

Questions and Answers under business rule 6.3

1. Diocesan Mission Policy

Mr Keith Smith asked –

In view of the need to assess growth with regard to our Diocesan Mission Policy and in view of the large number of parishes that have not returned complete information regarding average Sunday attendances and the number of baptisms and confirmations, what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure that a more accurate picture of annual surveys will result?

To which the President replied –

Mr Smith's question is prefaced by 2 assertions. Although a question containing an assertion is strictly out of order, both assertions made in Mr Smith's question raise important matters for our mission. I therefore make the following observations.

Although number counting is not our primary concern in undertaking the mission, it is nonetheless important that appropriate information is collected as one means of assessing how we are faring, particularly in respect of our initial 10% goal. It is true that a substantial number of parishes have not returned the necessary information to make this assessment. The parochial statistics for 2001, summarised on page 128 of the 2003 Year Book, show that 52 churches did not submit a return in respect of average Sunday attendances, baptisms, confirmations, marriages and funerals.

I will be asking the Archdeacons to follow up those parishes which did not submit an annual return for this information as a necessary imperative to Mission. We are also revising the form to make completion of the return easier.

In addition, the Registrar and I have been in regular communication with Anglicare's Research and Planning Department and the National Church Life Survey, seeking to obtain accurate figures of church attendance.

We are aiming to develop a more adequate method of assessing growth and to put this in place in the next 12 months.

2. Church Plants

Dr Rod James asked –

- (a) What is the status of a church plant in a building other than a licensed building in relation to –
 - (i) the involvement of members in a vestry meeting (clauses 7, 11 and 12 of the Church Administration Ordinance 1990) - do they hold a separate meeting or take part in the vestry meeting of the principal church?
 - (ii) clauses 11, 12 and 23 of the Church Administration Ordinance 1990 – is such a church entitled to churchwardens, and if not, who performs their functions?
 - (iii) clauses 6 and 7 of the Church Grounds and Buildings Ordinance 1990 – what activities are permitted, and who is allowed to conduct services and preach in such a church?
 - (iv) any other ordinances which may affect such a church and of which the questioner may be unaware.
- (b) Is it the intention of the Policy 4 committee to bring legislation before this Synod to deal with such matter?

To which the President replied –

- (a) This question seeks a legal opinion and is therefore strictly out of order. However, Dr James' question raises important issues for our mission which require a response. I make the following observations –

Firstly, it is true that a building which has not been licensed as a church is not generally regarded as a church for the purposes of our ordinances. One of the particular difficulties associated with licensing a building being used for an “off-site” church plant is that in general our ordinances require that no building is to be licensed as a church until the land on which the building is erected has been vested in the Property Trust. However there is some flexibility given to the Archbishop to license other types of buildings as churches and it would be my intention to do so wherever appropriate.

Secondly, I am informed that special provisions apply to a group which has been recognised as a church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000. These provisions make it unnecessary for me to license a building in which that group meets in order for that building to be regarded as a church for the purposes of our ordinances.

Finally, I think it is important to note that the Diocesan Mission requires innovative practice which of its nature challenges the rules and structures we currently have in place. By and large this is a healthy thing provided innovation is also accompanied with reforms to those rules and structures to allow us to move ahead in an orderly way.

- (b) The issues raised in Dr James’ question need to be further considered and in due course amending legislation may be required to be brought to the Synod.

3. Circular to parishes on Mission Property

Mr Graeme Marks asked –

In relation to the circular to parishes on Mission Property – availability of community buildings for use by parishes issued on behalf of the Mission Property Committee in May 2003 to “encourage churches to consider how they can use community buildings for church planting and other and other ministry purposes in fulfillment of the 2nd of the Mission policies recently adopted by the Synod” –

- (a) How many copies of this circular were issued?
- (b) What comments and feedback, as requested by the Mission Property Committee in the circular, have been provided?
- (c) How many churches have requested information from the database referred to in the circular containing information about 516 community facilities controlled by local councils in the Diocese in order to assess the suitability of such facilities for church planting purposes?
- (d) How can churches obtain access to the database?
- (e) Are the modifications, set out in the circular, to the Department of Education’s standard “Community Use Agreement” procured by the Mission Property Committee to facilitate Anglican use of school buildings still current, and if not, what has changed?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows -

- (a) 276
- (b) There have been a number of responses to the circular although no comments and feedback have been provided.
- (c) One church has initiated a request for information from the database.
- (d) An electronic copy of the database can be provided to any church by email on request. In addition, a search on the database can be undertaken on request as indicated in the circular.
- (e) The circular sets out 2 types of modifications that can be made to the Department of Education’s standard “Community Use Agreement”. While one of the modifications is no

longer relevant given recent changes to the Department's policies, the remaining modification is still current and should be used where appropriate.

4. List of names of persons licensed

Mr Graeme Marks asked –

In relation to Synod resolution 10/02 which is reproduced on page 397 of the 2003 Year Book –

- (a) what has happened in making available information that –
 - (i) is publicly available in the Year Book, and
 - (ii) is not publicly available such as non-ordained licensed but employed persons and
- (b) when is it expected that this information will be available?

To which the President replied –

- (a) I am informed that the answer is as follows –
 - (i) In view of the requirements of privacy legislation, all clergy have been asked to consent to their personal information being published, both in the Year Book and on the internet. To date, of the 286 who have replied, 14 are unwilling for their information to appear on the internet. Of those 14, 8 are currently incumbents.
 - (ii) A new software program has been installed, and it is expected that persons in the category referred to in Mr Marks' question will be incorporated, hopefully in 2004.
- (b) In view of the unwillingness of a significant number of clergy to have their details published on the internet, it is not anticipated that such information will be made publicly available on the internet. However, the possibility of a secure internet site protected by password which would be available to ministers and churches, is currently being explored.

5. Funding for indigenous people's ministry

Mr Richard Lambert asked –

In relation to resolution 25/02 of this Synod which in part reads –

“Synod recommends to the Standing Committee that priority be given.....to resourcing Indigenous Peoples' Ministry by directing that a percentage of the proceeds from all sales of church trust property be added to the Indigenous Peoples' Trust Fund...”

can the President please inform the Synod in respect of the period 1 January 2003 to 30 September 2003 –

- (a) How many ordinances did the Standing Committee pass to enable the sale of church trust property?
- (b) How many of those ordinances provided for a percentage of the proceeds to be paid to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund?
- (c) How many such ordinances did not make any such provision?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 10
- (b) and (c) One sale ordinance passed during the period in question provided for a percentage of the proceeds to be paid to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund. The other 9 ordinances did not. This reflects the decision of the Standing Committee to recommend that 1% of the total income available to Synod be added to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund each year from 2006 as a line item under the Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance.

6. Funding for indigenous people's ministry (2)

Mr Richard Lambert asked -

In relation to resolution 25/02 of this Synod which in part read –

“Synod...urges each parish of the diocese to generously support Indigenous ministry in the diocese any way it can, for example by giving a percentage of any land sales to the Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Trust Fund or by giving 1% of their income to the fund....”

can the President please inform the Synod in respect of the period 1 January 2003 to 30 September 2003 –

- (a) How many parishes are there in this diocese?
- (b) How many ordinances for sale of property held in trust for a parish contained a provision for a percentage of a land sale to be paid to the trust fund?
- (c) How many ordinances for sale of property held in trust for a parish did not contain such provision?
- (d) How many parishes have made donations to the trust fund?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 265
- (b) 1
- (c) 7
- (d) I am informed 2 parishes have made direct donations to the trust fund.

7. General Synod - Holy Communion Canon 2001 Adopting Ordinance 2003

Mr Donald McPhail asked –

Noting item 14 on the Business Paper for Monday 13 October 2003 concerning the bill for the General Synod – Holy Communion Canon 2001 Adopting Ordinance 2003, what are the current circumstances under which an Anglican Minister can refuse Holy Communion to a confirmed member of any Anglican Church and, in particular, to a member of the minister's own church?

If that minister does so refuse, what steps can be taken to direct that minister to give Holy Communion to all confirmed members of the Anglican Church?

To which the President replied –

This question seeks a legal opinion and is therefore out of order. However I draw Mr McPhail's attention to Canons 26, 27 and 28 of the Canons of 1603.

8. Moore Theological College

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

- (a) How many students are currently enrolled in Moore College?
- (b) How many of the students in Question 1 are currently Anglican candidates?
- (c) Of the Anglican candidates in Question 2, how many are catechists in churches within a 20km radius of Moore College?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 283
- (b) 93
- (c) 74

9. Glebe Income Accounts

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

- (a) How many parishes in the Diocese now have cheque accounts with the Glebe Income Accounts? How does this compare with 12 months ago?
- (b) How much is invested with the Glebe Board, in any accounts, by parishes within this Diocese? What percentage of the total funds of the Glebe Board is this? How do both these figures compare with 12 months ago?

To which the President replied -

I am advised that the answers are as follows –

- (a) 42 parishes now have cheque accounts with GIA. GIA cheque accounts were not offered to parishes 12 months ago.
- (b) \$16.5 million is currently invested with the Glebe Board by parishes representing 12.5% of total GIA funds. This compares with \$11.3 million representing 8.5% of total funds 12 months ago.

10. Special Session of Synod for the Archbishop's Election Synod

The Rev Ross Nicholson asked –

- (a) How many meetings did the Special Session of Synod of June 2001 sit for the Archbishop's Election?
- (b) How many hours did each of those sittings run for?
- (c) How many members of Synod attended each of those sittings?
- (d) Was there a call by Standing Committee, the regional councils or regional bishops before this Synod for the diocese and parishes to pray for the decisions of that Special Synod?
- (e) Did the movers of motion 17.3 on the Synod papers call their regions to pray for the decision to be made by the Standing Committee which extended the retirement age of the Archbishop?
- (f) Did any bishops call their regions to pray for the decision to be made by the Standing Committee?
- (g) Was a motion moved at that Standing Committee that requested debate on the extension of the retirement age of the Archbishop be adjourned until the parishes of the Diocese could be called together to pray for those deliberations?

To which the President replied -

By the "Special Session" for the "Archbishop's Election" I take it you mean the special session held on 4 and 5 June 2001 in which I was elected Archbishop. On that basis I am informed the answers are as follows –

- (a) and (b) The Special Session commenced at 4.30pm on Monday 4 June 2001, adjourned for dinner at 5.45pm, resumed at 7.15pm and adjourned for the night at 10.28pm. The second day of the session on Tuesday 5 June 2001 commenced at 6.30pm and ended at 10.50pm.
- (c) On the first day of the session a count during the pre-dinner session indicated there were 624 members present. At the count during the evening session there were 698 members

present. On the second day of the session, a count taken during the session showed there were 703 members present.

- (d) Yes. A call to pray was issued to Synod members by the Administrator, Bishop Paul Barnett on 20 March 2001.
- (e) Not specifically. However the movers have been calling for prayer for the Mission of which they consider the Archbishop to form an integral part.
- (f) No.
- (g) No.

11. Prohibited Persons (Church Administration) Ordinance 2003

Having been granted leave, the Rev Graham Fairburn asked the following question on behalf of Ms Aiki Darlow –

- (a) What were the circumstances which prevailed upon the Standing Committee to pass the Prohibited Persons (Church Administration) Ordinance 2003 which disqualified Prohibited Persons from holding positions as wardens or parish councillors?
- (b) How many prohibited persons were wardens or parish councillors before the legislation was passed?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) In 2002 a parish sought the advice of the Professional Standards Unit because of concern that a prohibited person had been nominated for a parish council. Following this, the Professional Standards Board recommended to the Standing Committee that an ordinance be passed preventing prohibited persons (those convicted of a serious sexual offence or other serious offence against a child) from holding positions of parish councillor or church warden. These positions are not “child related positions” under State legislation.

The Professional Standards Board recognised that there was a question of balance in the issue. However in its opinion the question of the protection of minors and the good name of the church as the body of Christ outweighed the issues of repentance, rehabilitation and restoration at least as applied to positions of leadership such as churchwarden and parish councillor. In recommending the passing of an ordinance, the Professional Standards Board acknowledged that there was a need for sensitive and careful pastoral care and support for disqualified persons.

Standing Committee passed the Ordinance at its March 2003 meeting and it received the Archbishop’s assent. At its April 2003 meeting Standing Committee reconsidered the matter, but decided not to amend the Ordinance.

- (b) It is not known how many prohibited persons were wardens or parish councillors before the ordinance was passed. However, the Director of the Professional Standards Unit is aware of one situation, mentioned already, where a prohibited person was nominated to a parish council but not elected and of another parish where a prohibited person was a member of parish council.

12. Indigenous ministry

Dr Laurie Scandrett asked –

In the light of the statement made to last year’s Synod that the total budget for all 23 Anglican dioceses for indigenous ministry was \$196,000, would the President please inform us of what was contributed by the Diocese of Sydney in the year 2002 for indigenous ministry both within the Diocese and outside it?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that actual expenditure on Indigenous ministry from the Indigenous Ministry Fund and regional grants totalled \$170,673 in 2002. To this can be added housing supplied by the Western Sydney Regional Council during this period notionally valued at \$20,000. I also understand that a number of parishes in the Diocese independently contribute to Indigenous work (in 2003 this is at least \$20,000 so far).

For the following groups, precise contributions to Indigenous work in 2002 could not readily be obtained. However I am informed as to the following –

- (a) The National Home Mission Fund will provide \$31,000 in the next year to support Indigenous work in Cairns, Northern Territory and North West Australia. Approximately 40% of the budget of the National Home Mission Fund is contributed by the Diocese of Sydney.
- (b) The Church Missionary Society spends in the order of \$314,000 annually on Indigenous work, a significant percentage of which is contributed by churches and CMS members in this Diocese.
- (c) The Australian Board of Missions partners Indigenous work costing in the order of \$300,000 annually. However it is not possible to ascertain what percentage of that is contributed by churches and members in this Diocese.

It is a matter of great encouragement to note that apart from the three Indigenous ministry centres in this Diocese, there are two assistant Indigenous bishops in Australia and a total of 32 Indigenous clergy.

13. Standing Committee Elections

The Rev Stephen Semenchuk asked –

During the last 6 years, how many elected Standing Committee positions were filled through contested elections and how many through uncontested elections?

To which the President replied –

I take it that the reference to “elected Standing Committee positions” is not intended to include the filling of casual vacancies by the Standing Committee. On that basis I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Synod Session	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Contested	nil	2	nil	2	6	nil
Uncontested	nil	28	nil	nil	36	1

14. Archbishop’s Election

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

Given the concerns that were widely expressed with the presentations made in our Synod meeting to elect an Archbishop in 2001, are there any plans now made to review the standards and processes that apply, so as to increase the probability that all future candidates proposed for consideration to that office would be treated with more respect, and fairness in future meetings?

To which the President replied –

This question contains an assertion and makes an inference and as such is out of order. However it is customary for the rules for the election of an Archbishop to be reviewed after each election Synod. As such a proposal to review the rules has been raised with the Standing Committee and will be considered in due course.

15. Support for churches and parishes without a minister

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

Noting Synod resolution 23/02 “Support for churches and parishes without a minister” and the recent diocesan website reference to a review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance 1988, which advises readers that there is a committee looking at the review of this ordinance and that they are also seeking submissions on resolution 23/02 and, given the differences between the resolution and the stated task of the Ordinance Review Committee, could the President advise what has been planned in relation to the matters specified in the resolution?

To which the President replied –

While it is true that there are differences between the terms of Synod resolution 23/02 and the committee’s task in reviewing the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance, there is an inter-relatedness between these 2 matters. The referral of resolution 23/02 to the committee is aimed at ensuring that these matters are considered in a coordinated way, although each on their own terms.

In reviewing the ordinance, I understand that the committee is considering the areas of human relationship involved in the process of a parish looking for a new incumbent. It is considering guidelines for parishes, Archdeacons and the Presentation Board which may assist all parties in the process.

Nevertheless Mr Mitchell’s question has alerted me to the need to ensure the committee gives proper consideration to Synod’s resolution in its own terms.

16. Review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance

Mr Ross Mitchell asked –

In relation to the questionnaire on the diocesan website seeking submissions for the review of the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance –

- (a) Could Synod members be advised of the processes involved in its preparation/design, publication, availability and possible use, that would ensure it yields statistically accurate, representative and significant results, that can be relied on when considering the results obtained to best alter our processes in appointing rectors to parishes?
- (b) Is it planned to make available a report on the results of this “survey” to Synod members?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) The questionnaires set up on the diocesan website were produced by the committee appointed to review the Presentation and Exchange Ordinance in conjunction with staff from the I.T. department in St Andrew’s House. It was first trialed by a sample of people who were familiar with the Presentation Board process.

Its purpose is to elicit responses that would be helpful in the process of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. The committee was concerned to allow opportunity for people who have been associated with the presentation process to make comments from personal experience.

The primary aim was not that of gathering statistics. The committee wanted to gain quick and reliable access to the attitudes, comments and suggestions from a wide range of people regarding the operation of the ordinance.

- (b) No. There will be no report, as such, specifically centred on the survey. The committee is using the responses from the questionnaires as one of a number of inputs as to the operation of the current Presentation Board. The results from the survey, along with

individual comments, will be used in making suggestions as to changes to the ordinance and guidelines for its operation.

17. Principal of Mary Andrews College

Miss Elaine Peterson asked –

- (a) Under what rule or rules does the Principal of Mary Andrews College have membership of -
 - (i) the Synod, and
 - (ii) the Standing Committee?
- (b) Does this person have voting rights in these bodies?
- (c) Is it true that the current Principal of Mary Andrews College, who also holds the position as Archdeacon of Women's Ministry, has thus lost her voting rights as Principal?
- (d) If so, under what rule has this been authorised?

To which the President replied –

- (a) The Principal of Mary Andrews College does not by virtue of that office have membership of the Synod or the Standing Committee. However the current holder of this office, Archdeacon Narelle Jarrett, is a member of the Synod because I have appointed her as a Nominated Minister under Part 7 of the Synod Membership Ordinance 1995. Archdeacon Jarrett is a member of the Standing Committee in her capacity as Archdeacon under clause 1A(1)(f) of the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897.
- (b) Archdeacon Jarrett is able to vote at Synod and the Mission Taskforce but not at the Standing Committee.
- (c) Archdeacon Jarrett's status as principal of Mary Andrews College is irrelevant to her right to vote on either the Synod or the Standing Committee. Ms Jarrett was a member of the Standing Committee elected by the whole Synod and, in that capacity, was able to vote at meetings of the Standing Committee. Upon becoming an Archdeacon she became an ex-officio member of the Standing Committee. Archdeacons can participate fully in the work of the Standing Committee except they cannot vote.
- (d) Clause 1A(2) of the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897.

18. Anglican Communion

Associate Professor Michael Horsburgh asked –

- (a) In the light of the current discussions in the Anglican Communion, what consideration has the Archbishop, the Standing Committee or any other part of the Diocesan administration given to the following matters –
 - (i) the way in which the Diocese of Sydney is in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury;
 - (ii) the way in which the Anglican Church of Australia is in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury,
 - (iii) the way in which the Diocese of Sydney might move out of communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury,
 - (iv) the effect of any such move on the Diocese of Sydney's membership in the Anglican Church of Australia, and
 - (v) the effect of any such move on the Diocese of Sydney's trust property; and
- (b) If any such consideration has been given, what was the results?

To which the President replied –

- (a) The questions raised by Professor Horsburgh have gained particular significance because of the statement by the Primates of the Anglican Communion meeting in Lambeth Palace

and released 15 October 2003 which addressed these issues at length. They stated “the ministry of this one bishop (the proposed Bishop of New Hampshire) will not be recognised by most of the Anglican world, and many provinces are likely to consider themselves out of communion with the Episcopal Church of the United States of America. This will tear the fabric of our communion at its deepest level, and may lead to further division on this and further issues as provinces have to decide in consequence whether they can remain in communion with provinces which choose not to break communion with ECUSA. Similar considerations apply to the situation pertaining in the Diocese of New Westminster”. It went on to say that “the Lambeth Conference 1998 requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to establish a commission to consider his own role in maintaining communion within and between provinces when grave difficulties arise. We ask him now to establish such a commission”. In addition the network of legal advisors established by the Anglican Consultative Council in 2002 has been asked to advise further.

In specific answer to his questions the person and bodies mentioned have given no formal consideration to these matters other than that at the Standing Committee meeting on 30 June 2003 where a motion was passed requesting “that the Chancellor and the persons who until recently were the members of the Legal Committee consider and advise it as to the legal implications of the concept of ‘communion’, with particular reference to the 1961 Constitution and the constitution of the organisation known as the ‘Anglican Communion’”.

At this stage that committee has not convened but is planning to do so.

- (b) Not applicable.

Although not directly raised by Professor Horsburgh’s question, I draw his attention to sections 6 and 69(3) of the Schedule to the Anglican Church of Australia Constitution Act 1961 (NSW).

19. Lay and diaconal presidency at the Holy Communion

Associate Professor Michael Horsburgh asked –

Given that the Archbishop has undertaken to consult with the bishops of the Anglican Communion prior to the adoption of lay and diaconal presidency at the Holy Communion, sometimes call “administration”.

- (a) What consultations have already taken place?
- (b) With what results?
- (c) When is it expected that a final report on the consultations will be available to the Synod?

To which the President replied –

I believe that, strictly speaking, I have not undertaken to consult with the bishops of the Anglican Communion. The media release referring to this was based on a report to the Standing Committee which the Standing Committee has not, in fact, endorsed at this stage. Nonetheless I have already been consulting widely, and it is in fact my intention to continue the process. Thus as far as specific answers are concerned -

- (a) As well as correspondence with Archbishop Carey, I have consulted with Bishops from South America, the United States of America, England, South East Asia, Papua New Guinea and many parts of Africa, across a range of churchmanship. In addition, I have spoken with the Bishops of the Australian Church at the General Synod in 2001, and listened to their concerns. In accordance with an understanding I have made with the Australian Bishops, I have arranged to have further discussions on this matter with the Bishops of the Province.
- (b) The results have been varied. Most have been opposed to lay and diaconal administration, but for different reasons. On two continents I have evidence that lay and/or diaconal administration may already be in operation.
- (c) I have not undertaken to deliver a final report in a formal way to the Synod. No doubt I will convey the results of the consultations to the Synod at the appropriate time.

20. Occupational health and safety legislation

The Rev Rick Miller asked –

Regarding the Government's Occupational Health and Safety legislation –

- (a) By what date must parishes comply with this legislation?
- (b) How many parishes complied with the legislation by that date?
- (c) What are the penalties for not complying with the legislation?
- (d) Has the Diocese sent information about its relevance and its details to parishes, and if so when?
- (e) Will parishes be receiving further information from the Diocese about its application to them in the near future, and if so when?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a) Occupational Health and Safety legislation has been in place for many years and as such parishes have been required to comply with the legislation to the extent it applies. I take it however that the "date" referred to in Mr Miller's question is a reference to 1 September 2003, being the date on which certain recently introduced obligations under the legislation started to apply to employers with 20 or fewer employees.
- (b) Parishes have not been asked to provide information regarding their compliance with the legislation and, as such, the information sought by the question is not available.
- (c) There are a range of monetary and other penalties for not complying with the legislation. Serious offences under the legislation attract substantial penalties
- (d) Yes. Information regarding the obligations under the legislation was sent to all parishes in 2002 as part of the Employment Relations Guidelines issued by the Secretariat. .
- (e) A significant amount of work has been undertaken in preparing further information for parishes. The Secretariat hopes to be in a position to issue such information shortly.

21. Administration of confirmation by presbyters

The Rev Rod Harding asked –

Noting that –

- (a) Synod resolution 14/00 requesting the appointment of a committee to examine certain aspects of the practice of confirmation and report to the next session of Synod was passed 3 years ago, and
- (b) in October 2001, the Standing Committee reported that it was still considering the appointment of the committee (Annual Report 2001, 7.21, pages 31-32),
- (c) after another year the Standing Committee reported that a committee has been appointed to consider and report on the matters raised, but that it had not yet reported (Annual Report 2002, 8.11, page 32),
- (d) after another year, the Standing Committee had been appointed, but the committee has still not reported on the matters raised by the resolution,

I therefore ask –

- (i) Who are the members of the appointed committee, and when was it appointed?
- (ii) How many times has the committee met since its appointment?
- (iii) Have submissions from interested persons been invited, and if so, how many have been received?
- (iv) When is it likely that the Synod will be able to receive and consider the report of the committee, which was originally requested to be completed by October 2001?

To which the President replied –

I am informed the answers are as follows –

Questions & Answers for the 2003 session of the 46th Synod

- (i) Bishop Glenn Davies, the Rev Dr Robert Doyle, the Revs Neil Flower and Bruce Hall, Mr Bill Nicholson and Deaconess Margaret Rodgers.
- (ii) Twice.
- (iii) Yes. 13 submissions have been received.
- (iv) It is anticipated that the committee will report to the next session of this Synod.

22. “Gilbulla” Memorial Conference Centre

Mr Peter Yates asked –

- (a)
 - (i) Has the sale of Gilbulla, permitted by the “Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001” been completed?
 - (ii) If so, who was the purchaser, what was the amount paid and how was that amount paid?
 - (iii) If the sale is still in progress by way of part payments, what is the status of the sale and has the purchasing party honoured its contractual obligations to make payments by specified dates. If not, have extensions of time been given by the Diocese of for the purchasing party to make its payments? What is the nature of those extensions and why have they been given?
 - (iv) Where are the payment funds, or part payment funds, found in the Diocesan financial income and expenditure statements?
 - (v) Have those funds been set aside for the purchase of a new Diocesan conference centre?
- (b) What is the status of the search for a new Diocesan Conference Centre to replace Gilbulla?
- (c) What is the status of the “Gilbulla” Menangle Memorial Chapel to the clergy of the Diocese? Is the Chapel to be demolished and/or removed and relocated?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answers are as follows –

- (a)
 - (i) Yes
 - (ii) The purchaser was Ellel Ministries Australia Ltd. The amount paid for the property was \$1,900,000. Under the terms of the sale a deposit of \$300,000 was paid on exchange of contracts on 19 April 2002 and the balance of \$1,600,000 was paid on settlement of the sale on 22 November 2002.
 - (iii) Not applicable.
 - (iv) Under the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 the net funds (approximately \$1,800,000 after paying the costs of the sale) are being held in a separate trust fund administered by the Church Property Trust. As such these funds do not form part of the general Diocesan financial statements of income and expenditure.
 - (v) Yes. Under the terms of clause 4(e) of the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 the funds are to be applied “towards the cost of acquiring, constructing, adapting and/or renovating a property or building to be used as a conference centre and retreat house in connection with the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Sydney and for purposes incidental thereto.”
- (b) The search for a new Diocesan Conference Centre is continuing. With the completion of the new development at Waterslea on the Shoalhaven River greater attention will now be given to finding a new conference centre site.
- (c) The Gilbulla Memorial Chapel was part of the property sold to Ellel Ministries Australia Ltd, a Christian organisation with links to the Anglican Church. As such it was considered appropriate that the Chapel remain and be available for use in conjunction with the ministry being developed by the new owners.

Clause 5 of the Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001 provides that “any new Anglican conference facility acquired from the proceeds of this sale is to be named and maintained in memory of Navy, Army and Air Force Chaplains.”