

**Day 9 — Morning Session****Friday, May 20, 2022****Article 114 – Reopening**

Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman observed all synod members were present. He welcomed everyone, including fraternal delegates. He had those present sing Hymn 41:1,3, read Philippians 3:17-21, and led in opening prayer.

Article 115 – Acts

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

Synod decided by a vote to insert the Advisory Committee 1 Minority Report on the SCBP Supplements as an appendix in the Acts and to note this in GS 2022 Art. 105.

Article 116 – Not Archiving Certain Sensitive Items

Committee 5 presented draft 1 of a report on keeping certain items submitted to GS 2022 out of the synod archives. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 117 – Appeal against RSE 2019 Art. 10 (*Worship Services on Days of Commemoration*)

Committee 4 presented draft 1 of a report on an appeal against RSE 2019 Art. 10. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 118 – Overture RSE 2021 re: Shorter Lord’s Supper Forms

Committee 3 presented draft 2 of RSE Overture 2021 for Shorter Lord’s Supper Forms. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 119 – BoG (Board of Governors) Foreign Students’ Bursary Fund**1. Material**

1.1 CRTS/BoG Supplementary Report to GS 2022 (8.2.4.2); the Supplement proposes that GS 2022 approve a method by which the Canadian Reformed Churches can provide financial support to theological students of the Free Reformed Churches in South Africa (FRCSA) studying at CRTS.

1.2 CRTS/BoG Report GS 2022: Sub-section South Africa (8.2.4.1).

1.3 Letters from: Burlington Waterdown-Rehoboth (8.3.4.1), Willoughby Heights (8.3.4.2), Aldergrove (8.3.4.3), Yarrow (8.3.4.4), Glanbrook-Trinity (8.3.4.5), Langley (8.3.4.6), Toronto-Bethel (8.3.4.7), Grassie-Covenant (8.3.4.9).

2. Admissibility

2.1 The submissions were declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

- 3.1 That financial assistance for theological students of the Free Reformed Churches in South Africa (FRCSA) be provided by means of freewill giving to the Foreign Students' Bursary Fund (FSBF).

4. Grounds

- 4.1 Past general synods encouraged Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary (CRTS) to support the FRCSA in providing theological education for their students (GS 2010 Art. 82 Rec.4.3; GS 2013 Art. 132 Rec. 4.2 & 4.3; GS 2016 Art. 47 Rec. 4.3). GS 2007 (Art. 124 Rec. 4.2) and GS 2010 (Art. 82 Rec. 4.2) have also encouraged the churches to prayerfully and financially support FRCSA.
- 4.2 In September 2016, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was approved by the CRTS/BoG (Board of Governors) and the Deputies (Curators) for Theological Training of the FRCSA (MoU; dd. May 2016). The MoU established the broad framework for this relationship. In December 2017, the MoU was broadened to include the provision of financial support for FRCSA students via the Foreign Students' Bursary Fund (FSBF). With respect to having the authority to enter into such an agreement, the College Act 5.11a grants the BoG: "...conduct, management and control of the College and of its property, revenues, expenditures, business and affairs ... and the Board has all powers necessary or convenient to perform its duties and achieve the object and purpose of the College" (as cited in GS 2019 Art. 84 Obs. 2.9.1). In November 2021, the Deputies of the FRCSA appealed to the Committee on Relations with Churches Abroad (CRCA) and to GS 2022 requesting financial assistance now that the number of theological students in their federation is increasing.
- 4.3 The Needy Students' Fund was established according to CO Art. 20 to provide financial support for theological students of the CanRCs. The intention of the FSBF is to provide financial assistance to foreign theological students; therefore, although the FSBF was not originally established with the intention of supporting all the theological students from a particular federation, it is appropriate to use the FSBF for the support of the theological students of the FRCSA.
- 4.4 None of the churches which addressed GS 2022 on this matter, objected to providing financial support to FRCSA theological students; however, objections were raised to meeting this need by way of assessment. In view of the nature of our obligation to the FRCSA students, which is an obligation of love, it would be preferable to meet this need by way of freewill giving to the FSBF. Further, freewill giving, rather than an ecclesiastical assessment, more appropriately meshes with the way that the FSBF operates. Finally, the number of students coming from the FRCSA will fluctuate from year to year, and consequently, so will the need. Again, freewill giving to the FSBF is the most appropriate way of responding to these circumstances.
- 4.5 The CanRC have a sister church relationship with the FRCSA. Within the framework of that relationship, the FRCSA have decided that the CRTS would function as their federational seminary. Consequently, our relationship with, and obligation to, the theological students of the FRCSA is a unique one. The uniqueness of this relationship



1 has been formalized by means of a Memorandum of Understanding which has been
2 ratified by the CRTS/BoG and the Deputies of the FRCSA.

4 **Article 120 – SCBP – Report Sections 1, 3 and 4**

5 **1. Material**

- 6 1.1 Report of the Standing Committee for the Publication of the *Book of Praise* (SCBP)
7 (8.2.2.1)– Sections 1, 3, and 4.
- 8 1.2 Submissions from the following churches: Niagara-South (8.3.2.2), Nooksack Valley
9 (8.3.2.4), Aldergrove (8.3.2.8), Devon (8.3.2.9), Flamborough-Redemption (8.3.2.17),
10 Owen Sound (8.3.2.18), Willoughby Heights (8.3.2.22), Grand Valley (8.3.2.25),
11 Neerlandia (North) (8.3.2.30), Lynden (8.3.2.32), Orangeville (8.3.2.35), Burlington-
12 Ebenezer (8.3.2.39), Grand Rapids (8.3.2.40), Coaldale (8.7.2).

13 **2. Admissibility**

- 14 2.1 The report was declared admissible.
15 2.2 The submissions were declared admissible.

16 **3. Decisions**

17 **Synod decided:**

- 18 3.1 To express thanksgiving and joy with the FRCA in the publication of the *Australian*
19 *Book of Praise*, and to thank the SCBP for their assistance to that end;
- 20 3.2 To thank the committee for its due diligence and hard work over the past three years. In
21 particular, to express thanks to those committee members whose work on the committee
22 is now completed: Alisha Boeringa, Rev. Rolf den Hollander, Dr. Karen Dieleman, Jeff
23 Jans, John Jager, Dr. Jannes Smith, and Rev. Dick Wynia;
- 24 3.3 To express gratitude to those brothers and sisters who assisted the SCBP with its work:
25 Dr. William Helder, Rev. George van Popta, Dr. Jason Van Vliet, Margaret Alkema,
26 Marina Rietema and Rita Kuik;
- 27 3.4 To thank the SCBP for appointing Brian Vanderhout, to validate and submit to the
28 treasurer of the General Fund all expenses submitted for the committee’s work;
- 29 3.5 To thank the SCBP for negotiating a new contract with Premier Printing Ltd. Which is
30 effective for a period of five years, until a new funding formula is presented to GS
31 2025;
- 32 3.6 To re-appoint two current members for a three-year term, two new members to replace
33 outgoing members and three additional members for a three-year term due to the
34 sizeable mandate;
- 35 3.7 To recognize that, for the selection of Psalm renditions, the SCBP created for its own
36 use guidelines which were aligned with the Guidelines for Hymn Selection (GS 2004);
- 37 3.8 To mandate the SCBP:
- 38 3.8.1 To fulfill, as yet, the directive of GS 2019 Art.23 Cons. 3.1 and 3.2. RSE Nov.
39 2018 makes a valid point that the English language has changed and therefore the
40 use of masculine pronouns in the forms for the Lord’s Supper could make them
41 liable to misinterpretation. It would be advisable to ask the committee to study this
42 and propose appropriate changes to the Lord’s Supper forms, giving special



- 1 attention to the personal nature of self-examination. In this process the churches
2 would have the opportunity to interact with any proposed changes;
- 3 3.8.2 To foster an increased awareness of the existence of the *Book of Praise* among
4 others in the English-speaking world;
- 5 3.8.3 To continue maintaining its archives (at CRTS) and website:
6 www.bookofpraise.ca;
- 7 3.8.4 To continue the process of reviewing the proposed songs according to the
8 Guidelines for the Selection of Music in the Church, as printed in Appendix 2B of
9 the *Acts* of GS 2004;
- 10 3.8.5 To maintain good contact with the Standing Committee for the *Australian Book of*
11 *Praise*;
- 12 3.8.6 To maintain its corporate status for the purpose of protecting the interests of the
13 Canadian Reformed Churches in matters concerning the *Book of Praise*;
- 14 3.8.7 To survey the churches to determine the priority/relative importance regarding
15 types of availability (digital, open-source, print), formatting (e.g., four-part
16 harmony), and other publication variables (including copyright) with regard to the
17 *Book of Praise*, as listed in the SCBP report:
- 18 3.8.7.1 To review the input of the churches, and on that basis, propose a publishing
19 and funding model to GS 2025;
- 20 3.8.8 To receive, scrutinize, and evaluate the content of correspondence from the
21 churches and to report to GS 2025 as to the validity of the suggestions made;
- 22 3.8.9 To appoint one of its members to validate and submit to the treasurer of the
23 General Fund all expenses being submitted for committee work;
- 24 3.8.10 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
25 general synod.
26

27 Article 121 – CER (Committee on Ecumenical Relations) General Mandate

28 1. Material

- 29 1.1 CRCA Report (8.2.1).
30 1.2 CCCNA Report (8.2.11).
31 1.3 CRCA-CCCNA Study Report on the Execution of CO Art. 50 (8.2.12)

32 2. Admissibility

- 33 2.1 The reports were declared admissible.

34 3. Decisions

35 Synod decided:

- 36 3.1 To discharge all members of the Committee for Contact with Churches in North
37 America (CCCNA) and Committee on Relations with Churches Abroad (CRCA) from
38 their present tasks.
- 39 3.2 To thank the following members of the CCCNA for their years of service to the
40 churches: Rev. Doug Vandeburgt, Henry van Delden, Les Vanderveen and Peter
41 Veenendaal.



1 3.3 To thank the following member of the CRCA for his years of service to the churches:
2 Rev. Arend Witten.

3 3.4 To appoint twelve members to the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER).

4 3.5 To give the CER the following general mandate:

- 5 a) To continue contact with churches with whom we are in ecumenical relations;
6 b) To send an appropriate number of delegates to represent the CanRC churches
7 at the meetings of the International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC)
8 and North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC);
9 c) To work in consultation with individual CanRC churches and classes that
10 maintain contact with churches for which the CER also has a mandate;
11 d) Upon request, to advise CanRC churches regarding the identity of other
12 churches and our relationship with them;
13 e) To report on any contact with a church with whom we are not in an ecumenical
14 relationship;
15 f) To appoint one of its members to validate and submit to the treasurer of the
16 General Fund all expenses being submitted for committee work;
17 g) To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of
18 general synod (a supplementary report can be submitted if necessary);
19 h) To facilitate hospitality support for fraternal delegates and observers, in
20 consultation with the convening church, at each general synod.
21

22 **Article 122 – FRCA (Free Reformed Churches of Australia)**

23 Committee 2 presented draft 1 of a report on the Free Reformed Churches of Australia (FRCA).
24 The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.
25

26 *Synod adjourned until 1:15 pm for lunch.*
27

28 **Day 9 — Afternoon Session**

29 **Friday, May 20, 2022**

30 **Article 123 – Reopening**

31 Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman had the meeting sing Psalm 46:2. He observed
32 that all synod members were present.
33

34 **Article 124 – IRB (Reformed Churches in Brazil)**

35 **1. Material**

36 1.1 CRCA Report 3: Brazil (IRB) (8.2.1.3)

37 **2. Admissibility**

38 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

39 **3. Decisions**

40 **Synod decided:**



- 1 3.1 To express gratitude for the continued desire of the IRB to grow in knowledge and
2 faithfulness;
- 3 3.2 To continue Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Reformed Churches of Brazil (IRB)
4 under the adopted rules;
- 5 3.3 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):
 - 6 3.3.1 To use every opportunity to have contact with the IRB and to provide
7 encouragement to this federation of churches;
 - 8 3.3.2 To visit the IRB at least twice prior to the next synod;
 - 9 3.3.3 To work in consultation and cooperation with the Aldergrove CanRC and the
10 Hamilton-Cornerstone CanRC given their mission work in Brazil;
 - 11 3.3.4 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
12 general synod.

13 4. Grounds

- 14 4.1 As far as can be determined, the IRB demonstrate that they remain faithful churches.
15 They abide by the Word of God, as the only rule for faith and life, and adhere to the
16 adopted confessions and church order.
- 17 4.2 In view of the needs in the IRB, it is important to make every effort to maintain direct
18 contact with the IRB, and to encourage these churches and their leaders.
- 19 4.3 There is good communication between the IRB and the CanRC, and the CanRC are able
20 to do much work in Brazil through the sending churches.
- 21 4.4 The sending churches of Aldergrove and Hamilton are to be encouraged in their support
22 of the churches in Brazil, especially in the training of ministers of the Word.

23 24 **Article 125 – GGRI (Reformed Churches in Indonesia)**

25 **1. Material**

- 26 1.1 CRCA Report 4: Indonesia (GGRI, GGRCI, GGRI-Timor) (8.2.1.4).

27 **2. Admissibility**

- 28 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

29 **3. Decisions**

30 **Synod decided:**

- 31 3.1 To continue ecclesiastical fellowship (EF) with the Reformed Churches in Indonesia
32 (GGRI);
- 33 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):
 - 34 3.2.1 To try to send a delegation of brothers to Indonesia to represent the CanRC at the
35 next national synod of the GGRI;
 - 36 3.2.2 To work in consultation and cooperation with the Free Reformed Churches of
37 Australia (FRCA) and United Reformed Churches in North America (URCNA) in
38 encouraging and supporting the churches of the GGRI in their efforts to grow in
39 Reformed doctrine and polity;
 - 40 3.2.3 To work in consultation and cooperation with the Smithville CanRC given their
41 mission work in Timor;



- 1 3.2.4 As opportunity arises, to be available for discussions with a view to promoting
2 ecclesiastical harmony and unity between faithful reformed churches in Indonesia;
3 3.2.5 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
4 general synod.

5 **4. Grounds**

- 6 4.1 As far as can be determined, the GGRI demonstrate that they remain faithful churches.
7 They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life and adhere to adopted
8 confessions and church order.
9 4.2 Given that the FRCA is closer to Indonesia than the CanRC, it is prudent that the CER
10 work in close conjunction with the FRCA. It would therefore be helpful if the respective
11 committees continue to share information on their observations and activities in
12 Indonesia.
13 4.3 Working together, the FRCA and the CanRC will be in a good position to continue to
14 support the GGRI and to encourage church unity among the various groups of
15 Reformed churches in Indonesia.
16 4.4 Since the GGRI now also have a relationship with the URCNA, it is advisable to share
17 information with this federation as well.
18 4.5 Given the mission work of Smithville in Indonesia, which impacts both the GGRI and
19 the Calvinist Reformed Churches in Indonesia (GGRCI), it is important for the CER to
20 share information concerning its findings with Smithville.
21

22 **Article 126 – GGRCI (Calvinist Reformed Churches in Indonesia)**

23 **1. Material**

- 24 1.1 CRCA Report 4: Indonesia (GGRI, GGRCI, GGRI-Timor) (8.2.1.4).

25 **2. Admissibility**

- 26 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

27 **3. Decisions**

28 **Synod decided:**

- 29 3.1 To continue ecclesiastical fellowship (EF) with the Calvinist Reformed Churches in
30 Indonesia (GGRCI);
31 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):
32 3.2.1 To try to send a delegation of brothers to Indonesia to represent the CanRC at the
33 next national synod of the GGRCI;
34 3.2.2 To work in consultation and cooperation with the Free Reformed Churches of
35 Australia (FRCA) and United Reformed Churches in North America (URCNA) in
36 encouraging and supporting the churches of the GGRCI in their efforts to grow in
37 Reformed doctrine and polity;
38 3.2.3 To work in consultation and cooperation with the Smithville CanRC given their
39 mission work in Timor;
40 3.2.4 As opportunity arises, to be available for discussions with a view to promoting
41 ecclesiastical harmony and unity between faithful Reformed churches in
42 Indonesia;



1 3.2.5 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
2 general synod.

3 **4. Grounds**

4 4.1 As far as can be determined, the GGRCI demonstrate that they remain faithful churches.
5 They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life and adhere to adopted
6 confessions and church order.

7 4.2 Given that the FRCA is closer to Indonesia than the CanRC, it is prudent that the CER
8 work in close conjunction with the FRCA. It would therefore be helpful if the respective
9 committees continue to share information on their observations and activities in
10 Indonesia.

11 4.3 Working together, the FRCA and the CanRC will be in a good position to continue to
12 support the GGRCI and to encourage church unity among the various groups of
13 reformed churches in Indonesia.
14

15 **Article 127 – GGRI-Timor (Reformed Churches in Indonesia - Timor)**

16 **1. Material**

17 1.1 CRCA Report 4: Indonesia (GGRI, GGRCI, GGRI-Timor) (8.2.1.4).

18 **2. Admissibility**

19 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

20 **3. Decisions**

21 **Synod decided:**

22 3.1 To instruct the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

23 3.1.1 In conjunction with the Smithville Canadian Reformed Church to provide
24 assistance within the normal ambit of CER work that would be of benefit to the
25 Reformed Churches in Indonesia Timor (GGRI-Timor);

26 3.1.2 As opportunity arises, to be available for discussions with a view to promoting
27 ecclesiastical harmony and unity between faithful reformed churches in Indonesia;

28 3.1.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
29 general synod.

30 **4. Grounds**

31 4.1 It is important to continue to show willingness to assist the GGRI-Timor. Moreover,
32 opportunities for further interaction may arise in the future.

33 4.2 Given the sensitivities apparent at the assembly of GS-GGRCI 2019 in regard to their
34 history with the mission work of Smithville, the CER would do well to continue to
35 encourage all parties to engage in peaceful, open communication with a view to moving
36 toward the goal of brotherly unity and cooperation according to the Word of God.
37 Furthering the cause of unity between the GGRI, GGRI-Timor, and the GGRCI will
38 only be fruitful if all parties agree to pursue that goal.
39

**Article 128 – KPCK (Kosin Presbyterian Church in Korea)**

Committee 2 presented draft 1 of a report on relations with the KPCK. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 129 – IRCK (Independent Reformed Church in Korea)**1. Material**

1.1 CRCA Report 5: Korea (KPCK, IRCK, RCK) (8.2.1.5).

2. Admissibility

2.1 The report was declared admissible.

3. Decisions**Synod decided:**

3.1 To end official contact with the Independent Reformed Church of Korea (IRCK).

4. Grounds

4.1 The lack of interaction and correspondence indicates that it is prudent to end official contact with the IRCK.

Article 130 – RCK (Reformed Churches in Korea)**1. Material**

1.1 CRCA Report 5: Korea (KPCK, IRCK, RCK) (8.2.1.5)

2. Admissibility

2.1 The report was declared admissible.

3. Decisions**Synod decided:**

3.1. To end official contact with the Reformed Churches in Korea (RCK).

4. Grounds

4.1 The lack of interaction and correspondence indicates that it is prudent to end official contact with the RCK.

Article 131 – GKv (Reformed Churches in The Netherlands (liberated))**1. Material**

1.1 CRCA Report 6: The Netherlands (GKv, DGK, GKN) (8.2.1.6)

1.2 Letter from the Glanbrook-Trinity CanRC (8.3.1.2) encouraging prayer and a tone of compassion and encouragement regarding the brothers and sisters in the GKv.

2. Admissibility

2.1 The report and letter were declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

- 3.1 That the mandate with respect to the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (GKv) has been completed.
- 3.2 To observe with deep sadness that, in spite of urgent appeals, the GKv continue on a path of disobedience to the Lord.
- 3.3 To give the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER) no further mandate specific to the GKv.

4. Grounds

- 4.1 The decisions of GS-GKv 2020 indicate that the GKv is not heeding the warnings of its (now mostly former) sister churches. The decision to allow women to serve in office was maintained, reunification with the Netherlands Reformed Churches (NGK) is to take place soon, and participation in broad ecumenical activities (National Synod and Council of Churches) was approved.

Article 132 – DGK (The Reformed Churches [The Netherlands])

Committee 2 presented draft 2 of a report on relations with the DGK. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 133 – GKN (Reformed Churches The Netherlands)

Committee 2 presented draft 2 of a report on relations with the GKN. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 134 – FCS (Free Church of Scotland)

1. Material

- 1.1 CRCA Report 8: Scotland (FCS, FCC) (8.2.1.8)

2. Admissibility

- 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

- 3.1 To continue Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Free Church of Scotland (FCS) under the adopted rules.
- 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):
 - 3.2.1 To continue personal contact with the FCS whenever that is feasible (e.g. at meetings of the International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC) and mutual presence at assemblies of sister-churches);
 - 3.2.2 To send a delegation to their assemblies at least once every three years;
 - 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of next general synod.



4. Grounds

- 4.1 Although communication with the FCS has been minimal in the past three years, as far as can be determined from the Acts of GA-FCS 2019, the FCS demonstrate that they remain faithful churches. They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life and adhere to the adopted confessions and church order.
- 4.2 With increased globalization, it is good to have interactions with the FCS to learn from their struggles in a similar secularized context.

Article 135 – FCC (Free Church of Scotland (Continuing))

1. Material

- 1.1 CRCA Report 8: Scotland (FCS, FCC) (8.2.1.8)

2. Admissibility

- 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

- 3.1 To continue Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (FCC) in accordance under the rules adopted by Synod Guelph 2022.
- 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):
 - 3.2.1 To continue personal contact with the FCC whenever that is feasible (e.g., at meetings of the International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC) and mutual presence at assemblies of sister-churches);
 - 3.2.2 To send a delegation to their assemblies at least once every three years;
 - 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of next general synod.

4. Grounds

- 4.1 Although communication with the FCC has been minimal in the past three years, as far as can be determined from the Acts of GA-FCC 2019 and GA-FCC 2020, the FCC demonstrate that they remain faithful churches. They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life, and adhere to the adopted confessions and church order.
- 4.2 With increased globalization, it is good to have interactions with the FCC to learn from their struggles in a similar secularized context.

Article 136 – FRCSA (Free Reformed Churches in South Africa)

Committee 2 presented draft 1 of a report on relations with the FRCSA. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

Article 137 – ICRC (International Conference of Reformed Churches)

Committee 2 presented draft 1 of a report on membership in the ICRC. The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.



1 *Synod adjourned until 4:00pm for committee work.*

2
3 **Article 138 – Reopening**

4 Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman observed all synod members were present.

5
6 **Article 139 – Appeals against RSE 2019 Art. 11**

7 Committee 4 presented draft 1 of a report on several appeals against RSE 2019 Art. 11 (8.6.5).
8 The report was discussed. The committee took the report back for refinement.

9
10 *Synod adjourned until 7:00pm.*

11
12 **Day 9 — Evening Session**

13 **Friday, May 20, 2022**

14 **Article 140 – Reopening**

15 Synod reopened in plenary session. The chairman had the meeting sing Psalm 146:1,3. He
16 observed that all synod members were present.

17
18 **Article 141 – Appeals against RSE 2019 Art. 11**

19 Committee 4 presented draft 2 of a report on several appeals against RSE 2019 Art. 11 (8.6.5).
20 The report was discussed. At the request of Synod members, discussion on this agenda item was
21 halted, to be resumed the next day.

22
23 **Article 142 – Appeals against RSE 2019 Art. 10**

24 **1. Material**

25 1.1 Appeals from the Flamborough-Redemption CanRC and the Toronto-Bethel CanRC
26 (8.6.4)

27 **2. Admissibility**

28 2.1 The appeal from Flamborough-Redemption was declared admissible

29 2.2 The appeal from Toronto-Bethel was declared admissible.

30 **3. Decisions**

31 **Synod decided:**

32 3.1 To sustain the appeals of Flamborough-Redemption and Toronto-Bethel that RSE 2019
33 erred when it judged that “CCO June 14, 2019 erred when it judged that Redemption
34 church, by ‘inviting’ members and visitors to a ‘commemorative service’ (and not
35 calling them to an official worship service) on Good Friday, fulfilled the obligations of
36 articles 52, 53, 55 of the Church Order and the judgment of Classis on September 6-7,
37 2018, concerning this matter” (Article 10, Recommendation 1).

4. Grounds

- 4.1 RSE 2019, in Consideration 4, is unconvincing in arguing that the churches must read CO Art. 53 in conjunction with CO Art. 52. Distinct articles in the CO are distinct for a reason. If the intent of the CO is to require that the consistory shall call the congregation together for worship on the Lord’s Day and on other days that commemorate events surrounding the life and ministry of Christ, then one article would be sufficient. Nevertheless, there are two articles which are distinct. There are common elements such as a reference to the consistory; however, where the one specifies “shall call,” the other does not. Where the one says “worship”, the other says “commemorate”. Where the one uses the phrase “in the manner decided upon by the consistory”, the other does not.
- 4.2 Since RSE 2019 is unconvincing in arguing that the CO makes no distinction between a ‘worship service’ and a ‘commemorative service,’ they err when they say in Consideration 4 that such an argument is ‘specious’. GS has received no clear evidence that Flamborough-Redemption’s service was anything but a commemorative service/event as they have claimed. (cf. Ground 4.x of Flamborough-Redemption’s appeal to GS 2022; Observation 3 in Classis Central Ontario, June 14, 2019). Further, GS 2022 has not received evidence that Flamborough-Redemption is insisting on this distinction to get around the stipulation of CO Art. 55 as RSE states in Consideration 5. RSE 2019 provides no ground to have GS suspect the veracity of their claim.
- 4.3 Given 4.1 above, RS 2019 errs when it claims in Consideration 6 that any distinction between ‘calling’ and ‘inviting’ is ‘specious’.

The following synod member abstained from voting and asked that this be recorded:
C.J. VanderVelde

Article 143 – Overture RSE 2021 re: Place of Preparatory Exams

1. Material

- 1.1 Overture from Regional Synod East (RSE) 2021 recommending that preparatory exams be conducted in a student’s ‘home classis’ (8.4.4.1).
- 1.2 Submissions from the following churches: Carman West (8.5.4.1); Smithers (8.5.4.2); Willoughby Heights (8.5.4.3); Yarrow (8.5.4.4); Cloverdale (8.5.4.5); Coaldale (8.5.4.6); Flamborough-Redemption (8.5.4.7); Fergus-Maranatha (8.5.4.8); Calgary (8.5.4.9); Chatham-Ebenezer (8.5.4.10); Glanbrook-Trinity (8.5.4.11); Neerlandia (North) (8.5.4.12); Edmonton-Immanuel (8.5.4.13); Edmonton-Providence (8.5.4.14).

2. Admissibility

- 2.1 The submissions were declared admissible.

3. Decisions

Synod decided:

- 3.1 To adopt the overture;
- 3.2 To amend the regulations for the preparatory examination adopted by GS 1958 (Art.188 Part 1) from:

1 *“The preparatory examination will take place in the classis where the student*
2 *resides.”*

3 to:

4 *“The preparatory examination is to occur in the classis where the church that sent the*
5 *student’s original attestation to the federational seminary belongs. The preparatory*
6 *examination for a student not originating within the Canadian & American Reformed*
7 *Churches is to occur in the classis where he lives.”*

8 3.2.1 In circumstances in which a particular student’s connection to his ‘home classis’ is
9 unclear or debated, requests for examination must be processed through the
10 student’s local consistory;

11 3.3 That these revised regulations for the preparatory examination, as well as the existing
12 regulations for the peremptory examination as found in GS 1958 Art. 188, be published
13 in English as an **appendix** to the Acts of GS 2022;

14 3.4 That CO Art. 4B be amended from:

15 *“Only those shall be declared eligible for call within the churches who (1) have*
16 *passed a preparatory examination by the classis in which they live. . .”*

17 to:

18 *Only those shall be declared eligible for call within the churches who (1) have passed*
19 *a preparatory examination by classis....*

20 3.5 That the above changes to both the regulations of preparatory examinations and the
21 Church Order take effect as of 1 January 2023.

22 3.6 That the cost of return travel for students undergoing a preparatory examination in their
23 home classis be borne by that classis.

24 **4. Grounds**

25 4.1 The letters from the churches expressed an overwhelming degree of support for this
26 overture.

27 4.2 Steadily growing enrolment at CRTS has significantly increased the workload for
28 Classis Ontario West (COW). This pressure would be alleviated by sharing the
29 workload among all the classes of the federation.

30 4.3 Doing so would not create insurmountable financial or logistical burdens for those
31 classes.

32 4.4 Preparatory exams determine who can serve as a minister in the federation. The
33 responsibility and privilege of sharing in this determination ought to be federational.

34 4.5 Re 3.2.1: Exceptional circumstances will undoubtedly arise when it comes to
35 identifying a student’s connection to his ‘home classis’. In such circumstances, students
36 would be well-served by guidance from their local consistory.

37 4.6 Though concern was raised regarding logistical complications which might arise, it
38 would be impossible to envision and account for every possible exigent circumstance.

39 4.7 Re 3.5: Given that it will take some time for students, churches, and classes to absorb
40 and adjust to these changes, it would be wise to implement these decisions on 1 January
41 2023.

42 4.8 Re 3.3: An appended translation of the GS Homewood Art.188 Part 1 would serve as a
43 useful reference for the reader.

1
2 **Article 144 – KPCK (Kosin Presbyterian Church in Korea)**

3 **1. Material**

4 1.1 CRCA Report 5: Korea (KPCK, IRCK, RCK) (8.2.1.5)

5 **2. Admissibility**

6 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

7 **3. Decisions**

8 **Synod decided:**

9 3.1 To continue Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Kosin Presbyterian Church of
10 Korea (KPCK) under the adopted rules;

11 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

12 3.2.1 To continue to work cooperatively with sister churches in exercising our
13 relationship with the KPCK in meaningful ways and to take turns visiting the
14 KPCK's General Assembly;

15 3.2.2 To meet with their delegates at the next International Conference of Reformed
16 Churches (ICRC);

17 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
18 general synod.

19 **4. Grounds**

20 4.1 As far as can be determined, the KPCK demonstrate that they remain faithful churches.
21 They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life and adhere to adopted
22 confessions and church order.

23 4.2 It is good to maintain ecumenical relations with the KPCK since we share the unity of
24 the faith in Jesus Christ.

25 4.3 Practically speaking, mainly due to language and cultural differences, our bond with
26 them is minimal.

27 4.4 EF will be enhanced by the fact that the CanRC now includes two ministers from South
28 Korean background and that the KPCK delegates attended General Synod Guelph 2022.

29
30 **Article 145 – ICRC (International Conference of Reformed Churches)**

31 **1. Material**

32 1.1 CRCA Report 10: ICRC (8.2.1.10)

33 Note: as GS 2019 neglected to make a decision on the ICRC, the CRCA resubmitted to
34 GS 2022 the report it submitted to GS 2019 with additional material.

35 **2. Admissibility**

36 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

37 **3. Decisions**

38 **Synod decided:**

39 3.1 To continue the membership of the CanRC in the ICRC;

1 3.2 Regarding membership of the Reformed Churches in The Netherlands (Liberated)
2 (GKv) in the ICRC:

3 3.2.1 To propose to the tenth ICRC to be held, the Lord willing, in Windhoek, Namibia
4 during October 2022, that the membership of the GKv be terminated, as its
5 decision on women in office no longer qualifies it for membership in the ICRC;

6 3.2.2 To express agreement with a similar proposal decided to by the 87th (2021)
7 General Assembly (GA) of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC);

8 3.2.3 To convey this proposal by means of a letter from General Synod 2022 via the
9 second clerk to the ICRC as soon as possible;

10 3.3 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

11 3.3.1 To ensure appropriate CanRC participation in ICRC activities;

12 3.3.2 To attend the next ICRC with a delegation of two voting members and two
13 advisory members.

14 **4. Grounds**

15 4.1 The CRCA has acted correctly in considering the mandate of GS 2016 as its mandate
16 after GS 2019.

17 4.2 With thankfulness to the Lord, the ICRC continues to be a useful forum to promote
18 harmony and unity among Reformed and Presbyterian churches worldwide.

19 4.3 The CRCA acted properly and appropriately in seconding the proposal of the OPC to
20 suspend the membership on the GKv in the ICRC. The correctness of this action was
21 confirmed by the decision of GS 2019 (Art. 41) to terminate EF with the GKv.

22 4.4 Regarding the membership of the GKv in the ICRC:

23 4.4.1 The CanRC have had very close ties with the GKv and have spent much time and
24 effort in communicating with the GKv about matters of concern and reprimanding
25 them with great intensity for the course they are on. It is appropriate for the CanRC
26 to initiate action that removes the GKv from the ICRC (analogous to Deut. 13:6-
27 11).

28 4.4.2 Just as the termination of EF with the GKv in 2019 clearly expressed where the
29 CanRC stand with respect to the issues at stake, so will a proposal to terminate the
30 membership of the GKv in the ICRC. This will unequivocally communicate to the
31 ICRC member churches that we are sorely grieved by decisions of the GKv and
32 were in earnest about our past letters and words of admonition (cf. GS 2019 art. 41
33 cons. 3.4).

34 4.4.3 GS-GKv 2020 (Art. 19 Dec. 3) maintained the decision of GS-GKv 2017 (Art. 18
35 Dec. 5&6) to allow women to serve in the offices of minister and elder. This puts
36 the GKv at odds with the ICRC Constitution IV.4.

37 4.4.4 The ICRC Constitution (Art. IV.4) requires that a proposal to terminate
38 membership in the ICRC be made by a decision of the major assembly of a
39 member church.

40 4.4.5 Given the seriousness of this matter, it would be proper and appropriate for GS
41 2022 itself to send a letter to the ICRC. GS 2019 (Art. 41 Rec. 4.3, Art. 104) took
42 it upon itself to send a letter to the GKv, rather than instructing the CRCA to do so.

43 4.4.6 The 87th (2021) GA of the OPC adopted an action to terminate the membership of
44 the GKv in the ICRC. Past synods instructed the CRCA-SRN to work together



1 with sister churches. It is appropriate for the CanRC to express agreement with the
2 proposal of the OPC.
3

4 **Article 146 – RCNZ (Reformed Churches in New Zealand)**

5 **1. Material**

6 1.1 CRCA Report: New Zealand (RCNZ) (8.2.1.7)

7 **2. Admissibility**

8 The report was declared admissible.

9 **3. Decisions**

10 **Synod decided:**

11 3.1 To continue the relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Reformed
12 Churches in New Zealand (RCNZ) under the adopted rules;

13 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

14 3.2.1 To express appreciation for the ongoing cooperation with the RCNZ in the mission
15 in Papua New Guinea;

16 3.2.2 To send a delegation to the next RCNZ Synod;

17 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
18 general synod;

19 3.3 To take note that the different structures of the RCNZ and the CanRC for the material
20 support of emeritus ministers complicates the transfer of ministers between the CanRC
21 and RCNZ, as it also does between the CanRC and the Free Reformed Churches of
22 South Africa (FRCSA). The material support for emeritus ministers is beyond the
23 jurisdiction of a general synod and thus beyond the scope of the CER.

24 **4. Grounds**

25 4.1 As far as can be determined from the Acts of GS-RCNZ 2021, the RCNZ demonstrate
26 that they remain faithful churches. They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for
27 faith and life, and adhere to the adopted confessions and church order.

28 4.2 The relationship between the RCNZ and CanRC has been of mutual benefit in the area
29 of missions and inter-church relations.
30

31 **Article 147 – FRCSA (Free Reformed Churches in South Africa)**

32 **1. Material**

33 1.1 CRCA Report: South Africa (FRCSA) (8.2.1.9.).

34 **2. Admissibility**

35 2.1 The report was declared admissible.

36 **3. Decisions**

37 **Synod decided:**

38 3.1 To continue Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with the Free Reformed Churches in South
39 Africa (FRCSA) under the adopted rules;



1 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

2 3.2.1 To send a delegation to the next synod of the FRCSA;

3 3.2.2 To continue involvement in discussions regarding financial requests from the
4 FRCSA and provide coordination assistance where possible;

5 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
6 synod.

7 **4. Grounds**

8 4.1 As far as can be determined, the FRCSA demonstrate that they remain faithful churches.
9 They abide by the Word of God as the only rule for faith and life and adhere to adopted
10 confessions and church order.

11 4.2 Our EF with the FRCSA dates back to the first CanRC synods. There continue to be
12 many close ties, sixteen ecclesiastical, operational, and personal, between the FRCSA
13 and CanRC.

14 4.3 The CRCA has never had a mandate to financially support other church federations;
15 however, in this situation it may be appropriate to mandate the CER to facilitate
16 assistance for the FRCSA, should further financial assistance be necessary. In
17 collaboration with others involved, the CER could seek out appropriate churches or
18 organizations to responsibly interact with requests for financial assistance.
19

20 **Article 148 – DGK (The Reformed Churches [The Netherlands])**

21 **1. Material**

22 1.1 CRCA Report 6: The Netherlands (GKv, DGK, GKN) (8.2.1.6).

23 1.2 Supplementary Report CRCA (8.2.1.6.1) regarding the DGK's relationship with the
24 Liberated Reformed Church at Abbotsford (LRCA).

25 1.3 Letter from the Glanbrook-Trinity CanRC (8.3.1.2) encouraging prayer and a tone of
26 compassion and encouragement regarding the brothers and sisters in the DGK.

27 **2. Admissibility**

28 The reports and letter were declared admissible.

29 **3. Decisions**

30 **Synod decided:**

31 3.1 To maintain contact with The Reformed Churches (DGK);

32 3.2 To express gratitude for how the DGK is dealing with the LRCA.

33 3.3 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

34 3.3.1 To continue to monitor developments within this federation, paying special
35 attention to:

36 3.3.1.1 The relationship between the DGK and the Reformed Churches The
37 Netherlands (GKN);

38 3.3.1.2 The relationship between the DGK and the LRCA;

39 3.3.2 To be available for dialogue with the DGK;



1 3.3.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
2 general synod.

3 **4. Grounds**

4 4.1 The DGK display the marks of the true church of Jesus Christ in their preaching,
5 worship, and governance.

6 4.2 There has been good contact with the DGK-BBK (DGK committee for Relations with
7 Churches Abroad). The DGK have recognized the Reformed character of the
8 Westminster Standards and thus the legitimacy of recognizing Presbyterian churches as
9 churches of the Lord Jesus Christ.

10 4.3 Although at their GS 2021-2022 the DGK decided to continue a sister-church
11 relationship with the LRCA, they at the same time called on the LRCA to return
12 unconditionally to the CanRC recognizing the catholicity of the church.

13 4.4 The DGK have recognized the GKN as a true and faithful church of Jesus Christ and are
14 working on merging with the GKN.

15 4.5 When working towards Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with two federations of churches
16 in the same geographical location who are working on merging, it is wisest to wait until
17 the new federation has formed. If EF is deemed necessary prior to the merger, EF
18 should be entered into with both federations at the same time. The situation between the
19 GKN and DGK is structurally similar to one GS 2019 dealt with (cf. GS 2019 Art. 120
20 Cons. 3.10).

21 **Article 149 – GKN (Reformed Churches The Netherlands)**

22 **1. Material**

23 1.1 CRCA Report 6: The Netherlands (GKv, DGK, GKN) (8.2.1.6).

24 1.2 Letter from the Glanbrook-Trinity CanRC (8.3.1.2) encouraging prayer and a tone of
25 compassion and encouragement regarding the brothers and sisters in the DGK.
26

27 **2. Admissibility**

28 The report was declared admissible.

29 **3. Decisions**

30 **Synod decided:**

31 3.1 To maintain contact with the Reformed Churches The Netherlands (GKN);

32 3.2 To mandate the Committee on Ecumenical Relations (CER):

33 3.2.1 To continue to monitor developments within this federation, paying special
34 attention to:

35 3.2.1.1 The relationship between the GKN and The Reformed Churches (DGK);

36 3.2.2 To be available for dialogue with the GKN;

37 3.2.3 To submit its report to the churches six months prior to the convening of the next
38 general synod.

4. Grounds

- 4.1 The GKN display the marks of the true church of Jesus Christ in their preaching, worship, and governance.
- 4.2 The fact that the GKN are seriously working on unification with the DGK is to be noted with gratitude.
- 4.3 When working towards Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) with two federations of churches in the same geographical location who are working on merging, it is wisest to wait until the new federation has formed. If EF is deemed necessary prior to the merger, EF should be entered into with both federations at the same time. The situation between the GKN and DGK is structurally similar to one GS 2019 dealt with (cf. GS 2019 art. 120 cons. 3.10).

Article 150 – Appeal against GS 1980 and GS 1983 (*Changes to Liturgical Forms*)

1. Material

- 1.1 Appeal of the Burlington-Fellowship CanRC (8.6.10.1).
 - 1.1.1 Burlington-Fellowship requests: “that GS 2022 judge that the 1980 and 1983 General Synods erred in the way they made changes to the questions in the Forms for Baptism and for the Public Profession of Faith, and for GS 2022 to reassess the decisions of the 1986, 1989 and 1992 General Synod, where these Synods denied several appeals about these changes.”
 - 1.1.2 Burlington Fellowship requests “this Synod to judge that the questions in the forms be changed back to the pre-1980 formulations.”
 - 1.1.3 Burlington Fellowship requests that “If the Synod determines that the changes were legitimate because the meaning did not change...you do not ‘bind the conscience’ and that the churches be free to change the questions to the pre-1980 formulations since ‘the meaning is the same.’”

2. Admissibility

- 2.1 The appeal was declared admissible.

3. Decision:

Synod decided:

- 3.1 To deny the appeal of the Burlington-Fellowship CanRC against GS 1980 and GS 1983 re: changes to liturgical forms for Baptism and Public Profession of Faith;
- 3.2 To deny the request that the churches be free to change the questions to the pre-1980 formulations.

4. Grounds

- 4.1 Re 3.1: Although Burlington-Fellowship (ground 1) is correct in asserting that we “do not pledge allegiance to any human document”, the only synod that mentions “allegiance” (GS 1986 Art. 144 Cons. 2), was simply taking over the same language that was used by the original appellants (cf. GS 1986 Art. 144 Obs. 5), where the appellant’s letter is summarized).
- 4.2 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship is incorrect (ground 2) in stating that GS 1983 brought an internal contradiction into the forms when it asked, “How can a summary of the

1 doctrine be the complete doctrine?”. In the Form for Infant Baptism (the only form in
2 which the phrase “complete doctrine” appears), the question “do you confess that the
3 doctrine of the Old and New Testament, summarized in the confessions and taught here
4 in this Christian church, is the true and complete doctrine of salvation?”, does not ask
5 whether you confess the doctrine of the Old and New Testament as summarized by the
6 confessions and taught here in this Christian church, but whether you confess that the
7 doctrine of the Old and New Testament is the true and complete doctrine of salvation.
8 The phrase “summarized in the confessions and taught here in this Christian church”
9 makes a declaration about the true and complete doctrine of salvation, namely that it is
10 summarized in the confessions and that it is taught here in this Christian church.

11 4.3 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship is incorrect (ground 3) in asserting that GS 1986
12 misquoted the forms to say “... as is taught here in this Christian Church...” and that
13 “the forms have never included this wording”. In the 1971 edition of the *Book of Praise*,
14 the fourth question of the Form for Adult Baptism asked “Do you assent to all the
15 articles of the Christian religion, as they are taught here in this Christian church from
16 the Word of God...”.

17 4.4 Re 3.1: While it is true that Synods 1986 and 1989 did not explicitly respond to various
18 references brought forward by the appellants (Bouwman, Ursinus, Synod 1923 GKN, P.
19 Dathenus, R. Schilders, VanderHeyden, Elsevier, National Synod ’sGravenhage 1586,
20 etc.), Burlington-Fellowship (grounds 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14) does not prove that these
21 Synods did not even consider the references when formulating their responses or that a
22 synod must even explicitly respond to every reference brought to its attention.

23 4.5 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship (ground 5) is incorrect in asserting that GS 1986 judged
24 that the questions have always referred to the Reformed confessions. What GS 1986
25 (Art. 145 Cons. 2) said was that “the questions asked never *excluded* the allegiance to
26 all the confessions which are maintained by the Canadian Reformed Churches” (italics
27 added).

28 4.6 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship (ground 6) is correct that the Acts of Synod 1983 contain
29 a typographical error. In article 145, consideration 2 (page 107) is obviously out of
30 place. Consideration 5 on page 107 follows Consideration 4 on page 100 (starting with
31 4A, Form for the Baptism of Infants); therefore, GS 1986 was correct in observing that
32 GS 1983 “considered under number 5 (p. 107) that “the use of the word ‘confessions’
33 instead of ‘creeds’ in the questions of the Forms for Baptism and Public Profession of
34 Faith answers the question posed by brother W. VanderKamp.””. Misplaced numbers
35 are not grounds for overturning previous decisions (especially considering the fact that
36 in the physical cut and paste process for preparing documents for printing at that time, it
37 is quite possible for this type of error to have occurred).

38 4.7 Re 3.1: The changes made by GS 1980 were the result of a general mandate given to the
39 Standing Committee for the Publication of the *Book of Praise* (SCBP) by GS 1977,
40 which included the mandate to “to re-translate the Liturgical Forms into present-day
41 English” (Art. 60, Rec. 4). Although in dealing with the overture from CCO 5-20 on the
42 questions in the liturgical forms, RSE 2020 (Art. 13 Cons. 7) acknowledged that there
43 were errors made in how the churches have arrived at the current formulation (cf.
44 Burlington-Fellowship, appeal, grounds 12, 13), GS 2019 (Art. 64 Cons. 4.4) also
45 considered that “The fact that the decision of GS 1983 has served in the churches for



1 more than 30 years is also significant. During all that time, the 1983 decision was
2 honoured as settled and binding. Also for this reason, the request of Hamilton-Blessings
3 should come in the form of an overture that follows the ecclesiastical route (see Cons.
4 4.2 and 4.3), seeking support. In this way, all the churches will have ample time and
5 opportunity to interact with it through this filtering process.”

6 4.8 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship (ground 15) is incorrect in its assertion that “Neither the
7 ‘specific question’ nor the avoided ‘misunderstanding’ have been recorded in the Acts
8 of Synods 1983, 1986, 1989 or 1992”. GS 1983 was responding to a question put
9 forward by Br. W. VanderKamp (Art. 145 Obs. 8). These Synods were not responding
10 to a particular misunderstanding but were seeking to avoid future misunderstandings.

11 4.9 Re 3.1: Burlington-Fellowship (ground 16) is incorrect in using a decision of GS 2019
12 (Art. 130 Cons. 4.1) to judge the actions of GS 1992, which had been convened 21 years
13 prior. The decision of GS 2019 was based on the decision of GS 2013 (Art. 125 Obs.
14 4.5) that “All requests concerning other changes to the contents of the *Book of Praise*
15 (e.g. translation of confessions, changes to metrical psalms, rewording and rhyming of
16 psalms and hymns, changes to liturgical forms) need to arise out of the churches in the
17 ecclesiastical way, namely from consistory to classis to regional synod and general
18 synod”.

19 4.10 Re 3.2: The request of Burlington-Fellowship presumes that in denying their appeal,
20 GS 2022 has affirmed “that the changes were legitimate because the meaning did not
21 change”. GS 2022 has made no judgment in this regard, and in doing so, leaves room
22 for a church to overture a future general synod to make the desired change to the
23 liturgical forms.

24 **Article 151 – Closing Devotions**

25 Some announcements were made regarding agenda items and housekeeping matters.

26 Rev. Van Dam read Mark 9:33-41, led in closing prayer, and had those present sing Hymn 55.

27
28
29 *Synod adjourned until 9:00 am the next day.*