

Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide

**THE PASTORAL ADDRESS  
AND  
THE REPORT**

**OF  
THE MOST REVEREND KEITH RAYNER  
ARCHBISHOP OF ADELAIDE**

SEPTEMBER 1984

"THE DIGNITY OF MAN"

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10089038 7

THE PASTORAL ADDRESS

*Delivered at the Synod Evensong  
in St. Peter's Cathedral, Adelaide  
on 13th September, 1984*

Psalm 8 : 5-7

"What is man that you should be mindful of him:  
or the son of man that you should care for him ?  
Yet you have made him little less than a god:  
and have crowned him with glory and honour.  
You have made him the master of your handiwork:  
and have put all things in subjection beneath  
his feet".

-----

The ancient and inspired poet who wrote these words was expressing a truth as profound and as significant for our estimate of human life as any that has ever been enunciated. In a few verses he has crystallised the understanding of the dignity of man which undergirds the entire biblical revelation. Incidentally, I speak unashamedly of the dignity of man, not from any disrespect for women, but because I want to recapture the word "man" in its proper meaning inclusive of the whole of humanity, men and women alike.

Our readings at this service were chosen deliberately from the first and the last chapters of the Bible.<sup>1</sup> Centuries separated these readings in time. But they give us essentially the same picture of man. He is made in the image of God, and so shares the divine nature;<sup>2</sup> he has been given dominion over the created world, with the power to think, and organise, and share the creative work of God;<sup>3</sup> though a creature of earth and of time, he is destined to share the life of God and to reign with him for ever and ever.<sup>4</sup> Yet he is not God. He is the creature, not the Creator; he is the servant, not the master;<sup>5</sup> it is not he but God who is "the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end".<sup>6</sup>

2.

It is at the heart of the biblical revelation, then, that man has immense dignity, and yet is not an end in himself. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews takes up this theme of the dignity of man. He quotes the precise verses from Psalm 8 which I took as my text and sees their meaning fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Christians have always seen the Incarnation of Our Lord as God's seal on the dignity of our human nature. If God became man, then how great must be the possibilities of man ! At his Ascension, Our Lord took not only his divine nature but his humanity into the life of the Godhead; and it is as our humanity is united with God in Jesus Christ that our human potential is attained. The theologians of the East speak of the divinisation, or even the deification, of man. "For he (Christ) was made man that we might be made God",<sup>7</sup> wrote St. Athanasius in language that sounds shocking to western ears. It is language which certainly highlights the dignity of our human nature.

Now clearly this understanding of the dignity of man has immense consequences. It has powerfully influenced not only the history of ideas but the history of man himself. It has shaped the Jewish, and even more the Christian, tradition. The dignity of man is one of the archetypal principles upon which western civilisation is grounded, and it is one of the best things that the West has given to the rest of the world.

Nor is it only those who consciously hold the Christian faith who have been influenced by it. Modern western humanism is best understood as a secularised version of the Christian doctrine of the dignity of man. It is no accident that modern science has taken root and flowered in the Christian West, for the scientific enterprise owes much to the belief that man is called to exercise dominion over the earth. Again, the impetus for the humanitarianism which has striven for justice, abolished slavery,

sought to relieve pain, and struggled against torture and oppression has come from the same source. I do not pretend that only professing Christians have taken a lead in these matters. Indeed, we Christians have sometimes been so concerned with being religious that we have forgotten to be truly human and humane. Our Lord had a good deal to say about that in respect of the Pharisees of his day ! But the biblical understanding of man is the root of the matter; and it is a real question how long the branch and the fruits can survive when cut off from the root. Jesus had something to say about that, too, when he spoke of the vine and the branches: "As the branch cannot bear fruit by itself, unless it abides in the vine, neither can you, unless you abide in me".<sup>8</sup>

It is worth noting that the Christian doctrine of man guards us against two opposite errors. The first error is to dwell on man's insignificance, seeing him as unimportant, powerless, meaningless. This temptation leads to hopelessness and despair. It has a variety of sources. It may stem from the sense of our smallness in a vast universe, as a speck of dust on a little planet among galaxies whose number and size baffle the imagination. Or it may come from the feeling of powerlessness of the individual under the pressures of mass society. That feels bad enough in a democracy: how much worse it must be under a ruthless totalitarian regime. Or it may be fostered by the feeling of becoming playthings of a technological system which is getting out of control. Yes, the temptations to the heresy of the insignificance of man are strong and threatening. In the face of them we need to affirm confidently the dignity of man, made in the image of God to whom "even the hairs of your head are all numbered."

The opposite error is the idolisation of man. This is the temptation for man to make himself God, to see himself as the end of all things. The Genesis story suggests that this is indeed the root of all sin.

Eat the fruit of the tree, the serpent says to Eve, and "your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil".<sup>10</sup> The temptation for man to make himself like God comes in new guises in every generation. The creature wants to be the Creator; the steward wants to be the master. When that happens, man becomes the great manipulator: he handles other creatures shamefully, he ruthlessly exploits the earth instead of conserving it as a good steward, he plays fast and loose even with human life.

So far I have spoken in generalities. These generalities have all manner of practical application in the affairs of our world. Let me earth what I am saying by relating the principle of the dignity of man to two important areas of contemporary life.

The first is poverty. Human dignity and abject poverty do not readily sit together. It is not that dignity (or happiness for that matter) is proportionate to wealth: indeed, there are those who, like the rich young ruler who came to Jesus, need to be freed from bondage to possessions if they are to find true freedom. But extreme poverty robs a man of his rightful dignity.

As we all know, there are parts of the world, particularly in Asia, Africa, South and Central America, where poverty is endemic. Many of us travel overseas as tourists and return thanking God that we live in affluent Australia. We fail to recognise the real poverty there is in this country. The Institute of Family Studies reported recently that up to 2.7 million people in Australia live in poverty, including three-quarters of a million children. Now of course poverty is relative. In absolute terms it is less drastic in this country than in many others; but there are still many Australians for whom poverty is very real.

Why do we not recognise this ? Partly because it exists in scattered pockets and is not so concentrated as in some countries; partly because it is worst in areas where many of us never go; and partly because we convince ourselves that in this land of opportunity poverty must be the fault of the poor. In some cases it may be, and it is true that many who are poor lack motivation. But lack of motivation is as much a consequence of poverty as a cause of it. If you had grown up in a broken home with a sole parent, if you were ill-educated, or unemployed for lengthy periods, or belonged to a minority group on the fringe of society, you might not have much motivation. We who have a job, a contented home life, a circle of friends and a place in society can find it hard to imagine what it must be like to lack those things.

Poverty - and I include more than lack of money - is destructive of the dignity of man. I know that it is not easily eradicated: but as a nation, and as a world, we can do - we must do - better than we have.

The problem of the poor in Australia is this: voting power lies in what our politicians call 'middle Australia'. That is where the majority of Australians are, not only most employers, professionals and small business people, but also most trade unionists. They are the people among whom there has been the quest for consensus. Consensus is admirable. But there is a lesson which I have learned in parish life which we need to heed. Sometimes people tell me about the wonderful spirit of fellowship in their parish. That is fine: but occasionally I discover that the fellowship is indeed very warm, but only among the in-group. And because that group are so cosy among themselves, it can be all the harder for the outsider to break in !

In a real sense business and trade unions have become cosy, equally concerned to maintain the status quo and equally conservative. Those of us with work and a good income are more concerned to maintain and

improve our position than to meet the needs of the outsiders - the unemployed, the new settlers, the one-parent families, and others like them. My plea is that as a nation we really take seriously the right to full human dignity of all who live in dehumanising poverty.

The other area to which I want to refer is that of in vitro fertilisation. The ethical questions which we face in this area are legion, and the answers we give will have profound consequences for the future of our race. Again the basic principles to guide our judgments should be the dignity of man and the reverence in which we are to hold human life. Let me suggest some ways in which these principles should apply.

First, far from condemning the researchers whose investigations have opened the way to in vitro fertilisation, we should rejoice at the uncovering of further facets of God's marvellous creation. God has given man dominion over the earth, and the uncovering of the mysteries of life by scientific research are a proper expression of that. This research may, of course, be misapplied; but in itself the uncovering of truth, which is God's truth, is good.

Secondly, as the procreation of children is a prime purpose of marriage, the enabling by I.V.F. of an infertile married couple to have their child can be seen as a positive way of fulfilling God's will for them. The couple do not choose I.V.F. as an alternative to normal sexual union but as a means of accomplishing what in their case is not possible by the normal means. In principle, then, in vitro fertilisation is seen by most Christians as morally acceptable, though we should weigh carefully the objections of those who reject it.

Thirdly, everyone involved in I.V.F. procedures should be deeply conscious that in the laboratory it is human life that is being procreated. There is a debate, among Christians as among others, as to the point at which it is appropriate to use the term

'person' of the embryo or foetus (if, indeed, it is appropriate at all before birth). It is an important question, on which some people hold strong views; but it is unlikely that there will soon be unanimity in the community on the answer. There can be no doubt, however, that once the ovum is fertilised by the sperm, we have a new creation. For the first time, all the genetic ingredients of a new human life are present, and unless the process is interrupted the embryo will grow into a fully developed human being. In the whole life cycle there is no moment comparable in significance with the moment of fertilisation. The embryo resulting from that fertilisation deserves to be treated with the utmost care and reverence appropriate to a human life. It is not a thing to be manipulated, used, experimented on, or made an object of commerce.

Fourthly, the question is asked: who owns the embryo? The answer is: no one - not even the biological parents, and certainly not the scientific team responsible for the I.V.F. procedures. Decisions have to be made about the embryo, of course, and the primary concern of these decisions should always be the well-being of the new life which has been begun. Everything possible must be done to ensure its safety and its healthy development to maturity. The freezing of embryos does not, I believe, accord with this principle. Many will perish in the process of freezing, and others not required for subsequent implantation will be deliberately allowed to perish on thawing. The report of a government committee in South Australia has recommended a ten year limit on the storage of frozen embryos.<sup>12</sup> The reasons for the recommendation are understandable; but the unspoken consequence is the destruction of living embryos. I appreciate the reasons advanced to justify the freezing of embryos; but there is a better way. The same ethical problems would not arise with the freezing of sperm and unfertilised ova. At present there are technical difficulties about the latter. The overcoming of those difficulties should be given priority in research, for in that direction lies the possibility of a great easing of the ethical problem.

In this address I have spoken as a Christian, and from biblical presuppositions. But the principles of the dignity of man and of the reverence in which human life is to be held at every stage of its development are of universal validity. All who care about the future of mankind - Christian and non-Christian alike - should start from these principles and stand firm upon them. Otherwise we shall find ourselves sliding down the slippery slope which leads inexorably to the abyss.

1. Genesis 1 : 24 - 31, Revelation 22: 1 - 17
2. Genesis 1 : 26
3. Ibid.; cf. Psalm 8 : 7
4. Revelation 22 : 5
5. Revelation 22 : 9
6. Revelation 22 : 13
7. St. Athanasius, On the Incarnation, Chap. 54
8. John 15 : 4
9. Matthew 10 : 30
10. Genesis 3 : 5
11. Luke 18 : 18-25
12. Report of the Working Party on In Vitro Fertilisation and Artificial Insemination by Donor, (January 1984)

REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE DIOCESE

-oo0oo-

THE SECOND SESSION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND  
TRIENNIAL SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF ADELAIDE  
OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA

*Delivered in the Memorial Hall  
at St. Peter's College  
on 14th September 1984*

My Brothers and Sisters in Christ,

I bid you a warm welcome to this session of the Thirty-second Triennial Synod of the Diocese. For the second time we are meeting over a week-end. The survey which we took after last year's experiment showed that this timetable, while not universally approved, was the most favoured option. I think we should continue with it during the present triennial Synod, and if any alteration to the timetable is then desired, it should be made before a new Synod is elected in 1986.

An unusually large number of our clergy have taken long service leave this year, and some are absent from Synod for this reason. I should like to record my belief that the long service leave scheme has been beneficial in enabling the clergy to gain mental and spiritual refreshment, and the wisdom of the Church in formulating this scheme years ago has been vindicated. One might even be tempted to imagine that some of the clergy see the opportunity to miss Synod once every fifteen years as one of the advantages of the scheme!

#### THE CHURCH AT LARGE

Parochialism is a constant temptation in church life; but we belong not only to a parish and a diocese but to the catholic Church and within it to the Anglican Communion. It was appropriate that this year's meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council should have taken place in Nigeria, because Africa is now the continent with the largest number of Anglicans and with the highest growth rate in our Communion. It is salutary for us white Anglo-Saxons to remember this, for the future of the Anglican Communion lies in its ability to be a truly multicultural church. In the face of an increasingly multicultural population in Australia, that is a fact with which we must reckon far more seriously than our Church has yet begun to do.

This is a good opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. John Denton, who has just retired as Chairman of the Anglican Consultative Council. This has been a responsible, and at times onerous, task which John Denton has fulfilled with distinction. As you know, he is the Secretary of our General Synod and is in effect the chief executive officer of the Anglican Church of Australia. He has been succeeded as Chairman of the Anglican Consultative Council by Archdeacon Yong Ping Chung, from the Diocese of Sabah, the first Asian to hold that office.

We look forward to the visit to Australia of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie, next year. His month-long visit will take in every province, and we expect he will spend two days in South Australia at the beginning of May. The Archbishop of Canterbury comes as an honoured Father-in-God and Christian brother, whose office symbolises the unity which we have in the Anglican Communion. He comes not as one possessing or claiming jurisdiction over us; and that signifies the dispersion of authority within Anglicanism which typifies our Anglican understanding of the nature of authority in the Church. Dr. Runcie brings rich and varied personal gifts to the exercise of his great office, and I know that we shall welcome him both for the man he is and the office he holds.

Within Australia we welcome Dr. David Penman as the new Archbishop of Melbourne. He had previously been, for a short time, one of the assistant bishops of that diocese, and brings wide experience of church life in New Zealand, Pakistan and the Middle East as well as Australia, to his new task. He has already given clear signs of strong leadership, and is obviously determined to relate the gospel to the life of the community at large.

Since we last met, four other Australian dioceses have welcomed new bishops: Clyde Wood in the Northern Territory, Owen Dowling in Canberra and Goulburn, Hamish Jamieson in Bunbury and Anthony Hall-Matthews who succeeded Bishop Jamieson in Carpentaria. The Right Reverend Donald Shearman, who was the senior bishop by consecration in the Australian Church, has resigned the see of Grafton; and the Right Reverend Maxwell Thomas will be leaving the Diocese of Wangaratta next year to become Warden of St. Paul's College in the University of Sydney. Two new assistant bishops are to be consecrated in the near future; The Reverend Bruce Wilson whose sociological insights have been reflected in some excellent books, for Canberra and Goulburn; and the Reverend John Stewart, a former assistant curate at Prospect in this diocese, for Melbourne.

The Province of Victoria has recently conducted an intensive exercise in self-examination as to the Church's effectiveness in mission. They invited a number of Partners in Mission from outside their province to assist them in their assessment, one of whom was Mr. Peter Kay, a member of this Synod. I hope that he will have opportunities to share with us in this diocese lessons which he learned from that experience. From time to time we all need to stand back from the business of each day to ask searching questions about our goals and whether we are pursuing those goals in the most effective way.

#### THE DIOCESE AND PROVINCE

The reports which have been presented to Synod set out the details of the manifold activities of diocesan life during the past year. I should like to highlight just a few matters of significance in the life of the diocese and province.

I begin by recording the death on 20 August 1984 of James Gibson Bailie, priest and medical practitioner, who sought to unite these two vocations in his life. Our sincere sympathy goes to his widow and family.

As I enter the tenth year of my ministry as Archbishop of Adelaide it is interesting to reflect that there has been no change in the episcopate in the province in that time. Bishop Bruce Rosier and Bishop Robert Porter are both in their fifteenth year as Bishops of the Dioceses of Willochra and The Murray respectively; and Bishop Lionel Renfrey is in his sixteenth year as Assistant Bishop in this diocese. That represents a remarkably stable period of episcopal ministry. I should like to take the opportunity of paying tribute to my episcopal colleagues in the province for the real spirit of co-operation and mutual support which has continued throughout those years. As always, we are glad to have observers from both Willochra and The Murray at our Synod, and we appreciate the helpful comments which they have made from time to time over the years in our proceedings. It is interesting that one of Mr. Kay's reactions to the Victorian Partners in Mission consultation was that it had made him appreciate the degree of provincial co-operation which we have in this province.

As the original and largest diocese of the province, the Diocese of Adelaide has a special responsibility to assist the country dioceses. Undoubtedly we could have done more than we have done, but I think it only fair to point out that we provide a variety of specialist services at considerable cost which benefit the whole province, as in the areas of theological training, post-ordination education, Christian education, social welfare and hospital chaplaincies. This Synod has indicated its mind that if the See Fund of the Diocese of Adelaide should have the resources, it should assist in the maintenance of episcopal ministry in the other dioceses of the province. If this should become possible (and it has not so far) I believe the first priority should be to assist the Diocese of The Murray in the provision of an adequate bishop's house. This is a matter of real concern for the Diocese of The Murray, and I myself believe that it is very desirable that a new bishop's house be obtained before the term of the present bishop comes to an end.

Important changes in personnel are taking place in our own diocese. We were very sorry when Mr. Ken Halliday resigned as Diocesan Secretary and Registrar after only two years in office, during which he served the diocese with dedication, competence and great courtesy. As you know, he is to be succeeded by Mr. Richard Parsons, who has been Registrar of the Diocese of The Murray for the past ten years, and is therefore already a well-known figure in the life of the province. He will commence duties with us in the middle of next month. We felt rather guilty about taking from The Murray a man on whom they had come to rely so greatly, but that guilt has been assuaged by the news that a member of this Synod, and a former Registrar of the Diocese of Wangaratta, Mr. Murray Nelson, has been appointed to succeed Mr. Parsons. He is admirably experienced and equipped for this position, and I am sure we all wish him well in his new sphere. I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Malcolm Levy, our diocesan accountant, who in addition to fulfilling his normal duties has acted as Diocesan Secretary during the interregnum. It is a tribute to him, and to the staff at Church Office generally, that everything has progressed so smoothly during this difficult time. We are particularly grateful to Mr. C.B. Kneebone, who unhesitatingly responded to my request to return to the Church Office on a part-time basis to supervise specifically the preparations for Synod.

The resignation of my secretary, Mrs. Dorothy Daw, has led to a general reorganisation of staff at the office. Mrs. Daw served for nine years as Archbishop's secretary, and my own debt to her for all that she did during those years is enormous. Fortunately, in my new secretary, Mrs. Joan Thomson, I have an admirable replacement, whose dedication and experience fit her ideally for the position.

The retirement of Archdeacon Allan Daw from the positions of Archdeacon of Adelaide and Organising Chaplain of the Anglican Home Mission Society takes effect in November, though his pre-retirement leave means that effectively it has already occurred. His record as a fine pastoral priest and missionary, his love for Our Lord and the gospel, his loyalty to colleagues, his good humour and his personal integrity made him one who was trusted, respected and loved in the diocese. We shall miss him greatly, though I am sure that his energy will soon find new avenues of service. His successor in both positions, Archdeacon Stuart Smith, will bring to the task distinctive gifts of thoroughness, scholarship and balanced wisdom which will be of immense value in the central administration of the diocese. He will also be in a position to continue to make his already considerable contribution to the national Church through the Standing Committee of General Synod.

I am pleased to announce that the new Archdeacon of Sturt will be the Reverend Brian Smith. As Archdeacon, he will continue as Rector of Hawthorn. His ministry has been chiefly as a parish priest in a variety of parishes in the diocese. His recent appointment as chaplain at a psychiatric hospital has added to his experience in the field of counselling and of inter-disciplinary team ministry. He has served as an army chaplain since 1966 and will shortly complete his term as Anglican Senior Chaplain in South Australia. At various times he has been Chairman of Cebis, the Diocesan Campsites Committee and the Good Shepherd Mission, where his administrative and financial skills have borne fruit. The new arrangements in the archdeaconries will take effect on 20th November, and the new archdeacons will be formally collated in the Cathedral at Evensong on Advent Sunday, 2nd December. Brian Smith will also succeed Stuart Smith as Hale Canon. I hope the confusion of Smiths will not prove too difficult! According to the old saying, people keep up with the Joneses. Indeed we have some distinguished Joneses among our clerical ranks in this diocese; but it seems that in Adelaide, it will now be a matter of keeping up with the Smiths!

The appointment of the Reverend R.J.C. Williams as Anglican Priest to the City of Adelaide is an experiment in a new kind of ministry which has aroused considerable interest in the city. It is funded chiefly from the proceeds of the sale of the former St. Paul's Church, Pulteney Street. Working from a centre in the heart of the city, in which a chapel dedicated to St. Paul (thus signifying the link with the former Church) is an integral part, the Priest to the City is aiming to find ways not only of ministering to individuals who live or work in the city, but of relating the gospel to that network of relationships which makes up the corporate life of the city. A good beginning has been made, but it will take time to determine whether we are working along the right lines. A review of the experiment will be made after three years to see whether it should be continued in its present form or modified in any way. The Reverend Ron Williams is now overseas investigating city ministries in North America and Great Britain.

Another matter which exercised the mind of Synod for many years came to a happy conclusion last November when I dedicated the Penny Nursing Home at Elizabeth. Long standing members of Synod will recall the complex legal problems which arose over the use of bequests from the late Misses E.E., G.M. and V.M. Penny. It was a great satisfaction that the Penny estate could be used to fund a nursing home, and the new home at Elizabeth adds another to our fine group of St. Laurence's Homes, which now cater for 419 elderly people in various stages of residential care.

One feature of the past year has been the Church's involvement in various projects which have both aided the unemployed and produced lasting tangible results. The development of the campsite at Harrogate gave excellent training to unemployed youth and has resulted in a very attractive and serviceable campsite. The Anglican Board of

Christian Education has been involved in two projects in association with State and Commonwealth Government employment programmes, one related to Sunday School curricula and the other to youth ministry. Through similar programmes the church grounds at Elizabeth Downs have been upgraded and a major extension to the church hall at Woodville Gardens is now being undertaken to equip it for wider community service. These initiatives deserve commendation, and I should like to express appreciation to the government agencies whose co-operation has made these projects possible.

This section of my report would not be complete without a word of congratulation to the Reverend Ralph Holden, editor for the Adelaide Church Guardian, for the recent transformation of our diocesan paper. The transition from a magazine to a tabloid format has required hours of careful thought and work. We have a paper of which we may be proud, which sells more cheaply than most specialist newspapers of its kind, and which now pays its own way. A good diocesan paper is essential if the life of our diocesan family is to be sustained and strengthened. I ask the clergy and laity alike to give your practical support to the initiatives which have been taken by encouraging others to subscribe to and read the Guardian so that its quality and influence may continue to grow.

#### THE CHURCH AND MONEY

"You cannot serve God and money", said Our Lord. But money can be made to serve God. I want now to speak to you about money, with particular reference to certain practical questions which we face.

Money is a touchy subject, I think because it comes so close to the bone. Our religion easily becomes a theoretical matter, but our attitudes to money and the way we use it test the reality of our theoretical religion in a very down-to-earth way.

That is why stewardship programmes often lead to tensions in parishes. Indeed, it has been said with some truth that a stewardship programme which arouses no opposition will be ineffective.

Because of touchiness about money we are tempted to avoid discussing it openly in the Church. This is a mistake. Decisions about the use of money crystallise policy, and if we are to have decisive policies in the Church we need to be decisive about money. I am convinced that if we debate financial issues in an open, honest and Christian spirit, far from being a cause of discord such discussion can be an opportunity for growth. But we need to see money not as an end in itself but as a means by which the mission which Our Lord has given to his Church may be more effectively fulfilled.

That mission has to be fulfilled at a number of levels. Most obviously there is the grass-roots level, where we seek to confront people with the message of the gospel in their daily lives. This is the mission of the parish in the local community or of such a body as the Inter Church Trade and Industry Mission in the workplace. At a different level the diocese has a mission. In part its mission is to provide and co-ordinate resources for more effective mission at parish level. So the diocese provides resources in such fields as Christian education, social welfare services, theological and post-ordination training, chaplaincy services in public hospitals, universities and prisons, as well as episcopal co-ordination of pastoral and missionary work. In part it is also the mission of the diocese to minister to the wider community at the level of the city and the state and in the diversity of corporate and public life. This is as much the mission of the Church as what happens at parish level. The Church also has a mission to the nation, though it must be admitted that the Australian Church has so far devoted only a small proportion of its resources to that level.

The point is that at parochial, diocesan and national levels we are all engaged in the one mission of the Church. We tend to be most conscious of what is being done, and needs to be done, at the level at which we ourselves are mainly engaged. We are inclined to think in terms of "we" and "they". "We" are the ones who are doing the important work; "they" -- other parishes, the diocese, the national Church -- are the ones who hinder our work by gobbling up the Church's limited resources. The trouble partly is that our vision is not wide enough; it is partly the natural fact that we know what we are doing and are less knowledgeable about what others are doing and why it is important; and it is partly a reflection of the human sinfulness which leads us to see everything in self-centred terms. This "we and they" thinking is never far from the surface. It was evident in some of our debates last year, and it will doubtless crop up again in the future. We must, however, try to transcend it for the sake of the total mission of the Church.

One factor which exacerbates this thinking is that the rate of assessment in this diocese is admittedly high. As parishes see part of their limited funds go to the diocese in assessments, they not unnaturally wonder whether "they" -- the diocese -- are not overstaffed, extravagant and inefficient. It is right that Synod should be watchful and self-critical about these possibilities. In fact, however, by comparison with other metropolitan dioceses of similar size or with our sister churches in the state, we have a modest diocesan establishment which I believe is frugal and reasonably efficient. Our high rate of assessment in fact reflects two other factors: endowments provide much less income than in some other dioceses, so that we depend heavily on the current giving of church people; and the level of giving of most Anglicans is frankly too low.

Last year Synod resolved to adopt the principle of graded assessments. I know that some of the stronger parishes were dismayed at this decision, and I appreciate some of the contrary arguments which they advanced. Nevertheless I believe the decision was right and that we should give it a fair trial, being ready to make adjustments if they should be found necessary in the light of experience. It is worth noting that the differential in rates which is being proposed to Synod is somewhat less than that mooted in some earlier discussions, so that the added load on the stronger parishes may not be as great as they had anticipated.

Another proposal came to the last session of Synod which was left to be finally resolved this year. This concerned Statutory Collections. You will recall that the Statutory Collections Ordinance requires a collection to be made in parishes on one Sunday in each quarter to support the work of the Social Welfare Committee, the Ordination Candidates Fund, the Anglican Home Mission Society and Australian and Overseas Missions respectively. Synod received a report last year which advocated abolishing statutory collections and increasing the rate of the Synod Assessment in order to recoup what was lost by their abolition. The Synod asked the Diocesan Council to prepare the necessary legislation to implement these recommendations. A draft ordinance has been prepared in accordance with this instruction, and it stands on our notice paper.

It is clear that something needs to be done. In answer to a question last year, I reported that 48 parishes had failed in some measure to fulfil their obligations under the Statutory Collections Ordinance. This is serious, both because of the loss of revenue for essential aspects of the Church's mission, and also because clergy and parish officers are being placed in the position of breaking their solemn undertaking to obey the ordinances of Synod.

Nevertheless I was aware of the misgivings of many members of Synod about the proposed solution to the problem, and I myself shared these misgivings. I therefore submitted a memorandum to the Diocesan Council proposing a radically different approach to the question, and the Diocesan Council encouraged me to present my alternative proposal to Synod. A paper entitled "Statutory Collections" setting out my proposals has been circulated to members of Synod, and Bishop Renfrey has given notice of a motion to accept my proposals in principle.

As my proposals would considerably alter our present financial arrangements, and as I shall not have the opportunity to introduce them myself in the motion which will come before Synod, I should like to explain briefly now what I have in mind. I see the four causes which are at present supported by our statutory collections as essential parts of the Church's mission. The level of support for our social welfare work, ordination training and home and overseas missions must not in any circumstances be allowed to diminish. Indeed, if we are to fulfil Our Lord's commission, the challenge must be to increase that support. But the giving which supports them should be voluntary. They should represent the extra mile, above what we are bound to give to maintain the ministry and the administration of the Church within the parish and the diocese. These four aspects of mission can, and should, challenge us. They should be so presented as to inspire and excite us to give gladly and generously, rather than being regarded as a burden to be grudgingly paid for by a higher assessment. Each of them is capable of challenging our people to give more generously, provided their story is told clearly and graphically, and provided there is full consultation and participation in decision making at parish level.

My proposal is that from April 1986 we abolish statutory collections and that we do not raise the assessment to the degree needed to make up the leeway. I hope we can avoid any increase in the rate

of assessment at all, though that will depend on sufficient response for each of the four funds. If, for example, the amount given voluntarily to the Ordination Candidates Fund did not meet the cost of training our candidates, we would have to fund the deficit from the Synod budget, and this must affect the rate of assessment.

A process of consultation would take place in the coming year between a representative of the diocese and every parish. Each parish would be asked to accept a voluntary target for the causes previously funded by the Statutory collections. They would be informed about the need, and challenged to consider what voluntary targets they could accept. While the needs of all four causes would be placed before them, parishes would be free to determine in which directions they particularly wished their giving to go. A parish which was particularly keen on overseas mission, for example, or on the training of ordination candidates, might plump to put more of its total giving into one or other of those spheres. The danger would be that some causes might prosper and others, equally necessary, be under-supported. I would hope that the process of consultation might overcome any such problem.

It would be a matter of honour for a parish to meet, and surpass, its overall target. It would not be a legal obligation. I believe that with the right kind of consultation and encouragement many parishes would respond to the challenge to give more generously to the wider work of the Church than ever before. We would also have a Church much better informed, at every level of its life, about the common mission in which we are engaged, and I hope that the process of consultation and joint decision-making, which is an integral part of my proposal, would do much to break down the "we-they" mentality of which I have spoken.

Am I being hopelessly idealistic? I do not think so. I am sure that we have only achieved part of our potential in our wider mission, and I think this

approach would enlarge the possibilities before us. There is admittedly an element of risk. But my proposal is that the coming year be a time of consultation. If by September 1985 the consultations were to show that parishes are not ready to rise to the challenge, then Synod would have to decide either to maintain the existing statutory collections or to legislate to replace them with a higher rate of assessments. This is why I am suggesting that my alternative proposal be not implemented until the financial year commencing 1st April 1986. Perhaps it might even turn out to be the most significant of our Jubilee 150 projects !

The other financial matter to which I should refer is the recent decision of the Diocesan Council to lift considerably the level of clergy stipends over the next two years. Two provincial committees have separately considered this question. A Provincial Committee on the Remuneration of the Clergy was appointed by the Provincial Council, and it advocated an immediate substantial increase in the stipend level. Our standing Provincial Stipends Committee took that report into account, as well as doing its own independent thinking. It recommended a smaller immediate rise - though it is still in the vicinity of \$1000 per year as from 1st October next -- and a succession of six quarterly increments of \$300 each, in addition to normal cost of living adjustments. This was the recommendation accepted by the Diocesan Council.

A strong case has been made out for these increases, but this is not the occasion to argue that case. I know that some parishes will be inclined to respond that they cannot afford this increase. I am particularly aware of the pressure it will put on parishes with more than one clergyman, and of the possibility of greater reluctance to appoint assistant curates. Over the past year or two I have not found it easy to place all of our curates, and this concerns me very greatly.

Yet I am aware that every stipend increase tends to bring the reaction that it cannot be afforded. If the level of giving of even the committed core of Anglican worshippers reflected the gratitude which we ought to have for all that God has done for us in Jesus Christ, then we would face no problem at all in meeting these additional costs. The tithe, or tenth, is not a binding regulation on Christians. But it does suggest the standard that ought to guide us in our decisions about our giving to God's work. If that were our standard, there would be no holding back our Church on the ground of lack of financial resources. Some of our parishes -- and this includes some of the wealthiest -- have a deplorable standard of giving, even after years of talk about stewardship. Proper stewardship must begin with us, the clergy and committed laity; and we must not be ashamed to call others to respond gladly with us to God's many and gracious blessings.

#### THE FUTURE

1985 is to be the International Year of Youth. This year's Social Justice Statement entitled "It's a Rocky Road -- Young People in Australia", prepared by consultation among the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Uniting Church and Australian Council of Churches bodies responsible for social questions, has focussed attention on the needs and dilemmas of youth. Many Australian dioceses, including our own, now have an annual Youth Conference or Synod, and an Australian Youth Synod, with representatives under the age of 25 years from every diocese is to be convened in January 1985. The time is clearly ripe for us to review the place of youth in the life of the Church.

Youth should neither be glamorised or underrated. Youth may be lacking in experience, wisdom and balance; but it typically possesses energy, openness and imagination. At one and the same time, youth can

be exciting and infuriating; and I suspect it has always been so. Certainly, any of the older generation who are inclined to write off today's youth would do well to remember two things: our parents often felt the same way about our generation; and insofar as things are wrong with youth today, it is largely because they have been moulded by us who have gone before them.

As the social justice statement reminds us, it can be a rocky road for young people today. A fearfully high proportion of them face extended unemployment, which means not only financial hardship, but a feeling of rejection and meaninglessness. Many of them have grown up in the context of broken homes and inadequate, if not loveless, families. More than older people, they are conscious of the threat of nuclear holocaust, which seems to place a question-mark against long-term plans and meaningful existence. And if we are inclined to be critical of the morals of youth, let us remember that for many of them it is not a question of choosing to reject the Christian standard. Rather they are surrounded by voices which speak so clamorously and seductively of other standards as the norm, that they scarcely have the chance to know the Christian option as a real one.

The proportion of young people to be found among our regular worshipping congregations is relatively small. We have some first-rate young people in the Church. Already a few of them have graduated through the ranks of our Diocesan Youth Conference to membership of this Synod. But they are few; and as a Church we are very complacent about our lack of impact on youth. Perhaps complacency is the wrong word; more often it is insecurity. Many of us feel insecure with young people. We do not find it easy to get on their wavelength, and we fear we might be rejected; so we avoid the danger by keeping away from them. For this reason many parents are unwilling to set clear moral guidelines (which, secretly, many youngsters would welcome) for fear of being thought old-fashioned. We clergy easily fall into the same

pattern, and I am often disappointed to hear the complaint of parish youth groups that their clergy hardly ever spend time with them.

I do not suggest there are easy answers to these problems. Insofar as there are answers, they will come from young people themselves. This is why I hope we shall encourage both our Diocesan Youth Conference and the National Youth Synod. Some parishes made no effort to send representatives to the last Youth Conference. I hate to think what that says about those parishes and their future. Youth are not only the Church of the future; they are a vital part of the Church of today. I call upon every parish to make a serious effort to take up the challenge of the International Youth Year to welcome young people, to listen to them, to encourage them to play a full and responsible part in the life of the Church, and to enable them to find their own ministry to others.

In 1986 we celebrate 150 years of South Australian history. As Charles Beaumont Howard, the first Anglican priest in South Australia, came on the 'Buffalo' together with numerous lay members of the Church of England, we shall also be celebrating 150 years of the life of the Anglican Church in this state.

For quite some time an Anglican Jubilee 150 Committee under the leadership of the Reverend R.J.C. Williams has been making plans for the celebration of the sesquicentenary, as has a similar ecumenical committee under the auspices of the Heads of Churches. Some plans are already well advanced; others remain to be formulated. As the time draws closer, public enthusiasm for the celebration of this landmark in our history will mount. The Church should be fully and enthusiastically involved, so that our own thanksgiving to God for his blessings may find

expression, and so that the spiritual dimension may be kept to the fore in the celebration of the whole South Australian community.

I recently consulted with the clergy on two projected developments in the ministry of the Church, and I should like to inform the Synod of what is proposed.

The first concerns the permanent diaconate, to which I briefly referred last year. The Anglican Church has always stressed the importance of maintaining the threefold apostolic ministry of bishops, priests and deacons; yet in practice we have regarded deacons only as apprentice priests rather than a distinctive and permanent order of ministry. I am not criticising the principle that men who are ordained should serve as deacons before they are made priests, because this signifies that the ordained ministry must always be grounded in humble and self-effacing service. But I believe there are people -- and I leave open at present the question of whether they include men and women -- who are called to the ordained ministry and whom God has given real gifts for ministry, but who are not called to or equipped for the leadership of a congregation which is the normal expectation for a priest. These are the people whom I envisage as permanent deacons. Generally (though not necessarily always) I would expect them to serve in a non-stipendiary capacity. As the Ordinal envisages, their functions would include liturgical, pastoral and administrative aspects, but their ministry might well vary in emphasis according to the gifts of the person and the needs of the congregation. I envisage that these deacons would emerge from the life of their congregation and be endorsed for ordination by the congregation; but they must have an inward conviction of being called

by God, and as they are called to a ministry that is universal and not merely local they must be approved by the bishop and his advisers. In the near future I intend to appoint a commission to make recommendations to me on the selection and training of candidates for the permanent diaconate, and in consultation with my fellow bishops I shall be prepared to take careful steps towards the establishment of a permanent diaconate. I emphasise that I do not see this as something novel, but as a restoration to the Church of the full meaning of an ancient order of ministry.

The second development is an extension in certain restricted circumstances of the ministry of Lay Assistants at Holy Communion. At present that ministry is only exercised in the church building by way of assistance to the presiding priest. It is a very valuable ministry, particularly when the number of communicants is large. In some parishes there are large numbers of elderly and infirm communicants, many of them in old people's or nursing homes, who are not able to come to church. Some of these people were regular weekly communicants when in good health, but their priest may only be able to bring the Sacrament to their home once a month or less frequently. In such cases, where the need can be demonstrated, I am willing to give special authorisation to certain Lay Assistants to take the Sacrament from the church to the aged and infirm. Naturally, I expect that the priest will himself fulfil this pastoral duty to each person as frequently as possible. Strict regulations will be laid down to guide this additional lay ministry.

#### THE BUSINESS OF SYNOD

We have a busy legislative programme before us at this session. Much of it represents mopping-up operations left over when our new Constitution and Ordinances were put in place several years ago. Some of it will not be the most exciting business, but it is necessary to tie up the remaining loose ends. I hope that it will not be many years before

the entire task is complete. This is a good opportunity to pay tribute to my dogged and persevering Constitutional Task Force. Its four members -- Mr. David Bleby, Q.C., Mr. Justice Prior, Archdeacon W.J. Chittleborough and the Reverend W.J. Goodes -- have now worked as a team with membership unchanged for more than seven years. I do not know what the present score is, but a couple of months ago they and their long-suffering wives had a dinner party to celebrate their 85th meeting! Just think what it would have cost the diocese if we had had to pay them at the customary rate for legal services!

We hope as soon as possible after this session of Synod to set in motion the printing of the Constitution and Ordinances, together with other associated documents. We recognise the great difficulty faced by members of Synod and others in not having had these in convenient form. The task of compilation is a large one and it has not been helped by changes in diocesan staff, but it will be tackled with new urgency after this session of Synod.

Now we turn to the business of Synod. May God give us the grace of clear thinking, charitable attitudes and decisive action in all things that may serve to the well-being of his Church and the advancement of his Kingdom.



