential Addresses to Synod I have spoken of this subject, outlining to the best of my ability the main theological and legal considerations which must inform any decisions to be made. I have not expressed my personal opinion as to the course of action that should be followed. My task as Archbishop is to administer the law of the church, whether I personally agree with it or not. I have sought to discover what is the law at present in this Diocese regarding the marriage of divorced persons and I am administering that, even though it does not in fact accord with my own views. I will administer whatever becomes the law in this Diocese by ordinance as a result of the present debate. However, part of the process by which an ordinance becomes law in this Diocese is the Archbishop giving his assent to an ordinance after it has been passed by the Synod. At this point the Archbishop's own opinion as to the rightness or wisdom of an ordinance must have a bearing on his decision whether or not to assent to it. It is not like the Governor's assent to an Act of Parliament, in which the Governor must act on the advice of

his Government. In some Australian synods the bishop is a separate house of the synod and he records his vote at the conclusion of the debate. In our NSW synods the bishop has no vote in the synod, but he has a month in which to decide whether or not he will assent to the ordinance. It would be a serious thing for a bishop to withhold his assent once the synod has declared its mind by passing an ordinance, and a bishop is bound to take into account the considered judgement of his synod, and not withhold his assent merely because his personal preference may have been other than that of the majority of the synod. But he may well have a duty to withhold his assent if he considers that a constitutional principle is endangered, or that the unity of the diocese with the rest of the church is threatened, or that his own episcopal prerogatives would be unwisely removed or at risk. There is as yet no ordinance before us. But even at this stage of debate I ask the Synod to bear in mind that there are, or could be, constitutional principles involved, in particular the consistency of any proposal with the doctrine and principles of the Church embodied in the Book of Common Prayer; and that there are, or could be, questions of our relation to the rest of our Church in the important matters of marriage discipline; and that there are, or could be, questions of the bishop's proper role involved, in particular the question whether the long-standing requirement of the permission of the bishop or his surrogate for the marriage of a divorced person should be dispensed with.

In regard to the first of these considerations I feel bound to tell the Synod that in my personal view the use of the Prayer Book services for the marriage of a person whose former spouse is still living is inconsistent with the doctrine of holy matrimony set out in those services, despite our present law, which permits the use of the marriage service for a divorced person whose former marriage was terminated because of the infidelity of the other partner. As I have said, I am administering this law now, and I expect the clergy to adhere to it. To widen the basis of this law clearly does not have my personal support.

I have to say also that I disagree with the recommendation of the Committee that episcopal permission for the marriage of a divorced person should no longer be required. Were the Church at large to adopt this principle, I would acquiesce in it. But its value in the present situation seems to me considerable, and not least for the parish minister, though I admit it has proved a disagreeable task for me. Although the bishop is always there to share pastoral concerns with the incumbent, his role in the situation is not primarily a pastoral one but a judicial one, and therefore the alleged distance between the couple and the diocesan bishop is not as a rule significant. The bishop ensures that the conditions required by the Church are properly met, and I have reason to believe

that this is not an unnecessary service. The Committee's recommendation is that certain declarations be made to the bishop and acknowledged by him before a marriage takes place. This may not perhaps differ in principle from the present requirement and the present procedure, but I am sure that in so vital an area of pastoral discipline the permission of the diocesan bishop, far from being "administratively or pastorally undesirable", is in the best interests of the Church at large. Perhaps I may add that the number of permissions granted by me so far each year has proved to be almost identical to the number granted in each of the last two years of my predecessor.

OUR COMMON FAITH

We need a Synod because the Diocese is a fellowship of many congregations for which it is desirable to have a common order and also instruments for common action. But the essence of our fellowship is not in the actions of a synod but in our faith. St. Paul exhorted the Corinthians to be "united in the same mind and the same judgement" and he urged the Philippians to "stand firm in one spirit, with one mind striving side by side for the faith of the gospel". Of course Christians have a long history of not doing this, but we dare not acquiesce in such failure. As fellow members of Christ we are bound to cultivate a community of mind and understanding. This is not a question of mere goodwill or tolerance. Such unity comes from our agreement in the faith of the gospel.

That faith we have all acknowledged at our baptism and it is articulated in the Apostles' Creed, which is the ancient and universally recognised baptismal confession.

Recently, many Anglicans in England and elsewhere have been disturbed by views expressed by the newly appointed Bishop of Durham. These views, publicly stated, seem to many to undermine the truth of those articles of the Creed which affirm Christ's birth of the Virgin Mary and his rising from the dead on the third day after his crucifixion. It must be stated clearly that Bishop David Jenkins affirms his belief in both the Incarnation and the Resurrection. No one who has read his Bampton Lectures of 1966, for instance, could doubt the centrality of these two doctrines to his theological position. His whole thesis there is based on his defence of the Chalcedonian Definition of the divine and human natures in the one person of Christ, and on the early disciples' discovery of the resurrection as a given reality. I think also that Bishop Jenkins considers the two articles of the Creed to which I have referred are a way of expressing belief in the Incarnation and the Resurrection. Nevertheless he does not regard it as essential to belief in the Incarnation to hold that Jesus was born of a Virgin mother, nor essential to belief in the Resurrection to hold that Jesus rose from the tomb on the third day and appeared to many. The Resurrec-

tion, he holds, was an experience of the "livingness" of Jesus, and the discovery that Jesus was "in fact not dead and finished but alive and purposefully active" (*The Glory of Man*, p.32). The Bishop appears to regard the New Testament account of Jesus' birth and the account of his resurrection as probably stories invented later to reflect or symbolise belief in Jesus as the incarnate and risen Son of God — belief which was apparently arrived at on other grounds.

The Bishop of Durham's views are familiar enough to students of New Testament historical and literary criticism, and they are not peculiar to him. Nevertheless it must be affirmed that the opinion which regards the Gospel records of the Virgin birth and resurrection on the third day as later compositions of the pious imagination is not the faith of the evangelists and apostles to whom we owe the New Testament. It is not the faith of the Creeds. It is not the faith of the ancient fathers or of any church of the early centuries which has any claim to be an inheritor of original Christianity. It is not the faith of the Reformers or of our Articles of Religion. Bishop Jenkins himself has warned us against conforming our belief to what at any particular time may be regarded in intellectual circles as "thinkable" (*op. cit.* p20). Mary herself reverently asked: "How can this be?" Those who first heard reports of the empty tomb, and of the angelic announcement that Jesus had risen, considered them "idle tales". But Mary's humble acceptance of her role as the mother of Christ has become the very prototype of that faith which knows that nothing is too hard for the Lord and yields to his will, and we know of no New Testament belief in the resurrection of Jesus which can be separated off from belief that the tomb was empty on the third day and that Jesus presented himself to his disciples alive over a period of many days.

We have no access to the knowledge of Jesus our Lord except through the revelation of the scriptures. We cannot rightly worship him except as his glory is displayed in the witness of those whose eyes saw him, ears heard him, and whose hands handled him, the Word of life. God grant, as we so often pray in this Synod, that we may be kept steadfast in this apostolic and catholic faith.

And now I commend you to God and to the word of his grace as we turn to the business of this session of Synod.