

ACC Transcript from Anglican TV Videos:

<http://anglicantv.org/.node/224>

Video 1: ACC 14 Raw Footage **Tape 1 Part 1** May 8th, 2009 Kingston, Jamaica

00:00:00:00

Dato Stanley Isaacs –South East Asia

..When we, when we, it is said here, even I would say the same thing in respect of Resolution A – to now say send this text to - Section 4 - to a committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, it simply means we are rejecting the draft that was prepared by the Covenant Design Group and this is like a review body, a review body of the Covenant Design Group's text. What input are they going to have, this so-called new committee? What input are they going to have? What input do they have, if the input is merely by the voices of those who have been expressed in the, what do you call it, discernment group? That is not the voices of the provinces. Because the complaint was, that the Provinces did not have sufficient time to look at this new section 4.

So I don't see how we can, we can, we are going in circles. We really are going in circles. Let us not play around. I think we are playing around with the bulk.

Archbishop Aspinall – I thank you for your attempt, I am quite sure you are sincerely trying to make an attempt to try and find a way out, but I would now say that we should respect the Covenant Design Group's formulation of that text, and that text which they gave in Section 4 is a text that was worked on by a very representative, eminent people, who have studied this in relation to the responses that were received to the St Andrew's Draft on the Appendix. So to appoint another committee now to look at their work, at their text, is to say now we need to override them and I think it is an act of disrespect.

Personally Bishop Chairman I would just like to suggest - let us just try and get ourselves going. I would like to propose that Resolution A be now put to a vote. Let us just vote on it and if that is carried, then we will have to look at the next resolution. Thank you very much.

00:02:37:19

Chairman Bishop Paterson:

Thank you Stanley.

It is my judgment that this is an amendment which has been properly moved and needs further debate before it be put or be moved or put anything at this stage. Rose:

00:02:55:00

Rev Rose Hudson-Wilkin, England

Rose Hudson-Wilkin, the Church of England. Um, I want to thank the design group of this conference that has enabled people in smaller groups to be able to speak to each other and hopefully to listen to each other, and, um, in a big plenary like this you already see that it is the same people speaking over and over again. However, I think what I want to say is this new resolution does provide us with the opportunity of actually hearing each other. What was being said quite clearly within the

discernment group by some people is that Section 4 needed more work done on it, in order for it to, um, have the full approval or for people to feel confident of it in the way people feel confident about Sections 1 to 3. And I don't think it hurts if we actually, we say we want to listen to each other, then let's listen to each other. We have already spent 50 odd thousand pounds listening. It's not going to hurt if we add another few months to this and make sure we get it right. It seems as if we are saying we want to listen but we will only listen to the bits that suits us. Come on, please, let's really listen to each other, and I think that this – um – new resolution in front of us is much much better, um, than the ones we had before, because it does bring in the opportunity for more work to be done on that particular section which will be meeting the needs of those who are saying please can we do some more work on this, which was not part of what they had before – and I think as part of the listening process, process we need to do that.

Thank you.

00:04:43:02

[unidentified Australian speaker – Australian Bishop?]

Point of order. Point of order. Chairman I don't see how we can go for a new Resolution **C** which is really an amendment to **B** when we haven't resolved **A**. [murmurs of hear hear]. I don't see how we can jump to **C**.

00:05:00:27

Chairman

There is a question before the house and before we decide I think we need to hear some more voices. Bishop Mouneer.

00:05:08:21

Archbishop Mouneer Anis, Jerusalem and the Middle East

With all my respect to the wisdom of my colleague Archbishop Phillip Aspinall, I see that Resolution **C** is also deferring Section 4. In this way I see it not very different from Resolution **A** - and I'm confused. I'm confused why Resolution **A** will be given the priority to be discussed and then now Resolution **C** will be given the priority to be discussed. Is this an attempt to put aside Resolution **B**? Why, why we give the priority - why not to discuss Resolution **B** in the first stage? Why to discuss the contrary first?

00:06:05:27

Rev Janet Trisk, Southern Africa

Janet Trisk from Southern Africa. I am probably as confused as the rest of you but as I understand this amendment, what it's trying to do is amend both **A** and **B** and incorporate them in a new Resolution **C**. So we're not losing the issues in **A**, we're not losing the issues in **B**, but we are trying to deal with them so that we don't end up with confusion. And so some of the speakers to this amendment are now talking about a substantive point raised in section **C**. But I stand in support of this amendment because what it does, is it takes the debate about Section 4 and it takes the issues raised in Parts **A** and **B** and it tries to put them together in a logical way.

If we go for this **C**, the big **C**, the new draft resolution, what we can then do, is we can debate each one of the (a) to (f) six points and make up our minds on each one of those. So if you are somebody who supports Section 4 as it stands, then we can make

a decision. If you are someone who says we need more work on Section 4 then you can also make a decision but that's all contained in this new Resolution C. The problem with going back to the old big A and big B is that we end up in that anomalous situation which Archbishop Phillip referred to earlier and we end up with people considering different versions of the Covenant in different parts of the Communion and so I would urge support of us abandoning A and B, big A and B, and going with this amendment and then debating the substantive clauses (a) to (f). Thank you.

00:08:01:00

Ms Sarah Tomlinson, Scotland

Sarah Tomlinson, Co-opted youth representative

Um, as well a little overwhelmed by the number of A's, B's and C's being, you know, dropped around the room, but regardless of, you know, the points of process.

I know that a lot of us came here for an answer – the situation's gone on for so long and, you know, goodness me I think we're all ready for some kind of an end to it. Um, but this is gonna last for a long time, the Covenant is going to be something that we take on as a Communion and it's going to last, hopefully. So, whatever we decide now, my generation is going to have to deal with. We are going to have to bear the burden of it, of dealing with this, long after, no offense, you guys aren't running the church. [laughter]...sorry. So, I know that we're all keen to get this finished and get it to come to an end, but let's take the time just to consult a bit more, just to make it that bit better, to make sure that people can sign on that bit more. Otherwise I'm going to be sorting out this mess and the rest of the youth are going to be sorting this situation out a lot longer. And goodness knows, if we are fed up now, how do you think we are going to feel in about a year's time? Thank you.

00:09:32:50

Mrs Jolly Babirukamu, Uganda

I am speaking with pain. Section B - we spent almost a whole day in Joint Standing Committee drafting this resolution and as members of Joint Standing Committee we agreed presenting Section B to the Plenary. Now we are discussing Section A and B and I thought we had the right motion, voting either for A or B. Now comes in Section C.

Brothers and Sisters, do we have the spirit of discernment among us? Is there any kind of the devil trying to craft and change things and some amendments that we take a different direction? Did we pray to ask God's guidance about this? I don't know whether this is the devil's plan to make us change everything and I fancy, because this is, some of them are getting angry and getting confused and I just believe Section C is a purpose to bring confusion in the house [murmurs of agreement]. Can I ask that we go back to Section A and B and be more organized and orderly and know what we are doing rather than having more confusion and please, can we pray for the spirit of discernment to know whether we are actually being question things orderly ... a kind of parliament discussing state issues. Praise God.

00:11:10:00

Bishop Ikechi Nwachukwu Nwosu, Nigeria

From the way the debate is going, putting one and one together, even with **A, B, C** and what has been said so far, considering also the fact that some people would like some more time to be given to the whole Covenant, I am of the opinion that this house agrees to return the Covenant back to the Provinces, with a word that it is not satisfactory, or that we are not sure what to do to with it, and that we want them to come up with an idea on how this Communion will go, because it will continue tinkering on (*this?*) there is a way we can come to this Covenant as before us, and myself from Nigeria I would be most reluctant to take whatever the ...back to Nigeria. Because Church of Nigeria, as far as we are concerned we are pretty clear about our position, and we are simply here to see how this church can go together. But listening from what is happening, we are simply not satisfied with that Covenant document. Why don't we take it back to the owners, that is the Provinces, and let them do what they can with it. There is a limit to what we can do here as far as we are concerned. And that is my whole suggestion.

00:12:56:13

Chairman

Thank you. Archbishop.

00:13:01:00

Archbishop Thabo Cecil Makgoba, Southern Africa

Thank you Chair. Perhaps in terms of my system, I just want to pause before I say what I want to say so that I allow the spirit of prayer to help us. The second point is just to support, and I am grateful to Bishop Phillip for this resolution because what it does, it addresses at least what we are raising and it provides the issue of process – and if you look at the **new Resolution C** quite carefully, the old **A** is covered by **(c)** and **(d)** and the old **B** is covered by **(a)** and **(b)** in the new resolution and the old **C** is covered by **(c)** and **(d)**, sorry **(e)** and **(f)**. Let me start. The old **A** is covered by **(c)** and **(d)**, but at least in terms of **(c)** and **(d)** we are given process in terms of how to go forward – and the old **B** is covered by **(a)** and **(b)** [voice interrupts **(e)** and **(f)**] ... yeah **(e)** and **(f)** and the old **B** is covered by **(a)** and **(b)**. So there is really nothing new in terms of this it is just the re-organization of the old resolution, but what it does in terms of old **A**, it helps us in terms of process and so I thank you Bishop Phillip for providing another process for us. Thank you.

00:14:55:27

Chairman

Thank you, we are coming to the point where we do need to decide which Resolution we now focus on, sorry Chris, I didn't spot you there:

00:15:05:07

Very Rev Christopher Potter, Wales

Chris Potter, Church in Wales. Chair, members of ACC. I thought I was confused, and I am even more confused now. I want to go back to Resolution **A** and propose that we vote it down and go straight to Resolution **B**. I am all for treating our Provinces as adults, that they can make their own decisions about this. I feel some debate on Section **(c)** of Resolution **B** might clarify their position to be able to debate this back in the Provinces, and that would be the speediest way of getting responses back to ACO. Um, I get the feeling that just about everybody here wants a

continuation of the Communion and I was just reminded of a quote from Walter Wink we had this morning.

‘Transfiguration is living by vision, standing foursquare in the midst of a broken, tortured, oppressed, starving, de-humanizing reality, yet seeing the invisible, calling it to come, behaving as if it is on the way, sustained by elements of it that have come already within and among us.’

I propose that we turn down Resolution A and move to Resolution B.

00:16:33:00

Bishop Gerard E Mpango, Tanzania

The problem with Resolution C is that it hasn't come through the process and the procedure of receiving resolutions. I wonder whether this has gone through the Resolutions Committee, so that is why it is confusing us. Thank you.

00:17:00:00

Ms Kate Turner, Ireland

I want to speak in favor of Resolution C because I think it gives us the opportunity to debate the issues that are in A and B, but to do them clause by clause and I also think it is much clearer than the original Resolution A which seemed to be breaking up the Covenant and I think the danger if we don't have a debate about looking at whether we revise and consider the Covenant in Section 4 – if we send it out and say to provinces tell us your thoughts on Section 4, we know that the responses that are going to come back, some of them in a few months, some of them can't respond for 2 years – I think five years was the longest on the form we got. And if we have people coming back over the next 6 years saying: I like the Covenant but I don't like this bit, I like the Covenant but I don't like that bit, we then have to collate all those different answers. And I can see it being 10, 12, 15 years. Sarah will be the only person in the room still discussing this. Whereas if we have the opportunity to look at it in this new format it gives us ... and we may not decide to do this, whether to take another few months to get it right before we send it out now, so that when the responses come back they are responses, rather than another 15 years of looking at this. Thank you.

00:18:34:00

Chairman

Let me just ask for clarification on that question that has been asked: has the Resolutions Committee had a chance over the lunch break to look at this C or not?

00:18:44:00

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

Mr Chairman. The Chairman of that Committee has not. [Pause] I think, if I could make a comment on process, Mr Chairman, we have been talking about this being an amendment. I think we are actually discussing what the process shall be as to whether we consider C in place of considering A then B. It's slightly complicated because we are really part way through discussing A – and I would be interested to hear the wording of the amendment we are said to be discussing. I think it's probably a separate amendment which says we discard A and B and adopt C for discussion, but I would be helped if I, it was clear as to what the precise question is.

00:19:51:30

Chairman

I doubt very much that using a word like discard is going to help us. What I understand to be the purport of this proposed **C** is to keep before us all of the original large **B**, and to insert, for us to decide whether we want it or not, two small pieces of the former **A**. So we would not be discarding **B**. It's all there.

The question before us is whether we wish to proceed to take option, Resolution **C** as the way we will proceed. That's the one we have got to decide...

I see Archbishop's hand [indicates to him]

00:20:39:21

Archbishop of Canterbury, England

Thank you Chairman, I was. It does seem to me that procedurally the simple, huh, simple way of dealing with this – having seen **C**, what we've seen is effectively two possible amendments to **B** – two additions to **B**. Having seen that I think we should vote on **A**, and then move to **B** and the extra material in **C** is moved as an amendment to **B**. [murmurs of hear hear]

00:21:12:00

Chairman

There seems to be a good deal of assent being murmured to the Archbishop's suggestion. I think that we should take the advice of our President and move in that direction. So we should resume our discussion on Resolution **A** and move to see whether Resolution **A** stands or falls.

So this will become Question 12? Question 12, are people clear what I am now asking you to vote on? Question 12 is simply: Do you agree with Resolution **A**? Are you for or against Resolution **A**, that we spent some time this morning debating? Are we clear? Does everyone need clarification? OK? Thank you.

Question 13 [calls of 12] ..sorry, I am confusing myself, thank you. Question 12: Are we in favor of Resolution **A** or are we against Resolution **A**?

[voting papers being collected]

Will you indicate if your yellow paper has not been collected.

Thank you, we move now to consideration of Resolution **B** as originally proposed.

00:23:44:20

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

Thank you Mr Chairman, Tony Fitchett, Chair of the Resolutions Committee - at the present. I think, I think I should thank the house for the debate on the principle of whether we want Part 4 in the Covenant or not and I think until we got confused before lunch we actually had quite a straightforward debate on that issue, and I thank the house for that. And that was the intention of the Resolutions Committee in putting that motion forward – not to promote it but to assist the house to make a decision on that matter.

The text of Resolution **B** differs in some ways from the original draft resolution that was circulated. You will note that in Clause **(a)** the wording is somewhat different. It used to refer to ‘work’, it refers now to ‘faithfulness and responsiveness’, and that was in response to feedback which noted in particular the way the Design Group had listened to the Provinces and responded to them as best it could and several speakers have referred to that already this morning. So that is the rationale for that change.

Section **(b)** – you will note there has been a subtle change from ‘may provide an effective’ – from ‘can provide an effective means’ to ‘may provide’ and that is designed to encompass opinions that were expressed to us that might not – so it is somewhat softer.

00:25:51:10

Section **(c)** is carefully worded to describe to whom the covenant text will be sent for decision-making and you will notice it does not talk about the Provinces or to Anglican Churches – it refers specifically to member churches of the Anglican Consultative Council and if you look at the constitution of the Council there is a clear list there of what those churches are. Now it may be that other ecclesial entities who describe themselves as Anglican may wish to subscribe to the Covenant or even other churches not Anglican may wish to do so, but at this time, and you will notice those words in there, it is suggested that this document should go only to those churches which are listed in the schedule in the constitution – the churches that are represented here.

And finally in Clause **(d)** – we picked up on what seemed to be a fairly general feeling that waiting until 2014 would be waiting too long so they are asked to report to ACC 15 which I understand is likely to be in 2012.

So that’s my explanation of the changes we have made to the original draft, and of course I would expect that after we have got through **(a)** and **(b)**, that there will be amendments moved perhaps by Archbishop Aspinall regarding the decision about whether we wait a few months before sending it out so that there can be further input from the Provinces.

Um **Gregory** has just pointed out to me that I have missed out one change we made. You will notice in **(d)** the second line talks about the processes of response to and acceptance or adoption of the Covenant, and that insertion of ‘acceptance’ was because of a plea from the Church of South India whose processes are somewhat different to those of most other churches represented here and their representative felt that ‘adoption’ was too hard a word, it would be easier to have the word ‘acceptance’ in there - and it seemed to us that that was perfectly reasonable. So Provinces can choose whether they wish to accept it or adopt it, but in my opinion the difference would be unnoticeable. Thank you

00:29:17:30

Chairman

Before we proceed to the substantive debate on Resolution **B** I can give you the result of the vote of the ballot on Question 12. Question 12 was the adoption or otherwise of Resolution **A**: voting for were 17 members; voting against were 47; one abstention – out of a total of 65 votes. So Resolution **A** is no longer before us.

Debate is now on Resolution **B** as it appears on our sheet. Are there any speakers?
Janet.

00:30:00:23

Rev Janet Trisk, Southern Africa

Janet Trisk, Southern Africa. Chair, are you going to put each of these clauses sequentially, because I would like to propose an amendment but it might be that you want me to do that at a later stage?

00:30:15:11

Chairman

I think in terms of our process it would be easier if we took four votes – four clauses, as they stand at the moment. So if you don't have an amendment to Clause (a) at this point I think I would advise you to hold.

Are there any speakers then to Resolution **B**? [murmuring] What is Clause (a), I was taking an overall view first but let us take Resolution **B** Clause (a) the first clause.
Thank you George.

00:30:53:07

Professor George Koshy, South India (United)

Chairman, my concern is about the word 'draft'. We are not sending a draft to the Provinces, we have to send text to the Covenant to the Provinces. So I would expect the Resolutions Committee to try to find, or to make some appropriate changes so that we send a text of the Covenant to the Provinces, because Provinces are not supposed to alter or even to propose amendments to the text that we are sending out.

00:31:29:23

Chairman

Thank you George. Tony.

00:31:36:06

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

Mr Chairman, speaking as the Chair of the Resolutions Committee, that clause refers to the draft we have received from the working group the Design Group, does not refer to the text to go out to the Provinces. It may be that you wish to make some changes when you get down to Clause (c), but at the moment we are talking about what the Design Group has sent us and I think they were specifically labeled 'draft'.

00:32:20:11

Chairman

Any further speakers to Clause (a)? If not then I wonder if we are ready to vote on [refers to notes] Question 13? And the question is that small clause (a) of Resolution **B** - is that a for or against? Please vote.

Are there any further ballot papers to pick up? Please indicate. Thank you.
Christine, there is one just in front of you I believe.

00:34:04:00

Alright, thank you, we move to lower case **(b)** ‘recognizes the Covenant may provide’. Are there any speakers to Clause **(b)**?
If not then this become Question 14. [delegate waves] There is some attention needed at the far table, Christina.

Video 1 Tape 1 Part 1. ends

Video 2 ACC 14 Raw Footage Tape 1 Part 2 May 8th, 2009 Kingston, Jamaica

00 34 45 00

Canon Kearon, Ireland

Christine, you are confusing...that was the last vote... we are on the next vote.

00:35:08:00

Chairman

Just give the staff a minute or two to empty their totes and then come back to collect this one.

Thank you Joanna, if you would start collecting. You’ve got to be fit to be a teller in this house.

Are there any further ballots for Question 14 to be picked up?

00:37:00:00

We move now to consideration of Clause **(c)** of Resolution **B**: ‘Asks the Secretary General to send the Ridley Cambridge Draft at this time’.

Are there any speakers at this point, George [Koshy, South India] that you wish to amend, and then if not I shall ask Joanna [Trisk, Southern Africa] to speak

I think let’s look at..sorry..

00:37:24:05

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

I wonder if this would be an appropriate time to invite Archbishop Aspinall to move his amendment because that slots in the head of what is at present Clause **(c)**. [calls of confusing]

[not clear who] I thank you it’s being attended to.

00:37:43:23

Chairman

I think this time to tidy the language which George helpfully wants us to do.

00 37 48 19

Professor George Koshy, South India (United)

What I want to suggest is a small amendment in **(c)**: ‘Ask the Secretary General to send the Ridley Cambridge Draft as the text of an Anglican Covenant’ – addition of those words “as the text of an Anglican Covenant”.

00:38:10:17

Chairman

Would you consider please, would you consider a suggestion from the Chair which sort of says we replace the word draft here with text [calls of Yes] – just change the word ‘draft’ to ‘text’ – ‘the Ridley Cambridge text’?

[Prof Koshy assents and nods his head]

00:38:35:10

Chairman

George accepts that the amendment would be in the first line of Clause (c) to change the word ‘draft’ to read ‘text’. Are ten people willing to support such an amendment? [hands are seen raised]

Yes, there are more than ten. Thank you. Does anybody wish to speak to that amendment? Yes bishop.

00:39:04:05

Bishop Gerard E Mpango, Tanzania

Mr Chairman I want to be clear about the words here – ‘acceptance’ and ‘adoption’. Please help me - can you accept something without adopting it? If you can, then there is a problem there.

00:39:30:10

Chairman

Thank you bishop we will come to that point I am sure a little later. At the moment we are addressing an amendment which would change the word ‘draft’ to the word ‘text’ in the first line. Is this something you are willing to vote on just by show of hands? [calls of yes]

Please raise your hand if you agree with the amendment: change the word ‘draft’ to read ‘text’.

Clearly there is a majority there. That change is thus made.

00:40:05:00

Chairman

Now is this the point Janet at which you wish to introduce

00:40:11:00

Rev Janet Trisk, Southern Africa

Janet Trisk, Southern Africa. I would like to propose an amendment which sounds complicated, but it’s not because it follows the wording on the paper that was given to you under the resolution, big capital C.

I propose the following amendment:

That the present small clause (c) be renumbered (e) that the present small clause (d) be numbered (f) and that two new clauses be inserted:

a small (c) “ask the Archbishop of Canterbury in consultation with the Secretary General to appoint a small working group to consider and consult with the Provinces on Section 4 and its possible revision and to report to the next meeting of the Joint Standing Committee” and (d) “ask the JSC at that meeting to approve the final form of Section 4; and if that is accepted, then the word “at this time” in the new Section (e) will have to be changed to “at that time”.

00:41:11:00

Chairman

Thank you Janet.

The difficulty I have is that the house has already decided not to proceed along the lines of Resolution A [murmurs of assent] and that this...um The Archbishop of Canterbury...

00:41:34:05

Archbishop of Canterbury, England

Sorry Chair I don't know if this is a point of order or information or what but it did seem to me that the voting on **A** may very well have been properly influenced by the fact that an alternative form of **A** was known to be about to be tabled. When I spoke earlier I said that I suggested the new material at **C** should be moved as part of **B**. I suspect people may have voted on **A** with that in view.

00:42:06:00

Chairman

Thank you, you often come to our rescue and I am very grateful.

I need then to ask Janet whether there are ten persons in the house prepared to support such amendment? Yes there are certainly more than ten.

So we turn our attention to the amendment. Are there any speakers?

[someone says they've already spoken]

They've already spoken. Bishop Mouneer I think you have in fact spoken to this material

00:42:43:09

Archbishop Mouneer Anis, Jerusalem and the Middle East

Not...to this

00:42:44:10

Chairman

Not to this amendment.

00:42:51:13

Archbishop Mouneer Anis, Jerusalem and the Middle East

I see this as like bringing **A** again. This is my view. We have already decided against **A**. That is bringing **A** again, but in a different form [murmurs of agreement]

00:43:14:00

Chairman

I think that we need to .. there is another speaker, Sarah.

[Kearon whispers to Chairman]

00:43:20:05

Ven Dr Sarah Macneil, Australia

Sarah Macneil, Province of Australia. If introducing **(c)** and **(d)** into this draft resolution, what I believe we are doing is offering people the opportunity to take a little more time to look at Section 4. We have heard in the process our brothers and sisters from a number of Provinces saying that they do not believe their Provinces

have had sufficient time to look at this and to comment on this section. In other places in these debates we have been asking for moratoria and we have been giving, both moratoria have been granted. This is an opportunity for there to be a little bit longer for those places who feel they need a little bit longer to decide whether they want to say yes or no to the Covenant as a whole based on Section 4, their responses to Section 4. It seems to me that we are doing a disservice to each other if we do not allow this time. Thank you.

00:44:25:00

Chairman

Right if there are no further speakers I shall put this as question 15. Question 15, [consults] 16 [someone says taken by a show of hands] Well let's keep the numbering and the bishop happy and make this Question 16. And the question is whether you vote for the introduction, for the amendment or against the amendment, the introduction of those two clauses and the subsequent renumber.

00:46:21:00

For the record, Question 13 resulted in a vote expressed by 63 people: for 60, against 2, abstained 1. This is Question 13: 60 were in favor, 2 were against and 1 paper was abstained or spoilt.

Now Question 14, Question 14 resulted in a vote of 61 in favor, for and 3 against.

We turn now, without knowing the result of that particular, our last vote, but let's consider what is currently listed as Clause (c) dependant on the outcome of the last vote. But let's consider Clause (c). Tony.

00:47:46:03

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

Mr Chairman [cries of can't hear you].. can you hear me now.? Thank you. Tony Fitchett from Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. I think we do actually need to add a few words to what is presently listed as (c) and I think those words should be at the very end after the word 'them' "as the Anglican Covenant", because otherwise we are just sending them a text and saying you might like to consider and accept or adopt this but without having a formal title for it and I think a formal title would be helpful. So I would like to move an amendment if 10 people will back me to add those words "as" capital T, "The Anglican Covenant".

00:48:44:13

Chairman

The amendment would add the following words at the end of what is the currently Clause (c) "in consideration of acceptance or adoption of The Anglican Communion Covenant", I am sorry, "as The Anglican Communion Covenant"

00:49:03:21

Dr Anthony Fitchett, New Zealand, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee

Capital T would be in order for The as well because I think 'The' forms part of the title.

00:49:11:27

Chairman

There is an amendment. It will become Question 17. If there are no speakers to that amendment. Do you wish to speak? Yes bishop.

00:49:29:30

Bishop Gerard E Mpango, Tanzania

Begging the question, can you accept something without adopting it? If that is true then I propose we have an amendment to strike off the 'acceptance' and leave 'adoption' only.

00:49:55:05

Chairman

Right, bishop you are foreshadowing another amendment and since we have dealt with this one that's fine, that's quite in order.

Are we ready to vote then on Dr Fitchett's amendment? Question 17: amendment by way of addition of those words at the foot of the text "as The Anglican Communion Covenant" - those in favor put for or against, Question 17.

I have been asked to repeat the result of Question 14: 61 persons voted for and 3 voted against.

00:51:48:11

Results of Question 16, we can go back to Question 16, yes. The question of whether those clauses should be inserted. 33 persons voted for 30 voted against 2 abstained. The amendment is carried.

That leaves us still debating what was clause (c) and is now (e) and the bishop proposed or foreshadowed an amendment. Um, for clarification of the language, whether acceptance or adoption. Bishop do you wish to come and rephrase your amendment for us?

00:53:14:00

Bishop Gerard E Mpango, Tanzania

Thank you Mr Chairman. I...really as a door way here acceptance, adoption If you can accept something without adopting it, then I am proposing that we remain with one word 'adoption' rather than 'acceptance or adoption', but again it depends on what you think: by acceptance and adoption.

00:53:44:10

Chairman

I think that, yes bishop.

00:53:47:13

Bishop John Gladstone, South India (United)

This word, these two words I can accept and adopt after fairly good discussion on the Uniting Churches. 'Adopt' is very strong legally, some of that word, so something like double we had to look for, also either or so those who can accept they can accept. Legally adopt...means those words.

00:54:22:09

Chairman

With that explanation bishop [Mpango], do you wish to proceed with your amendment?

Doesn't wish to proceed, thank you.

00:54:37:00

That leaves us with the vote on whether the new Clause (e) which was (c) do now stand as amended, so this becomes Question 18?

00:55:00:00

[Unidentified Speaker?]

But please note that there is a revised text in the light of the amendment (c) and (d) which now reads as shown on the screen.

00:55:14:00

Chairman

I will read it in case it is too hard for others.

The Clause will now read "asks the Secretary General to send the revised Ridley Cambridge text at that time only to the member to the member churches of the Anglican Consultative Council for consideration and decision on acceptance or adoption by them as The Anglican Communion Covenant. That is Question 18 for us now to cast a vote.

00:55:60:00

It may help members and I am sorry to be slightly out of order on this, it may help members in casting their vote on this to know that the result of Question 17: 64 people voted for and only 1 against and that is the, affects the amended wording of this text. So that stands as we are just voting on.

Are there any ballots to be collected? Yes still, thank you Joanna

00:57:15:00

We move now to the newly numbered (f): "asks those member churches to report to ACC 15 on progress made in the processes of response to and accepting or adoption of The Covenant. Can you speak to this? Yes.....

00:57:43:00

Dato Stanley Isaacs, South East Asia

Thank you Mr Chairman, Bishop Chairman. Stanley Isaacs, South East Asia again. I am sorry I overlooked this point and I should have saw this a bit earlier before it was, um, voted on. I see a practical problem in the paragraph at E that we just voted on and that is simply this. In the light of the adoption of the new paragraph C, it may result in a change to the Ridley Text and so it will, if it results in some change, then it will not be quite correct to be sending, asking the Secretary General to send the Ridley Cambridge Text because the Ridley....sorry [interruptions from various people] .. it is already that, revised [someone says yes] Oh I am sorry, thank you.

00:58:55:00

Chairman

Thank you. If there are no speakers to Clause (f) as proposed, this will become question 19. Are you ready to vote? Please. [voting taking place]

00:59:20:00

[Someone approaches Chairman from the right passing in front of right screen and talks to him?]

01:00:43:17 [Tape change noted to be about 30 seconds]

22:26:26:24 [New tape numbering changes]

22:26:26:18

Chairman

...with one abstention

I want to ask the house if they would join me in thanking, er, John Perfranca and Terry Robinson, Sue, Christine, Joanna and Rachel and Fiona for their hard work ... [Applause]

22:26:53:00

I think the most useful thing we can do now is adjourn for afternoon tea and commence work on the ecumenical streams at 4:15, 4:15 until 5 p.m. when we will resume in the plenary for resolutions regarding ecumenical accounts

22:27:22:00

[Someone approaches Chairman from right again crossing the right screen – same person as at 00:59:20:00 above]

22:28:19:00

Chairman

Members of the Council – I have been asked to clarify the status of where we have got to and I think it is fair to say that the vote on the amendment to include those two clauses was carried but we still need to commit those clauses to a vote. And I apologize for misleading you on that matter.

I have called the adjournment and so I think we have to stay with that. I think we might have to recommit those two clauses – not to recommit just to vote on those two clauses when we reassemble at the plenary at 5.

Video 2 Tape 1 Part 2 ends
