

**MINUTES OF THE XXI SOBOR**  
**OF THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OF CANADA**  
**VICTORIA INN HOTEL – WINNIPEG, MB**  
**13-17 JULY 2005**

**WEDNESDAY, 13 JULY 2005**

**OPENING OF SOBOR 2005**

*(Processional entrance of the Hierarchs with the Wonderworking Icon of the Mother of God of Pochaiv, to the singing of the Troparion to the Wonderworking Icon of the Mother of God of Pochaiv by clergy and the assembly).*

**1. PRAYER & OPENING OF THE 21<sup>ST</sup> SOBOR**

*(Following the singing of the Prayer to the Holy Spirit and blessing by the Patriarchal Exarch, His Eminence Archbishop JOHN officially opened the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada and called upon the Chair of the Presidium, Fr. William Makarenko to carry out the election of the Sobor Presidium and Sobor Scrutineers).*

**2. ELECTION OF SCRUTINEERS**

**NOMINATED:** (G. Slawchenko/E. Shapka) OKSANA REWA.

**NOMINATED:** (S. Bejzyk/M. Bugera) LEONA HLADIUK.

**NOMINATED:** (V. Hetmanczuk/Fr. W. Wasyliv) THE INTERNAL AUDITORS – FR. JOHN MELNYK, HAROLD CIPIWNYK and VICTROIA PESTRAK.

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. V. Kouchnir/A. Ciacka): IRENE GERICH.

**MOTION:** (Fr. W. Wasyliv/Fr. M. Sawchenko) to close nominations.

**CARRIED.**

**MOTION:** (P. Amiot/Fr. N. Rauliuk) to elect the six nominated Scrutineers.

**CARRIED.**

**3. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRS OF THE 21<sup>ST</sup> SOBOR**

**ELECTED AT THE CLERGY CONFERENCE:**  
FR. GREGORY MIELNIK and FR. TARAS UDOD.

**NOMINATED:** (F. Slywka/W. Chymyrysh) ORYSIA SUSHKO.

**NOMINATED:** (F. Slywka/W. Chymyrysh) VICTOR PEDENKO.

**NOMINATED:** (P. Kondra/G. Udod) VICTOR HETMANCZUK.

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. W. Wasyliv/M. Zaleschuk) AUDREY SOJONKY.

**MOTION:** (Fr. H. Fil’/Fr. M. Sawchenko) to close nominations. **CARRIED.**

**RESULTS OF VOTING:** Co-Chairs: FR. GREGORY MIELNIK  
ORYSIA SUSHKO

Vice-Chairs: FR. TARAS UDOD  
VICTOR HETMANCZUK

*(Fr. T. Udod assumed the Chair).*

4. ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP JOHN OF EDMONTON  
& THE WESTERN DIOCESE, ACTING PRIMATE OF THE UOCC

5. ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP YURIJ OF TORONTO &  
THE EASTERN DIOCESE

*(Fr. G. Mielnik assumed the Chair).*

6. GREETINGS FROM GUEST HIERARCHS

a) His Eminence Metropolitan SOTIRIOS (Exarch of Canada; Representing  
His All-Holiness Patriarch BARTHOLOMEW)

b) His Eminence Archbishop ANTONY (President of the Consistory of the  
UOC – USA [representing His Beatitude Metropolitan CONSTANTINE])

c) His Eminence Archbishop VSEVOLOD (UOC – USA)

*(Fr. T. Udod assumed the Chair).*

7. ELECTION OF SECRETARIES OF THE 21<sup>st</sup> SOBOR

**NOMINATED:** (Y. Lozowchuk/V. Pedenko) DR. ED KLOPOUSHAK.

**NOMINATED:** (S. Bejzyk/Fr. C. Zubritsky) LLWELLYN ARMSTRONG  
(Guest - St. Ivan Suchavsky Cathedral, Winnipeg).

**MOTION:** (Fr. M. Sawchenko/L. Chomik) to close nominations. **CARRIED.**

**LAY SECRETARIES ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:**

DR. EDWARD KLOPOUSHAK  
LLWELLYN ARMSTRONG

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. P. Berezniak/Fr. W. Wasyliv) FR. JAROSLAW BUCIORA. (Fr. Jaroslaw DELCINED THE NOMINATION).

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. J. Lipinski/Fr. W. Wasyliv) FR. TARAS MAKOWSKY.

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. J. Lipinski/Fr. N. Rauliuk) FR. IHOR OKHRIMTCHOUK. (Fr. Ihor DECLINED THE NOMINATION).

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. W. Wasyliv/Fr. M. Sawchenko) FR. JOHN LIPINSKI.

**MOTION:** (Fr. V. Lakusta/Fr. M. Sawchenko) to close nominations.  
**CARRIED.**

**CLERGY SECRETARIES ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:**

FR. TARAS MAKOWSKY  
FR. JOHN LIPINSKI

## 8. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

i. **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:** (V. Hetmanczuk/Fr. W. Wasyliv [on behalf of the Consistory])

(i) Approval of Directors Actions (of the Consistory) to take place at the end of Session III this evening;

(ii) Election of the Chair of the Presidium to take place as the first item on Friday morning, to allow unsuccessful candidates to still be considered for election to the full Consistory Board.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED.**

ii. **PROPOSED AMENDMENT:** (Fr. H. Fil'/O. Yereniuk) to add an item to the agenda to deal with the issues of his suspension 30 years ago.

- Fr. H. Fil' feels his suspension in 1975 was not just and his issue was not dealt with properly by the Church. He desires this issue to be resolved at this Sobor.
- Archbishop Yuriy recommended that this issue be referred to the Church Court for investigation and resolution.
- O. Yereniuk expressed her opinion that Fr. Hryhorij deserves some closure, though perhaps the Sobor is not the appropriate venue for these discussions.

*(Further comments on procedure in relation to the Church Court).*

**MOTION TO REFER TO COMMITTEE:** (Dr. P.M. Kondra/M. Makowsky) to refer the matter of Fr. Hryhorij FIL' to the Church Court, for resolution within one year. **CARRIED.**

iii. **AGENDA CLARIFICATION**: G. Hupka commented that the agenda closes nominations to the Consistory Board on Thursday and therefore the amendment to the agenda still does not allow for defeated Presidium Chair candidates to be nominated to the full Consistory Board.

- V. Hetmanczuk, Chair of the Elections Committee, responded that it has been a tradition to allow defeated candidates to the Chair Presidium to stand for election to the full Consistory Board, even though nominations have officially closed by that time.
- W. Strus commented that it must be more formal than simply “a tradition”.

**MOTION**: (W. Saranchuk/Dr. H. Hohol) that nominees for Chair of the Presidium may also stand for election to the Consistory Board.

- Speaking against the motion, A. Sojonky commented that democracy allows for a candidate to be nominated only for one position at a time.

**MOTION DEFEATED.**

**MOTION**: (A. Sojonky/V. Hetmanczuk) that, commencing with this 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor and at all subsequent Sobors, all unsuccessful candidates for Chair of the Presidium also be allowed to have their names stand for election to the Consistory, following the election of Chair of the Presidium. **CARRIED.**

iv. **AGENDA CLARIFICATION**: M. Strus recommended that for upcoming Sobors, voting on the resolutions occur before elections for Chair of the Presidium and the Consistory Board, in order to hear their comments about the resolutions, which are the guiding principles of activity in our Church. (*RULED OUT OF ORDER by the Chair*).

**MOTION**: (K. Swinton/Pdcn. T. Maluzynsky to accept the agenda as amended. **CARRIED.**

## 8. APPROVAL OF VOTING PROCEDURES

*(V. Hetmanczuk [Chair of the Elections Committee] assumed the Chair and highlighted from the Voting Procedures, that statements be limited to a maximum of two minutes).*

**MOTION**: (E. Yereniuk/A. Kachkowski) that clause 8 (with respect to quorum) be removed from the Voting Procedures. **CARRIED.**

i. **CLARIFICATION OF RESOLUTION PROCEDURES**: W. Balan requested clarification on the discussion of and voting on resolutions.

- Dr. N. Aponiuk (Co-Chair of the Resolutions Committee) stated that resolutions will be presented in Session VI and then there will be three breakout sessions. Facilitators will then bring forth the results of these

discussions on Friday morning. Further discussion will take place throughout Friday. Dr. N. Aponiuk requested that any newly prepared resolutions be handed in by the end of today. Voting on resolutions will take place on Saturday morning. There will be limited opportunity for resolutions from the floor and therefore she highly recommended that they be submitted in advance. *(Followed by further questions and clarification).*

**MOTION: (G. Hupka/Fr. V. Lakusta) to strike clause 14 from the Voting Procedures, as this appears simply to be a holdover from the last Sobor. CARRIED.**

**MOTION: (W. Balan/G. Udod) to approve the amended Voting Procedures. CARRIED.**

*(Fr. T. Udod assumed the Chair).*

**9. RATIFICATION OF WORKING COMMITTEES**  
*(As per attached lists in XXI Sobor binder).*

- (i) Sobor Organizing Committee
- (ii) Sobor Registration & Verification Committee
- (iii) Sobor Equalization Committee
- (iv) Sobor Media Relations Committee
- (v) Sobor Nominating Committee
- (vi) Sobor Resolutions Committee
- (vii) Sobor Elections Committee

**MOTION: (W. Balan/Fr. R. Ehrmantraut) to ratify all Sobor Working Committees and their membership. CARRIED.**

**10. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 20<sup>th</sup> SOBOR**

**MOTION: (Dr. P. M. Kondra/Fr. G. Maximiuk) to accept the minutes as printed and distributed. CARRIED.**

**11. REPORT OF THE VERIFICATION COMMITTEE**

- S. Bejzyk (Sobor Planning Committee Co-Chair) reported the following:  
As of 1400h today, the number of delegates – 313.

*(The Chair requested a further breakdown into clergy and laity and also a count of the registered guests).*

**SESSION I - INTRODUCTION OF METROPOLITAN & BISHOP(S)**

*(The Chair of the Presidium, Fr. W. Makarenko expressed his gratitude for the leadership offered our Church over the past decades by Metropolitan WASYLY, of blessed memory).*

**A) MOTION:** (Fr. W. Makarenko/E. Yereniuk) with the approval of the episcopacy and the Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, the Chair of the Presidium of the Consistory presents Archbishop JOHN as candidate for the office of Archbishop of Winnipeg and the Central Diocese and Metropolitan of All Canada.

- J. Calkins, along with five additional delegates, requested that the vote for the new Metropolitan be put to a secret ballot.

*(At 1600h the Chair called a 10 minute recess).*

*(Upon resumption of the meeting, the Chair called on V. Hetmanczuk, Chair of the Elections Committee, to clarify the voting procedure. V. Hetmanczuk reported that 324 ballots have been produced. A single ballot will be distributed to each delegate upon presentation of his/her voting card. Ballot distribution followed).*

**i. QUESTION:** M. Strus questioned how there can be a Metropolitan when there is not a Full Council of Bishops (minimum of three hierarchs). *(RULED OUT OF ORDER by the Chair).*

*(Following voting, V. Hetmanczuk verified that 324 ballots were returned to the scrutineers. **By simple majority, delegates CARRIED THE MOTION to approve the candidacy of Archbishop John to the office of Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada.** This announcement was met by a standing ovation and chanting of "Axios!." His Eminence thanked the Sobor for its vote and pledged his continued work for the good of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada).*

**MOTION:** (E. Hyworon/V. Pedenko): **that the ballots be destroyed and we unanimously honor Archbishop and Metropolitan-Elect JOHN with a unanimous show of voting cards. CARRIED.**

**POINT OF CLARIFICATION:** Archbishop YURIJ clarified that we have elected a candidate whose name will now be forwarded to the Patriarch of Constantinople for synodal election. Following this, his enthronization shall take place. Until that time, he will continue to be titled "Acting Primate."

*(At this time, Metropolitan SOTIRIOS commented that he was confident that the nomination will be accepted by the Ecumenical Patriarch quickly and, on behalf of His All Holiness, offered his congratulations to Archbishop JOHN).*

B. Archbishop JOHN announced that the hierarchs have approved only Very Rev. Fr. Michael SKRUMEDA as a candidate for Bishop, but the Consistory has failed to endorse this candidate and therefore there is an impasse currently.

Archbishop YURIJ continued explaining that, following the submission of its report, the Consistory's Bishop Search Committee continued to work on seeking out candidates; the Council of Bishops considers this out of order. The hierarchs agree upon only one candidate at this time; the Patriarch was presented and is aware of Fr. Michael's candidacy. There is a necessity, when selecting candidates to the hierarchy of the Church, for confidentiality on the side of the bishops – for good reason. The distribution of a "candidate list" is viewed as very unfortunate and unfair.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**i.** W. Sametz expressed his concern that the delegates receive no information on the candidates or the duties of the offices of Bishop, Archbishop, and Metropolitan. He suggested consideration for a Special Sobor to be called within two years to resolve the issue of augmenting the Council of Bishops.

- Archbishop YURIJ clarified that at this moment, we are discussing the impasse, not the election of a candidate.

**ii.** G. Luciuk, on behalf of the Bishop Search Committee, expressed his concern that it would be a disservice to focus simply on one candidate. The Search Committee felt that there were a number of worthy candidates and presentation of one candidate disregards the will of the 20<sup>th</sup> Sobor. He would ultimately prefer that the Search Committee and Council of Bishops work together.

**iii.** W. Chewchuk commented that the need for bishops was expressed at both the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Sobors and that these issues should be tabled until a special Sobor is called.

**iv.** Fr. R. Kocur asked if there is some realistic resolution to the impasse during this Sobor.

**v.** V. Pedenko added that there is definitely a need for additional candidates and recommended that for now we resolve the impasse, consider one candidate and set a deadline for the proposal of additional candidates.

- Bishop YURIJ repeated that the Council of Bishops needs to propose and approve, by majority, candidates for the office of Bishop. At this time, there is consensus on simply one candidate.

**vi.** Dr. N. Aponiuk commented that the Bishop Search Committee has shown that there are a number of suitable candidates.

*(At 1730h the meeting was adjourned for supper. The Sobor reconvened at 1840h. The chair reminded the Sobor that so-called "campaign literature" may not be distributed).*

**MOTION: (V. Pedenko/W. Balan) that the Sobor direct and charge the Consistory Board to meet with the Acting Primate immediately to discuss the issue of the candidacy of Fr. M. Skrumeda, reporting back to the Sobor no later than noon tomorrow, and that W. Saranchuk (UOCC Legal Counsel) act as facilitator and chair for this meeting.**

**DISCUSSION:**

- i. Fr. J. Buciora opposes the motion because this motion denotes a lack of trust in the Bishops.
- ii. L. Chomik asked for clarification, re: the intent of a meeting between the Consistory Board and Archbishop John.
  - V. Pedenko replied that the Consistory Board and the Primate need to come together and resolve this impasse for the good of the Church.
- iii. W. Chewchuk, in favour of the motion, underlined that this is exactly what a Sobor in our Church is called for – to resolve the problems and issues of our Church.
- iv. Fr. I. Okhrymchouk, in favour of the motion, added that in his opinion this impasse is simply a symbol of a larger problem in our Church.
- v. I. Triska sought clarification on the motion – are we directing them to seek consensus on one candidate or on many candidates?
  - V. Pedenko clarified that a decision should be made on one candidate, but a discussion should also proceed with regard to a number of candidates.
- vi. M. Kopala, against the motion, noted that this simply prolongs a frustrating issue. We need the Bishops to articulate the qualifications and standards of the position of Bishop.

**AMENDMENT: (S. Luciuk/Dr. P.M. Kondra): to not only include discussion on the candidacy of one nominee, but also include the additional candidates named in the Search Committee’s report in the discussion between the Primate and the Consistory Board.**

**DISCUSSION:**

- i. Archbishop YURIJ expressed his agreement with Mr. Pedenko’s proposal and the discussion currently taking place.
- ii. V. Pedenko, speaking against the amendment, believes this limits the scope of discussion.

**AMENDMENT CARRIED.**

**MOTION CARRIED AS AMENDED.**

*(The Chair requested the Consistory and the Acting Primate to convene in the Chapel Room. A brief recess was called at 1935h).*

*(The session was called back to order at 1940h).*

### **SESSION III – FINANCIAL REPORTS**

*(The Chair, Fr. T. Udod, requested that A. Sojonky act as co-chair while the other co-chairs are attending the Consistory meeting).*

**MOTION: (G. Syrnick/Fr. A. Jarmus to accept AUDREY SOJONKY as a temporary Co-Chair. CARRIED.**

#### **1. INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT**

*(H. Cipywnyk, Chair of the Internal Audit Committee, led the delegates through the distributed report [SEE ATTACHED]).*

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Bishop YURIJ questioned the completion of a prayer book by the Liturgical Committee. He is on the committee and has seen no such manuscript.
  - H. Cipywnyk replied that the Internal Auditors stand corrected.
- ii. W. Sametz commended the committee for their courage and hard work. He further requested a report on the trust funds. He has seen the reports of a previous forensic audit on the trust funds and queries whether the audit committee has reviewed the practice of borrowing from the Millennium Trust Fund.
  - H. Cipywnyk responded by reporting that no internal audits were conducted prior to 1995. However, H. Cipywnyk recalls \$200,000 being borrowed from the Trust Fund. Half of that was repaid, but the remainder never was. A large portion of the Trust Funds were transferred to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada Foundation.

*(A. Sojonky assumed the Chair).*

- iii. Dr. H. Hohol questioned which “chair” confiscated the 2003 Audit Report.
  - H. Cipywnyk responded that the Chair of the Presidium took the report into his possession and did not mail it out. The Chair of the Internal Audit Committee took it upon himself to distribute the report to the membership, as per UOCC By-Laws.
- iv. W. Balan commended the Internal Audit Committee for their thorough review of the management practices and corporate culture. He further commented that the issues, re: the Millennium Fund, arose before 1995. The funds were used to look after budgetary deficits. The Millennium funds were raised for Millennium projects but were in fact never used to pay for these projects – funds from the

operating budget were used. Then on the advice of financial advisors, they reversed the charges from the operating budget and attributed them to the Millennium Fund. The remainder of the Millennium Fund was then transferred to the UOCC Foundation.

*(Fr. T. Udod assumed the Chair).*

v. B. Strus questioned whether there is a requirement to publish the response of the Consistory to the Internal Auditors' report.

- H. Cipywnyk responded that the Internal Audit Committee is responsible to the Sobor, not the Consistory. Reports are shared with the Consistory as a courtesy to aid them in their work between Sobors (the Presidium refers the Internal Auditors report to the Consistory); they are to respond to the comments of the Internal Auditors Report.

vi. W. Chewchuk questioned where monies from the church sold in Brantford have been placed. H. Cipywnyk suggested that this issue be referred to the Finance Committee.

- W. Balan informed the delegates that the funds from the sale of the church in Brantford will appear in the financial statements of the UOCC Foundation. He feels that there should be a policy to distribute these funds through the Foundation.

vii. Fr. J. Melnyk (Member, Internal Audit Committee) recommended that thanks be extended to the staff of the Consistory, in particular to M. Labelle for his scrutiny of the Consistory's expenses. *(The Sobor replied with applause).*

viii. W. Senchuk questioned what is meant by "ill-defined and cryptic nature of the minutes".

- H. Cipywnyk responded that unless you were at the meeting, you cannot decipher what happened.
- A. Kachkowski commented that minutes are to record what is done and accomplished, not what is said.

viii. M. Nimchuk expressed his regret in seeing the Brantford church sold. His understanding is that these funds will be put in trust for 10 years so that they may be transferred back if they wish to establish a new congregation.

- H. Cipywnyk suggested that this be referred to the Finance Report.

**MOTION: (H. Cipywnyk/V. Pedenko) to accept the Internal Auditors' Report. CARRIED.**

**MOTION: (H. Cipywnyk/Fr. G. Maximiuk) that the services of Craig & Ross be retained as external auditors for the next five years. CARRIED.**

*(At this time, A. Hohol reported briefly on the Flowers of the Bible Project [SEE ATTACHED]. She presented a donation of \$20,000 to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada from the project's profits).*

**POINT OF PRIVILEGE:** Fr. M. Skrumeda expressed his wish for harmonious cooperation and reported that he had felt very afflicted throughout the day. He recognizes the current impasse involves him personally. He seeks peace in the family. He hopes that a suitable candidate for the episcopate of our Church will be found, but at this point he humbly declines the nomination.

- Archbishop YURIJ expressed, with profound regret, his feeling that Fr. Michael has had a completely normal reaction. He understood and accepted Fr. Michael's reaction; it is his right to withdraw and have a more peaceful time. Now a process will be initiated for a search for new candidates.
- Fr. J. Melnyk asked that Fr. M. Skrumeda withdraw his last statement.
- Archbishop YURIJ called upon Fr. Michael to reconsider his withdrawal, considering the reaction of the Sobor.
- Fr. M. Skrumeda responded that he is prepared to withdraw his name pending the results of the special meeting currently taking place. However, Fr. Michael also agreed to withdraw his previous statement.

*(Further informal discussion to Fr. Michael's comments followed).*

*(The meeting adjourned for the day at 2105h).*

## **THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2005**

*(Fr. T. Udod, Chair, called the meeting to order at 0925h).*

### **SESSION I - INTRODUCTION OF METROPOLITAN & BISHOP(S) (CONT'D)**

*(Following the Special Consistory Meeting, called by Sobor motion the previous day, the Chair of the Presidium read the following motion emanating from that meeting):*

**MOTION:** (Fr. W. Makarenko/E. Shapka) that the Consistory, while reserving its own convictions on the matter, agrees with the presentation by the Acting Primate of the candidacy of Fr. Michael Skrumeda for the episcopate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada to the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor and respectfully requests that the balance of the candidates presented by the Bishop Search Committee and other such candidates who qualify, to be presented to an Extraordinary Sobor within one year.

**AMENDMENT:** (Dr. A. Melnyk/W. Chewchuk) add, following "21<sup>st</sup> Sobor and...", ... further, whereas the Consistory nominates and proposes the following candidates and the Primate consents thereto, all pursuant to the Statutes and By-Laws of the UOCC including, without limitation, Article 16, therefore it is moved that an Extraordinary Sobor be convened no later than one year from now at which the following candidates shall be brought forward for consideration: Bishop ILARION

**(Rudnyk), Fr. Archimandrite Tykhon (Chyzhevsky), Fr. Archimandrite Job (Getcha), Fr. Archimandrite Pankratij (Dubas), Fr. Michael Skrumeda and any other suitable candidates that may be found, for the purposes of considering these candidates, and electing a minimum of one Bishop.**

**DISCUSSION:**

- i.** Archbishop YURIJ expressed his view that the amendment is unacceptable in that nominees must proceed through the vetting process of the Bishops.
- ii.** K. Swinton believes that the motion and amendment are manifestations of a larger issue and that the impasse has arisen as a result of the process, not any particular candidates.
- iii.** A. Kachkowski feels that the amendment fundamentally changes the original motion and therefore should be considered as a separate motion.
- iv.** W. Chewchuk is in favor of the amendment because he wishes to hear reasons for exclusion of candidates.
- v.** Dr. P. M. Kondra feels that the amendment does not change the intent of the original motion, but simply seeks clarity so that there is no future impasse.
- vi.** Dr. E. Klopoushak mentioned his displeasure at the way this issue was handled last night – with the Acting Primate and Consistory absent from the proceedings and is distressed about the lack of conciliarity and cooperation and wishes that both the Consistory and the Bishops work together.
- vii.** Archbishop YURIJ clarified that while conciliarity is sought, both the Bishops and the Consistory serve different functions and it is up to the Bishops to ordain whom they deem appropriate without a need for detailed discussion of the merits of particular individuals.
- viii.** Archbishop ANTONY cannot agree to have one of his clergy considered a candidate for Bishop as this may cause problems in his own Diocese and, in particular, his parish.
- ix.** Archbishop JOHN stressed that the outcome of last night’s deliberations seems to have been ignored; he still presents Fr. M. Skrumeda as a candidate for Bishop at this Sobor.  
  
*(At this point, the chair asked if the mover/seconder of the original motion agreed to the amendment – they do not. Following a re-reading of the original motion and the amendment, discussion on the amendment continued).*
- x.** W. Saranchuk expressed his view that the group came to a consensus in the form of the original motion presented by Fr. W. Makarenko. To appease the Consistory, there

already was an agreement to hold an Extraordinary Sobor within a year. The amendment is redundant.

- W. Balan feels that the discussion has revealed that the amendment is not redundant in that further clarification on the amendment was required.
- Dr. N. Aponiuk feels that the Consistory does not need to be appeased. Much thought and prayer had been put forth in their deliberations.

**xi.** Archbishop ANTONY insisted that the name of the candidate from his Diocese be removed from the amendment to the motion for his own protection.

- Dr. A. Melnyk agreed to remove Fr. Pankratij's name from his amendment.

**xii.** Archbishop YURIJ added that the amendment is acceptable if the it is understood that nothing is being imposed upon the hierarchs.

**AMENDMENT DEFEATED. (107 “FOR”; 156 “AGAINST”)**

**DISCUSSION ON ORIGINAL MOTION:**

**i.** Fr. B. Hladio felt that there has been five years to define a transparent process and delegates must be able to make informed decisions and therefore he speaks against the original motion.

**ORIGINAL MOTION CARRIED. (196 “FOR” [162 votes represents 50% of the votes])**

**NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE TO THE HIERARCHY OF THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OF CANADA: (Archbishop JOHN/Fr. W. Makarenko) present Very Reverend Father Michael SKRUMEDA as a candidate for Bishop of Edmonton and the Western Diocese of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada.**

*(Fr. W. Makarenko read a biographical synopsis of Fr. Michael Skrumeda. A vote on the candidacy of Fr. Skrumeda was called. By request of five delegates, a secret ballot was called for. The meeting was recessed at 1030h for 15 minutes).*

*(Following the break, Fr. B. Hladio respectfully suggested a prayer before the ballots were cast. This was followed by the singing of the “Prayer to the Holy Spirit” and a moment of silent prayer. The room was sealed for voting. V. Hetmanczuk confirmed that 324 ballots were produced).*

*(The Verification Committee reported 247 laity and 71 clergy for a total of 318 delegates. There are also 9 youth and 36 guests).*

**POINT OF CLARIFICATION TO SESSION I:** K. Swinton requested further clarification re: the report of the Search Committee. He questioned the status of; 1) the elevation of Archbishop YURIJ to the rank of archbishop, and 2) the issue of “cathedral overlap” in the Eastern Eparchy, i.e. the see of Toronto.

- Archbishop YURIJ replied that these issues must be addressed in conjunction with the Patriarchate. He clarified that we are not an autocephalous church. We are in the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; we need to hold to a specific order. He further explained that there was already a Bishop of Toronto (of the Greek Metropolis) when Archbishop YURIJ was Bishop of Saskatoon, Vicar of the Central Diocese. Though our Terms of Agreement with the Ecumenical Patriarchate list Toronto as a cathedral see of our Church and we have a decades-long history of occupying that cathedral see, Archbishop YURIJ is officially referred to by the Patriarchate as the Bishop of Saskatoon as there cannot be two Bishops for the same city. The question remains as to whether to change Archbishop YURIJ's title or to ask the Greeks to change their title. The issue is an ongoing one with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, who prefers this issue be resolved in Canada.
- K. Swinton responded with a query whether the elevation of Archbishop YURIJ can even be entertained, given the uncertainty with Archbishop YURIJ's title.
- Archbishop YURIJ responded that the titles of Archbishop and Metropolitan are interpreted differently in the Greek tradition. This requires further dialogue with the Patriarchate.

*(At this point, V. Hetmanczuk announced **that the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor ELECTED Very Rev. Fr. Michael SKRUMEDA as a candidate to the office of Bishop of Edmonton and the Western Diocese in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada.** The assembly responded with the triple chanting of "Axios." Fr. Michael responded to the vote with thanks to the hierarchy and delegates for their confidence and love and asked the Sobor to forgive him any misgivings and to walk with him along this new path with patience, tolerance and all those things that are of the good of God).*

**MOTION:** (V. Pedenko/Fr. V. Lakusta) to destroy the ballots. **CARRIED.**

*(SESSION I WAS CONCLUDED at this point).*

## SESSION II – ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

*(O. Sushko assumed the Chair, asking for continued cooperation and prayers as the Sobor continued).*

*(Fr. W. Makarenko, Chair of the Presidium, presented his report [SEE ATTACHED]).*

**MOTION:** (V. Pedenko/Fr. H. Lakusta) to accept the Report of the Chair of the Presidium.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 1200h for lunch. The meeting resumed at 1325h. ).*

### **DISCUSSION:**

- i. W. Chewchuk questioned the characterization of Church Goods as an income-generator when in fact they are operating at a loss.

- Fr. W. Makarenko reported that historically it has provided a greater income and in fact \$1000 per month in rental income is paid to the Consistory.
- ii.** W. Chewchuk questioned what in particular is being done with respect to unification of the Church in Ukraine.
- Fr. W. Makarenko reported that there have been many unofficial contacts, but it remains a delicate matter.
- iii.** W. Chewchuk mentioned the importance of active communication on the side of the Chair of the Presidium with individual priests, congregations.
- iv.** V. Pedenko queried whether there is a process to look at updating the by-laws.
- Fr. W. Makarenko responded that there has been mixed reaction to the distribution of amendments to the by-laws. He felt that an open and formal process should be initiated.
- v.** M. Makowsky questioned what actions were taken in response to the Internal Auditors Report of 2003.
- Fr. W. Makarenko responded that he objected to subjective wording in the report and less than accurate information. The intent was to send the report out. The Chair of the Presidium was not provided with an opportunity to respond to their concerns and therefore decided not distribute the report.
- vi.** M. Koszarycz questioned when the revised prayer books would be published.
- Archbishop YURIJ responded that the previous prayer book was published without full opportunity to correct typographical errors. However, there is still a lot of work to do. He indicated that there have been suggestions to use prayer books from the Kyivan Patriarchate. There simply have not been a lot of financial and human resources put toward this work.
  - M. Chobotar requested greater consideration of including tropars, kondaks, etc. in new publications of service/prayer books.
- vii.** Pdcn. T. Maluzynsky commented that the issue of a centralized approach to Missions and Education was raised in the Internal Auditors' report. He feels that Mission Work in the Church is crucial and in fact feels that the level of these efforts must be increased. In particular, Pdcn. Taras commended the good work of Fr. A. Jarmus (*this comment was responded to with applause*).
- ix.** Z. Zmiyiwsky questioned what were the benefits for our church of the one million dollar Millennium Fund.
- Fr. Makarenko responded that only through a detailed review of income and expenses could that question be addressed.
- x.** Reader I. Pawliuk expressed concern with the loss of rural parishes and priest loads in amalgamated congregations.

**xi.** A. Ciacka questioned why we don't simply adopt the Kyivan Patriarchate prayer book.

- Archbishop YURIJ responded that this does not simply stop with the prayer book and added that the services are indeed the same, but the language is different than what we are used to. The idea requires further development.

**xii.** Fr. I. Okhritchouk requested that immigrants not be looked at as a special group, but be incorporated within the community and introduced to the Canadian traditions. He also questioned whether the option of working priests has been considered versus amalgamation of small parishes.

- Fr. W. Makarenko responded that there is nothing specifically to prevent working priests. He also raised the possibility of a greater use of "hubbing" – i.e. priests stationed in a larger community and who travel to rural parishes to offer services.

**xiii.** Y. Slawchenko reported that he had phoned the Church Goods Supply to inquire about Study Bibles. There was no catalogue of items available and so he questioned when a Bible would be readily available from our Church.

- Fr. Makarenko responded that special orders are always a possibility and that a catalogue is currently being produced.

### **MOTION CARRIED.**

## **SESSION III – FINANCIAL REPORTS (CONT'D)**

*(The Chair called upon V. Hetmanczuk, Chair of the Finance Committee, to present his report).*

### **2. TREASURER / FINANCIAL MANAGER**

*(V. Hetmanczuk, Treasurer, expressed his thanks for being allowed to serve the Church for the last ten years and wished to publicly acknowledge the work of M. Labelle. He proceeded to present a "PowerPoint" presentation summarizing the financial report [SEE ATTACHED STATEMENTS]).*

**SUMMARY STATEMENT:** The debt has been eliminated and levy revenues continue to closely match Consistory expenses. The Foundation stands at \$828 000.

**MOTION:** (Fr. V. Lakusta/W. Mukanik) to accept the report of the Treasurer. **CARRIED.**

**MOTION:** (H. Cipiwnyk/Fr. M. Sawchenko) having received the Finance Report, the Report of the Chair of the Presidium and the Reports of the External and Internal Auditors, a vote of confidence in the Consistory Board for its work over the past five years be expressed by the Sobor. **CARRIED.**

*(At this point, a suggestion was made that UOCC congregations and clergy provide e-mail addresses to the Consistory [via the Sobor registration desk] for facilitation of better communication within our Church).*

#### **SESSION IV – ST. ANDREW’S COLLEGE REPORT**

*(Very Rev. Fr. Roman Bozyk, Acting Principal, was asked to present the St. Andrew’s College Report [SEE ATTACHED]. He specifically thanked the Board and donors for their support in retiring the College’s mortgage this past year).*

*(W. Balan, Treasurer, presented the College’s financial statement. The budget continues to be balanced. He felt that the proportion of unpredictable revenues remains high and the goal remains to achieve financial stability. He therefore recommends a strategy for the next five years of increased guaranteed revenues. The large Scholarship Fund is not accessible as general revenue. Work is progressing to determine how some of these funds may be freed up. There have also been preliminary discussions with the Shevchenko Foundation – a potential investment manager. There needs to be development of a capital plan. Mr. Balan commended Olga Kowalchuk for her tenacity in both identifying building problems and undertaking the fundraising to complete the work. He also commended the staff for their dedicated work and particularly commended Fr. Roman and Dobr. Genia Bozyk for their efforts. He also extended thanks to the Bursar, M. Labelle).*

*(Fr. R. Bozyk reminded the Sobor about College reports in Visnyk and extended his thanks to the Board and staff of the College for their work).*

**MOTION: (Fr. G. Maximiuk/Fr. R. Ehrmantraut) to accept the St. Andrew’s College report.**

#### **Discussion:**

- i.** B. Strus questioned why the 2003-2004 summary does not agree with the audited financial statements.
  - W. Balan indicated that a correction will be made and mailed along with the minutes.
- ii.** A. Hohol questioned the future of the College with an enrolment of only seven students - perhaps it would be cheaper to send our students to another seminary.
  - Fr. R. Bozyk responded that the number of students fluctuates and it would be more expensive to send our students to other seminaries.
- iii.** A. Hohol questioned the status of continuing education for seminarians.
  - Fr. R. Bozyk responded that while this is encouraged, it is not compulsory.
- iv.** Fr. I. Okhrymchouk commended the College on an excellent report.

v. O. Mysak questioned the lack of mention of the contributions made by the Order of St. Andrew. He also questioned why there are not more branches of the Order of St. Andrew.

- M. Bugera, Chair of the Order of St. Andrew, stated that annual support for the College stands at about \$30,000.

Y. Lozowchuk questioned if the Foundation has the authority to place its funds with the Shevchenko Foundation for management. Is a resolution needed?

- W. Balan stated that the RBC group is currently managing the funds. He commented that they had been using a conservative strategy, but in light of low interest rates, a different strategy is being adopted in hopes of realizing a greater return.

### **MOTION TO ACCEPT REPORT CARRIED.**

## **SESSION V – NOMINATIONS**

*(V. Hetmanczuk assumed the Chair).*

### **1. NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT**

*(L. Chomik and Dr. A. Melnyk, Co-Chairs, presented the report of the Nominating Committee. The following slate of candidates was presented):*

#### **Eastern Diocese:**

**Fr. Gregory Mielnik (Oshawa)**  
**Fr. Ihor Okhrymchouk (Ottawa)**  
**Fr. Eugene Ruditch (Lachine)**  
**Walter Chewchuk (Richmond Hill)**  
**Judge Eugene Fedak (Hamilton)**  
**Yoris Gella (Montreal)**

#### **Central Diocese:**

**Fr. Roman Bozyk (Winnipeg)**  
**Fr. Taras Udod (North Battleford)**  
**William Balan (Winnipeg)**  
**Gerald Luciuk (Regina)**  
**Gordon Trischuk (Saskatoon)**

#### **Western Diocese:**

**Fr. Taras Krochak (Calgary)**  
**Fr. Victor Lakusta (Edmonton)**  
**Fr. Patrick Powalinsky (Calgary)**  
**Thomas Haugen (Edmonton)**

**Oles Pasichnyk (Port Coquitlam)**  
**Dr. Sandra Sawchuk (Edmonton)**  
**Internal Auditors:**

**Harold Cipywnyk (Hamilton)**  
**Fr. John Melnyk (Winnipeg)**  
**Victoria Pestrak (Winnipeg)**

**Church Court:**

**Fr. Stephan Jarmus (Winnipeg)**  
**Fr. Ihor Kutash (Montreal)**  
**Walter Saranchuk (Winnipeg)**  
**Alternates: Fr. M. Derewianka (Sudbury), John Krawchenko (Hamilton)**

*(The following instructions were given: each delegate will have 17 votes: 6 from the Eastern Diocese, 6 from the Western Diocese, and 5 from the Central Diocese. New nominees from the floor will need to fill out a nomination form and will have their pictures taken and displayed along with those candidates put forth by the Nominating Committee. L. Chomik thanked the Nominating Committee for their hard work).*

**Questions:**

- i. A. Kachkowski: is there a minimum requirement, re: the length of time a nominee has been a member of the UOCC.
- Dr. A. Melnyk responded that while there is no formal requirement, the parish priest must sign the nomination form.

Nominated to the St. Andrew's College Board:

Uliana Holowach-Amiot (Calgary)  
Walter Manulak (Winnipeg)  
Mark Ferbey (Edmonton)  
Ivan Franko (Toronto)  
Fr. Bohdan Sencio (Toronto)  
Audrey Sojonky (Vancouver)  
James Teterenko (Calgary)  
Fr. Roman Tsaplan (Kamloops)  
Michael Zaleschuk (Regina)

**MOTION: (Fr. G. Maximiuk/Fr. I. Okhrymtchouk): to accept the nominations for the Church Court. CARRIED.**

**2. NOMINATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

a) For the Internal Auditing Committee:

**NOMINATED:** (W. Chewchuk/Dr. L. Sulyma) **BILL STRUS** (Etobicoke).

**MOTION:** (Dr. G. Rewa/Dr. P.M. Kondra) to close the nominations for the Internal Auditing Committee. **CARRIED.**

b) For St. Andrew's College Board:

**NOMINATED:** (Dr. N. Aponiuk/ Fr. W. Wasyliv) **FR. CORNELL ZUBRITSKY** (Winnipeg).

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. J. Melnyk/Dr. O. Gerus): **HELEN MAYBA** (Winnipeg).

**MOTION:** (Fr. H. Lakusta/A. Kiyko) to close the nominations for St. Andrew's College Board. **CARRIED.**

c) For the Consistory Board:

**Question:**

i. Fr. N. Rauliuk questioned what will be done now that Fr. P. Powalinsky is being transferred to the Central Diocese.

- Dr. A. Melnyk responded that the Nominating Committee was working with the information they had at the time.

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. N. Rauliuk/J. Stolarchuk) **FR. ROMAN KOCUR** (Yorkton).

**NOMINATED:** (S. Bezyk/L. Hladiuk) **FR. HENRY LAKUSTA** (Winnipeg).

**NOMINATED:** (H. Allan/D. Hardy) **DOBR. MERRIE ZUBRITSKY** (Winnipeg).

**NOMINATED:** (Fr. M. Pogranichny/V. Royenko) **STEPHANIA SPYTKOWSKA** (Grimsby).

**NOMINATED:** (O. Gerus/J. Jurychuk) **DR. PETER M. KONDRA** (Hamilton).

**NOMINATED:** Fr. J. Rybalka/M. Koszarycz) **FR. RICHARD EHRMANTRAUT** (Melfort).

**NOMINATED:** (E. Hyworon/D. Duschak) **FR. JAROSLAW BUCIORA** (Winnipeg).

**NOMINATED:** (G. Zaharia/D. Kowalyshyn) **EMIL YERENIUK** (Edmonton).

**NOMINATED:** (G. Hupka/A. Danyluk) **FR. BOHDAN DEMCZUK** (Saskatoon).

**NOMINATED: (Fr. J. Lipinski/Fr. S. Lomaszkiewicz) FR. JOHN PLEWA (Kelowna).**

**NOMINATED: (J. Teterenko/K. Swinton) FR. PETRO ANHEL (Toronto).**

**NOMINATED: (M. Sorochka/P. Powalinsky) ERNIE STEFANUK (Saskatoon).**

**NOMINATED: (V. Pedenko/V. Tkachuk) EUGENE MASLAK (Windsor).**

**MOTION: (Fr. V. Kouchnir/G. Syrnick) to close the nominations for the Consistory Board. CARRIED.**

d) Chair of the Presidium:

**NOMINATED: (Dr. A. Melnyk/L. Chomik) FR. OLEH KRAWCHENKO.**

**NOMINATED: (Fr. P. Wasylenko/V. Pedenko) FR. WILLIAM MAKARENKO.**

**NOMINATED: (U. Holowach-Amiot/J. Jurychuk) FR. BOHDAN HLADIO.**

**MOTION: (Fr. W. Wasyliw/Fr. M. Sawchenko) to close the nominations for Chair of the Presidium. CARRIED.**

### **3. CANDIDATES' SPEECHES (CHAIR OF THE PRESIDIUM)**

*(The Chair then called on the candidates for Chair of the Presidium to address the Sobor. Each candidate, in alphabetical order, made a brief presentation).*

#### **SESSION VI – REALIZING VISION 2000: A BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE**

*(Fr. G. Mielnik assumed the Chair. He began by clarifying that election of the Presidium Chair will take place on Friday morning).*

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk, Co-Chair of the Resolutions Committee, thanked the Chairs of all of the Vision 2000 implementation teams. The delegates at this Sobor are key in setting priorities for the next five years. After supper, the delegates will be divided into 3 breakout sessions. Dr. Aponiuk explained the facilitation of the sessions):*

Spiritual Renewal: Dr. Allan Sanger, Facilitator  
Joanna Calkens, Recorder

Educational Development: Dr. Roman Yereniuk, Dr. Sandra Sawchuk, Facilitators  
Fr. Gene Maximiuk, James Teterenko, Recorders

Responsible Stewardship: Vasyl Balan, Facilitator  
Stephania Luciuk, Llwellyn Armstrong, Recorders

*(G. Luciuk, Co-Chair of the Resolutions Committee, thanked all of the individuals and parishes for their input on the resolutions).*

*(The meeting was adjourned for supper at 1730h).*

## **SESSION VII – BREAKOUT SESSION 1**

*(The meeting reconvened with break-out sessions from 1845h – 1945h).*

## **SESSION X – PARISH LIFE WITNESSING AND SHARING**

*(O. Sushko, Chair, called the plenary session to order at 2000h.)*

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk reported that the initial breakout sessions have been very productive. Tomorrow morning will begin with the election and then continue with the remaining two breakout sessions. For this session, the committee thought that it would prove enlightening to hear the growth and mission experiences of particular parishes).*

### **St. Anthony, Edmonton (Dr. Allan Sanger)**

#### **Summary Comment:**

- They recently underwent a strategic planning process. This involved a diverse demographic, from youth to seniors. Champions are needed and targets required (6 month targets, one year targets, five year targets). This is an ongoing effort and all sectors must be involved in the process. This project was not executive-driven.

### **St. Volodymyr, Calgary (Ihor Triska)**

#### **Summary Comment:**

- The Calgary Mission Project, originally implemented in 2000, was presented. Their goal is to expand the Ukrainian Orthodox presence in southern Alberta, with a special focus on Red Deer. The funding for the program has come through special donations made by members of the Calgary congregation. In June 2004, the project was extended indefinitely. In addition to Red Deer, the program has also benefited the communities of Oyen, Cranbrook, and Lethbridge, currently with 50-75 attendees. This model – of larger congregations supporting smaller ones – is critical for the future of our Church.

### **St. Vladimir Cathedral, Hamilton (Dobr. Tania Hladio)**

#### **Summary Comment:**

- It became apparent to the congregation in Hamilton that many parishioners were no longer able to be active members of the church. The “Fellowship of the Myrrh-

Bearers” currently has a membership of approximately 25. There are just under 100 individuals who are visited a minimum of 2 times per year. A handbook has been created for each volunteer and prayer books were also created to be distributed at the initial visit. Christmas and Easter gifts are created by CYMKivsti. The response has been positive both from the shut-ins and program volunteers.

**Holy Cross Mission, Winnipeg (Fr. Andrew Jarmus, Dr. Bruce Naherniak, Jennifer Johnson)**

**Summary Comments:**

- In the fall of 2001, a core group of individuals came together to pursue missionary work in the city of Winnipeg. There are currently 32 members, some of whom are third or fourth generation Ukrainian-Canadians, and others are Orthodox from other ethnic backgrounds. Services are conducted exclusively in English. Fr. Andrew believes that if you would like your children or grandchildren to return to the Church, you must leave the door open for them.

**Descent of the Holy Spirit Sobor, Regina (Dr. Tony Harras)**

- In 2000 the parish originally initiated a process of spiritual renewal and stewardship through a “Future Search Conference;” the process is still ongoing, other such conferences have been held since. It is important for a parish to develop a vision and to work towards fulfillment of established goals. There is need to develop a plan with milestones and also need to continually recommit to working together.

*(The sessions adjourned for the evening at approximately 2100h).*

**FRIDAY, JULY 15, 2005**

*(The Chair, Fr. G. Mielnik, called the meeting to order at 0920h).*

**SESSION XVI – ELECTIONS**

**1. CHAIR OF THE PRESIDIUM**

*(The verification committee reported that there are **248 laity and 71 clergy** for a **total of 319 delegates**. A list of all nominees [both from the Nominating Committee and from the floor] will be distributed this afternoon).*

**MOTION: (Dr. H. Hohol/A. Kachkowski: that today’s program include an introduction to each of the candidates nominated to the Consistory Board.  
CARRIED.**

## **SESSION XVIII – SOBOR RESOLUTIONS**

*\*SECRETARYS' NOTE: Full text of Resolutions is found  
ATTACHED, IN APPENDIX "A"*

*(G. Luciuk, Co-Chair of the Resolutions Committee, proposed that some resolutions from the Responsible Stewardship breakout session be presented for adoption while votes are counted for the election of Chair of the Presidium. Achieving consensus from the Sobor, the following adjustments were made):*

Breakout Session II: 1030h – 1200h

Breakout Session III: 1315h – 1445h

Plenary Sessions: Saturday, 1030h – 1200h and 1330h – 1430h

*(V. Hetmanczuk, Chair of the elections Committee, reported that 324 ballots have been produced. Following distribution and casting of ballots, V. Hetmanczuk declared the voting closed).*

### **Resolutions C21 (Benefits Package for UOCC Clergy & Lay Employees) and C22 (Retirement Benefits for UOCC Clergy & Lay Employees)**

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk asked L. Chomik to review the resolutions. L. Chomik introduced Randy Southall of Westchester Financial Group, who was available to address questions from the delegates. She further reported that there has been a favourable response from both the clergy and Dobrodijky conferences and from Consistory staff).*

### **DISCUSSION:**

- i.** With respect to the benefits package, dental work conducted prior to the adoption of the plan will not be covered.
- ii.** E. Shapka questioned whether retirees would be covered under the benefits plan.
  - R. Southall replied that they would not be covered.
- iii.** Fr. P. Yamniuk questioned coverage under the plan if a previously installed filling broke.
  - Yes – it would be covered.
- iv.** Dr. L. Sulyma sought clarification re coverage for pre-existing illnesses and medication.
  - If the employees are currently active, then they are covered.
- v.** Dr. Tony Harras asked what sort of reference employee was used for this plan – federal government, private industry?
  - L. Chomik responded that the Committee reviewed several catalogues. Changes to coverage levels are possible in the future.

vi. G. Trischuk queried whether all post-secondary students (as opposed to simply university students) are covered under this plan.

- They are covered.

**MOTION:** (A. Sojonky/ L. Chomik): that Resolution C21.1 be adopted by the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor. **CARRIED.**

**MOTION:** (G. Luciuk/ Dr. N. Aponiuk): that Resolution C21.2 be accepted. **CARRIED.**

**DISCUSSION:**

*(G. Luciuk clarified that an increase from 5% to 6% is in keeping with employment standards).*

*(The meeting was interrupted with voting results for Chair of the Presidium. V. Hetmanczuk reported that 312 valid ballots and 12 blanks were collected by the Internal Auditors. The results are):*

**Fr. Bohdan Hladio: 126 votes**

**Fr. Oleh Krawchenko: 105 votes**

**Fr. Wasyl Makarenko: 81 votes**

*(A second ballot will be produced containing the names of the top two candidates).*

**MOTION:** (Pdcn T. Maluzynsky/Fr. P. Powalinsky) to destroy the ballots. **CARRIED.**

**AMENDMENT:** (W. Senchuk/Fr. G. Podtepa) that a sample of both blank and completed ballots be retained for archival purposes.

**AMENDMENT DEFEATED.**

**Resolution C21.3 (Minimum Wage of Clergy)**

*(This resolution proposed that the minimum salary for full time priests should increase from \$2000/month to \$2200/month. G. Luciuk clarified that the original motion from the Clergy Conference was an increase in the minimum wage from \$2000/month to \$2500/month [rather than \$2200/month]).*

**MOTION:** (Dr. N. Aponiuk/ G. Luciuk): that Resolution C21.3 be accepted.

**DISCUSSION:**

i. Fr. B. Hladio indicated that there has not been an increase in the minimum salary in 10 years. He further stressed that this is not a raise for all priests, simply for those earning the minimum wage. This is an important symbolic action.

ii. A. Sanger commented that a raise of \$200 is simply 0.6%/yr. Cost of living is much higher. The message sent by such a small raise is that we do not value their efforts, especially priests working in the rural parishes. He is of the opinion that the priests be granted a cost-of-living increase each year.

**AMENDMENT: (A. Sanger/S. Sawchuk) to raise the minimum wage from \$2000/month to \$2500/month.**

**DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENT:**

i. E. Hyworon questioned whether wages include simply salary or whether housing allowances, car allowances, etc. are included. Every parishioner would like to see his or her priest paid well, but parishes must face difficult realities.

ii. S. Zehner indicated that a raise and new benefits package will lead to the closing of rural parishes. The larger urban parishes need to perform more missionary work.

iii. G. Leskiw indicated that we need to start thinking of wages in different ways. Priests should be paid a wage which is closer to a true reality – no housing and car allowances. Priests should receive a good wage but all extra allowances and benefits need to be considered together.

iv. Dobr. J. Okhritchouk commented that there needs to be guidance to the parishes on salary/benefits/allowances.

v. S. Luciuk clarified that the resolution only indicates that the Sobor supports the will of the clergy with respect to a raise. She is against the motion at this time because there is also a resolution, re: a centralized pay system.

**MOTION TO TABLE: (A. Sojonky/M. Strus) to table the item until Saturday for the purpose of rewording. CARRIED.**

*(At this time, V. Hetmanczuk distributed the second ballot containing the names of Fr. B. Hladio and Fr. O. Krawchenko).*

**MOTION: (W. Chewchuk/J. Calkins): that the results of the second ballot for the Chair of the Presidium be announced as soon as the votes have been counted. CARRIED.**

*(The Chair, Fr. G. Mielnik, took the opportunity to thank Fr. William Makarenko for his past five years of service as Chair of the Presidium).*

*(V. Hetmanczuk reported the results of the second ballot. There were 11 blanks, 4 spoiled, and 309 valid ballots):*

**Fr. B. Hladio: 175**

**Fr. O. Krawchenko: 134**

*(Fr. B. Hladio was **DECLARED ELECTED CHAIR OF THE PRESIDUM**. Called to the podium, Fr. Bohdan expressed his intention to act on a basis of good will and common sense for the good of the Church).*

*(V. Hetmanczuk stated that the unsuccessful candidates now have the opportunity to stand for nomination to the full Consistory Board).*

**NOMINATED: (Dr. P. M. Kondra/Dr. A. Melnyk) FR. OLEH KRAWCHENKO.**

**NOMINATED: (Fr. B. Demczuk/Fr. J. Buciora) FR. WASYL MAKARENKO.**

**MOTION: (Pdcn. T. Maluzynsky/E. Shapka) to destroy the ballots. CARRIED.**

**AMENDMENT: (W. Senchuk) to retain the blank ballots and a sample of the marked ballots for archival purposes. NO SECONDER WAS DECLARED for the motion.**

**Full List of Candidates for the Consistory Board:**

**Central Diocese:**

**William Balan  
Fr. Roman Bozyk  
Fr. Jaroslaw Buciora  
Fr. Bohdan Demczuk  
Fr. Richard Ehrmantraut  
Fr. Roman Kocur  
Fr. Henry Lakusta  
Gerald Luciuk  
Ernie Stefanuk  
Gordon Trischuk  
Fr. Taras Udod  
Fr. Oleh Krawchenko  
Fr. Wasyl Makarenko**

**Eastern Diocese:**

**Fr. Petro Anhel  
Walter Chewchuk  
Judge Eugene Fedak**

**Yoris Gella  
Dr. Peter M. Kondra  
Eugene Maslak  
Fr. Gregory Mielnik  
Fr. Ihor Okhrintchouk  
Fr. Eugene Ruditch  
Stephania Spytkowski**

**Western Diocese:**

**Fr. Taras Krochak  
Thomas Haugen  
Fr. Victor Lakusta  
Oless Pasichnyk  
Fr. Patrick Powalinsky  
Dr. Sandra Sawchuk  
Fr. John Plewa  
Emil Yereniuk**

*(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 1230h).*

**SESSION VIII – BREAK-OUT SESSION 2**

*(The breakout sessions were held from 1330h –1430h).*

**SESSION V – NOMINATIONS (CONT'D)**

**4. CANDIDATES' SPEECHES (CONSISTORY BOARD)**

*(The meeting resumed at 1445h with brief speeches given by the candidates for the Consistory Board).*

*(At 1530h the Sobor was temporarily in recess for a meeting of the UOC Foundation).*

**SESSION XIV – UOCC FOUNDATION**

**Meeting of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada Foundation**

**1. Call to Order**

*(The meeting was called to order at 1530h by V. Hetmanczuk, Chair of the Foundation).*

**2. Opening Prayer**

*(An opening prayer was led by the Primate).*

### 3. Quorum for Meeting

*(By virtue of membership in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, all delegates are members of the UOC Foundation. A quorum of 50 members was achieved).*

**POINT OF PROCEDURE:** A. Sojonky queried if the Chair runs the annual meeting of the Foundation. V. Hetmanczuk responded that is indeed the case.

### 4. Agenda Approval

**MOTION:** (W. Sametz/Fr. V. Lakusta): to approve the agenda. **CARRIED.**

### 5. External Auditor's Report

*(V. Hetmanczuk reviewed the financial statements. At Sept. 30, 2004, total assets were \$297,691. At June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2005, total assets exceeded \$800,000).*

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Fr. W. Wasyliw questioned what had happened to the scholarship fund.
  - V. Hetmanczuk responded that the documents to transfer these funds have yet to be signed.
- ii. E. Hyworon questioned whether the Sobor appoints representatives or does the Sobor elect representatives to the Board of St. Andrew's College.
  - V. Hetmanczuk replied that the by-laws read "appoint".

### 6. President's Report

*(V. Hetmanczuk reviewed the report as distributed. The Foundation was mandated by the 20<sup>th</sup> Sobor. There are nine directors, three from each eparchy).*

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i. Fr. B. Wasyliw queried if there is always a Consistory Board representative.
  - V. Hetmanczuk replied that is indeed the case. Victor mentioned at this point that the recent increase in the fund was due to monies realized from the sale of the Brantford parish.

### 7. Questions from Reports

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i.** A. Sojonky questioned the “General Endowment Fund” line in the Financial Statement. Can the Foundation simply use the interest on these funds or is the capital now available for the operating costs of the central Consistory office?
- V. Hetmanczuk replied that the Foundation prefers that these funds not be restricted, but he does not at this time have the letter detailing the conditions of the transfer of funds from the UOCC Endowment to the UOCC Foundation.
- ii.** W. Sametz stated that the Endowment Fund stood at \$492,000, but the Foundation received only \$250,000 of this total. He recommends that the Internal Auditing Committee perform an audit as to whether all issues of compliance have been addressed.
- V. Hetmanczuk clarified that the Consistory passed a motion to transfer \$400,000 but at this time the Foundation has received only \$250,000. They are currently seeking a document to remove restrictions on the fund in order that the remainder may be transferred from the UOCC to the Foundation.
- iii.** V. Pedenko queried whether there is a window of opportunity for the Brantford parish to gain access to funds for developing a new parish if their circumstances should warrant such a move.
- V. Hetmanczuk responded that a \$825/month subsidy for the next three years was negotiated with the Brantford parish.
- iv.** A. Kachkowski requested a copy of the mission/vision/objectives of the Foundation.
- V. Hetmanczuk will have copies produced for tomorrow morning.
- v.** Pdcn T. Maluzynsky questioned where the funds are invested. Who manages the funds and what is the interest rate?
- V. Hetmanczuk responded that M. Labelle manages the funds through RBC at a rate of approximately 2.5%.
- vi.** Pdcn. T. Maluzynsky queried about the status of meetings with the Ukrainian Canadian Congress Taras Shevchenko Foundation concerning the possibility that the UOCC Foundation funds could become part of the Taras Shevchenko Foundation for management.
- V. Hetmanczuk responded that there have been preliminary meetings, but it is up to the new Consistory Board to complete this work.
- vii.** D. Duschak questioned why the funds are not invested with Ukrainian financial institutions, as we often approach them for support.
- V. Hetmanczuk responded that he believes that the Shevchenko Foundation has a large proportion of their funds invested with Ukrainian institutions.
  - A. Sojonky commented that the Shevchenko Foundation is looking to expand their capital and is aggressively campaigning to do so. Given that the UOCC

is seeking for parishes to join this effort, what sort of fee will be charged for this investment management service?

- V. Hetmanczuk responded that at this time they are simply looking to gauge interest. Each transaction would have a separate signed agreement detailing the arrangement.

viii. J. Oystryk suggested that he, as a private individual, may invest his money as he pleases, but the Foundation, as a public body, is obligated to find the best investments. Also, he questioned why we must wait five years (between Sobors) to have questions answered.

- V. Hetmanczuk replied that the Foundation is “relatively young;” the best interest is obtained in a safe environment.

## **8. Acceptance of External Auditor Report**

**MOTION: (E. Revutsky/ W. Balan) to accept the External Auditor’s Report. CARRIED.**

## **9. Ratification of Directors’ Actions**

**MOTION: (Fr. G. Maximiuk/Fr. M. Sawchenko) to ratify the directors’ actions. CARRIED.**

## **10. Nominating Committee Report for 2005 Board of Directors**

*(V. Hetmanczuk reported that Peter Charuk has withdrawn from the Board).*

**NOMINATED: (W. Balan/Fr. G. Maximiuk [St. Volodymyr, Vegreville]): to nominate GREG SYRNICK to the Board of Directors. CARRIED.**

*(The additional nominees consist of the seven remaining current board members. One board member will be appointed by the Consistory).*

## **11. Board Election**

**MOTION: (Fr. W. Wasyliv /A. Sojonky) to accept the slate of nominees. CARRIED.**

*(The UOCC Foundation Board is as follows):*

**Victor Hetmanczuk (Toronto)  
Frank Slywka (Toronto)  
Caroline Yewchin (St. Paul)  
Walter Saranchuk (Winnipeg)  
William Balan (Winnipeg)  
Harry Nichiporuk (Edmonton)**

Greg Syrnick (Calgary)  
Maxym Trojan (Toronto)

## 12. Election of 2005 External Auditor

**MOTION:** (W. Balan/J. Mykytyshyn) to appoint Craig and Ross as the External Auditor. **CARRIED.**

## 13. Other Business

**MOTION:** (E. Hyworon/D. Duschak) that when possible, the Foundation utilize local Ukrainian credit unions to manage its funds. **CARRIED.**

**MOTION:** (W. Balan/Fr. O. Krawchenko) that the meeting express its support for the Foundation Board with regard to the direction the Board is taking in considering the Shevchenko Foundation as manager of its funds. **CARRIED.**

**AMENDMENT:** (W. Sametz/W. Chewchuk) (added to the end of the motion...) that this direction be followed only until the Foundation can perform investment management functions on its own. **AMENDMENT CARRIED.**

## 14. Adjournment

**MOTION:** (Fr. B. Demczuk/V. Pedenko) to adjourn at 1640h. **CARRIED.**

## 15. Closing Prayer

*(A closing prayer was led by the Primate).*

**SATURDAY, JULY 16, 2005**

*(The Chair, O. Sushko, called the Sobor to order at 0915h).*

### **SESSION XVI – ELECTIONS (CONT'D)**

*(V. Hetmanczuk reported that **five ballots have been produced:** three for the Consistory Board [Western, Central, and Eastern Dioceses], one for the Internal Audit Committee, and one for the Board of St. Andrew's College. There are **319 copies of each ballot.** V. Hetmanczuk further noted that although Fr. J. Melnyk appears on the ballot for the Internal Auditor, he will be elected by acclamation in that he is the only clergy member appearing on the ballot.)*

**POINT OF PRIVILEGE:** A. Kachkowski suggested a manner of voting which allows for the best composition of the Consistory Board. There is nothing in the by-laws requiring the delegates to vote by district.

**MOTION:** (A. Kachkowski/H. Mayba) that the delegates vote for eight clergy and nine laity without regard to district of residence.

**DISCUSSION:**

i. I. Triska commented that the tradition is to vote by Diocese to best represent the parishes across the country. We do not fill our Parliament with residents of one region.

ii. K. Swinton stated that there is no regional requirement in the by-laws. The clergy candidates may in fact be transferred to another Diocese.

iii. W. Balan stated that it is not specified in the by-laws to have voting proceed in either fashion. There have been years in the past when there have been nine candidates elected from Winnipeg. We should have regional diversity and representation.

iv. J. Jurychuk commented that the change should have been made before the nominations closed.

v. Dr. H. Hohol expressed disappointment with divisions between Diocese, clergy, and laity. He has trust in delegates from both the East and West to vote for the best candidates from across the country.

vi. Fr. I. Okhrymchouk added that regional representation facilitates communication back to the parishes.

vii. M. Kopala suggests that two clergy and two laity be elected from each region and the rest of the board be filled by nominees from across the country.

**MOTION DEFEATED**

*(The ballots were then distributed. V. Hetmanczuk clarified that while you may not exceed the given number of representatives from each region, you may in fact vote for less than the limit. Following the casting of ballots, V. Hetmanczuk declared the voting closed).*

**SESSION XVII – SOBOR YOUTH RALLY STATEMENT**

*(Fr. A. Jarmus, Office of Missions and Education, opened the floor to the Youth Rally participants. Each of nine youth made brief statements on the future of the Church. They were greeted by the Acting Primate, His Eminence Archbishop JOHN and Very Rev. Fr. Michael Skrumeda, Bishop-Elect. The children presented special gifts to both the Bishop-*

*Elect and Metropolitan-Elect. Fr. A. Jarmus commented that future does indeed look very bright!)*

*(Following this presentation, Fr. T. Udod assumed the Chair and introduced presidents of various organizations to the Sobor).*

## **SESSION XVIII – SOBOR RESOLUTIONS**

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk expressed gratitude to G. Luciuk and V. Hetmanczuk [Co-Chairs of the Resolution Committee] and all members of the Resolutions Committees. She also thanked the delegates for expressing their views during the breakout sessions. The committee has reformulated resolutions based on the feedback received. The report of the resolutions committee was distributed. For ease of presentation, the resolutions have been renumbered sequentially).*

*(Resolutions 1 [Benefits Package for UOCC Clergy and Lay Employees] and 2 [Retirement Benefits for UOCC Clergy and Lay Employees] have already been adopted).*

### **Resolution 3 (Extraordinary Sobor in 2006)**

*(Presented by W. Balan: At this Sobor, there have been many issues with respect to transparency and clarity of process. It is the wish that this resolution will help in clarifying the process. Mr. Balan expressed the desire to strengthen our Church by healing and uniting).*

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 3.**

### **DISCUSSION:**

**i.** I. Triska feels that points 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 are necessary to ensure that we discuss these issues at the extraordinary Sobor. Points 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 clarify that questions were not a result of the suitability of the candidates, but questions about the process. There are clear deadlines and transparency.

**ii.** Dr. E. Klopouschak is concerned about the wording of 3.1.2. It should read “The Committee, at its first meeting on Saturday, 16 July, shall strike a committee...” *(This was **ACCEPTED AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**).*

**iii.** Fr. J. Buciora stated that the wording “The final process is blessed by the Primate of the Church” must be added.

**iv.** Archbishop YURIJ added that we want the legitimate rights and responsibilities all reflected in this process. The phrase “to the extent permitted by canon law” is very important. There should be some discussion of the practicalities involved. Article 3.1.4 creates a situation with a bishop-elect and no Metropolitan for another year. This is unacceptable. Once approval is received from the Patriarch, we must get started as there

are many steps to be taken prior to consecration. In point 3.1.1 (iv), what does “consider” mean?

- G. Luciuk responded that both the bishops and the laity have a role in evaluating the candidates.

v. A. Sanger added that this issue was supported by a large portion of the individuals at the breakout sessions. There must be an open process or confidence erodes rapidly.

vi. K. Swinton stated that the resolution simply states that we’re striking a committee to clarify procedures, not necessarily to change the process. He interprets 3.1.4 as allowing time to prepare the bishop-elect.

- G. Luciuk indicated that the mover and seconder are prepared to remove 3.1.4 if that is the will of the Sobor plenary.

vii. Dr. P. M. Kondra commented that the process has been a travesty and disrespectful of the bishop-elect, Consistory Board, etc. The wording of this resolution was chosen very carefully. The process must be explicit. Consecration should occur in one year so that there is sufficient time for preparation.

#### **MOTION CARRIED.**

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk clarified that while the English version is the official one, a Ukrainian translation will be created).*

#### **Resolution 4 (Amendments to the Statute and By-Laws)**

*(Dr. N. Aponiuk clarified that the wording re 4.1.1 has come from the clergy).*

i. Fr. J. Buciora questioned what does “cancelled by the Primate through the Presidium” mean?

- Dr. N. Aponiuk responded that this is language taken from the by-laws and she interprets this as “in consultation with”.

ii. A. Sojonky seeks further clarification, re: 4.1.1. What are the criteria that doctors will be given re judging the capacity of a priest to serve?

- Archbishop YURIJ clarified that they are seeking an opinion on physical capability (and perhaps mental fitness) from the physicians. The onus is on the patient to present a document before the Consistory and Council of Bishops.

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 4. CARRIED.**

#### **Resolution 5 (Rural Issues Committee)**

*(This motion calls for the establishment of a rural issues committee).*

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 5.**

**DISCUSSION:**

i. A. Sanger commented that it can be difficult for rural parishes to raise their issues. We need a forum for these issues to be addressed.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

*(The meeting was adjourned at 1200h for lunch).*

**SESSION XIX – SOBOR RESOLUTIONS**

*(The Chair, Fr. T. Udod called the Sobor to order at 1335h).*

**Resolution 6 (Minimum Salary of Clergy)**

**MOTION: (S. Lebedowich/Fr. R. Ehrmantraut) to bring this issue back to the floor. CARRIED.**

*(This resolution was based on feedback from the breakout sessions. It still respects the will of the clergy conference, but also respects the concerns of the rural parishes).*

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 6.**

**DISCUSSION:**

i. Sophie Zehner requested clarification re the definition of a full-time vs. part-time priest.

ii. E. Hyworon questioned whether it is intended that there be an across-the-board increase in clergy salary.

- Dr. N. Aponiuk responded that this is just an increase in the minimum wage.
- E. Hyworon suggested that this should be subject to the approval of the parish executive.
- G. Luciuk indicated that the next resolution deals with the issue of equity.

iii. A. Triska clarified that this is simply salary, not benefits such as housing allowance. Some priests receive additional benefits, while others have no such allowances.

iv. G. Hupka is concerned with the definition of a full-time priest. Some priests make up to \$2500/month at another job.

v. Judge E. Fedak hopes that this resolution might encourage more individuals to enter the priesthood.

**AMENDMENT:** (A. Kachkowski/Fr. T. Makowsky) (that the following condition be added to the Resolution): “and has a full complement of church services in his parish.” **CARRIED.**

i. Z. Zmiiwsky requested further standards and regulations, such as performance reviews, etc.

ii. M. Holowaty commented that the small churches are getting smaller all the time. There is no money in the budget to pay this increase immediately.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** This increase takes effect on January 1, 2006.

*(Resolution 6 now reads):*

*Whereas “full-time priest” is defined as a priest whose primary source of income is derived from his parish assignment, and has a full complement of church services, BE IT RESOLVED that the minimum salary for full-time priests be increased from \$2000 per month to \$2500 per month, commencing 01 January 2006.*

**AMENDED RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

*(Fr. C. Zubritsky wished to acknowledge and appreciate what the laity have provided in terms of enhanced benefits and an increased minimum wage. The clergy rose and applauded the laity).*

**Resolution 7 (Centralizing Priests’ Salaries/Benefits)**

*(W. Balan clarified that this resolution is imply to commission a study. Establishment of a national payroll service should also be a part of the study).*

**MOTION:** (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk): to adopt Resolution 7.

i. A. Triska (St. Volodymyr, Vegreville) questioned whether it is intended to include a pay scale. Would there be consideration of years of experience, education, etc?

ii. W. Balan stated that he believes that point 2 should include a pay scale.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** (G. Syrnick) delete 7.2.

**AMENDMENT:** (D. Huzyk/A. Kachkowski) that both “whereas” clauses be stricken. **CARRIED.**

iii. B. Strus supports centralized accounting services, but not centralized payroll services.

**AMENDED RESOLUTION CARRIED.**

*(Resolution 7 now reads as follows):*

**7.1 BE IT RESOLVED** that the Consistory commission a feasibility study on centralizing priests' salaries / benefits at the Office of the Consistory, with the report to be completed by the Spring 2006 meeting of the Consistory; and

**7.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the study include the establishment of a National Payroll Service for all parishes in Canada.

**Resolution 8 (Publication of Bilingual Liturgical Texts)**

*(G. Luciuk reported that this is a follow-up to a resolution from the 20<sup>th</sup> Sobor. Dates have been added. There was much passion surrounding this issue in the breakout sessions).*

**MOTION:** (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 8.

**AMENDMENT:** (A. Ciacka/Fr. H. Fil') that Ukrainian text be acquired and translated into English if it is more economical.

*(The Chair clarified that the intent is to make extensive use of the texts of the Kyivan Patriarchate).*

i. K. Swinton commented that in his parish they use the Kyivan Patriarchate texts for Vespers. A lot of the text is rushed and slap-dash. We cannot rely on one source for Ukrainian and English. The English sources already exist elsewhere.

**AMENDMENT DEFEATED.**

**AMENDMENT:** (M. Koszarycz/Fr. C. Zubritsky) to add "including Kyivan, Galician and Znamennyj chants" in point 8.2 after "texts". **CARRIED.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** (Z. Zmiyiwsky) that we change the deadline from the fall of 2006 to June 2006 or, to the extent possible, before the Extraordinary Sobor.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** (M. Koszarycz) that this be considered a celebratory document in honour of the elevation of Archbishop John.

**AMENDED RESOLUTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

*(Resolution 8 now reads as follows):*

**8.1 BE IT RESOLVED** that the Liturgical Commission of the UOCC make one of its highest priorities to develop, produce or acquire standardized bilingual liturgical texts for publication and implementation in the liturgical life of the UOCC, and

**8.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that a project management process for this initiative be implemented by the fall of 2005, so that the first texts, including Kyivan,

*Galician and Znamennyj chants, can be delivered by June 2006 or, to the extent possible, before the Extraordinary Sobor.*

**Resolution 9 (Clergy Resolutions)**

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 9.**

*(Fr. B. Hladio took the opportunity to read the additional resolutions proposed at the Clergy Conference).*

**Resolution 9.A**

We respectfully request the hierarchs to review the practice of confession always preceding communion.

**CARRIED.**

**Resolution 9.B**

Specific booklets (in the Ukrainian language and for priests only) to be updated and republished by July 1, 2007.

**CARRIED.**

**Resolution 9.C**

A specific amount of time (up to one full day) at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Sobor be devoted to difficult priestly/pastoral and parish issues.

**CARRIED.**

**Resolution 10 (Formation of “Dobrodijky” Association)**

**MOTION: (G. Luciuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to adopt Resolution 10.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: (Z. Zmiyiwsky) (added to the end): to assist the small parishes in sending clergy wives to the meetings.**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**Resolution 11 (UOCC-USRL Joint Standing Committee)**

*(A. Sojonky reported that in 2004, the National Ukrainian Self-Reliance League approached the Consistory to look at areas of shared interest. The Consistory agreed and these groups have been meeting together for 6 months).*

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 11.**

- i. W. Chewchuk commented that this violates point 1 of the Patriarchal decree.
- A. Sojonky responded that we are talking about convergence. We need to engage everyone in the cause of the church. It is important to bring these projects to light.
  - Archbishop YURIJ stated that the resolution simply states that we can cooperate on areas of common interest.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**Resolution 12 (Office of Missions and Education)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 12.**

*(There was extensive vetting of this resolution during the breakout sessions).*

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**Resolution 13 (Religious Education Courses)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 13.**

*(Dr. R. Yereniuk commented that the groups recommended courses for both 2007 and 2006. This gives time for the development of new materials. However, they will endeavour to produce materials as soon as possible).*

**MOTION CARRIED.**

*(At this time, the Youth Rally participants made a presentation to Archbishop YURIJ).*

**Resolution 14 (Communications from the Office of the Consistory to UOCC Membership)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 14. CARRIED.**

**Resolution 15 (Reconstitution of the Visnyk/Herald Board)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 15. CARRIED.**

**Resolution 16 (Allocation of Monies Acquired from the Dissolution of a UOCC Parish)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 16.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: (M. Nimchuk) that three years be changed to five years in that during any five year period a Sobor will take place. We should also strike the 3 year time limit and change this to “a unanimous vote at the Sobor.” In**

**point 16.1, add “if not already completed, conduct an inventory of all church contents.**

**i.** D. Kowalyshyn stressed that we need to let others know if a church is in danger of closing.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**Resolution 17 (Operating Budget of the Office of the Consistory)**

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk) to adopt Resolution 17.**

**i.** B. Strus clarified that if the intent is to protect the purchasing power of the Consistory, then a \$1 increase is not equivalent to a cost-of-living increase.

**AMENDMENT: (B. Strus/Dr. L. Sulyma) that the increase be a cost-of-living adjustment rather than a \$1 per year increase.**

**AMENDMENT CARRIED.**

*(Concerns were raised as to the specific wording of the amendment. The majority expressed their wish to vote again).*

**AMENDMENT: (B. Strus/Dr. L. Sulyma) BE IT RESOLVED that a levy increase per member per year equivalent to the Canadian cost-of-living be adopted for 2006-2010.**

**DISCUSSION:**

**i.** B. Strus commented that he supports the adjustment be applied to the total budget divided by the membership, not an adjustment applied to the individual membership levy.

**ii.** I. Triska sought clarification on the amendment: is it for a cost-of-living adjustment on the levies or on Consistory expenses?

**iii.** W. Balan expressed the general feeling that there is sympathy towards an increase, in particular to a \$1 per year increase. With regards to the Consistory budget, there is the issue of the Consistory Office, Church Goods Supply, etc.

**iv.** G. Hupka supports the original motion in that this is simpler for parish-level planning.

*(The Chair conducted a straw poll for a \$1 per year increase versus a cost-of-living adjustment. The majority voted to support a \$1 per year increase).*

**AMENDMENT DEFEATED.**

## **ORIGINAL MOTION CARRIED.**

### **Resolution 18 (Incentive Program for Parishes to Recruit New Members)**

#### **MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk): to adopt Resolution 18.**

*(W. Balan reported that this encourages parishes to recruit new members. Immigrants from Ukraine do not have a tradition of membership fees. The resolution is for only a two-year moratorium).*

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i.** A. Sanger supports the motion but would like some indication of the costs of this program.
  - G. Luciuk responded that the only cost would be for copies of Visnyk, to be covered by the Missionary Fund.
- ii.** I. Pawliuk questioned whether “new members” are simply recent immigrants from Ukraine?
  - The Chair indicated that “new members” are not simply recent immigrants from Ukraine.
- iii.** I. Triska requested clarification that this is meant for those who have never been members, not for those who need the church for a wedding or funeral.

## **MOTION CARRIED.**

### **Resolution 19 (Presidential Elections in Ukraine)**

#### **MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk): to adopt Resolution 19.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: (Dan Huzyk) to rephrase the last sentence to say, “... clergy and faithful historically and during the recent Presidential elections in Ukraine”.**

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- i.** J. Balan stated it is important to show that we are not indifferent to what goes on in Ukraine. We are committed to a united autocephalous Church in Ukraine. We need to convey our disappointment in strong language.
- ii.** Y. Lozowchuk suggested that it be changed to “profound sadness and disappointment” and change “chauvinistic” to “Ukraine-o-phobic”.
- iii.** Archbishop YURIJ proposed a **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT** alluding to the actions in 1593 by the Moscow Patriarchate.

iv. E. Hyworon stated that we cannot sit on the fence anymore. He was very disappointed when in Ukraine for the recent elections.

**AMENDED MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Resolution 20 (Vision 2000)**

**20.1 Be it resolved that the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor of the UOCC reaffirms its support of the resolutions passed at the 20<sup>th</sup> Sobor and embodied in Vision 2000 as the blueprint for the continued development of the UOCC.**

*(All resolutions adopted by this Sobor will be incorporated into Vision 2000).*

**MOTION: (Dr. N. Aponiuk/G. Luciuk): to adopt Resolution 20. CARRIED.**

**Resolution 21 (Greetings)**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: In point 5, correct the spelling of “VSEVOLOD” and add prayers for the health of Metropolitan CONSTANTINE.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: In point 16, add the name of the Ukrainian President.**

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: In points 13 and 16, correct the spelling of “autocephalous.”**

**AMENDED MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Resolutions from the Floor:**

*(Dr. H. Hohol presented a resolution dealing with suicide [SEE ATTACHED]. This resolution is referred to the Council of Bishops).*

*(Dr. H. Hohol presented a resolution dealing with the Primate’s residence [SEE ATTACHED]. This resolution was referred to the new Consistory Board).*

**MOTION: (M. Kopala/A. Kachkowski) Be it resolved for the next Sobor that the Consistory Board be elected as follows: two clergy and two laity representatives per Diocese and three clergy and three laity to be elected as members-at-large.**

**CARRIED.**

**MOTION: (M. Strus/Y. Slawchenko) that serious discussion take place in regards to reformatting future Sobors to make maximal use of the limited time (SEE ATTACHED). CARRIED.**

**POINT OF PRIVILEGE: W. Chewchuk recommended that the Rozmet committee finish its deliberations by the end of July so that the money can be in the hands of the**

parishes by mid-August. The Rozmet Committee, consisting of one individual, requested more time.

*(The Chair, Fr. T. Udod, closed the Resolutions Session).*

**POINT OF PRIVILEGE:** V. Pedenko questioned the dissemination of information re: the Resolutions. He needs help with resolutions pertaining to budgetary matters in order to relay this information back to the parish.

*(R. Eliuk expressed his concern with parish fundraising through gambling endeavours).*

*(W. Senchuk (St. Mary the Protectress Cathedral, Winnipeg) expressed his disappointment re: the completed ballots. They have now been destroyed. He would have liked 10 ballots to be saved for archival purposes).*

**MOTION:** (W. Senchuk/Dr. N. Aponiuk) to retain 10 marked ballots of each type with regards to the Consistory Board election.

i. V. Hetmanczuk clarified that he pledged to retain all of the marked ballots. The earlier motions to retain marked ballots were not passed.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

## SESSION XVI – ELECTIONS (CONT'D)

*(V. Hetmanczuk reported the following results):*

### **Internal Audit Committee**

**Fr. John Melnyk (by acclamation)**  
**Harold Cipywnyk**  
**Victoria Pestrak**

### **Church Court (all by acclamation)**

**Fr. Stephen Jarmus**  
**Fr. Ihor Kutash**  
**Walter Saranchuk**  
**Alternates: Fr. Mykola Derewianka, John Krawchenko**

### **St. Andrew's College**

**Uliana Holowach-Amiot**  
**Ivan Franko**  
**Walter Manulak**  
**Rt. Rev. Fr. Bohdan Sencio**  
**Audrey Sojonky**

**James Teterenko  
Fr. Roman Tsaplan  
Michael Zaleschuk  
Fr. Cornell Zubritsky**

**Consistory - Western Diocese**

**Very Rev. Fr. Taras Krochak  
Rt. Rev Fr. Victor Lakusta  
Rev. Fr. Patrick Powalinsky  
Thomas Haugen  
Dr. Sandra Sawchuk  
Emil Yereniuk**

**Central Diocese**

**Rt. Rev. Fr. Oleh Krawchenko  
Rev. Fr. Taras Udod  
Vasyl Balan  
Gerald Luciuk  
Gordon Trischuk**

**Eastern Diocese**

**Rev. Fr. Petro Anhel  
Very Rev. Fr. Gregory Mielnik  
Rev. Fr. Ihor Okhrymchouk  
Judge Eugene Fedak  
Dr. Peter Kondra, Jr.  
Stephania Spytkowski**

*(V. Hetmanczuk thanked the scrutineers for their hard work throughout the Sobor).*

**SESSION XX – SOBOR CLOSING**

*(The Chair [on behalf of all co-Chairs] thanked the gathering for the opportunity to co-Chair the Sobor. His Eminence Archbishop JOHN, thanking all the hierarchs, clergy and lay delegates for their prayerful and sincere deliberations, blessed the Sobor to depart and do the Good Works of our Lord, based on the decisions of this assembly. His Eminence officially closed the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada. The singing of Dostoyno and Procession closed the Sobor at 1645h).*

Minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada respectfully submitted by:

Llwellyn Armstrong  
(St. Ivan Suchavsky Cathedral, Winnipeg)

Dr. Ed Klopoushak  
(Descent of the Holy Spirit Sobor, Regina)

Fr. Taras Makowsky  
(Holy Trinity Cathedral, Saskatoon)

Fr John Lipinski  
(St. Paul – Bonnyville Parish)

Minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada approved by:

+JOHN, Archbishop of Edmonton & the Western Diocese  
Acting Bishop of Winnipeg & the Central Diocese  
Primate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada  
President of the 21<sup>st</sup> Sobor