

## Questions under business rule 6.3

### 1. Greenoaks Apartments

Mr Peter Young asked –

What were the detailed and total expenses and proceeds incurred and arising from the development and sale of all the Greenoaks Apartments, Darling Point?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer to the question is expressed in tabular form. A copy will be provided to the questioner and posted on the notice board in the foyer.

<b>Greenoaks Apartments</b>	
<b>Project outcome</b>	
<b>Revised net proceeds</b>	<b>Actual As at 9 October 2012</b>
	\$
Gross sale amount	21,715,000
GST payable after application of margin scheme	(1,587,725)
<b>Net Sales Amount</b>	<b>20,127,275</b>
<b>Project costs</b>	
Consultants	1,771,928
Legal	321,734
Construction	13,743,293
Marketing and selling	1,063,618
Borrowing costs	3,718,318
Holding costs	170,290
<b>Total costs</b>	<b>20,789,180</b>
<b>Net proceeds</b>	<b>(661,905)</b>

### 2. Moore College's funding from Synod

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked –

- (a) What were the surpluses from ordinary activities reported by Moore College in the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 in their audited financial statements?
- (b) What were the total accumulated funds and reserves in those same years?
- (c) What is Moore College's risk assessment in their "strategic risk analysis and management plan 2012-14" of any "disruption to its capabilities" if a collapse of Synod funding should occur?
- (d) Is it correct that Synod funding to Moore College was \$1,577,000 in 2012, and is proposed to be \$1,577,000 in 2013?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) In 2009 the profit from operations was \$5,501 including the Synod grant of \$1,664,000 and donations of \$600,411. Before the Synod grant and donations the College made a loss from ordinary activities of \$2,258,910.

In 2010 the profit from operations was \$833,631 including the Synod grant of \$1,722,000 and donations of \$571,915. Hence before the Synod grant and donations the College made a loss from ordinary activities of \$1,460,284.

## Questions & Answers for the 2012 session of the 49<sup>th</sup> Synod

In 2011 the profit from operations was \$889,438 including the Synod grant of \$1,777,000 and donations of \$673,040. Hence before the Synod grant and donations the College made a loss from ordinary activities of \$1,560,602.

- (b) The College's total accumulated funds and reserves were –  
 \$36,037,357 in 2009  
 \$37,624,791 in 2010  
 \$40,720,176 in 2011  
 These figures include Land and buildings of some \$40 million.
- (c) The College's overall risk assessment related to a collapse in Synod funding is HIGH.
- (d) Yes.

### Supplementary answer

Yesterday I provided answers to part (a) and (b) of the question based upon advice I received from Moore College.

I am informed that the term surplus from "ordinary activities" was interpreted by the college as referring to the "profit from operations" disclosed in the accounts. The college has also provided details of the proceeds from synod grants and other donations relating to the library and a once off gain from sale of a property in 2011.

A table has been provided to the questioner and placed on the notice board, using figures drawn from the annual audited accounts of the college.

(a)

	Year ended 31 December		
	2009	2010	2011
"Surplus" for the year as per audited accounts (total comprehensive income)	\$1,030,522	\$1,587,434	\$3,095,385
Less non operational income items (ie, Extraordinary items – endowment receipts, library fund etc)	(\$1,025,021)	(\$753,803)	(\$2,205,947)
Profit from operations (ie, from ordinary activities)	\$5,501	\$833,631	\$889,438
Which included the following major funding sources –			
(a) Synod grants	\$1,664,000	\$1,722,000	\$1,777,000
(b) Donations	\$600,411	\$571,915	\$673,040

- (b) The opportunity has also been taken to provide additional detail in respect of accumulated funds and reserves.

The College's total accumulated funds and reserves were as follows –  
 \$36,037,357 in 2009  
 \$37,624,791 in 2010  
 \$40,720,176 in 2011, represented by –

	2009	2010	2011
Current Assets	\$2,102,314	\$4,111,357	\$6,906,683
Fixed Assets	\$41,383,045	\$42,571,777	\$41,278,763
Total Assets	\$43,485,359	\$46,683,134	\$48,185,446
Less Loans	(\$5,365,944)	(\$6,704,113)	(\$5,467,428)
Less Other Liabilities	(\$2,082,025)	(\$2,354,230)	(\$1,997,842)
Net Assets	\$36,037,357	\$37,624,781	\$40,720,176

**3. Parishes reporting deficits**

Mr Peter Hanson asked –

- (a) How many parishes reported deficits for the year ended 31 December 2011?
- (b) What was the total of these deficits when added together?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

SDS does not collect parish financial information in a form that provides a ready answer this question.

While offertories and each of the elements needed to calculate net operating receipts is captured in a database, the actual net surplus or deficit reported by each parish for the year is not recorded electronically. It is therefore not practical to provide an answer to this question.

**4. Synod expenditure**

Mr Peter Hanson asked –

- (a) Is each line item recommended to Synod for appropriation examined by Standing Committee or their delegate in detail?
- (b) What criteria are used to determine whether each line item is fundamentally necessary Synod expenditure?
- (c) Is “need” for the funds a fundamental criterion for Standing Committee recommending to Synod expenditure on each line item?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Yes. The Mission Board Strategy Committee, a sub committee of the Mission Board, compiles the draft appropriation schedule which is examined in detail by the Mission Board on behalf of Standing Committee which in turns makes the recommendation to Synod.
- (b) Those set out in the Statement of Funding Principles and Priorities for 2013.
- (c) Need for funds is not a fundamental criterion.

**5. Towards 2050**

Mrs Susan Hooke asked –

In preparing the report on page 92 of the Report of Standing Committee on 3/11 Towards 2050, did Standing Committee and Mission Board take into consideration the report issued in May 2012 by the New South Wales Department of Planning entitled “Sydney Over the next 20 Years??

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No. Consideration of the demographic aspects of the Towards 2050 report was essentially finalised before the May 2012 Discussion Paper prepared by the New South Wales Department of Planning was released. However it is likely that the Mission Board will take into account the latest available demographic information as it considers the Towards 2050 report in the context of the next phase of the mission of the Diocese.

**6. Affiliated Churches**

Ms Caroline Bowyer asked –

- (a) Relating to Affiliated Churches, how many churches are presently affiliated?
- (b) In respect of each affiliated church –
  - (i) What services have been provided to each of them?
  - (ii) What is the cost of services provided?
  - (iii) What other funds have been provided?
  - (iv) What are the terms of the affiliation agreement?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 9
- (b) (i) The services provided typically involve the provision of general guidance in matters which affect our own parishes as well as our affiliates. This includes sharing information about regulatory, professional standards, financial and pastoral matters, among others. Other more specific assistance is provided as requested from time to time.
  - (ii) The only cost is a relatively minimal amount of staff time.
  - (iii) None.
  - (iv) Each affiliation agreement is based on a standard form, a copy of which will be provided to the questioner and posted on the notice board in the foyer.

**7. Consistency of parish levy with teaching of Jesus**

Mrs Pamela Shaw asked –

Is the proposal for a levy on parishes for the funding of property in future years consistent with Jesus' teaching found in Matthew 6:19-34, which is quoted in Section 1 of the Funding Principles paper?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Yes.

The passage encourages us to trust in God to supply as we get our priorities correct. We believe that as we seek his kingdom and righteousness, he supplies our needs. What the levy asks for is that we may be generous with what God has provided in order to help those unable to help themselves in setting up new churches in line with Diocesan Mission.

**8. Analysis of Greenoaks development**

The Rev Craig Roberts asked –

Item 4.22 of the Report of the Standing Committee notes that –

- (i) no funds were ever made available from the Greenoaks development to fund the intended purpose of the project (ie, "the repair and maintenance of Bishopscourt"), and
- (ii) as the Greenoaks "development is now complete and all apartments sold this is the final report that is required to be made to Synod under the Ordinance."

With a view to learning from any unfounded assumptions, in order to retain corporate memory within the Diocese, has there been, or will there be, any further analysis of the decision-making processes that led to the commencement of the Greenoaks development?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The summary in point (i) of the question is not entirely accurate in that the intended purpose of the project was broader.

Be that as it may, the answer to the question is, Yes. The Endowment of the See Committee is currently preparing a comprehensive report on the history of the Greenoaks development. That report is expected to be completed by the end of this year.

**9. Gilbulla**

The Rev Nigel Fortescue asked –

With reference to the Report of Standing Committee page 8, point 4.23 –  
How much was Gilbulla sold for? What is the total of the invested funds related to the sale proceeds (as at 30 June 2012)?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Gilbulla was sold for \$1.9 million on 30 September 2002. The fund comprising the sale proceeds had a balance of \$1.968 million on 30 June 2012.

**10. Greenoaks Apartments**

The Rev Nigel Fortescue asked –

With reference to the Report of Standing Committee page 7, point 4.22 –  
What is the final balance of the sale of the Greenoaks Apartments?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Greenoaks development did not result in a surplus due to higher than expected development costs and a material fall in property values as a result of the global financial crisis.

A detailed breakdown has been provided in the answer to the first question which shows a loss of \$661,905 on the project.

**11. Quantity Surveyors' Report for Bishopscourt**

The Rev Nigel Fortescue asked –

Is there a current Quantity Surveyors Report for purposes of Repairs and Maintenance for Bishopscourt? If no, has acquiring one ever been considered? If yes, could this please be released to the Synod prior to debate on Bishopscourt Sale Ordinance 2012?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No. Although, a Specification and Schedule of Conservation Works was prepared by Noel Bell Ridley Smith and Partners on 20 October 2006. That report is 122 pages in length (excluding schedules). It is not feasible to make it available.

**12. Secure website for Synod members**

Ms Holly Raiche asked –

As a Secure part of the SDS website now exists (see 2.3 of the Archbishop's summons to Synod), why can't Synod documents considered by Standing Committee to be sensitive (eg, annual reports, including audited statements of all Diocesan organisations) be lodged there?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The SDS website does not provide a secure section for Synod members. The reference in the question to "2.3 of the Archbishop's summons to Synod" appears to relate to the section in the Circular to Synod members dated 1 August 2012 dealing with the Registry's secure website. This secure website contains the contact details for Synod members and allows members to update their contact details directly using the Maintain Personal Information option. It is not a place to make documents available to members.

**13. Impact of levy on parish ministries**

Ms Tricia Blombery asked –

- (a) The "Towards 2050" paper states that 70% of the predicted population growth will be in Brownfields sites. What analysis has been undertaken of the impact of this population growth on parishes?
- (b) In this context, what analysis has been undertaken of the impact of the proposed levy on parish ministries?
- (c) What was the outcome of this analysis?
- (d) If the analysis was not done, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The enhanced ministry centres at parishes of Annandale, Auburn, Berowra, Broadway, Cammeray/Naremburn, Dapto, Hoxton Park, Glenmore Park, Marrickville and Rooty Hill have been completed with the valuable assistance of various amounts from the \$10 million allocation from the Diocesan Endowment for "brownfields projects". In the light of the completion of these major ministry projects, the absence of any further prospect for allocation from the Diocesan Endowment towards brownfields projects and the wider Diocesan Mission, the Mission Board is of the view that existing parish ministry buildings are largely able to cater for the anticipated population growth in the brownfields communities. Therefore, the focus of the "Towards 2050" strategic paper is on the mission needs of future greenfield communities, where land for new church sites does not exist.

The Mission Board understands that the proposed parish contribution towards church sites in new communities may have an impact on existing parish ministries. However, the Mission Board also recognises that the cost of purchasing land for ministry centres is now beyond the means of any one local parish. The Mission Board also recognises that previous generations of Anglicans have generously provided most of the land and buildings in which congregations now meet. Accordingly, the proposed parish contribution towards the acquisition of church sites in new communities reflects the nature of the Diocese as a fellowship of parishes with a common mission to ensure that the gospel is able to be presented to as many people within the Diocese as possible.

If Synod does not act to secure funding for new ministry sites in new communities now, the Mission Board is firmly of the view that land from which ministry can be effectively conducted is unlikely to be available in the future when the new communities are established. The stark example is at Oran Park Town in the south west population growth corridor, which is forecast by Landcom to be home to 25,000 people by the mid 2020's. At this stage, a single site has been acquired for Christian ministry by this Diocese in the very early stages of the planning

for the community infrastructure when land costs were relatively affordable. It is understood that other Christian churches, while keen to be present in the community, are now finding the escalated cost of land prohibitive.

**14. Impact of levy on achieving parity with population growth**

Mr Stuart Grigg asked –

The “Towards 2050” paper (see page 92 of Standing Committee Report) states, in the context of church attendance, that “... we are still not maintaining parity with population growth”.

- (a) Has there been an assessment of the impact of the proposed levy on all parishes in terms of the goal (stated in the same report) of achieving parity? and
- (b) If not, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Yes. It is acknowledged there will be an impact. It is a matter of balancing needs. Failure to act now to acquire land to support ministry in Greenfield areas where great growth will occur but where little resources are held will have enormous repercussions.
- (b) Not applicable.

**15. An Australian Prayer Book**

The Rev Craig Schafer asked –

In the light of the Common Prayer resource, are there any plans to republish AAPB for parish use or to make AAPB available in electronic form?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

AAPB was published in 1978 by the Anglican Information Office, the former publishing arm of what is now known as Anglican Media in the Diocese of Sydney. The publishing rights were only held for a period of 25 years, and after that time reverted to the General Synod, whose Liturgical Commission had produced the book. The General Synod has since transferred the rights to Broughton Publishing. Since Broughton are also the publishers of APBA (A Prayer Book for Australia), they have indicated that there is no viable market for reprinting AAPB. However, they have given permission for Anglican churches to reprint AAPB for Sunday Services, as long as the service is faithful to the original text of AAPB. Broughton have not offered to provide an electronic version of AAPB, but are happy for churches to compile their own electronic version. The service builder on the website of the Archbishop’s Liturgical Panel ([bettergatherings.com](http://bettergatherings.com)) contains the full text of the regular services from AAPB.

**16. Georges River Regional Council grants**

The Rev Richard Blight asked –

Would you please provide details of Parishes and other organisations that received grants from the Georges River Regional Council in 2011, specifically those covered by the descriptions “Cross-Cultural Grants to Parishes”, “Leadership and Parish Ministry Grants” and “Grant re Church Planter”? Could you please indicate if the regional council is willing to provide this information in future reports?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Cross-Cultural grants were made to –

The parish of Canterbury for the ministry of the Rev Seti Latu and to the parish of Bankstown for the Rev Raymond Leung, being \$10,000 each, and to Evangelism and New Churches for the ministry at Arncliffe for Mr Paul Tait, being \$20,000. The total of Cross-Cultural grants being \$40,000.

Leadership and Parish Ministry grants were made to –

The parish of Sadleir for student ministers \$10'000, the parish of Brighton/Rockdale \$10,000 and the parish of Greenacre \$25,000. The total Leadership and Ministry grants being \$45,000.

The “Grant re Church Planter” was for the parish of Marrickville, a continuing but reducing grant is being provided for this ministry.

The Regional Council is always willing to provide details of income and expenditure through its council members as well as through Synod.

**17. Relationship between Evangelism and New Churches and Mission Property Committee**

Archdeacon Deryck Howell asked –

- (a) In its review of the Department of Evangelism and New Churches (“ENC”) what analysis, if any, did Standing Committee undertake of the relationship between ENC and Mission Property Committee;
- (b) What analysis was made of the process by which the use of Mission Property is decided?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) None.
- (b) None in the context of the review of the Department of Evangelism and New Churches Ordinance 2010.

**18. PCR charges and levies as a percentage of net receipts**

Canon Sandy Grant asked –

What has the variable PCR charge, applied to parishes, been as a percentage of net receipts, over the last ten years, including any and all one-off or short term charges and levies?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is expressed in tabular form. A copy will be provided to the questioner and posted on the notice board in the foyer.



<b>History of variable PCR charges and levies paid by parochial units</b>							
Figures below are expressed as a percentage of Net Operating Receipts							
		Asbestos Levy	Connect09 Levy	EOS Funding Assessment	Church Land Acquisition Levy	Variable PCR Charge *	<b>Total</b>
2003	actual					5.18%	<b>5.18%</b>
2004	actual					5.10%	<b>5.10%</b>
2005	actual					4.92%	<b>4.92%</b>
2006	actual					5.51%	<b>5.51%</b>
2007	actual					5.46%	<b>5.46%</b>
2008	actual	0.46%	0.41%			5.07%	<b>5.94%</b>
2009	actual	0.45%	0.52%			4.64%	<b>5.61%</b>
2010	actual	0.44%	0.13%			4.80%	<b>5.37%</b>
2011	actual			1.14%		4.59%	<b>5.73%</b>
2012	actual					5.11%	<b>5.11%</b>
* These figures ignore the effect of the lower insurance program costs paid by those few (currently 7) parochial units without property.							

**19. Information from Synod funding recipients**

Mr Peter Young asked –

How many times in the past year has the Standing Committee called for the provision of information from organisations seeking diocesan funds (in accordance with Annexure 1 of the Statement of Funding Principles and Priorities for 2013) and how many times in the past year has the Standing Committee failed to call for such information?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Standing Committee (or its delegates) routinely call for information from diocesan organisations seeking Synod funding. The Procedure in Annexure 1 of the Statement of Funding Principles and Priorities for 2013 will be applied by the Standing Committee in 2013.

**20. FeeHelp and Synod grant to Moore College**

Mrs Susan Hooke asked –

- (a) Does FeeHelp cover all costs of providing courses at Moore College? If not, what costs are not covered?
- (b) What is the amount of FeeHelp debt of students completing four years study at Moore?
- (c) Is the grant from Synod being used to subsidise the fees of all students or only those from Sydney Diocese?
- (d) What is the amount of subsidy for each student that the Synod grant covers?
- (e) What is the replacement cost of the full delivery of the BD degree at Moore?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) FEE-HELP is an Australian Government loan program to help eligible fee paying students pay their tuition fee debts, and only their tuition fees.

This means that students at Moore College who are Australian citizens can choose FEE-HELP to discharge their entire tuition fee debt each year to the College. Alternatively those students may wish to pay that debt themselves, or use FEE-HELP to meet part of their debt and pay the balance themselves.

FEE-HELP of itself does not cover any costs of providing courses at Moore College. The advantage of FEE-HELP to the College is that it enables Australian students, who otherwise may not be able to afford to come to College, to study there.

- (b) If an Australian student completing a BD this year had taken out FEE-HELP to pay their entire tuition fee debt their amount of FEE-HELP would be \$61,590.
- (c) The Synod grant is not used to subsidise the fees of any students studying at Moore College. Rather it is used to defray the costs of faculty, library, communal meals and student housing.
- (d) Not applicable in light of the answer to the previous question.
- (e) The College does not separately cost the delivery of the BD program. It is not possible to isolate, with any degree of precision, the cost of delivering the BD program. For example BD students attend lectures with part-time students and students studying the Bible and Missions Course. To apportion the cost of the member of faculty and use of the lecture theatre to the BD students as distinct from the others would be a nearly impossible exercise. Similarly the library is used by all students, as well as being a resource for the Diocese. Again, apportioning the costs of its operation to BD students specifically would be nearly impossible.

**21. St Andrew's House financials**

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

- (a) Could the Archbishop please advise summary details of the income and expenses of the St Andrew's House Corporation ("SAHC") for the most recent financial year, together with comparatives for the previous financial year, and the details of the assets and liabilities of SAHC at its most recent balance sheet date, together with comparative figures as at the previous balance sheet date?
- (b) Note 14 of the accounts of the GAB as trustee for the DE for the year ended 31 December 2011 show (on page 208 of the purple Synod book) a share of profit for the year from SAHC of \$9,319,239, which in turn is included in the income of the GAB for the year (page 188 of the purple book). Can the Archbishop please advise how much of this income represents cash income and how much represents a non-cash increase in the value of St Andrew's House?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) In 2011 Rental and Other revenue from SAH was \$12.1m. In 2010 it was \$11.6m. In 2011 the non-cash fair value increase of SAH was \$14.2m. In 2010 it was \$4.7m.

In 2011 SAHC had operating expenditure of \$6.1m and interest costs of \$1.5m. In 2010 these figures were \$5.7m and \$1.5m respectively.

Assets

Cash 2011 - \$5.1m; 2010 - \$3.8m

St Andrew's House 2011 - \$99.5m; 2010 - \$83.0m

Other assets 2011 - \$1.1m; 2010 - \$0.3m

Liabilities

Long term debt 2011 - \$22.0m; 2010 - \$23.0m

Other liabilities 2011 - \$1.7m; 2010 - \$0.9m

- (b) The amount recorded in the accounts of the GAB for 2011 reflects the GAB's share of the increase in the net assets of the St Andrew's House Corporation for that year. There was no cash distribution made to GAB in respect of 2011. The surplus from the

operations of St Andrew's House was required to be retained in order to fund major capital works in 2011 and 2012

**22. Gilbulla sale proceeds**

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

Can the Archbishop please advise where the funds from the sale of Gilbulla, set aside for a Youthworks Conference Centre (as per item 4.23 of the Standing Committee Report on page 8 of the Synod purple book), are currently held, and how much they are?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney is the trustee of the funds from the sale of Gilbulla.

As stated yesterday in the answer to question 9, as at 30 June 2012 the fund had a balance of \$1.968 million.

**23. Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee**

The Rev Ian Millican asked –

Can the Archbishop please advise how much money is currently held in the Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee trust fund, and what the movements in that fund were during the past 12 months?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The current balance of the fund is \$3.057m.

Of this figure \$3.006m is held in the capital account. The current balance of the income account is \$51,785.

Over the last 12 months, the movements in the fund were –

Additions to Capital	\$1,006,645
This figure includes amounts from the sale of properties by the South Sydney Regional Council and the parish of South Sydney.	
Additions to the Income Account net of fees	\$117,358
Deductions from the Income Account (budgeted and requested by the Committee)	\$238,715

Of the \$238,715. deducted from the Income Account over the last 12 months, \$232,354 was directly related to supporting Indigenous Ministry Workers and \$6,360 was for other Indigenous Ministry expenses (including insurance).

The Committee is currently formulating its budget for 2013.

**24. Women at the Executive table**

Mr Norman Smith asked –

What action is the Diocese taking to have women seated at the Executive table at the front of Synod?

## Questions & Answers for the 2012 session of the 49<sup>th</sup> Synod

---

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Those seated at the front are:

1. The Archbishop
2. The “Synodical Assistant” to the Archbishop
3. The person holding the office of Diocesan Registrar
4. The person holding the office of Chancellor
5. The person elected by Synod as Chairman of Committees

It should be noted that Dr Karin Sowada has been elected as a Deputy Chair of Committees. Dr Sowada has taken her place and will continue to do so during certain times when Synod is meeting in Committee.

### 25. Work Outside the Diocese

Ms Caroline Bowyer asked –

Relating to Diocesan expenditure outside the Diocese –

- (a) Please identify the beneficiaries of the \$158,180 applied for work outside the Diocese referred to in paragraph 4.13 of the Report of Standing Committee.
- (b) How much was spent by the Diocese, including the EOS, in sending people to the FCA Leadership Conference in London in April 2012? What was the source of those funds?
- (c) How much is allocated by the Diocese, including the EOS, to pay the travel expenses of representatives of Sydney Diocese to GAFCON2 in 2013? Please identify the fund from which these payments will be made.

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The beneficiaries were –

Diocese of Armidale	\$5,000
Diocese of North West Australia	\$50,000
Diocese of Tasmania	\$5,000
Diocese of Northern Territory	\$38,000
Northern Territory - Support for Katherine Christian Convention	\$1,780
Travel and accommodation by Bishop Peter Tasker as the Archbishop of Sydney's Bishop for International Relations	\$10,457
Travel and accommodation for visitors brought to Sydney	\$1,531
Accommodation, course fees and incidentals for Canon Alfred Olwa from Uganda to study at Moore College	\$4,510
Airfares and accommodation for Canon Mark Derry from South Africa to study at Moore College	\$2,111
Course fees and cost of travel to present Moore College PTC courses in the Seychelles	\$9,763
Subsidies provided to assist people from other dioceses attend the GAFCON leaders conference in London	\$14,681
Travel and accommodation for the Archbishop associated with GAFCON and FCA	\$13,278
Travel and accommodation for the Rev Dr Mark Thompson for consultation with African leaders about theological education	\$2,069

- (b) The amount spent directly from Work Outside the Diocese Funds was \$13,278. A further amount of \$14,681 was paid out of contributions from Anglican Deaconess Ministries and other donors. The EOS did not contribute anything.

- (c) No decisions have yet been taken in this regard, as the details of any possible GAFCON 2 have not been finalised.

#### 25.1 Closure of Kingsdene School

Mr Tom Mayne asked –

Understanding that the current management of Kingsdene School at Telopea for disabled children formerly operated by Anglicare will cease operation at the end of the year –

- (a) What provision is the Diocese making for the care of these children once the current management ceases operations?
- (b) What provision is the Diocese making for future disabled children?
- (c) If such provision is being made but which is not residential, what provision is being made for respite for parents/carers of such children?
- (d) If the Diocese is relying on the proposed National Disability Insurance Scheme to take care of such children and their parents/carers, what is the future of these children and their parents/carers in the interim, given that the NDIS is only being trialled in 2013 in the Hunter Region, that its funding is not yet assured and that its implementation is not expected to be completed before 2018?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The closure of Kingsdene by ANGLICARE in 2009 was only undertaken after all internal and external options for recurrent financial support had been exhausted. Of chief concern was the welfare of the children and their families. ANGLICARE negotiated at that time with the NSW Government, with the support of the Kingsdene parents, to ensure that the students would be appropriately cared for once the current lease to the NSW Departments of Education and Community Services expires. The Telopea campus will cease to exist given that the NSW Department of Education has informed ANGLICARE that they expect to vacate the school premises this calendar year. Currently there are 12 students enrolled at the Telopea campus until the end of the 2012 school year. 7 of these students, who will not be completing their schooling this year, will be returning to the geographical areas where their families live and therefore will be attending special schools in those areas across Sydney and the Central Coast. Transition plans for these seven students remain the responsibility of the NSW Department of Education, NSW Department of Community Services and the families of the students.
- (b) The Diocese, primarily through its range of ANGLICARE services and programs, has a significant stake in supporting children with a disability and their families, as well as young adults and older adults, across the Sydney metropolitan area. ANGLICARE is one of the major community agencies involved in delivering government-funded disability support services in Sydney, especially in the areas of carer respite and support. As of 2012-2013, ANGLICARE is responsible for approximately \$13 million of government funded programs and continues to be involved in extensive research and advocacy work in the disability arena at both State and Federal levels. ANGLICARE allocates significant funds towards disability support and advocacy. A lengthy qualitative research project is currently being finalised, which will report to Government, parishes and the wider community, concerning the issues, needs and policy options for families which have children experiencing severe intellectual and behavioural issues. The research has been based on lengthy interviews with the Kingsdene families.
- (c) Thanks to a fundraising campaign and the ongoing support of John Howard, ANGLICARE will open its first respite cottage, to be called the Kingsdene Respite Cottage, in December this year. This facility at Rooty Hill will be a short-term residential service expected to support up to 100 families a year. Apart from the provision of respite, ANGLICARE will continue to seek ongoing funding from government to support parents and caregivers of children, adolescents and adults with a disability.

- (d) Both the Commonwealth and the NSW State Government will continue to fund both community agencies and individual people with a disability in the intervening years through their range of current service delivery models. ANGLICARE has been participating in ongoing consultations with governments in relation to the NDIS and other related reforms in the disability sector to ensure future services are able to meet the complex needs of families who have a child with a disability. In addition to the Commonwealth NDIS program, the NSW Government is also currently funding and promoting a range of client-based programs for children and adults with a disability across the state, with ANGLICARE involvement in these initiatives in western Sydney.

**26. Brochures from diocesan organisations**

Ms Jan Liddiard asked –

Could it be suggested to organisations sending glossy brochures to all Synod members that reports could go on a website instead?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Yes, this could be suggested to organisations. However it is a matter for the organisations concerned.

**27. Expenditure of the Diocesan Endowment**

The Rev Michael Williamson asked –

Are there any hindrances in the ordinances governing the expenditure of the Diocesan Endowment (or any other relevant ordinances) that would stop annual appropriations from being expended on acquisition of land for future church sites or for development of existing church sites?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4)(f) as it seeks a legal opinion.

**28. Clergy Removals Fund**

The Rev Michael Williamson asked –

In the recently published Schedule to the Clergy Removals Fund Ordinance 2003, in paragraph 2, point (b) on page 3, it is reported that a Regional Bishop may determine that a parish is “under financial hardship” and therefore may receive a reimbursement from the Clergy Removals Fund.

In regards to this determination by a Regional Bishop –

- (a) what are the criteria the Bishop is to utilise to determine financial hardship in a parish?
- (b) where are these criteria published?
- (c) what is/will be required in reports by the parish in question to establish such hardship?
- (d) who is charged to assist/counsel/keep accountable, the Regional Bishop in making this determination?
- (e) is such a hardship determination by a Regional Bishop applicable to any other aspects of the financial affairs of the parish in question, in its wider dealings with the Diocese?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

## Questions & Answers for the 2012 session of the 49<sup>th</sup> Synod

The Clergy Removals Ordinance does not prescribe the information that will be sought from parishes making an application for financial hardship. The information to be provided by a parish will be determined on a case by case basis by the Regional Bishop in consultation with the parish and the Clergy Removals fund administrator.

In respect to part (e) of the question, the assessment of a financial hardship application under the Clergy Removals Ordinance is independent of any other application a parish may make under other ordinances.

### 29. Parochial Cost Recoveries remissions

The Rev Michael Williamson asked –

- (a) For each calendar year for the period 2002-2012 what was –
  - (i) the annual budgeted provision for PCR remission?
  - (ii) the annual expenditure on PCR remission?
  - (iii) the number of applications made for PCR remission annually?
  - (iv) the number of applications paid out for PCR remission annually?
  - (v) done each year with any non-expended funds from this budget line item?
- (b) What Ordinances currently provide for the application by Parishes (of all types) for PCR remission?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a)(i) to (iv): The answers are shown in tabulated form. A copy will be provided to the questioner and posted on the notice board in the foyer.
- (a)(v): They are retained with the PCR fund.
- (b): The Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008.

PCR Remission				
	(i) Provision	(ii) Expenditure	(iii) Applications	(iv) Paid
2002	20,000			
2003	25,000			
2004	25,000	42,764	1	1
2005	50,000			
2006	50,000	16,934	2	2
2007	50,000	12,000	1	1
2008	30,000			
2009	20,000			
2010	20,000			
2011	20,000			
2012	20,000			

### 30. Common Prayer resource

The Rev Mark Gilbert asked –

It is noted with joy that the words of administration, first used by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in the Protestant 1552 version of *The Book of Common Prayer* are published exclusively in Form 3 and 4 of the Lord's Supper Service in *Common Prayer*, and as a second option in Forms 1 and 2.

Given this change, will the Archbishop consider sending a copy of *Common Prayer* with a letter outlining these changes to other Evangelical Anglican Dioceses as an encouragement for them to make similar changes?

To which the President replied –

I will consider this.

**31. Liturgy for non-English speaking congregations**

The Rev David Zhang asked –

A question to the Liturgical Commission through the Archbishop –

- (a) Is the Commission aware of the fact that there are at least 20 parishes in the diocese where services are conducted each Sunday in languages other than English using various forms of liturgy from sources other than the authorised and recommended liturgy of this Diocese?
- (b) What provisions have been made to serve the needs of these congregations whose common languages in worship are not English?
- (c) How will the Commission take into account in its future work the liturgical needs of the increasing number of Anglican people of this Diocese as predicted by all kinds of good and reliable authorities?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The Archbishop's Liturgical Panel has a general awareness of the fact alluded to in (a).
- (b) So far no provisions have been made to serve the needs of these congregations whose common languages in worship are not English. The needs of congregations whose common language is English has dominated the time and energy of the Panel up to today.
- (c) The Archbishop's Liturgical Panel is keen to learn of the specific needs of such congregations and how it may helpfully serve them. The chairman Bishop Rob Forsyth would welcome any communication from the leaders of such churches that they would like to make to him.

**32. Ethical investment policies and gambling**

Canon Sandy asked –

- (a) Would the ethical investment policies of the Glebe Board, ACPT, and Anglican National Super (our default superannuation fund for Anglican clergy and employees) prevent investment in companies like Woolworths which derive a significant share of profits from gambling in poker machines?
- (b) How else could concerned Anglicans bring pressure to bear on parliamentary and corporate leaders in favour of effective reforms to minimise the current enormous harm arising from problem gambling on poker machines?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Glebe Administration Board and ACPT

Under the ethical investment policies applying to the Diocesan Endowment and the Property Trust's Long Term Pooling Fund, a trust in which the property of the respective funds is invested must not invest mainly in the securities of a corporation or scheme which conducts a "disapproved business" as its main business or one of its main businesses.

For these purposes, a "disapproved business" includes the business of gambling or betting or a business directly connected therewith.

The exposure of the Diocesan Endowment and the Long Term Pooling Fund to Australian shares is made through the Mercer Socially Responsible Australian Shares



Fund. Consistent with the ethical investment policies that are in place, the Fund does not invest in companies which derive a significant share of their profits from gambling. In particular, shares in Woolworths are not held by the Fund.

Anglican National Super

AMP has determined, under the AMP Responsible Investment Leaders Charter of Operation, that Woolworths should be excluded from the portfolio of Anglican National Super. Woolworths was excluded from the portfolio 6 years ago when it purchased the ALH Group, which operates a chain of hotels and liquor shops.

- (b) In relation to corporate and political action regarding problem gambling and poker machines, concerned Anglicans could bring pressure to bear on politicians by writing to their local State and Federal members of parliament, the Prime Minister and Premier of NSW; contributing short submissions to relevant parliamentary inquiries; and asking questions of candidates and MPs during elections and other public forums. In relation to corporate pressure, Anglicans could consider their influence as consumers in directing their dollars away from companies engaged in such activities, and those holding shares in listed companies with gaming interests should consider attending Annual General Meetings to ask questions of management and the Board.

**33. Procedures requiring eight members under business rules**

Mr James Mayfield asked –

Noting that there are various procedures of Synod that would require eight or more members of Synod to stand for a particular procedure to take effect –

- (a) Which sections of the Constitution of the Synod and/or Ordinances and/or other materials give rise to this convention?
- (b) From what date was this procedure, including the specific requirement of eight (8) persons, in effect?
- (c) What was the total number of voting members of Synod during the first session of Synod after the date from (a)?
- (d) What is the total number of voting members of Synod this year?
- (e) In what years, if any, following the date from (a), has the Synod or the Standing Committee considered changes to the number of persons required to stand for any or all of the procedures requiring this?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4)(f) as it seeks a legal opinion.

**34. Voting by houses at Synod**

Mr James Mayfield asked –

Noting that at this session of Synod there have already been 2 votes that have been taken by houses –

- (a) Which sections of the Constitution of the Synod and/or Ordinances and/or other materials give rise to this convention?
- (b) What is the biblical basis for the separation of the voting powers of the clergy and the laity?
- (c) Given the various “Parts” that make up the Synod, which of those Parts form part of the House of Clergy and which of those form part of the House of Laity?
- (d) What, if any, would be the procedure required for the mover of a motion to ensure that the vote on the motion was not taken by houses?
- (e) In each of the last 10 years, how many votes at the ordinary sessions of Synod have been taken by houses?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4)(f) as it seeks a legal opinion.

**35. Asking questions at Synod**

The Rev John Cornish asked –

As we are governed by synodical government, what avenues are available for members of Synod to be able to ask questions of the administration of the Diocese, while making a statement that clarifies the question, without being told that statements are out of order?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4)(f) as it seeks a legal opinion.

Nonetheless given that the question relates to the question process itself I will allow some latitude.

The business rules in rule 6.3 of the Conduct of the Business of Synod Ordinance 2000 provide that no question is to contain –

- (a) an assertion,
- (b) express an opinion,
- (c) offer an argument,
- (d) make an inference or an imputation,
- (e) be expressed in language which, in the opinion of the President, is disrespectful or offensive, or
- (f) seek a legal opinion.

A question can contain a statement provided the statement does not transgress the business rules.

The purpose of a question is to seek an answer. If a member of Synod wishes to express an opinion or offer an argument the proper course is to move a motion and speak to that motion.

**36. Child abuse and sexual misconduct**

Mrs Patricia Mayne asked the following question –

Referring to page 76 of the *Safe Ministry Board and PSU Report* paragraph 62 and the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> dot points –

- (a) With respect to dot point 2: How many victims of child abuse and sexual misconduct were reported in each of the 4 dioceses? How many in each diocese were substantiated? How many in each diocese were disciplined? Were any clergy licences revoked? If so in what dioceses?
- (b) With respect to dot point 3: Of the 38 complaints against 24 ministers, what is the breakdown across dioceses? How many complaints in each diocese were substantiated? Did any have their licence revoked? If so, in what diocese?
- (c) With respect to dot point 4: Of the 6 ministers accused of child sexual assault, what is the breakdown across dioceses? How many accusations in each diocese were substantiated? Did any have their licence revoked? If so, what diocese?
- (d) With respect to dot point 5: Of the 37 lay leaders accused of child sexual assault, what is the breakdown across diocese? How many accusations in each diocese were substantiated? Was disciplinary action taken? If so, in what diocese?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The statistical information in paragraph 62 of the Safe Ministry Board and Professional Standards Unit report was provided by the PSU chaplain shortly prior to her completion of service in mid 2012. The statistical information has not been provided in a way that facilitates any further breakdown of the information in the manner sought by the question. Therefore, a comprehensive audit of files would be required to answer the question, and it has been impossible to conduct such an audit between the time the question was asked and now. Unfortunately, therefore, the question is unable to be answered at this time.

Furthermore we are not able to provide detailed information regarding the Dioceses of Bathurst, Grafton and Armidale as they are separate dioceses.