

Robert Caddies

From: Robert [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 19 May 2015 7:09 AM
To: bishopgreg@newcastleanglican.org.au
Subject: Ms Dalmazzone's letter of 11 May 2015

Dear Bishop

I have read Ms Dalmazzone's emailed letter on your behalf addressed *inter alia* to me.

I am not, and neither is David Stewart nor Bill Scott, a member of Synod. Laurie Tabart is a member of Synod and in view of your email felt it necessary to dissociate himself from signing the most recent email of 11 May 2014.

None of us has circulated emails to the media.

I was of the belief that Synod comprising Bishop, Clergy and Laity, meeting in Synod, was a democratic body. Diocesan Council (DC) as the standing body of Synod owes its loyalty to the Synod as a whole and takes its authority from Synod not to DC.

I was unaware that there was such a thing as cabinet solidarity by Synod or DC or that Synod cannot be lobbied to change its course on a particular or many matters.

The resolutions of Synod are ambulatory and as such capable of being changed. They are not immutable.

Our letter was to you as the Lord Bishop and to other members of DC.

Our letter was a legitimate attempt to lobby and persuade Synod from drawing back from committing what we believe to be a serious error. To do so may have required a rescission of a resolution. That is all lawful and democratic.

By seeking to threaten the person who was a member of Synod, who wished to sign the letter, so that he happened to feel so intimidated as to withdraw his signature, you have interfered with the legitimate workings of the democratic process of Synod.

Ms Dalmazzone's letter was with great respect misconceived and undoubtedly was not meant to have the particular effect on the member of Synod that it created. If that is so it should be retracted.

It is very unfortunate that we are reduced to communicating in writing as it is hard to always appreciate the "tone" in writing and the intent of a writer.

It needs to be said that if you will not communicate with people (and I am not referring to myself here), and DC chooses not to be mindful of the legitimate concerns of the Synod members and laity as it (legally) rushes to possibly commit serious commercial errors, then you can expect to read more of the business of the Diocese in the Newcastle Herald and elsewhere.

Are you aware of the community concern over the whole matter of selling Bishops court? A Presbyterian lady whom I thought I recognized slightly as being familiar spontaneously raised the subject of the sale with me when we were both sitting in our general practitioner's surgery. Another friend raised with a mutual friend at the beach: "What's going on in the Diocese?" (about Bishops court).

The history of the Bishops court Ordinances over time which I have now reviewed (mostly inaccessible to others) and the departure from the intentions of Mrs Bode is nothing short of a disgrace. Had Synod been reminded each time

proposed legislation regarding Bishopscourt was considered namely that Mrs Bode gave her parents' home for the use of the Lord Bishops for ever, then the various changes up to this point, may not have occurred. In this context 'Being Together' could be read to be critical of the lack of respect for a donor's intentions.

I would also suggest 'Being Together' applies so as to create mutual obligations.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Caddies