

**Special Session
of the 52nd Synod**

4 – 6 May 2021

**Archbishop
Election
Synod
Proceedings**

**Anglican Church of Australia
Diocese of Sydney**

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Presidential Address	3
Nominations	9
Proceedings	
Synod Service	11
Presidential Address	11
Proceedings held in private	11
Documents tabled	11
Officers and committees appointed.....	11
Petitions.....	11
Questions	11
Compilation of the Select List: 4 May 2021	12
Select List: 5 May 2021	12
Names placed on the Select List.....	13
Compilation of the Final List.....	13
Final List: 6 May 2021	13
Name placed on the Final List.....	14
Invitation to become Archbishop of Sydney	14
Adjournment	14
Report on the Finances of the Endowment of the See and Housing for the Archbishop	15

Presidential Address

Introduction

As Synod gathers for the 11th time to elect the next Diocesan of the See of Sydney, otherwise known as the Archbishop of Sydney, I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land upon which we meet. In his wisdom and love, our heavenly Father gave this estate to the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation. Upon this land they met for generations until the coming of British settlers. As we continue to learn to live together on these ancestral lands, we acknowledge and pay our respects to their elders, past and present, and pray that God will unite us all in the knowledge of his Son, in whom all things were created, in heaven and on earth, whether visible or invisible—for all things have been created through him and for him.

"The election of every one of Sydney's archbishops has been a great drama" states Dr Stuart Piggin in his recent biography of Harry Goodhew, a former Archbishop of Sydney. It remains to be seen whether that will be the case this time, but drama is acceptable, even riveting, as long as it is drama played out in a godly and gracious way. And as the curtain rises, please allow me to make some remarks for your consideration in the conversation that we are about to have and in the votes you will cast.

Previous Election Presidential Addresses have tended to define the role of the Archbishop in order to help the Synod determine who can best fill that role. Of course, there have been many different views expressed on the role of the Archbishop. I do feel at some level I have been alleviated of this task, since the Synod has adopted parts of the Doctrine Commission's report from 2018 on "An Evangelical Episcopate", which included the Appendix entitled "The Contemporary Role of the Archbishop of Sydney". There we collectively decided that the Archbishop of Sydney is to be a guardian of 'the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints', committed to order the ministry of the Diocese to the gospel of Christ and his mission, to exercise pastoral concern and insight, to represent the Diocese, to administer the Diocese in line with its mission, and all undergirded by a godly, gospel-driven character.

It is my opinion that we have four nominees who can fill this role. I think the question, then, is not so much who could fill this role but *how* will each one, if elected, fill this role? That is, what kind of Archbishop will each one of these men be? Each will bring to it different strengths and weaknesses, different priorities and emphases. Part of our discernment will be understanding our context and challenges we face, so that we might assess with humble wisdom which of these men may bring the kind of qualities we most need as they execute the role of Archbishop.

Let me suggest 5 areas for you to consider as you speak, listen and pray, and as you seek to discern what kind of Archbishop each of these men might be.

1. Our strategic moment

In my view, we are at a crucial, strategic moment for the work of the gospel in the Diocese for the future. It is crucial now because to wait will be too late. Let me explain.

It is no secret that the city is going through massive, infrastructural changes.

This has become necessary due to the rapid population increase that will see more than 8 million residents in the Diocese by 2056, if not sooner: 1.5 million more people by 2036, another 1.6 million by 2056.

50% of the growth will be in new land release areas – with the largest portion of these being housed in Western, North Western and South Western Sydney.

By 2056 it is forecast that the current Western Region alone will have a population two and half times that of the South Sydney Region or the Northern Region.

Or take the South West, where the new city of Bradfield will be located next to Sydney's second airport. Size-wise, this city will be in the order of 1.5 million people. There will be over 300,000 people moving into just the immediate area around the new airport. We currently have 3 churches available for those 300,000 people.

Compare that with the fact that, for example, we have 3 churches in Lindfield alone, covering a population of 18,000 people. Having 3 churches in Bradfield, would be the equivalent to having only 9 churches in the South Sydney Region or 11 churches in the Northern Region.

And given the size of Bradfield, not to have a major Anglican church there to preach the gospel, as well as have a significant symbolic presence, would be like not having St Andrew's Cathedral in the CBD or St John's in Parramatta or St Michael's in Wollongong. And given that currently the closest churches to the city centre of Bradfield are 18-20kms away, it would be similar to not having the Cathedral in Sydney, and the closest church being Hornsby or Pennant Hills or Narrabeen or Sylvania or Georges Hall. This simply will not do.

By approximately 2056, there will be 50% of the population of Sydney west of Parramatta. However, 70% of the Diocesan parish assets (namely, church buildings) are east of Parramatta.

To be quite frank, there needs to be re-imagining, dare I say it, a re-distribution of the church assets and ministry resources of the Diocese so that these burgeoning areas have gospel ministry available to them.

The growth is tremendous and so, therefore, is the responsibility. By that I mean the responsibility of the Diocese as a whole, of this Synod, in fact. It is not the responsibility of those in the new areas because they are not there.

As such, a monumental task lies ahead. These are not distant mission fields we may or may not choose to support. This is our own backyard. They have been entrusted to us as a Diocese. Or if I may push the analogy further, this is our front yard as hundreds of thousands of people come in the gate. The question is, will they have a door to walk into?

The urgency is that the plan and the initial implementation of securing land needs to happen under the next Archbishop. The future churches we have out there will be determined under the leadership of the Archbishop we elect this week. It is no exaggeration to say that if the churches we need are not put on the development and planning tables of these new areas now, there is no way, *no way*, that we will be able to insert ourselves later. Once the planning has been decided, that is it. And even if we were to try to come in later, if that were even possible, it would be at a minimum of 4 times the cost. If we do not secure our position today, we shall have no presence tomorrow.

What happens in the growth areas will be our legacy, for good or ill. It is not up to one man. It is all our responsibility. But our era and the legacy we leave will be known by the Archbishop of the day. No pressure gentlemen.

The next Archbishop will need to lead and inspire us into quite possibly enormous acts of gospel sacrifice. What kind of Archbishop will each of these gentleman be?

2. Our cultural moment

When I was at university, in our tutorials, you were asked at the beginning to state your name, what school you went to, maybe your favourite hobby. My daughter who is currently at university, in one of her first tutorials, was asked to state her name and the pronoun she designated for herself.

We live in a time where identity rules the market place of ideas, and the moral and political landscape. Identity, in the main, has been hijacked by sexuality and gender, and identity is self-designated by how you feel. You are what you feel you are.

The notion that you are what you feel, and that this has moral authority and objective truth, demonstrates a clear shift in how people think about themselves in relation to society. As such, this way of thinking infiltrates more than just the areas of sexual and gender identity. In just about any sphere now, how I feel is who I am. And it cannot be questioned because there is broad agreement that self-designation is unquestionable.

How did we get from a time where your gender was determined by your biology, confirmed by your name, and normalised by the symbol on the restroom doors, to gender being assigned by individual feelings, and being accepted as authoritative and affirmed by unisex facilities?

Carl Trueman's recent book, *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self*, referred to in yesterday's Presidential Address as well, is a fascinating analysis of the current state of play but even more so, how we arrived here. While one may question Trueman's heavy reliance on the agnostic Jewish sociologist, Philip Rieff, given his heavy reliance on the theories Freud developed from an extremely skewed dysfunctional sample group, I think enough of Trueman's analysis is convincing, especially as he interacts with Charles Taylor and Alistair MacIntyre.

In short, he proposes the current manifestation of the sexual revolution is not because of the sexual revolution itself or because of sex, but a far deeper revolution in how people see themselves. People became consumed with their inner being and its well-being, and sexuality and gender came to lie at the heart of one's authenticity as a person. You are what you feel you are, and to express what you feel you are defines authenticity. Self-attestation indisputably reigns.

And yet despite the supremacy of individual self-designation of identity, Trueman posits society is still important in recognising that identity. Society is the theatre in which someone expresses their true self because try as some may, affirmation of identity does not occur in a vacuum. Affirmation of identity is required to legitimise it because we are in a world where individuals still live in community. Society is the mirror that you hold your identity up to. And you expect to see in that societal mirror what you have decided others must see.

How this schema has taken hold is outlined in Trueman's book, albeit giving slightly more credit to the philosophers and poets than I would. Douglas Murray's work in *The Madness of Crowds*, complements Trueman's as he outlines group think in the areas of gender, race and identity. Murray assists us in not only understanding the content of group think in these areas but also provides a window into the dynamics of group think. People want to be individuals but to be individuals with everybody else. Group think still matters. Group think is still important because group think is about acceptance and affirmation. People want to say it only matters what a person thinks of themselves, but it turns out that it does matter what others think of you as well. And what matters is that what others think of you aligns with how you feel about yourself, and that all people think the same.

And so, public and private engagement is no longer two people differing over ideas or issues but simply two people differing, because people think how they feel and what you feel is who you are. To disagree, therefore, is not merely to say what you think or believe is wrong, it is to say that YOU are wrong. Your chosen existence is wrong. Your expression of self is wrong.

So you can no longer "play the ball, not the person", because the ball is the person. It simply does not wash to say that we love the person but disagree with their lifestyle or what they do, because to love them IS to love their lifestyle or what they do.

To disagree with the identity of another, then, is quite opposite to affirming them. It is to erase them. It has nothing to do with freedom of speech about issues. You are attacking the individual, their entire being.

Therefore disagreement is not simply wrong – it is harmful and, therefore, not safe, for it violates a person's authentic existence. So where disagreement occurs, it is not a safe space.

The response to the perceived attack on self, is often to respond in kind – giving rise to cancel culture. This is facilitated by social media where virtual distance fires the dutch courage of the keyboard warriors and is fuelled by the intoxication of “likes”.

And that arguments and ideas are prosecuted in memes and tweets ensures complexity, depth and nuance, or even just plain explanation are discarded, and meaningful deep engagement leading to mutual understanding is lost.

I have only touched the tip of the iceberg in terms of the cultural context, but this is something we all must grapple with as we seek to share a gospel that says repent, that says change, and that says your ultimate identity is not located within you but in being called a child of God.

Why this is important is that our Archbishop will have platforms and opportunities to do this which are not available to most of us and will have much more broadcast than just about any of us. He will need to lead by example: to engage, and be heard. He will need to be insightful and incisive, deliver depth with precision, be winsome and warm, yet clear and bold, unflinching on truth.

What kind of Archbishop will each of these gentlemen be?

3. National Church moment

All the Election Presidential Addresses dating back to 1982 mention the National Church, and our ongoing relationship with her. Each alert the members of those Synods to the issues of their day. Yet we remain an active participant in the National Church. However, our relationship with her now, in my view, raises more serious questions than it ever has in the past. The key issue of tension - homosexuality and same-sex marriage – is a gospel and salvation issue, because it is about its status as sin, and therefore of the most serious order. That this is an issue is not because we hold it out to be an especially grievous sin, but because some consider it to be no sin at all.

If homosexual activity in any form is accepted, blessed or celebrated, then it is an encouragement to sin, not to repentance. This is a line in the sand moment because unrepentant sin has eternal consequences.

Our position as Anglicans here in Australia, as affirmed by General Synod, has always been that homosexual activity is sin. And so we have never sought to bless it in any way, let alone liturgically, and certainly have not, and currently do not, celebrate it in marriage. The constant moves to splinter away from our long held, and only, position doctrinally and practically threaten relationships within the National Church in a way it never has before.

Do we want people to move away from the doctrine we hold and have always held? No.

Do we want people to move away from the practice that reflects the doctrine we have always held? No.

Do we desire relationship with those who continue to agitate for a divide? Yes we do.

But if people decide to leave what we have always held to, which we are committed to, which have consequences at the very core of what we believe, then it is right to ask how this impacts our relationship with them. For the question becomes: what relationship can we have with those who essentially believe a different gospel?

It may be pointed out to me that this is “what I believe it to be”. That I might not be right. Show some epistemic humility. You could discover you are wrong. Stay united in the meantime.

There have been endless conversations, active listening, study, research, teaching and learning for more than three decades. We are called to live and act according to what we believe, on all sides of the equation. If this is what we believe, integrity demands we act accordingly, until shown otherwise. If the integrities on both sides end up mutually exclusive, then what meaningful unity is there?

The question is whether this difference that divides us is greater than the threads that unite us? If so, what might that look like? Does unity turn into mere association, fellowship into simple, constitutional connection? Or is it more severe? I do not know.

I think for most of us, our desire is the National Church stay as we are doctrinally, liturgically, in practice, united, and non-negotiably on gospel issues such as this. We do not want to see people or Dioceses move away from this, because I do not believe any of us want the situation where we may share a denominational label but unable to share at the Lord's Table.

The Archbishop will need to be one of the leading lights navigating us through these tricky waters whether things change or they don't. Lord help him.

What kind of Archbishop will each of these men be?

4. Personal moments

I have often heard how important it is that the Archbishop deliver well in the media. My view from the episcopal bunker is that while it is not unimportant, what the Archbishop is like when the cameras are off and away from public view is far more important. An Archbishop can be upskilled in media performance, at least to the point of not doing too much damage, and most gaffs are forgotten by the next news cycle anyway.

However, what happens in his office has a much greater and more lasting impact.

There are the hundreds of difficult and delicate conversations, the gut-wrenching hearing of courageous victims and survivors, the heaviness of the most awful decisions, often lose-lose, and unable to be understood to those without full knowledge. There are the confrontations with misconduct and the unrepentant. Sometimes he must be the bearer of the worst of news, or bears the brunt of brutal attack. Sometimes it is just weeping with those who weep and, in a different way equally impactful, rejoicing with those who rejoice.

These moments cannot be diluted by the distance of media or the buffer of screens. They cannot be brushed aside with a tweet or a post. They are immediate, yet lasting.

These moments can be a balm or an abrasion. They can leave scars for years or heal wounds for a lifetime. They can make or break, revive or ruin.

Any lack of genuine care, any hint of stunted emotional insight or superficial assumptions or rehearsed responses will be detected in a second.

Media-savvy public performance can matter, but the personal, the private, the pastoral matters so much more.

What kind of Archbishop will each of these men be?

5. Gospel moment

Fifthly, finally and in conclusion, it goes without saying, though always worth saying, that we live in a time of gospel urgency because any time is a time of gospel urgency. For the Diocese, any overall statistical growth that can be detected should be interpreted at best as stagnation. We continue to trend downwards in newcomer attendees and invitations to church from attenders. Careful attention must be given to ministry amongst first nations people, as well as the ever changing ethnic mix across the Diocese, all of which are under-represented in our churches.

When it all boils down, quite simply, we are in a city where millions of people do not yet know the Lord Jesus as Saviour. They need to hear the message of salvation – that God so loved the world, that he gave his one and only son, that whoever believes in him – his death and resurrection for the forgiveness of sin – shall not perish but have eternal life.

And to put it in perspective, the proclamation of the gospel to them is not dependent on the Archbishop, nor is the growth or decline of our churches.

Whoever we elect cannot sink or save us. He may, however, help or hinder us. As such, he will need to lead from the front and set the example but he is also uniquely placed to urge and arm us from behind – cheering us on in fruitfulness, focussing us in distraction and challenging us in complacency.

In the end, though, God has given him the responsibility of reaching this Diocese with the gospel as much to the Archbishop as he has given it to each one of us. Yes, what we are doing this week is significant, but it is still not as vital as each of us going out to share Jesus with those at the school gate or the person behind the counter at the shops or mowing the lawn next door or sitting across from your desk or next to you on the bus or family.

So as we begin our important task, we do so in the context of the greater task of God's plan and purpose in the gospel. Thus, we must remember that he is sovereign, and he is able, whoever God has in mind, whether he is your choice or not.

Yes, we are electing someone to lead, and carry weighty responsibility. But what we are electing the Archbishop to do out the front of us is not as important as what we do as he stands beside us, and we stand beside him, as fellow foot soldiers seeking to proclaim Christ crucified to a city of souls in desperate need of forgiveness, and all to the glory of God.

The Rt Rev Peter Lin

Bishop of Georges River Region

4 May 2021

List of Nominations for the Office of Archbishop of Sydney

List of Nominations

In accordance with clause 8 of the *Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982* (the **Ordinance**) the following is the list of the persons nominated for the office of Archbishop of the See of Sydney (in alphabetical order), along with any information in the National Register relating to each nominee and the determination of the Director of Professional Standards referred to in clause 7A(3)(a) of the Ordinance:

Nominees	National Register	Determination of the Director of the PSU
The Rt Rev Chris Edwards	None	Fit for Archiepiscopal ministry
The Rt Rev Peter Hayward	None	Fit for Archiepiscopal ministry
The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel	None	Fit for Archiepiscopal ministry
The Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead	None	Fit for Archiepiscopal ministry

Names of Nominators

Names of nominators are listed in alphabetical order.

Nominations made for individuals other than those listed above are kept confidential.

Nominee: The Rt Rev Chris Edwards

Alcordo, Eduard	Hammond OAM, Gregory	Smith, David
Bates, Geoffrey	Happer, Robert	Smith, James
Carpenter, Ian	James, Richard	Smith, Michael
Chapman, Stacey	Jeffrey, Stephen	St Quintin, Timothy
Chappell, John	Kazogolo, George	Stanley, Bruce
Chilton, Frederick	Lee, Michelle	Stedman, Matthew
Chilton OAM, Roger	McLachlan, Andrew	Steel, Sylvia
Clarke, Bruce	Miller, Ian	Steward OAM, Ian
Claxton, Stephen	Millican, Ian	Stretton, Christopher
Dale, James	Mitchell, Martyn	Summers, Pamela
Dalziel, James	Nicholson, Ross	Tong, Peter
England, Michelle	Powell, Margaret	Wallace, William D.
Gray, John	Powell, Thomas	Warwick-Mayo, Nicola
Gruben, Dana	Rees, Andrew	Young, Kristen
Hall, Yvonne	Reid, John	

Nominee: The Rt Rev Peter Hayward

Alcordo, Eduard	Davis, Martyn	Radkovic, Susan
Barrie, David	Douglas, Anthony	Sharp, Robert
Chaplin, Simon	Fitzhardinge, Roger	Swanepoel, Stephen
Chapman, Stacey	Fryar, Tara	Tonks, Danielle
Cottom, Mark	Hooper, Craig	Tonks, Jeremy
Crawshaw, Peter	McNeill, Jodie	Warren, James
Crawshaw, Stuart	Mildenhall, Timothy	
Darvell, Adam	Pursell, Samuel	

Nominee: The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel

Alcordo, Eduard	Humphreys, Ross	Scandrett, Laurence
Barraclough, Antony	Jensen, Michael	Schafer, Craig
Barrie, David	Judd, Stephen	Schmidt, Andrew
Barry, Andrew	Kim, Kevin	Smith, Claire
Braga, Christopher	Loane, Edward	Smith, Michael
Chappell, John	Marriott, Jason	Steel, Sylvia
Cheung, Eric	Maze, Stuart	Steele, Dominic
Clarke, David	McNeill, Jodie	Steggles, Michael
Colgan, Phillip	Melbourne, Thomas	Stretton, Christopher
Coombes, Penelope	Mildenhall, Timothy	Swan, Timothy
Cunningham, Roger	Millican, Ian	Symons, Luther
England, Michelle	Moffatt, Justin	Thompson, Mark
Fitzhardinge, Roger	Morgan, Martin	Thornett, Emma
Flavin, James	Newman, Barry	Tong, Peter
Flinders, Simon	Noakes, Ken	Veron, Zachary
Freeman, Jeremy	Ozols, Edgars	Walter, Nathan
Galea, Raymond	Paget, Michael	Warren, James
Gibson, Stephen	Parsons, Gavin	Watson OAM, Alicia
Gupta, Rajeev	Penzo, Emma	Watson, Graeme
Haggar, Katrina	Perkins, Gavin	Wenden, Richard
Hall, Yvonne	Poulos, Archie	West, Melinda
Hargreaves, Thomas	Pursell, Samuel	Wheeler, Philip
Harricks, James	Roberts, Craig	York, Malcolm
Hodgkinson, Stephen	Robinson AM, Anne	

Nominee: The Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead

Alcordo, Eduard	Jensen, Michael	Schmidt, Andrew
Barrie, David	Johnson, Lynette	Seabrook, Alistair
Calayag, Karen	Katay, Andrew	Smith, Claire
Chapman, Stacey	Lee, Michelle	Sowada, Karin
Cocks, Neralie	Lukabyo, Alan	St Quintin, Timothy
Douglas, Anthony	Lum, Jennifer	Stanley, Bruce
England, Michelle	Marriott, Jason	Steel, Sylvia
Gibson, Stephen	Maze, Stuart	Stretton, Christopher
Gray, John	Mildenhall, Timothy	Thompson, Mark
Hall, Yvonne	Moffatt, Justin	Tong, Peter
Happer, Robert	Nicholson, Ross	Warren, James
Howells, Graeme	Paget, Michael	
Hubbard, Nigel	Powell, Thomas	
Humphreys, Ross	Salmon, Steven	

Proceedings

Synod Service

The Synod service was held in St Andrew's Cathedral prior to the start of the first session of the 52nd Synod on Monday 3 May 2021. The preacher was Canon Simon Manchester.

The Synod assembled in the Darling Harbour Theatre, International Convention Centre at 4.30 pm on Tuesday 4 May 2021 under the Presidency of the Rt Rev Peter Lin.

Presidential Address

The Presidential Address was delivered by the Rt Rev Peter Lin, Bishop of Georges River Region.

Proceedings held in private

The proceedings were held in private from the end of the Presidential Address.

Documents tabled

1. List of clergy summoned to the Synod and list of representatives
2. Minute book of the Standing Committee
3. Document appointing a Commissary
4. Copies of the Summons to Synod, dated 25 January 2021, the Circular to Members of the 52nd Synod, dated 16 March 2021 and the Report on the Finances of the Endowment of the See and Housing for the Archbishop

Officers and committees appointed

The officers and committees for the 52nd Synod that were appointed at the first session of the 52nd Synod on Monday 3 May 2021 were –

1. Secretary of the Synod: Mr Daniel Glynn
2. Chair of Committees: Dr Robert Tong AM
3. Deputy Chair or Deputy Chairs of Committee: Canon Phillip Colgan, Mr Michael Easton and Dr Karin Sowada
4. Committee of Elections and Qualifications: Mr Michael Easton, Mr Ian Miller, Dr Karin Sowada and Mr Tony Willis
5. Committee for the Order of Business: The Rev Anthony Douglas, Bishop Chris Edwards, Mr Daniel Glynn and Dr Robert Tong AM
6. Minute Reading Committee: Mrs Stacey Chapman, Mr Clive Ellis, Miss Jenny Flower, Mrs Jeanette Habib, Mrs Patricia Jackson, Mr Malcolm Purvis and Dr Claire Smith

Petitions

There were no petitions.

Questions

There were no questions.

Compilation of the Select List: 4 May 2021

The nominees appearing on the List of Nominations were the Rt Rev Chris Edwards, the Rt Rev Peter Hayward, the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel and the Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead.

Each nominee was proposed, seconded and discussed in the order in which his name appeared on the List of Nominations. Thereafter, voting on each of the nominees was undertaken simultaneously by secret ballot in each order of the members of the Synod, the lay members voting first.

Before the results of the ballots were determined, the Synod adjourned for the day.

Select List: 5 May 2021

The Synod reconvened in the Darling Harbour Theatre, International Convention Centre at 6.30 pm on Wednesday 5 May 2021.

The Rt Rev Chris Edwards - Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 4 May 2021 that the name of the Rt Rev Chris Edwards be placed on the Select List was not carried in either the house of laity or the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	195	283	0	18	496
House of Clergy	76	188	0	11	275

The Rt Rev Peter Hayward - Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 4 May 2021 that the name of the Rt Rev Peter Hayward be placed on the Select List was not carried in either the house of laity or the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	72	402	1	21	496
House of Clergy	30	228	0	17	275

The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel - Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 4 May 2021 that the name of the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel be placed on the Select List was carried in both the house of laity and the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	417	71	1	7	496
House of Clergy	248	23	0	4	275

The Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead - Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 4 May 2021 that the name of the Rt Rev Michael Stead be placed on the Select List was carried in the house of laity but not in the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	287	198	0	11	496
House of Clergy	130	134	0	11	275

Names placed on the Select List

The President announced under clause 15(6) of the *Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982* that the names of the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel and the Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead have been placed on the Select List.

Compilation of the Final List

The nominees appearing on the Select List were the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel and the Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead.

Each nominee was proposed, seconded and discussed in the order in which his name appeared on the Select List.

Thereafter, voting on each of the nominees was undertaken simultaneously by secret ballot in each order of the members of the Synod, the lay members voting first.

Before the results of the ballots were determined, the Synod adjourned for the day.

Final List: 6 May 2021

The Synod reconvened in the Darling Harbour Theatre, International Convention Centre at 6.30 pm on Thursday 6 May 2021.

The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel – Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 5 May 2021 ‘that the name of the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel be placed on the Final List’ was carried, having received a majority in both the house of laity and the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	366	123	0	5	494
House of Clergy	231	49	0	2	282

The Rt Rev Dr Michael Stead - Result of Ballot

The motion put to the vote on 5 May 2021 ‘that the name of the Rt Rev Michael Stead be placed on the Final List’ was not carried, having failed to receive a majority in the house of laity and the house of clergy, the results of the ballot being –

	Votes in favour of the motion	Votes against the motion	Informal Votes	Abstentions (blank ballots)	Total
House of Laity	186	306	0	2	494
House of Clergy	77	202	0	3	282

Name Placed on the Final List – The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel

The President announced under clause 16(5) of the *Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982* that the name of the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel had been placed on the Final List.

Invitation to become Archbishop of Sydney

The President moved that the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel be invited to become Archbishop of Sydney.

A vote on the motion was taken by show of hands in each order with the house of laity voting first.

The majority of the house of laity, present and voting, voted in favour of the motion, with 362 votes for and nil votes against.

The majority of the house of clergy, present and voting, voted in favour of the motion, with 205 votes for and nil against.

There having been a unanimity of members voting in favour of the motion, the President declared the Very Rev Kanishka Raffel to have been duly elected to the Office of Archbishop of Sydney.

Members of the Synod stood and applauded.

The Very Rev Kanishka Raffel and Mrs Cailey Raffel entered the Synod meeting hall. Dean Raffel addressed the Synod commencing with a reading from 1 Corinthians 3 and led the Synod in prayer.

Adjournment

The Synod adjourned without appointing another day of sitting.

Report on the Finances of the Endowment of the See and Housing for the Archbishop

1. This report provides details of the finances of the Endowment of the See (EOS) and the housing to be provided as a residence for the Archbishop, as required by the *Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982*.

Structure of the EOS

2. The structure of the EOS has recently changed. Prior to 1 April 2021 the EOS structure consisted of a corporate trustee and two funds. These were –
 - (a) The Endowment of the See Corporation – this is the Corporate Trustee under the *Endowment of the See Corporation Ordinance 2019*,
 - (b) The Endowment of the See Trust (EOST) – this fund was regulated by the *Endowment of the See Trust Ordinance 2019*, and
 - (c) The Endowment of the See Capital Fund (EOSC) – this fund was regulated by the *Endowment of the See Capital Ordinance 2012*.
3. With effect from 1 April 2021 the EOS was restructured and streamlined under the *Endowment of the See Amendment Ordinance 2021*. As a result of that ordinance the assets of the EOST were added to the assets of the EOSC to form a single amalgamated trust known as the Endowment of the See Property Fund (EOSPF). The EOSPF holds in one fund all the assets previously split between the EOST & EOSC. Similarly, income and expenditure previously split between the two funds is now received and spent from the one successor fund.
4. The governing ordinance of the EOSPF from 1 April 2021 is the *Endowment of the See Property Ordinance 2021*. Broadly speaking, this ordinance combines the functions of the EOST & EOSC ordinances into a successor fund ordinance.
5. The Endowment of the See Corporation retains its function as the corporate trustee of the EOSPF.

Finances of the Endowment of the See

6. Prior to the amalgamation of the two EOS funds on 1 April 2021, the income and expenditure of each fund was as follows.
7. The EOST income was derived from various sources including –
 - Distributions from the St Andrew’s House Trust
 - Distributions from the EOS Long Term Investment Fund, (of which the Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney (ACPT) is the trustee)
 - Income distributions from two other ACPT funds
 - Synod grants
 - sub-lease income.
8. The EOST was the fund from which most of the operating expenditure was paid, including the stipends of the Archbishop and assistant Bishops, the salaries of the Registry and support staff, office rent, costs of services provided by Sydney Diocesan Services and costs of the Diocesan Archives.
9. The EOSC held a 50% share in the St Andrew’s House Trust as its main asset together with property holdings at Forest Lodge on which a residence and ministry centre for the Archbishop is being constructed and properties at Pymble and Oatlands.
10. A summary of the Balance Sheets and Statements of Comprehensive Income (P&L) for the years ended 31 December 2018, 2019 and 2020 are attached.
11. The investment assets held by the EOSC were restructured during 2018 and 2019. As a result of the restructure –

- The cash holdings of the EOSC were transferred to the EOST
 - The investment in the ACPT Long Term Pooled Investment Trust was transferred to an ACPT fund 'The Endowment of the See Long Term Investment Fund' (Client Fund 367)
 - Income distributions from the St Andrew's House Trust were changed to be paid to the EOST rather than the EOSC
 - EOSC ceased to make income distributions to the EOST, and
 - The ACPT client fund 367 commenced to make quarterly income distributions to the EOST.
12. The results of these changes were to –
- Strip income and cash from the EOSC and direct it to the EOST, and
 - Enhance the liquidity and income of the EOST.
13. The value of the investment in the ACPT Long Term Pooled Investment Trust transferred to the ACPT Client Fund 367 in 2019 was \$20 million. As at 31 December 2020 the market value of these units was \$23.9 million and income distributions of \$724,000 had been paid from client fund 367 to the EOST in 2020. After the restructure, the value of the assets held in Client Fund 367 did not show as an asset in either the EOSC or the EOST as the EOS funds did not generally have the right to redeem the capital value of the units, it only received the income distributions from the fund. Similarly, the market value of the assets held in client fund 367 will not be recorded as an asset of the EOSPF.

Capital Commitments to build new Archbishop's residence

14. At 31 December 2020 the EOSC had a capital expenditure commitment of \$6.7 million to build the new residence and ministry centre for the Archbishop at 22 Catherine Street Forest Lodge. The costs of the building were being paid from cash of \$8.5 million held in the EOST fund. Most of this cash was originally sourced from the sale of the Bishops court residence at Darling Point. Given the cost of the new residence, the available cash will be substantially depleted during 2021. The EOSC is considering whether to instruct the ACPT to redeem approximately \$3 million from ACPT client fund 367 to replenish cash holdings of the EOSPF. The relevant ordinance allows this as the only circumstance in which the capital of Client fund 367 can be redeemed.

Housing for the incoming Archbishop

15. The Registrar has provided the following report about the provision of housing for the incoming Archbishop –

"The Endowment of the See Corporation (EOSC) has the responsibility to provide the stipend, allowances and residence for the Archbishop. For over 100 years the property at Darling Point known as Bishops court was the residence for successive Archbishops. Following the sale of Bishops court the EOSC (or Endowment of the See Committee as it was then) rented a house at Haberfield as a home for Archbishop Davies and his family. Prior to his retirement, Archbishop Davies moved to a home he had purchased to be a retirement residence and the EOSC provided a housing allowance.

In December 2020 the EOSC executed a contract for the construction of a substantial home (with other facilities) at 22 Catherine Street, Glebe. Plans and other information about the new residence are available. The construction of this property will not be completed until the second quarter of 2022 so alternative short term arrangements will need to be made for the incoming Archbishop. It is expected the EOSC will source and rent a suitable residence for the new Archbishop and his family and this will be available from the date the new Archbishop commences in the role until the new residence is available for occupancy. Depending on the current living arrangements of the incoming Archbishop, the EOSC will seek to minimize the disruption to the new Archbishop and his family."

Balance Sheet Summary - year ended 31 December			
Endowment of the See Trust (formerly Endowment of the See Expenditure Fund, to 31 May 2019).			
	2018	2019	2020
	\$	\$	\$
Current Assets			
Cash and cash equivalents	103,372	122,008	138,730
Receivables	195,891	314,388	838,523
Short-term investments	4,346,402	9,158,568	8,585,278
Total	4,645,665	9,594,964	9,562,531
Non Current Assets			
Other financial assets at fair value	435,060	-	-
Plant & equipment	201,693	200,540	214,721
Right of use assets	-	879,927	537,569
Total	636,753	1,080,467	752,290
Total assets	5,282,418	10,675,431	10,314,821
Current Liabilities			
Payables	414,189	329,231	273,447
Provisions	300,102	319,992	349,287
Lease liabilities		338,631	351,572
Total	714,291	987,854	974,306
Non-current liabilities			
Provisions	-	-	-
Lease liabilities		566,160	214,588
Total	-	566,160	214,588
Total Liabilities	714,291	1,554,014	1,188,894
Net Assets	4,568,127	9,121,417	9,125,927
Equity			
Capital	3,801,336	8,144,621	8,144,621
Accumulated surplus/(deficit)	766,791	976,796	981,306
Total equity	4,568,127	9,121,417	9,125,927

Statement of Comprehensive Income (P&L)			
Endowment of the See Trust (formerly Endowment of the See Expenditure Fund, to 31 May 2019).			
	2018	2019	2020
	\$	\$	\$
Revenue			
Distributions	3,619,750	3,457,213	3,485,297
Grants & donations	40,315	10,000	-
Other income	431,529	490,315	311,592
Total	4,091,594	3,957,528	3,796,889
Expenses			
Staff & related costs	2,103,033	2,187,591	2,493,052
SDS Cost recovery fees	334,447	344,484	423,072
Rent & occupancy costs	471,932	466,880	531,137
Other expenses	365,653	748,568	345,118
Total	3,275,065	3,747,523	3,792,379
Surplus/Loss for the year	816,529	210,005	4,510

Balance Sheet Summary - year ended 31 December			
Endowment of the See Capital Fund			
	2018	2019	2020
	\$	\$	\$
Current Assets			
Cash and cash equivalents	5,243,955	196,252	179,975
Receivables	215,755	10,948	123,285
Total	5,459,710	207,200	303,260
Non-current assets			
Investment I Long Term Pooled Investment Fund	20,366,077	-	-
Land & buildings	10,774,802	10,574,802	11,431,278
Investment in St Andrew's House	88,556,640	110,783,179	110,381,325
Total	119,697,519	121,357,981	121,812,603
Total assets	125,157,229	121,565,181	122,115,863
Current Liabilities			
Payables	118,454	17,340	585,681
Provisions	458,700	-	-
Total	577,154	17,340	585,681
Total Liabilities	577,154	17,340	585,681
Net Assets	124,580,075	121,547,841	121,530,182
Equity			
Capital	12,176,650	12,176,650	12,176,650
Reserves	4,724,451	5,221,890	4,912,210
Accumulated surplus	107,678,974	104,149,301	104,441,322
Total equity	124,580,075	121,547,841	121,530,182

Statement of Comprehensive Income (P&L)			
Endowment of the See Capital Fund			
	2018	2019	2020
	\$	\$	\$
Revenue			
Interest	92,197	37,567	540
Distributions from Long Term Pooled Investment Fund	690,400	527,369	-
Fair value adjustments to financial asset	(1,027,802)	2,968,576	-
Total revenue	(245,205)	3,533,512	540
Expenses			
Professional fees	243,861	104,991	-
Rent & occupancy	610,480	274,428	-
Depreciation	34,939	34,939	32,820
Audit fees	12,954	17,362	16,345
Other expenses		7,271	-
Total expenses	902,234	438,991	49,165
Share of net profit of investment in St Andrew's House trust	9,458,605	24,942,039	2,381,146
Surplus for the year	8,311,166	28,036,560	2,332,521
Other comprehensive income			
Gain/(loss) from revaluation of land & buildings	34,939	(165,061)	432,820
Total	34,939	(165,061)	432,820
Total Comprehensive Income	8,346,105	27,871,499	2,765,341