

**INTEGRITY COMMISSION ORDINANCE DRAFT**  
Diocesan Council 26 November 2015

---

**HISTORY – Diocesan Council 27 August 2015**

Ordinances being referred to Synod (Professional Standards Ordinance Amendments Ordinances 1, 2 and 3):

It was resolved:

“That this Diocesan Council:

1. Approve the submission of the Bills to the Synod; and.
2. That this Diocesan Council confirms that the Bill for the Integrity Commission Ordinance will not be presented to Synod.
3. That the Professional Standards Committee make a counter proposal regarding the Integrity Commission Ordinance noting their concerns.”

**RESPONSE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

From: Geoffrey Spring REDACTED  
 Sent: Wednesday, 11 November 2015 4:30 PM  
 To: John Cleary  
 Cc: Bishop Greg; Bishop Peter; Michael Elliott; Lynette Wickham; Glen Pope; Dymphna Rees Peterson  
 Subject: Draft Integrity Commission Ordinance

Dear John,

I refer to your letter of 1st September relating to the above draft Ordinance and requesting on behalf of the Diocesan Council that the PSC suggest an alternative to it.

On 3rd July 2015 I submitted a Report in this regard which for whatever reason was not put before the DC. The resolution of the PSC was and is as follows:-

The PSC resolved that the Newcastle Integrity Commission Ordinance 2014, which has been submitted to it in draft form, should not be proceeded with for the following reasons:-

- (a) That the Ordinance is not necessary as it only adds another level of bureaucracy to disciplinary proceeding such as may occur under the Professional Standards Ordinance.
- (b) That whilst it is stated that “the work of the commission is to ensure the prompt administration of any complaint” the reality is that there can often be many reasons for apparent delay which should not in fairness to both the party complaining and the Church body or Church Authority be made public or discussed by bodies other than those handling a complaint.
- (c) That the Ordinance potentially places far too much authority in the hands of the members of the Commission to deal with a complaint against the Bishop particularly as the membership of the Commission will only be determined fortuitously according to who may be available on the day it is chosen.

(d) That referral of an application to a Chancellor or deputy Chancellor of another Diocese may not always be satisfactory.

(e) That notwithstanding the timeframes in cl12 these in reality can seldom be met and thus this Ordinance would be counter productive and provide further delay in dealing with disciplinary complaints.

(f) That this draft Ordinance was the product of certain people who wished to provide a mechanism for unhelpfully, mistakenly and unnecessarily interfering with the work of the Professional Standards Director which has been of the highest order as clearly demonstrated by the decision of the Supreme Court.

I would be grateful if you would table this on the agenda of DC.

Warmest regards,

Geoff Spring  
Chair PSC