

Day 6 — Morning Session
Tuesday, May 17, 2022

Article 69 – Reopening

Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman observed all synod members were present. He welcomed all present, including students from the Cornerstone Christian School in Guelph. He had those present sing Psalm 133, read Philippians 2:19-30, and led in opening prayer.

Article 70 – Acts

The prepared articles of the *Acts* were corrected and adopted.

Article 71 – SCBP (Standing Committee for the Book of Praise)

1. Material

1.1 Report of the Standing Committee for the Book of Praise (SCBP):

1.1.1 Section Two – Committee Proposals.

1.2 Submissions from the following churches: Ancaster (8.3.2.28) re: further recommendations to update Hymn 1; St. Albert (8.3.2.5) re: the notation and wording change to Hymn 1 as recommended by the committee; Owen Sound (8.3.2.18) re: the recommendation to change the wording of Hymn 46; Willoughby Heights (8.3.2.22) re: proposed changes to Hymn 60:4; Orangeville (8.3.2.36) re: support for recommendations of the committee and a suggestion that publication of any changes be made in the next edition of the *Book of Praise*.

2. Admissibility

2.1 The report was declared admissible.

2.2 The submissions were declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

3.1 Re: SCBP 11.1: Amend the wording and musical notation of Hymn 1 and the Apostles' Creed:

3.1.1 To adopt the wording and notation recommendations of the committee;

Current Version	Proposed Change
	
and sit-teth at the right hand	and is seat-ed at the right hand

3.1.2 To send to the SCBP, for its consideration, the recommended changes to Hymn 1 made by Ancaster;

3.2 Re: SCBP 11.2: Hymn 46 – Proposed revision to lyrics in stanza 1:

3.2.1 To maintain the current wording of Hymn 46 re: “They that wilds inhabit shall their worship bring”;

3.3 Re: SCBP 11.3: Hymn 55 – Proposed revision to lyrics:

3.3.1 To adopt the updated language of this hymn as recommended by the committee;



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

3.3.1.1 Stanza 1

Who trusts in God, a strong abode
in heaven and earth possesses;
who looks in love to Christ above,
no fear his heart oppresses.
In you alone, O Lord, we own
our hope and consolation,
our shield from foes, our balm for woes,
our great and sure salvation.

Stanza 2

Though Satan’s wrath beset our path
and worldly scorn assail us,
while you are near, we will not fear;
your strength shall never fail us.
Your rod and staff shall keep us safe
and guide our steps forever;
no shades of death, nor hell beneath
your people from you sever.

Stanza 3

In all the strife of mortal life
our feet shall stand securely;
temptation’s hour shall lose its power,
for you shall guard us surely.
O God, each day direct our way;
renew us by your Spirit
until we stand at your right hand
through Jesus’ saving merit.

3.4 Re: SCBP 11.4: Hymn 60 – Proposed revision to lyrics of stanza 4:

3.4.1 To retain the current wording of Hymn 60:4;

3.5 Re: SCBP 11.5: Hymn 58 – Propose to replace the melody:

3.5.1 To adopt the change of melody as recommended by the committee;



1

Hymn 58 – “Our Children, LORD, as Covenant Heirs”

1. Our child - ren, LORD, as cov - enant heirs, are bap - tized in your name, for
 2. Such child - ren Je - sus did em - brace while dwell - ing here be - low; to
 3. As they grow up, keep them se - cure from world - ly snares we pray; O

5
 they your stead - fast prom - ise share, which you to us pro - claim.
 us and ours, O God of grace, the same com - pass - ion show.
 let them to the end en - dure in ev - ery right - eous way.

- 2 3.6 To mandate the SCBP to publish these changes in the next edition of the *Book of Praise*;
- 3 3.7 Prior to the publication of the next edition of the *Book of Praise*, the churches can either
- 4 maintain past practices or implement these changes.

4. Grounds

- 6 4.1 Re: 3.1.1: Although alternate notation and wording for Hymn 1 were submitted for
- 7 Synod’s consideration, the recommended change to the wording by the committee was
- 8 deemed better because it both removes archaic language and maintains familiar
- 9 notation.
- 10 4.2 Re: 3.1.2: The comments of Ancaster can be considered by the committee (excluding
- 11 their comment re: “is seated”) for consideration by a subsequent synod prior to the
- 12 publication of a new edition of the *Book of Praise*.
- 13 4.3 Re: 3.2.1: While the suggestion from the committee is meant to address potential
- 14 offence, the expression “they that wilds inhabit shall their worship bring” beautifully
- 15 articulates the call of the church to reach every remote region with the gospel, and the
- 16 wonderful effect of such missional activity. In maintaining this wording, the concern of
- 17 Owen Sound is addressed.
- 18 4.4 Re: 3.3.1: The suggested change by the committee removes and replaces archaic
- 19 language in this hymn. This change can be made because the churches have the freedom
- 20 to do so regarding copyright, and in doing so is consistent with previous synod
- 21 decisions.
- 22 4.5 Re: 3.4.1: Hymn 60 is a Lord’s Supper hymn. The current version of stanza four retains
- 23 the connection to Christ’s suffering and how it unites us to him and to each other, by the
- 24 Holy Spirit, until Christ returns. The proposed version by the committee omits this
- 25 connection and emphasizes the ascension, which is not the point of the hymn. This also



1 addresses the concern of Willoughby Heights (8.3.2.22) re: a preference to return to the
2 original form of the hymn or to delete stanza four altogether.

3 4.6 Re: 3.5.1: The new melody recommended by the committee is well-suited to the lyrics
4 of Hymn 58 and serves to enhance the use of this baptism hymn, whereas the original
5 melody feels unfinished and unresolved, which may be an inappropriate ending for a
6 joyous occasion such as baptism.

7 4.7 Re: 3.6 and 3.7: While the churches have the ability and freedom to implement these
8 changes locally with the available technologies, these changes do not warrant the
9 printing of a new edition of the *Book of Praise* at this time.

11 **Article 72 – CPTPF (Committee for Pastoral Training Program Funding)**

12 **1. Material**

13 1.1 Report of the Committee for Pastoral Training Program Funding (CPTPF) with all its
14 appendices (8.2.5.1).

15 **2. Admissibility**

16 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

17 **3. Decisions**

18 Synod decided:

19 3.1 To express gratitude to the Guelph-Emmanuel CanRC and its committee for the work it
20 has done;

21 3.2 To reappoint Guelph-Emmanuel as the Committee for Pastoral Training Program
22 Funding (CTPTF) with the following mandate:

23 3.2.1 To look after all internship-related funding matters;

24 3.2.2 To assess the churches each year based on the anticipated funding required for a
25 particular summer;

26 3.2.3 To report about its activities to the next general synod, which report shall be sent
27 to all the churches at least six months prior to the next general synod.

29 **Article 73 – Appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 33 (Hymn Cap Overture – procedure)**

30 Committee 3 presented draft 1 of a report on an appeal by the Chilliwack CanRC against RSW
31 2021 Art. 33 (8.6.6.1) regarding procedure in dealing with an overture. The report was discussed.
32 The committee took the report back for refinement.

34 **Article 74 – Appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 33 (Hymn Cap Overture – grounds)**

35 Committee 3 presented draft 1 of a report on an appeal by the Chilliwack CanRC against RSW
36 2021 Art. 33 (8.6.6.2) regarding the grounds for an overture. The report was discussed. The
37 committee took the report back for refinement.

38
39 *After the chairman said goodbye to the students, Synod adjourned until 2:00pm.*
40



1 **Day 6 — Afternoon Session**
2 **Tuesday, May 17, 2022**

3 **Article 75 – Reopening**

4 Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman had the meeting sing Psalm 135:6,10. He
5 observed that all synod members were present.
6

7 **Article 76 – Appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 33 (*Hymn Cap Overture – procedure*)**

8 **1. Material**

9 1.1 Appeal from the Chilliwack CanRC asking GS 2022 to judge that RSW 2021 erred in
10 the way in which it dealt with submissions from Chilliwack (and other churches), in
11 processing an overture presented to RSW 2021 by Classis Pacific East (CPE) Sept. 2020
12 (8.6.6.1).

13 **2. Admissibility**

14 2.1 The appeal was declared admissible. However, it was noted that Chilliwack neglected
15 to submit a copy of the relevant Acts of RSW 2021, as well as a copy of the original
16 overture as submitted by CPE as part of their appeal.

17 **3. Decisions**

18 **Synod decided:**

19 3.1 To deny the appeal of the Chilliwack CanRC against the procedure followed by RSW
20 2021 (Art. 33).

21 **4. Grounds**

22 4.1 Though Chilliwack contends that “*an overture should come from a local congregation,*
23 *not a major, or broader, assembly*” and concludes, on the basis of that belief, that “*it is*
24 *prohibited to alter any submissions by anyone, after it (sic) has been presented*” to a
25 major assembly, this is an incorrect understanding of the nature of overtures. Although
26 overtures originate with a consistory, they are presented to the major assemblies for
27 adoption. Major assemblies have the right to amend overtures, for the sake of their
28 adoption. An adopted overture then becomes the overture of the major assembly which
29 adopted it.

30 4.2 If a major assembly were to amend an overture in such a way that it no longer honoured
31 the original intent of the minor assembly which submitted it, that would, indeed, be
32 improper. However, the information which Chilliwack excerpts from the Acts of RSW
33 2021 shows that RSW honoured the original intent of the overture submitted by CPE
34 Sept. 2020. The amendments made by RSW 2021 served to strengthen the argument of
35 the overture.

36 4.3 Chilliwack cites excerpts from the Acts of RSW 2021 as suggestions that their
37 submissions were not dealt with impartially. Chilliwack did not, however, submit a
38 complete copy of the relevant portions of the Acts RSW 2021, or of the overture that
39 originated with the Vernon CanRC and was submitted by CPE Sept. 2020 to RSW
40 2021, or the “list of concerns” presented by Chilliwack to RSW 2021. It is, therefore,
41 not possible, or appropriate, for GS 2022 to make a judgement in this matter.



1
2 **Article 77 – Appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 33 (*Hymn Cap Overture – grounds*)**

3 **1. Material**

4 1.1 Appeal from the Chilliwack CanRC (8.6.6.2) against RSW 2021 Art. 33, in which it
5 appeals the overture from RSW to remove the so-called “Hymn Cap”.

6 **2. Admissibility**

7 2.1 The appeal was declared admissible.

8 **3. Decisions**

9 **Synod decided:**

10 3.1 To deny the appeal of the Chilliwack CanRC against RSW 2021 Art. 33.

11 **4. Grounds**

12 4.1 Chilliwack “*wishes to appeal the overture from RSW.*” Churches may interact with
13 overtures by means of letters, but by their very nature, overtures cannot be appealed.

14 4.2 Though Chilliwack asserts “*that the decision of Chatham 2004, must first be proven to*
15 *be in conflict with either the word of God, or the church order*”, they have not
16 demonstrated that the decision of RSW 2021 was in conflict with either the Word of
17 God, or the CO.

18 4.3 Though Chilliwack asserts “*that RSW 2021 has wronged the churches by its decision to*
19 *present the overture to GS 2022 without first proving the error of our current practice*”,
20 previous decisions can be revisited as proposals (which includes overtures)
21 substantiated by new grounds.

22
23 **Article 78 – Appeal against RSE 2020 Art. 13 (*Language of questions in Liturgical Forms*)**

24 **1. Material**

25 1.1 Appeal from the Hamilton-Blessings CanRC against the decision of RSE 2020 not to
26 adopt the overture of Classis Central Ontario (CCO) May 2020, regarding the
27 amendment of the language of the questions in the liturgical forms (8.6.9.1).

28 1.2 Overture (request), embedded in the appeal, from Hamilton-Blessings that if their
29 appeal to GS 2022 is upheld, GS 2022 would adopt the CCO May 2020 overture to RSE
30 2020 (8.6.9.1).

31 **2. Admissibility**

32 The appeal, and the overture within it, was declared admissible.

33 **3. Decisions**

34 **Synod decided:**

35 3.1 To sustain the appeal of Hamilton-Blessings against RSE 2020 Art. 13 (1.1);

36 3.2 To deny the overture (request) of Hamilton-Blessings (1.2).

37 **4. Grounds**

38 4.1 Re: 3.1: RSE 2020’s decision not to take over the overture is based on insufficient
39 grounds as demonstrated by the following:



- 1 4.1.1 RSE 2020 Art. 13 Cons. 1 makes an observation about the overture. Hamilton-
2 Blessings is correct to note this. An observation cannot be a ground for a decision
3 without further clarification as to how that observation would form an argument
4 against the overture being adopted. As such, RSE 2020 Art. 13 Cons. 1 is
5 insufficient.
- 6 4.1.2 RSE 2020 misunderstands the intent of the overture when it states in consideration
7 2 that the current phrase in our forms, namely, “summarized in the confessions” is
8 “inclusive of what is expressed in the Apostles’ Creed”. Hamilton-Blessings is
9 correct to assert that the overture does not say this, but rather seeks to have the
10 form refer to the Apostles’ Creed to make explicit the historical connection
11 between triune baptism and faith in the triune God as we confess it in the Apostles’
12 Creed.
- 13 4.1.3 Although Hamilton-Blessings overstates RSE 2020’s position in Consideration 3
14 as “a theological blunder” since it is evident from the context in which RSE 2020
15 made their statement that they did not intend to say that every theological
16 formulation in the confessions is promised to candidates for profession of faith;
17 nevertheless, RSE 2020 in answer to Ground B of the overture uses as a ground the
18 very consideration the overture is contesting in Ground B (GS 1986 Art. 144 Cons.
19 1). It is not sufficient to answer an objection against a consideration by repeating
20 the consideration.
- 21 4.1.4 RSE 2020 Art. 13 Cons. 4 fails to consider Ground C on its own merits, even
22 though later in Consideration 7, it will acknowledge that the overture does make a
23 historical case that the Apostles’ Creed is the correct referent for the phrase “the
24 articles of the Christian faith” in the original liturgical forms. RSE 2020’s primary
25 concern with both considerations 4 and 5 is to argue against the overture’s
26 conclusion that if the historical referent for the phrase “the articles of the Christian
27 faith” is the Apostles’ Creed, then the term “confessional membership” is
28 erroneous. Whether or not the term is erroneous, the overture’s contention that the
29 phrase “articles of the Christian faith” cannot mean “confessions” does not
30 necessarily mean the overture seeks to minimize the confessions in the life of the
31 members. Contrary to what RSE 2020 says in Consideration 4, when it refers to
32 Ground D of the overture, there is no evidence that the overture is arguing that the
33 Apostles’ Creed is something that “stands alone” from all that is in the Scriptures
34 as summarized in the confessions.
- 35 4.1.5 RSE 2020 declares in Consideration 6 that no evidence was presented that the
36 sister churches referred to in the overture (URCNA and OPC) “limit their
37 member’s confessional vow” to only the Apostles’ Creed in their formulations;
38 however, RSE 2020 offers no evidence themselves that the phrase “articles of the
39 Christian faith” in the URCNA membership vows includes more than the
40 Apostles’ Creed.
- 41 4.1.6 Although Hamilton-Blessings did not appeal Consideration 7, the question of
42 whether the 1983 decision changed what the churches were asking in the liturgical
43 forms goes to the heart of what the overture is addressing and, therefore, cannot be
44 used as an argument against the overture.



1 4.2 Re: 3.1: GS 2019 Art. 64 Rec. 5.1 left Hamilton-Blessings with the impression that their
 2 request could come back to Synod in the form of an overture via the ecclesiastical route
 3 when they pointed Hamilton-Blessings to Considerations 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4. This is
 4 certainly the impression given by Consideration 4.4 which states, “In this way, *all the*
 5 *churches* will have ample time and opportunity to interact with it through this filtering
 6 process.” (Italics added)

7 4.3 Re: 3.2: It is not possible for GS 2022 to adopt the overture since all the churches have
 8 not had the opportunity to interact with the overture through submissions to GS 2022.
 9 Since this overture has already been considered by a Regional Synod, a church can take
 10 over this exact same overture and submit it directly to GS 2025, at least six months prior
 11 to the synod, also distributing it to all the churches, analogous to Synod Guidelines I.F.

12
 13 During discussion, a motion to amend was made and duly seconded:

14 To remove:

15 *Since this overture has already been considered by a Regional Synod, a church*
 16 *can take over this exact same overture and submit it directly to GS 2025 at least*
 17 *six months prior to the synod.*

18 And add at this point:

19 *To be considered, the overture should be sent to the next RSE, which can then*
 20 *decide whether to submit the overture to the next general synod as per Synod*
 21 *Guidelines.*

22 The motion was defeated.

23
 24 During the course of making this decision, it was moved and seconded to divide the question into
 25 3.1 (with 4.1 and 4.2) and 3.2 (with 4.3) This motion was defeated.

26
 27 **Article 79 – Appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 31 (Worship)**

28 Committee 3 presented draft 1 of a report on an appeal against RSW 2021 Art. 31 (Worship).
 29 The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

30
 31 **Article 80 – Acts – GS 2022 Art. 60**

32 Confidential

33
 34 **Article 81 – Appeal against GS 2019 art. 98 (Personal)**

35 Confidential

36
 37 **Article 82 – Appeal against GS 2019 art. 98 and Art. 141 (Personal)**

38 Confidential



1 *Synod adjourned until 7:00pm.*
2

3 **Day 6 — Evening Session**

4 **Tuesday, May 10, 2022**
5

6 **Article 83 – Reopening**

7 Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman had the meeting sing Psalm 84:6. He observed
8 that, with the exception of two members, all synod members were present.
9

10 **Article 84 – GGRCI – Fraternal Delegate Address**

11 Rev. Janssen introduced Rev. Yonson Dethan, credentialed delegate of the Calvinist Reformed
12 Churches in Indonesia (GGRCI). Rev. Dethan addressed Synod via video conferencing,
13 describing the GGRCI, especially its outreach work in various places in Indonesia among
14 Muslim communities, and speaking appreciatively of visits by the GGRCI and CanRC. The full
15 text of his address can be found in Appendix #15. The chairman spoke some words in response.
16

17 *During this event one synod member absent at the start of the session joined the meeting.*
18

19 **Article 85 – Closing Devotions**

20 The chairman made some announcements regarding agenda items and housekeeping matters.
21 Rev. Janssen read Romans 16:25-27, led in closing prayer, remembering the GGRCI in his
22 prayer, and had those present sing Psalm 87.
23

24 *Synod adjourned until 9:00 am the next day.*