

**ST MARK'S NATIONAL CATHEDRAL
OR COLLEGIATE CHURCH,
CANBERRA:
ANGLICANISM'S CULTURAL PROBLEM.**

**A paper read at the 2002 Australian Anglican History Seminar,
Morpeth NSW**

21-22 September 2002

T W Campbell

**ST MARK'S NATIONAL CATHEDRAL OR COLLEGIATE CHURCH,
CANBERRA: ANGLICANISM'S CULTURAL PROBLEM.**

**A paper read at the 2002 Australian Anglican History Seminar, Morpeth NSW,
21-22 September 2002**

T W Campbell

The debates that have ensued within the various forums of the Anglican church of Australia (and its predecessor organisation) since 1905 over the construction within the national capital, Canberra of a significant, appropriate national symbol, such as a cathedral, have demonstrated time and again that Australian Anglicanism is only superficially national in outlook, and divided in its religious culture, despite the 1962 advance of a common national constitution.

The focus of this paper is on proposals up to 1983 for the construction of a significant national symbol in Canberra and who might pay for it. The related issue always has been who might run and be responsible for the proposed national cathedral (or whatever it might be called), once built.¹ This question of who might sit in or operate from the national cathedral once constructed has been addressed on numerous occasions within the General Synod since 1910, when first raised. The most detailed proposals were set out in a report to the 1926 General Synod.² The management options canvassed have included making the national building the episcopal seat of the Primate, creating a diocesan bishopric (probably within the province of New South Wales) as the 'Diocese of the National Capital' or such like, appointing a co-adjutor bishop of Goulburn who might live in and operate out of Canberra, or establishing some other arrangement not considered at the time or later. Underlying the episcopal arrangements, but only mentioned cautiously from time to time, has been the line of theology any bishop might follow, if Canberra were a separate diocese.

From 1905, when discussion began, there has been confusion about the fact that the new federal capital territory was to be located within the boundaries of the existing Diocese of Goulburn (later Canberra and Goulburn), even though that federal territory ought properly to be regarded and managed as a national responsibility. Equally, when matters pertaining specifically to the diocese of Goulburn, and its interests, have arisen, there periodically have been quite divergent views within the Goulburn diocese itself, whether they be city

¹ For other published discussion of this matter, see Gretel Ayre, *Visions on Rottenberry Hill: the Story of an Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture*, Bathurst, Charles Sturt University, 2001. See also Tom Frame, *A Church for a nation: a history of the Anglican Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn*, Alexandria, Hale & Iremonger, 2000; Paul Radford, *A Scholar in a New Land: Lewis Bostock Radford*, Adelaide, Flinders University, 1979, and C A Warren, *A Little Foolishness: An Autobiographical History*, Virginia Qld, Church Archivist Press, 1993. A related informative work is Alan Roberts, 'Memorials in the National Capital: developing a sense of national identity', in *Canberra Historical Society Journal*, No 26, September 1990, pp2-16.

² *Proceedings of the General Synod of the Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania, Session 1926*, Sydney, The Synod, 1927, pp125-127. Subsequent references to Synod Proceedings will simply be recorded as 'Proceedings [year of Synod]', with the relevant page reference.

versus rural, the city of Goulburn versus the city of Canberra, or a combination of several. The battles fought by Archdeacon Charles Robertson of Canberra over many years, particularly in relation to who had parochial responsibility for Canberra, and the financial and management acumen of Bishop Burgmann, are legendary.³

The Federal (later Australian) Capital Territory was created as a consequence of section 125 of the Australian constitution. Its creation, and very existence in the first years of federation, was deeply despised by politicians and people alike, especially in Sydney and Melbourne. Nevertheless, South Australian member King O'Malley quickly started the site selection process, with a motion in the House on 19 July 1901.⁴ After the politicians played around without real direction for a year, looking at possible sites, a Capital Sites Enquiry Board was established on 16 December 1902, and began work in early 1903.⁵ By 15 August 1904, when the Seat of Government Act 1904 completed its passage through the federal parliament (nominating Dalgety as the preferred site for a federal capital) it was obvious that the south eastern corner of New South Wales ultimately was to be the region within which the new federal territory would be located.⁶ That area of the State fell totally within the boundaries of the Diocese of Goulburn. Therefore the 1905 General Synod resolved:

That in the opinion of this synod steps should be taken to secure the representation of the Church in the proposed Federal capital, and that this could best be provisionally arranged by transferring the episcopal charge of this territory for Church of England purposes to the Primacy. That the following be a committee to watch the whole question, and to take such steps as they deem necessary: the Primate, the Metropolitans of Victoria and Queensland, and the Bishop of the diocese in which the capital may be situated.⁷

The Synod report continued: 'The motion was brought forward with the full concurrence of the Bishop of Goulburn, in whose diocese the proposed Federal capital site was located'.⁸ The episcopal debate commenced forthwith. The Bishop of Gippsland immediately declared the position taken anomalous. 'Either a new diocese would have to be formed out of Goulburn, should the capital be established as now proposed, or the Primate would be the Bishop of a portion of another Bishop's territory'.⁹

³ For details, see Frame. See also Peter Hempenstall, *The Meddlesome Priest: a life of Ernest Burgmann*, St Leonards, Allen & Unwin, 1993.

⁴ Roger Pegrum, *The Bush Capital: how Australia chose Canberra as its Federal City*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1983, p69.

⁵ Pegrum, p79.

⁶ Pegrum, p119.

⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald (SMH)*, 11 October 1905, p10.

⁸ *SMH*, 11 October 1905, p10.

⁹ *SMH*, 11 October 1905, p10.

The federal capital site was established by law on 14 December 1908¹⁰. A subsequent 1910 Act declared that all land within the Federal Territory would be held as leasehold, not freehold, a system of land tenure lost on many early players.¹¹

The Synod's 1905 Select Committee duly reported to the 1910 Synod that no action of any kind had been taken by it, basically because nothing substantial had happened during the period to advance the notion of a national capital territory, other than machinery pieces of legislation.¹² At that 1910 Synod an updated resolution was passed:

That whereas a site for the Capital of the Australian Commonwealth has been selected by the Federal Parliament this Synod appoints the Primate, the Metropolitans of Victoria and Queensland, the Bishop of Goulburn, the Rector of Canberra, the Chancellor and Registrar of the Diocese of Goulburn, Sir Albert Gould, Messrs Frederick Campbell, W L Docker, Minton Taylor and the mover (Archdeacon Spencer of Goulburn) to act as a Committee for the purpose of taking such steps as may be necessary to secure a suitable and sufficient site or sites for the erection thereon of Church buildings in connection with the Church of England in such Capital.¹³

Goulburn's new bishop, Lewis Bostock Radford, only appointed in August 1915, quickly had recognised the potential problems for his diocese and the church as a whole, even if the other members of General Synod had not come to grips with or accepted the implications of the leasehold system of land tenure that had been introduced.¹⁴ Radford took the running at the 1916 Synod. He immediately focussed on whether the new territory would become a diocese in its own right, remain a part of the Goulburn diocese, or be separately administered in some other way as the episcopal seat of the Primate. These questions were both practical and symbolic. Radford's focus on episcopal matters was for the very simple reason that, if a bishop was to be appointed separately for the capital territory, then the construction and operation of a major national church would be his problem, not Radford's. The Goulburn diocese was very large in area, stretching at the time from a point near Temora due south to the Victorian border and due east to the great dividing range, where it turned southeast to reach the coast near Bateman's Bay. The NSW/Victorian border and the eastern coastline represented the southern and eastern boundaries. In later years Radford was to make it clear that, if a new diocese was

¹⁰ Seat of Government (Yass-Canberra) Act 1910.

¹¹ Seat of Government (Administration) Act 1910, promulgated 25 November 1910.

¹² *Proceedings* pp18, 80.

¹³ *Proceedings*, 1910, p53.

¹⁴ How the Goulburn diocese looked at and worked its way over the years through the issues involved, because Canberra was within its boundaries, is well described in Ransome T Wyatt, *The History of the Diocese of Goulburn*, Sydney, Edgar Bragg & Sons, 1937. See also the more recent history by Tom Frame.

proposed, the Goulburn diocese would not stand in the way, but release the required territory to the new diocese.¹⁵

As nothing of substance happened in the years from the 1916 General Synod, mostly because of World War I, the 1921 Synod resolution, proposed by Radford, was worded:

That the Committee established in 1910 for the purpose of securing sites at Canberra for the erection thereon of Church buildings be reconstituted and authorised to proceed with its original purposes, and also to consider and report upon the question of the ecclesiastical position of the Federal Capital Territory.¹⁶

The bishopric question was again on the agenda.

At that 1921 Synod the Primate (Archbishop Wright of Sydney) in his Presidential Address at the 1921 General Synod, declared:

In Australia it is we who as the General Synod can alone speak with the authority of one voice for our Church through the length and breadth of our continent.¹⁷

He was wrong.

Walter Burley Griffin's prize winning design for a national capital was accepted on 23 May 1912, and Griffin worked on it until his departure from the job in 1920. His plan was gazetted in 1923, so fixing many of the features of the plan, and enabling the commencement of sales of land leases for private development and other purposes.

By 1923 the major Christian churches had started jockeying for prime positions provided in the Griffin design, as he had ideas that they should be represented with large monumental buildings which might take on symbolic national roles. In a formal sense the Commonwealth authorities nominated a series of five acre sites for national church purposes in 1925, from which the Anglican, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Baptist and Congregational churches were invited to choose one. Additional smaller sites were also reserved around the city for standard purposes. The Anglican community selected and ultimately was assigned a site known as Rottenbury Hill.¹⁸ Archbishop of Perth C O L Riley, Acting Primate at the time, dedicated the site on Sunday 8 May 1927

¹⁵ *The Canberra Times (CT)*, 9 May 1927, p6. See also *SMH*, 9 May 1927, p14.

¹⁶ *Proceedings*, 1921, p93. Ayre records in her book that there are alternative spellings for the name 'Rottenbury'. She follows the spelling 'Rottenberry' at the request of a descendant. This paper uses 'Rottenbury', as it was the name recorded on contemporary maps.

¹⁷ *SMH* 5 October 1921, p11.

¹⁸ See map 'Church Sites' overprinted in 1924(?) on 'Canberra plan of city and environs: Walter Burley Griffin, Federal Capital Director of Design and Construction: drawn by Home and Territories Lands and Survey Branch, published 1918 (National Library of Australia map reference MAP G8984.C3E4 1920-1930).

two days before the official opening of the new Parliament House in Canberra.¹⁹ Riley also commented on future episcopal arrangements, as he saw them, and launched an appeal for funds, declaring that 'Canberra would have its own Bishop in the near future'. He also stated quite clearly that, in his view, the construction of a new cathedral 'was a matter which should command the attention of all Church of England people in Australia, for the building of a national cathedral was a national obligation'.²⁰

At that same dedication ceremony Radford told the gathering there was 'a suggestion before Synod (ie, General Synod) to constitute the Federal Capital Territory a separate diocese. The question of the appointment of a Bishop was in abeyance, but it would be revived prior to the constitution of the Federal Territory Diocese'. He also told the gathering that the Synod had decided that everything done on the Rottenbury Hill site was of a national character.²¹

Serious issues immediately arose as to who would be responsible for any building constructed at Rottenbury Hill, how it might be paid for, and what steps could be taken to meet the Commonwealth's requirement that construction commence within a short period of time on the site held by each denomination. Radford and his Canberra Committee colleagues had to take action. The actions they took were supported retrospectively by the resolution passed at the 1926 General Synod. That resolution was based on the Committee's Report tabled at General Synod:

That this Synod:

- 1) approves and confirms the actions taken by the Committee on Canberra Church Sites and Problems;
- 2) reconstitutes the Committee with power to add to its number for the twofold purposes of promoting an appeal to the whole Anglican Church of Australia for a Canberra Cathedral Building Fund and of considering and reporting upon the question of the Ecclesiastical position of the Federal Capital City; and
- 3) authorises the Committee so reconstructed to proceed with the erection of such Church Buildings on the Cathedral Site as may be necessary in the immediate future in view of the requirements of the Capital City Commissioners.²²

During the Synod debate an amendment that attempted to place the new Federal Territory under 'special Episcopal supervision' was withdrawn.²³ The various ecclesiastical options

¹⁹ *Proceedings*, 1932, p132. See also Wyatt, p252.

²⁰ *CT*, 9 May 1927, p6. See also *SMH*, 9 May 1927, p14.

²¹ *CT*, 9 May 1927, p6. See also *SMH*, 9 May 1927, p14.

²² *Proceedings*, 1926, p51.

²³ *Proceedings*, 1926, p51.

suggested by the Committee in its 1926 Report to Synod were consistent with options already put forward.²⁴ It was at this point that things began to unravel.

The original conditions for allocation of a lease required each church to start work within two years on appropriate buildings. The Canberra Committee acted on the advice of three leading church architects and held an open competition for the design of a cathedral, a Bishop's residence, a Synod Hall and a church office. They received 49 entries. The plans submitted by the winning architect, Harold Crone, and those of the runners up, Messrs A E La Gerche and W E Gower, subsequently were published.²⁵ The estimated cost of the Crone submission was £150,000.

General Synod had no authority to require the Australian dioceses to contribute towards a national cathedral or symbol, but only to recommend, and the Synod did little to give guidance, direction and support for Goulburn's bishop as he strove to meet the requirements of the Federal Capital Commissioner to start a building on the site, or lose it.

When ultimately the great depression came the matter was removed from the realm of the possible to the impossible. While Synod had established the Canberra Committee, the responsibility for raising funds for the design competition and construction of a first component of the proposed national cathedral fell heavily on Goulburn's Bishop Radford. As the great depression began to bite, making such efforts practically impossible, Radford had to bear almost single handedly the brunt of attacks on the debts incurred by the Canberra Committee at the 1932 Synod. Radford's difficulties with the implications of this national proposal had been exacerbated by the onset of the depression, his own separate diocesan problems of funding both a girls' school (St Gabriel's, Canberra, later Canberra Girls Grammar), and a boys' school (Canberra Grammar) in the new city. His only relief had come in December 1928 when he laid his problems before his colleague bishops at a regular meeting of Standing Committee. They decided:

That the Bishops recommend that, pending the meeting of General Synod the interest on the overdraft, approximately £150, be regarded as a charge in the proportion of the assessment for General Synod expenses upon the dioceses of Australia, and that the Bishops be asked by the Primate to make arrangements in their dioceses to provide the amount.²⁶

At their meeting the Bishops virtually underwrote a Goulburn diocesan overdraft with the Bank of New South Wales, by letter dated 17 December 1928 signed on behalf of the bishops by the bishops of Sydney, Adelaide, Melbourne Brisbane and Newcastle.²⁷ In his

²⁴ For the options canvassed, see Appendix 10, 'General Synod Committee on Canberra Church Site and Problems', *Proceedings*, 1926, pp125-127.

²⁵ *Architecture, the journal of the proceedings of the Institute of Architects of New South Wales*, Vol 17, No 12, December 1928, pp254, 263-272.

²⁶ Presidential address, *Proceedings*, 1931 and 1932, p48.

²⁷ *Proceedings*, 1931 and 1932, p48.

report to the 1932 Synod Primate Le Fanu then recorded that the bishops had decided at the time to concentrate on a part of the proposed Cathedral of St Mark, rather than to aim at the whole scheme of cathedral, residence, chapter hall and school but, only in the weeks before the 1932 Synod, had come to the view that the whole project should be held in abeyance.²⁸ The General Synod adopted that course of action by Resolution:

- 1) That this Synod recognises that the Church in Australia has a responsibility to assist in the ultimate development of the Church in Canberra as the National Capital;
- 2) That this Synod considers the present time is inopportune to consider the proceeding with the movement for building a Cathedral or the creation of a Bishopric;
- 3) That the Bishop of Goulburn be requested to submit to each Diocesan Bishop a statement as to the amount required to save the Canberra Schools in their present grave emergency in the hope that individual Dioceses may be able in some measure to take a share in this responsibility;
- 4) That a Committee be appointed to deal with the matters which are the subject of this resolution.²⁹

In order to help meet the strains imposed on their bishop the Goulburn Synod of 1929 had authorised Radford to appoint a co-adjutor bishop who could take charge of the Canberra component of the diocese, or release Radford to assume that responsibility. When that proposal went forward to the 1932 General Synod, however, for ratification, the idea was blocked, as pre-empting decisions General Synod might or might not make in due course about the national church.

Radford's detailed report to the 1932 General Synod clearly shows the burdens and problems that he faced virtually alone.³⁰ While the General Synod eventually helped to solve some of the problems the stress resulted in his resignation in September 1933, and replacement by Bishop Ernest Henry Burgmann. Radford died in England on 2 April 1937. His ashes were returned to Canberra, and remain interred in St John's church, Reid ACT, with a view to their placement in the National Cathedral Canberra, when built.

One of the matters brought to the 1932 General Synod was the problem of expenditure incurred in the cathedral design competition, for which there were no funds available to meet the debts incurred. A 'Committee to Finalise Outstanding Matters re the Business of the Former Canberra Committee' was established, chaired by the Bishop of Adelaide. The

²⁸ *Proceedings*, 1931 and 1932, p50.

²⁹ *Proceedings* 1931 and 1932, pp59-60

³⁰ *Proceedings*, 1932, pp132-134.

report of their efforts was tabled at the 1937 General Synod.³¹ It showed that the original outstanding debt of £4,121 had been reduced to £721 by 30 June 1937.³²

After the depression had wreaked its havoc World War II intervened and prevented any serious movement forward in the subject. The 1945 General Synod resolution (passed when Synod met just after the war concluded) declared:

This Synod recommends the reappointment of the Canberra Committee of General Synod so that the Church may make full use of the ecclesiastical, educational and other opportunities presented in the national capital.³³

Once again nothing of any substance happened. That Synod was told, however, that the outstanding debts incurred by the Canberra Committee in the design competition had been met.³⁴

Burgmann originally had little time for his predecessor's proposals for the national church complex, but gradually warmed to them and the broad thinking Radford had demonstrated. Burgmann eventually was seized with the significance of the national capital in the life of the country, moved his official residence from Goulburn to Canberra in 1947, and in 1950 achieved a change in the name of the diocese to 'Canberra and Goulburn', so reflecting by his actions his realisation of the increased significance of the national capital in the life of Australia and the church.

Burgmann developed a different view and priority for the proposed national site. He launched St Mark's Library in 1952. He had spoken enthusiastically at his diocesan synod of a 1948 visit made to St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Wales, erected as a memorial to W E Gladstone, a former Prime Minister of Britain and significant Anglican scholar.³⁵ Burgmann then set about constructing St Mark's Library, which opened on 24 February 1957, as the first step in meeting his dream of a centre of scholarship that would stand well against the Australian National University, and the National Library of Australia. Originally intended for location on land near St John's church, Reid, Burgmann placed the Library on the Rottenbury Hill site when the National Library was set for construction in a similar location against the putative Lake Burley Griffin. A successor to Burgmann, Cecil Warren, described Burgmann's obsession with St Mark's as follows:

His great initiative was the founding of St Mark's National Memorial Library; national, in the sense that it was located adjacent to the as yet undeveloped national church site, and was intended for nationwide use, and its chapel a memorial to non-combatants who had served with the armed forces in Australia's

³¹ *Proceedings*, 1937, pp40-1

³² *Proceedings*, 1937, pp81-85

³³ *Proceedings*, 1945, p59.

³⁴ *Proceedings*, 1945, pp73-4.

³⁵ Warren, p26.

wars. In the Bishop's mind, it was a foundation for theological scholarship in the city that now housed the Australian National University as well as the nation's Parliament. Whatever the ecclesiastical destiny of the cathedral site, he hoped to ensure that the Anglican presence in the city would be distinguished by sound theology.³⁶

Burgmann equally became very enthusiastic about a 'great church' or 'collegiate church' at the time of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, when he was reminded that London's Westminster Abbey complex also comprised an ancient library. In a printed fund raising brochure distributed as part of a major appeal for St Mark's Library Burgmann wrote:

We aim . . . in due time to create an Australian version of Westminster Abbey. The proper name of this great church is 'The Collegiate Church of St Peter in Westminster' . . . so it is thoroughly appropriate that we should call our Australian version of the Abbey by the name of 'The Collegiate Church of St Mark in Canberra'.³⁷

The term 'Collegiate Church', rather than 'Cathedral', with its diocesan connotations, also neatly got around the problems of a bishopric and diocese.

Placing the new St Mark's Library on Rottenbury Hill had been a first step in achieving this great objective. He saw the 'great church' as 'the parish church of the nation',³⁸ but was not able to progress his ideas, as even he eventually had to accept that there was no money for the projects envisaged.

Burgmann's replacement, Ken Clements, had been Assistant Bishop and Registrar of the diocese before some years as Bishop of Grafton. He therefore was in a position to know well the problems to be faced in Canberra, and gave St Mark's a lower priority than had Burgmann. Enthroned in mid 1961 Clements was more concerned with basic administrative details and attending to the pressing requirements of the diocese, which was expanding rapidly in its Canberra population because of deliberate Government policies that increased Canberra's size significantly. Clements' successor, Cecil Warren, wrote:

He [Clements] quickly saw the challenge that Canberra's expansion presented to our otherwise mainly rural diocese and, within the limited resources available to him, responded to it. His administrative firmness convinced the diocese of the need to transfer the diocesan office to Canberra.³⁹

³⁶ Warren, p36.

³⁷ St Mark's Memorial Library, Canberra, Church of England, Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn, 195[3]

³⁸ Hempenstall, p314. Hempenstall wrongly attributes to Burgmann the selection of the name 'St Mark's' for the complex. The name was in fact selected by the Conference of Bishops held in November 1927 (see *Proceedings* 1931 and 1932, pp50, 133).

³⁹ Warren, p94.

Cecil Warren, enthroned as bishop of Canberra and Goulburn on 31 January 1972, was the next to try to do something about the proposed national church.⁴⁰ A first step had been tried in 1971 when the diocese sought to locate a new residence for the bishop on Rottenbury Hill (a residence had formed part of the 1928 winning design entry). This move was rebuffed by the National Capital Development Commission, on the grounds that the church had not demonstrated a commitment to fulfill the original intentions for the site.⁴¹

Early in 1978 Warren heard that the Blackett designed church in Sydney suburban Newtown might soon become redundant. Another church having already successfully been transferred stone by stone from Rookwood, Sydney, to Ainslie, a Canberra suburb, Warren entertained the idea of similarly removing the Newtown church. The proposal hit raw nerves in Sydney, however, and the idea soon was dropped.

Warren next took to the 1981 General Synod a motion welcoming the establishment of a national 'Great Church' building in Canberra, seeking completion by bi-centennial year 1988, the setting up of a building fund, and the conduct of a national appeal, asking for a Committee to supervise all the development to ensure construction by 1988. His proposals were badly mauled by Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide members and he was forced to withdraw his motion, gaining a resolution only:

That this General Synod endorses the proposal that the Anglican Primary Site in Canberra be developed as a national project of this Church and asks the Standing Committee to appoint a working group to plan the project in detail, so that if the next General Synod so approves it may be implemented without delay.⁴²

In his autobiography Warren wryly notes: 'I had misread the degree of unity that the Church had achieved'.⁴³ He lamented his failure to convince the Church, as had Radford, 60 years earlier, that Canberra's development was a national responsibility, in relation to its national characteristics, as well as his own, in relation to standard diocesan commitments.⁴⁴ The issue was dropped, and Warren resigned office in August 1983, and departed for life in England for some years.

Despite Bishop Warren's lack of success the Primate, Archbishop Grinrod, referred specifically to Warren's drive and vision in his 1985 Presidential Address to Synod (Warren was by now in England):

⁴⁰ For his autobiography, see Warren

⁴¹ Warren, p96.

⁴² *Proceedings, 1981*, Resolution 63.81, p44. See also Warren, p187

⁴³ Warren p187.

⁴⁴ Warren p190.

A man who 'dreamed' the Australian Church was Bishop Cecil Warren. He moved with a sense of urgency, for he had a vision of the Anglican church of Australia, not just as a collection of dioceses, but a Church with a strong cohesion and sense of mission. . . . I have written at some length about Bishop Warren, as his part in the development of the national church since the acceptance of the Constitution in 1962 has been so formative.⁴⁵

Nice words, but they did nothing to address the issues Warren had raised.

A number of initiatives to develop the Rottenbury Hill site have been taken since 1983. They are outside the scope of this paper.⁴⁶ Moving the Synod Secretariat from Sydney to Canberra, and locating the Primate in the national capital, have also been discussed, without resolution.⁴⁷

As a related postscript it is noted that, in its Report to the 1985 General Synod, the Standing Committee recorded that it had received a resolution from the Synod of Canberra and Goulburn to confer the title 'Archbishop' on the Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn. The Standing Committee indicated that it was not prepared to promote the matter as:

- a) the Anglican tradition is only to relate the title 'Archbishop' to metropolitan authority; and
- b) it had a disinclination to increase the number of Archbishops from five to six, which would inevitably lead to the conferring of the title on the Bishop of Tasmania as well, making seven.

Standing Committee then wrote: 'The Anglican Church of Australia shares a certain notoriety in the Anglican communion with the Anglican church of Canada due to the number of Archbishops in our Church'.⁴⁸

Acknowledgements

Ms Kate Taylor, as usual, read and commented on an early draft, to great effect. Ms Chris Fernon, Canberra national capital historian, equally has provided much advice and given direction to rare material. Staff of the National Library of Australia, and Petherick Room colleagues, have consistently been positive supporters. All are thanked most sincerely.

⁴⁵ Archbishop J B R Grinrod, Archbishop of Brisbane and Primate, Presidential Address, General Synod 26 August 1985, *Proceedings*, 1985, pp9-10.

⁴⁶ For much more detailed information of developments since 1983 see Ayre and Frame.

⁴⁷ For discussion see Frame, pp302ff.

⁴⁸ *Proceedings*, 1985, pp235-236.