

Church Society AGM June 14th 2003

The Gay marriage agenda, lessons from Canada

INTRODUCTION

I am very grateful to Church Society for giving me the honour of speaking to you today. I am acutely aware of the text in 1 Corinthians 1:26 – 31 *“Brothers, think of what you were when you were called. Not many of you were wise by human standards; not many influential; not many of noble birth. But God chose the foolish things of the world to shame the wise; God chose the weak things of the world to shame the strong. He chose the lowly things of this world and the despised things and the things that are not – to nullify the things that are, so that no one may boast before him. It is because of him that you are in Christ Jesus, who has become for us wisdom from God – that is our righteousness, holiness and redemption. Therefore, as it is written: “Let him who boasts boast in the Lord”.”*

I stand before you as a sinner saved by grace and I discover to my delight that I stand before you in the presence of a Church Society member who used to be a physics master at my school. Mr John Neal, 31 years ago took the time and trouble to witness about Jesus Christ to boys like me and to help us on our journey to the foot of the cross where in November 1972 in Emmanuel Church, Northwood, I knelt humbly in repentance and faith asking God to forgive me and to fill me with his Holy Spirit.

God in his mercy did something that day, as Paul puts it again later in 1 Corinthians....”but you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.’ A text from 1 Corinthians 6:11 to which I intend to return later in my talk.

So I come originally from Pinner, in North West London. Just over three years ago my wife and I left the UK with our 3 young daughters to begin a new life and ministry in Vancouver in

Canada. We went with high expectations of preaching and teaching and evangelism in the style that I had been trained to use by Emmanuel Church Northwood; The London Bible College, Ridley Hall Cambridge; John Stott and Dick Lucas who had kindly helped to mentor me. ·

I went to be an Assistant Priest in an Anglican Church in the Diocese of New Westminster. · After 10 months of evangelism using the Alpha programme, seeing a good number of people converted, or healed and all changed; reseeded a youth work; preaching bible expositions and starting home groups, a group of 13 so called tolerant, inclusive, liberal parishioners persuaded my Rector to tell me to look for another job. · And a so called open; inclusive; tolerant Bishop Michael Ingham six months later told me to vacate the Rectory where we were living, yet was not prepared to license me to another parish in his Diocese full-time as I was deemed to be 'trouble' as a conservative evangelical in a liberal Diocese.

Therefore, in September 2001 I found myself with no job or home. · Thanks to the support of the evangelical clergy and the members of the newly formed Anglican Communion in New Westminster (ACiNW) I have been given work and have continued to preach and teach and evangelise, but this last 2.5 years has not been easy for my wife or for me. ·

I have no desire to fight political battles; to rise through the ecclesiastical ranks to become a contemporary Archdeacon or Dean or Bishop who have become so often little more than administrators and convenors of meetings. I am a simple Pastor/Teacher and evangelist who longs to see Vancouver and the lower mainland won for Christ and his Lordship established in the hearts and lives of the 2 million people who live there. ·

Perhaps I should tell you that I spent 16 of the 22 years that I have been ordained as a British Military Chaplain. Unlike most of my British and American contemporaries, I have been to War and

know its horrors and tragedies. My last job in the Army in the rank of Lt Col was Senior Chaplain Northern Ireland, where I was privileged to lead a team of 40 clergy from a variety of denominations and churchmanship. I immersed myself in that military sub-culture in order to witness and pastor. During that time I came to understand a thing or two about Warfare. ·

It was once said of the British Army that it was great at planning; training and equipping its soldiers to fight the last battle well. I fear that it is the same for Evangelical Christians in the Anglican Communion. · The battlefields of France bear testimony to the failure of Generals to adopt new tactics in the face of new situations. Generals who ordered the sacrifice of thousands of soldiers long before unworkable principles; models; strategies and plans, were finally acknowledged not to be working. · Today, the British Army works differently as many of you will have seen in the recent war in Iraq, where one of the former units with whom I was privileged to serve, 3 PARA, and tens of my former colleagues and friends fought, I hope you will agree with distinction, honour and when appropriate compassion.

Modern Generals are at the forefront of fresh thinking and preparation. You will have seen this for yourselves. The modern Battlefield is 24/7 and it is now 3 dimensional. No soldier is expected to fight alone on the ground without the assurance of so called 'top cover' from Observer, Transport and Attack Aircraft and Helicopters. They may have to die, but they are not abandoned on the battlefield, to fight alone without back up and support. ·

On June 15th 2002, some 13 clergy (INCLUDING Prof J I Packer) and the Synod delegates from 8 parishes walked out of the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster and formed an interim coalition called **The Anglican Communion in New Westminster (ACiNW)**. They also very kindly agreed to employ me half-time as Administrator and in the light of rapid developments in August

2002 changed this to **Full time as Executive Director of the ACiNW**. Walking out was not an impetuous act. Evangelicals in the Diocese have wrestled with this issue since 1998, (when Synod first voted in favour of blessing same sex unions), trying in every way to dialogue and change the minds of the Revisionist liberals who control the Diocese. We did not leave the Diocese and we have certainly not left the fight for orthodoxy in Canada and the Anglican Communion. Bishop Michael Ingham of the Canadian Diocese of New Westminster, which includes Vancouver and the lower Fraser mainland, in the light of a third skewed Synod vote (& that is a story that needs to be told one day) had agreed to bless same sex unions. By so doing he had moved his Diocese into what the former Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey said was a schismatic position, that the Synod was in danger of undermining the sanctity of marriage and had made themselves (and by implication the rest of the communion) an ecumenical embarrassment. We the clergy and delegates from 8 parishes wished then and still wish to remain in communion with Canterbury and the rest of the Anglican Communion. The key question before us today in Canada and I would suggest for the rest of the entire Anglican Communion is: **can we both be right?** Can Bishop Michael and his Synod continue to be the officially recognized Anglican presence and expression in this part of Canada and in communion with Canterbury even though he has acted unilaterally to allow the blessing of same sex unions and can I as a member of what we have dared to call **“The Anglican Communion in New Westminster”** be recognized by The Most Rev’d Rowan Williams to be in Communion with Canterbury. **Are we legitimate Anglicans?** or as some of the people in the Diocese of New Westminster would prefer to call us, are we ‘dissidents’ who need to accept the new reality in this Diocese and get on with it under the provisions Bp Michael has made?

So after this rather lengthy scene setting and introduction let me get to the heart of what I would like to say to you.

1. THE PROVISIONS FOR THE ACiNW

There are two key components to what Bishop Michael, the House of 41 Bishops after their meeting in Ontario in April and finally the Council of General Synod (COGS), when they met in May have said to us. Perhaps I should tell you that in Canada unlike in England, because it is such a large country and it costs so much to get people together, the General Synod only meets every 3 years. In between the business of the Synod is conducted by this so called **Council of General Synod** or (COGS). This group is in theory representative of the Synod and therefore of the Church at large, but in practice, in my private opinion, is cleverly dominated by the liberals. The liberals are therefore able to control the whole of the General Synod, for this is the group that can pass motions in between and on behalf of General Synod, sets committees to work, sets agendas etc. It is really very clever and under the banner of open, tolerant, inclusive, governance, a systematic policy of liberalisation has gone unchecked for many, many years. Make no mistake, as sadly so often evangelicals have done, in the USA and Canada and probably here in the UK too, the revisionist agenda has been carefully constructed and systematically implemented by placing gay or gay friendly people in key positions. Someone, for example from Church Society could well do with researching the role and influence that William Chapman has played in the Crown appointments office. It is alleged by journalists for example that the last seven Deans to be appointed have all either been gay men or gay sympathizers, placing them in prime positions for preferment as Bishops once the precedent of Canon Jeffrey John has been established. This is outside my brief, but if true, may help some evangelicals in this country finally wake up to what has clearly been a tactic in the Episcopal church of the USA and the Anglican Church of Canada for a very long time.

So **first**, we have been offered a **conscience clause**. We are told as clergy that we will never have to perform a blessing ourselves.

Now this too is a clever device that has been used before to introduce a controversial measure. No priest currently serving in the Diocese is to be forced to conduct the blessing of a same sex union. It sounds very plausible and a number of open, peace loving, evangelical clergy have been snared by it. A conscience clause provision is a **temporary** measure. It is a method used in Canada to change the reality in a three phase operation. **Stage one**, allow us to perform the blessing of same sex unions and you will never have to perform one yourself. **Stage two**, some years later, you wish to move to another parish, or you wish to come into the Diocese for the first time and the Bishop says something like this to you. *“You do realise that this is a Diocese that allows the blessing of same sex unions and you will accept this reality won’t you, without creating a fuss, for this is how we now have operated for X years.”* What can you say if you want a job in his or her Diocese? (for we already have women bishops in Canada) **Stage three**, you wish to move again or to enter the Diocese at this later stage, perhaps even after a new Bishop has come. The conversation runs like this, *“you do realize that this is a Diocese where for a number of years now the blessing of same sex unions has taken place and you will allow this to happen in your parish won’t you, if you wish to be a part of this Diocesan family?”* So you are snared, you either compromise and agree or you cannot function in that Diocese.

No Church Society or CPAS or Martyrs Memorial Trust in Canada I am afraid. No patrons helping to ensure that the parish remains true to its evangelical heritage and that the clergy are able to function in good conscience as the bible makes clear on this issue. Clergy and parishes are left to the power of the changed canons, the rule of time and experience and the implementation strategy of the Bishop.

I have laboured this a little, I hope you get my point, conscience clauses, which sound so gracious and accommodating are actually a means to an end and do not safeguard an integrity for very long.

The ACiNW has written 9 other objections to the conscience clause which you can find on the **ACiNW.org website** if you are interested. Conscience clauses are to be avoided at all costs by evangelicals in any future negotiations, if you care about the next generation of evangelicals ability to function with integrity.

So, if the first thing we have been offered is a conscience clause the **Second**, thing we have been offered is an **Episcopal visitor**, not an alternative Bishop with full jurisdiction over us as we had asked, but an Episcopal visitor. The idea of an Episcopal visitor is an interesting one. I think its origin was in the USA Resolution B022 of the ECUSA General convention 1988. I have come across it in this document, (HOLD UP) the so called **Eames Commission Report**, the official report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's commission on Communion and women in the episcopate.(p29)

I and the members of the ACiNW do not believe it is appropriate to remain in 'fellowship' with a bishop who has allowed the blessing of same sex unions. Our communion is broken, there is a divide between us, **in principle**, that affects our koinonia our fellowship. Not because we are homophobic as so often people like to say of us. (And as I see Bishop Richard Harries, never lost for a quick way to stir up a crowd and get a sound bite into the media, did last weekend) No we are not homophobic. I would suggest it is evangelical Christians who love homosexuals the most, for if we are right about God's attitude to homosexual practice as evidenced in the text to which I referred earlier in connection with my own brokenness and need for redemption, 1 Corinthians 6:10, this is not just a moral issue, but a **salvation** issue. So if we love homosexuals and I do, it is the most loving thing to do to warn them as Paul does that "*do not be deceived, neither the sexually immoral, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor male prostitutes, nor homosexual offenders, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor slanderers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God. And that is what some of you were. But you*

were washed, you were sanctified you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the spirit of our God”. As this very helpful booklet ‘**True Union in the Body**’ (HOLD UP) studied at the recent Primates meeting in Brazil and sent to every Bishop on the planet, makes clear, this is not just a question of proof texting. Homosexual practice is unacceptable throughout the whole of the so called **epochs of biblical theology**. This is a salvation issue and we are doing the most loving thing for homosexuals to warn them of this. I hope if you read nothing else on this issue you will read this helpful booklet, which I know you will be able to get from Grove Books in Cambridge and I hope through Church Society in the future, there are several copies for sale here today at £3.

Bishop Michael like so many revisionist theologians doesn’t seem to understand this critical point about same sex unions being a salvation issue. Many revisionists have long since abandoned the central doctrines of Anglican theology: the Fall and sin and judgement and hell and substitutionary atonement and salvation only by grace, through faith, in Christ. So, Bishop Michael will not accept the fact that he has to give up any of his power or jurisdiction over conservative evangelicals, now that he has crossed the rubicon and allowed in his Diocese that which **scripture** does not allow. This dispute is at one level about the moral question of homosexual practice, but at a much deeper and to my mind more profound level, it is about the **authority of scripture** and how we interpret and live under the word of God today.

So, the proposed Episcopal visitor, the Retired Bishop of Fredericton in New Brunswick, may fly in (from approx 4000 miles away) and sip tea or offer counsel, he may even sit on an advisory committee on appointments or if the Diocesan Bishop allows conduct a service of confirmation, but he has no real power, no jurisdiction delegated to him by Bishop Michael or the HOB or COGS. For this would be to suggest some form of alternative

jurisdiction in Canada, some valid expression of two Bishops in one geographical area.

In Canada, historically missionary Bishops at the very far edge of the British Empire on the West Coast of Canada were given huge powers by those back in the United Kingdom. They have more power than UK Bishops to hire and fire, it seems to me. There is no desire in Bishop Michael Ingham or the Canadian House of Bishops to allow any new system that means they will have to relinquish power and allow another Bishop to break **territorial integrity**. That is to say, another Bishop to look after parishes whom, for profound **theological** reasons, cannot accept the oversight of the local Diocesan Bishop anymore. So, no alternative jurisdiction has been offered to us after a year of appealing for it.

There are however, precedent setting examples of parallel and/or overlapping jurisdiction firstly, on the grounds of **ethnicity**, with first Nations people in Canada being given oversight by another bishop across diocesan boundaries, **or** in New Zealand where five dioceses serving Maori Anglicans overlap seven dioceses serving the descendants of Europeans. Secondly, of course from my own background on the grounds of **functionality**, that is to say bishops who are allowed to cross geographical boundaries to offer oversight to military personnel wherever they are stationed. Thirdly, examples from other parts of the world include the Arabian Gulf bishops from the Church of South India, Pakistan and the Province of Jerusalem who minister to three separate Anglican communities. In the United States, the Church of South India maintains 20 parishes outside the jurisdiction of the Episcopal Church. In South Africa, the episcopal-led Order of Ethiopia maintains congregations independent of diocesan control. So that which Bp Michael and the Canadian House say is impossible, could be achieved if there was the political will to do so, which there isn't.

So far Bishop Michael has refused to acknowledge the seriousness of our claim that this issue is so important to us **theologically** that we can no longer acknowledge his jurisdiction. However, one Bishop in Canada has come to understand the seriousness of our plight and is prepared to do something about it. He is a godly, pastoral Bishop from the tiny Diocese of the Yukon. His name is Terry Buckle. In February of this year Bp Terry said he was willing to come to offer Alternative Episcopal oversight with full jurisdiction to the clergy and parishes of the ACiNW. The great thing from our point of view was that on February 27th, the day a number of International Primate were in Canterbury for the enthronement of the new ABC Rowan Williams, Bp Terry and a number of us from ACiNW met with some of the more conservative Primate. They agreed that Bp Terry was doing an honourable thing in offering AEO with full jurisdiction to the parishes of the ACiNW. This was very good news for us, for at last we sensed we had the so called **‘top cover’** that I referred to analogically from my military past. International Primate who recognized the seriousness of what Bp Michael Ingham was proposing to do unilaterally in introducing the blessing of same sex unions and who were no longer prepared to allow this to happen without some sort of intervention.

Armed with a letter and encouraged by their support Bp Terry returned to Canada and formally offered us **Alternative Episcopal Oversight with full jurisdiction**. 7 of the 8 ACiNW parishes voted on March 23rd by an average of 98% (Extraordinarily high, such is the feeling of support in the parishes) to accept Bp Terry’s offer of AEO with full jurisdiction. By full jurisdiction I mean that he will come to confirm, ordain, license clergy and appoint clergy to Parishes. As you can imagine Bp Michael Ingham is unhappy about this situation and says that the canons of the church **‘compel him’** to fight off this challenge to his legitimate jurisdiction over the geographical area known as The Diocese of New Westminster.

What a pity that he doesn't say the canons compel him to uphold scripture; two thousand years of moral teaching; the Lambeth 1998 resolution 1:10 and the 1997 Canadian HOB resolution on the blessing of same sex unions. No Bp Michael feels he can change all these, but that he must challenge Bp Terry to the full extent of the law. In the Diocese of New Westminster, it would seem, deference is no longer to scripture but to the canons and constitutions and synods of the church. You see once revisionists lose confidence in scripture they have to resort to other **grounds of authority**.

Fearing for loss of power and for trouble in their own Dioceses when Bp Terry crosses a Diocesan boundary and comes to rescue the parishes of the ACiNW soon, the other Canadian Bishops would sadly, also prefer that he be prosecuted to the full extent of the Canadian ecclesiastical law. He will probably be **deposed** by the Canadian system. The House of Bishops, unable to countenance the idea that illegal and inappropriate action by Bp Michael within his Diocese to allow the blessing of same sex unions **is more serious** than breaking territorial integrity, Bp Terry will be ousted from the Anglican Church of Canada.

Ladies and Gentleman I want to suggest to you that this is both crazy and wrong, it reflects the fact, as Andrew Carey notes in the CEN this week, that Bp Michael is able to act with impunity in Canada, because his Archbishop David Crawley and his Primate Michael Peers privately agree with him even though publicly they play a very shrewd game and appear to tow National and International party lines. So Bp Michael will get away with his actions this summer and will **not** be disciplined by the Anglican Church of Canada. All will go quiet apart from say, up to 10 blessings taking place between now and general Synod 2004. Then when Bishops and Archbishops meet with the Synod delegates in Ontario next summer, they will argue that the **new reality** is here, is working and needs to be embraced by the whole Anglican Church of Canada.

The Bible makes clear that when one loses confidence in scripture two things happen, **idolatry and immorality**. The Anglican Church of Canada, though few will thank me for saying so, has allowed the idol of its canons and synods to be venerated and the immorality of same sex unions to be slipped into its corporate life.

If you will allow me a small yet very relevant digression, this distinction between private opinion and public office is rearing its head in the UK too and you will have to make up your own minds about the integrity of it. Personally, I am quite clear and in one of the strangest ironies of my week, agree with bishop designate Jeffrey John who is quoted as once saying of Bishops in the Church of England, “*‘hypocrisy’ and ‘dishonesty’*. *He laments that the Church of England has made a ‘collective decision to collude in a lie Dr John encourages bishops “to stick their necks out” and let the public know what they truly believe. ...He declares “The bishops themselves must realize that no effective process of education will begin in the Church until they see to it that ‘what is whispered in private rooms is shouted from the housetops’.....The gospel does not allow a divergence between public and private moralities, and political expediency is not a Christian virtue – rather the opposite. The unity of the Church should not be bought at the price of hypocrisy.” (CEN June 12th no 80 England on Sunday)* How he lives with himself having written that and now having agreed to draw a distinction between his private beliefs and his public office as a Bishop in Reading is beyond me. It never ceases to amaze me to see the things people will say and do if given the chance to wear purple or keep power.

2. IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA AND THE WIDER COMMUNION

So ladies and gentlemen this is where the battle lines in Canada are drawn. On 28th May, as I am sure most of you are aware, Bishop Michael Ingham, timing his action superbly, for he is a master tactician, (ie after the Primates had left Brazil to fly home, but just

in time to be given a standing ovation at the 2003 Diocesan Synod), issued a rite, that has never been seen or debated, and allowed the first official blessing of a same sex union in the Anglican world. Michael Kalmuk and Kelly Montfort had their so called twenty year union blessed. We are told by the spin doctors in Lambeth that The Archbishop of Canterbury “*regrets the tension and division that this will cause*”, but interestingly enough there is no mention of regretting or not accepting the act itself. While the powerful and ultra liberal Canon Peterson of the influential Anglican Consultative Council regrets the difficulties this will raise for the communion, but again says nothing about the act itself. So, you have it ladies and gentlemen, the gentle introduction of a **new reality** into Anglicanism. Bp Michael is quite clear someone has to act first. Now, all that is left is for the wider Anglican communion slowly but surely to come to terms with it in the fullness of time and learn to live with it, to accommodate it, to facilitate unity at the expense of truth. You will already have heard the cries and the comments. “*We cannot allow this issue to divide the church. We must stay together. We can work this out in time. Let’s wait and see what Lambeth 2008 can do with this issue.*”

The price the Canadian Church is prepared to pay to keep the façade of Unity is to sacrifice one Bishop to ensure that the system stays the same. If Bishop Terry crosses from the Yukon into New Westminster and comes to the rescue of the orthodox Anglicans of the ACiNW he will be deposed and the parishes of the ACiNW will be marginalized and forced to acquiesce to Bishop Michael or to leave the Anglican Church of Canada. Dissidents will not be tolerated and challenges to Territorial Integrity will be crushed. It is a tragic situation in a desperate land where only 4% of the population in Vancouver attend any sort of church on Sundays. Where only 10,000 Anglicans in the Diocese of New Westminster are in church on Sunday and where the total population of Anglicans in Canada is fewer than 800,000. Less than a million,

compared with the 17 million who actually worship in Anglican churches in Nigeria. This is why we are so grateful for the Primate of Nigeria who has severed communion with Bishop Michael Ingham. To date another 15 Primates have either severed or declared a state of impaired communion with Bishop Michael Ingham. Many of them and the orthodox Christians within their Provinces are incensed by the relentless innovations of the revisionist Northern Provinces.

If the first reformation was facilitated by the printing press, this second reformation, through which we are living, is being worked out at break neck speed, facilitated by the internet. The tectonic plates of Anglicanism are shifting. No longer will the African and Asian Provinces stand by while the revisionist agenda is implemented in the western world of North America and Europe. I believe that something has to happen soon to change the present impasse in Canada and indeed in the USA where last weekend a practicing homosexual, Gene Robinson was voted in to become the next Bishop of New Hampshire. If his appointment is endorsed by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the USA at the end of July, then a huge fissure will open up in ECUSA and outside intervention from the International community of Anglicans is the only solution.

Quite what this will look like in North America I do not know. Personally I think it has to be the provision of a new orthodox province for Canada and the USA where, with full integrity and in communion with Canterbury, orthodox Anglicans can be allowed to get on with what we do best: evangelism, training new disciples and then planting new churches. This is what I intend to do and two Sundays ago **'Immanuel Church Westside'** began in our home with some 20 people. One day with Bp Terry's license, the support of my evangelical colleagues in Vancouver, the Lord's help and blessing, I pray that it will grow to become a large vibrant orthodox Anglican Church, recruiting, training and deploying tens

of newly born again Christians for ministry in Canada and around the world.

Allow me to return to my military analogy for a moment. Today, The British Army (& the US Army) work differently from their predecessors and Modern Generals are at the forefront of fresh thinking and preparation. The latest is called **Preemptive Defense** and it was signed off by the US Congress last year and used as the doctrine behind the recent Gulf War. Essentially, as I understand, it revolves around the idea that if you know an enemy has the capability and intent to inflict **Mass Casualties** on you or an ally, then you act decisively first, to destroy that capability and to force that regime to stop its actions. There are uncanny parallels for us in Anglicanism today as we witness the three events of the last two weeks. We know the Revisionists agenda, capability and intent from North America at large and in the Diocese of New Westminster where I live and work in particular. We know the content of the writings of Canon Jeffrey John and his unrepentant stance on sexuality and a revisionist interpretation of Scripture. What more intelligence do we need before we act quickly and decisively? The Primates expressed their opinion in a pastoral letter from Brazil. If you don't draw a distinction between private beliefs and public office, as I don't, then this has been singularly ignored in Canada; the USA and here in the UK since the Primates left Brazil. Do they have any authority? Are we really a communion or a federation of independent Provinces and it would appear autonomous Dioceses?

Ladies and Gentleman. under the banner and shibboleth of **territorial integrity**, in North America (in places like the Dioceses of Pennsylvania, and our own New Westminster) revisionist bishops, who are quite frankly what the New Testament describes as wolves, are ravaging the flock and picking off the under-shepherds one by one. **Territorial integrity** has become an anachronism in today's world and we have got to rethink it.

I have no problem giving my life for the people I have come to love in Vancouver and the lower mainland. A **good shepherd** must be prepared to give his life for the sheep. What I find hard is that no conservative bishops from my homeland have passed comment on the plight of conservative Christians in Vancouver since May 28th. No Bishop has said that in the light of the unilateral decision to allow the blessing of a same sex union, **communion is impaired or broken**. No one in the UK has publicly called upon Archbishop Rowan Williams to distance himself from Bishop Michael Ingham. So, the other clergy of the ACiNW may soon be stripped of their licenses, or deemed to be on leave without permission to officiate as I was in September 2002, soon unable to be in communion with you all, sacrificed on the altar of Canadian Diocesan **territorial integrity**; abandoned to pastor and teach and evangelise alone, while Bishop Michael remains undisciplined and in full communion with **you** in the Church of England. **There is something very wrong with this**. I cannot understand why British Bishops have not acted decisively **and I, a nobody, nevertheless call upon them to do so**. Please could you the member of Church Society help us by contacting them and asking them to sever communion with Bishop Michael Ingham. If this does not happen he will get away with this act and conservative ministry in Vancouver and next year across Canada will be seriously undermined.

3. LESSONS FROM CANADA

Let me close by offering a few practical observations which may be of help as you face up to the challenges that we have lived with in Vancouver since 1998, and that I have wrestled with daily since 2000.

1. Not all evangelical Clergy and laity will see this issue as a **'Salvation Issue'**. They will not be as clear as Prof JIPacker and walk with you. There will be conservative, charismatic and lots of so called **open evangelicals** who will not see this as the decisive issue on which to fight.

They will be unable to make the connection between this presenting, culturally bound and driven issue of **homosexuality** and the underlying assault on **the authority of scripture**. Many of you already know this in the UK and sadly, you will just have to factor it into your strategy.

2. Most Caucasian Conservative Bishops will talk a good story of support on telephones and behind closed doors, but they will not act decisively to help you. We have found, as you will find, that most Bishops prefer the status quo and would rather support present structures than challenge them decisively. Sadly, power is often at the root of this and not theology.
3. **Psychologically**, some clergy will not be able to contemplate what they will see as aggressive action against the authority structures. They just cannot go there and you will lose another cadre of support at this point. We did. The mistake we made was only liaising with the clergy in these parishes in the 6 months leading up to Synod and not the massive numbers of their conservative parishioners. So that it was the clergy who have blocked approximately another **10 parishes** in our Diocese from tracking the crisis with us. This continues to make life very difficult for these clergy, parishioners and for us. Most of the 10 parishes are now hemorrhaging in some way losing revenue or parishioners or both and most will not survive the crisis intact.
4. You will therefore have to accrue more money from somewhere to support you as a society if you intend to engage in this fight for orthodoxy within the Anglican tradition. Researching the extent of the revisionist infiltration of the structures and control of key appointments is one area I would suggest. Another would be to seek to grow the number of parishes for which you

are responsible as patrons and to play a more determined role in ensuring that those parishes stay orthodox.

5. It is unfortunate, but true, that one of the key weapons in our Armoury is the **withholding** of parish quota money from the Diocese. The Eight parishes in Vancouver provide 25% of the Diocesan budget. In New Westminster this May the Diocese of New Westminster has come in \$187,000 below the revised budget it agreed on January 18th 2003. Our resolve has resulted in individuals marking their weekly offertory envelopes, **for parish use only**. We estimate the Diocese has now lost 40% of its revenue. The Diocese is slowly bleeding to death and its Officers are being forced to dip into reserves and make adjustments. Slowly it is dawning on them that this money is gone for ever. It is a great tactic. I do not believe it is sub-apostolic or inappropriate for bible believing Christians in the light of Paul's comments to Timothy. If more parish councils were to follow the lead of Jesmond parish church in this regard, many a Diocese would be forced out of its **maintenance paradigm** and urged to face up to the fact that mission and ministry have got to be done differently in the 21st century.
6. We may have to walk away from our buildings, for the Canons and Constitution are stacked against us. Some parishes will fight the Bishop, others will walk immediately he comes after them. It is very hard, especially for parishioners who have sacrificed to pay for the building; have worshipped there for over 30 years or who have relatives in the Memorial gardens. You will have to face your people with this reality, as the Revd Charles Raven in Kidderminster did and **some will love the building more than the issue or frankly more than Christ**. You will lose some more people at this point.
7. The secular media is not automatically your friend, we will have to see how this talk is reported and spun for

example. We have needed the full-time support of a media expert to craft media advisories and press releases; to shape our media strategy and hone our key messages; to coach us in interview techniques and to field calls and handle reporters and TV crews at our events.

And so I draw to a close.

I can no longer speak authoritatively about the UK for I am out of touch, though I try and follow from afar via the internet. What I can say to you today, from where I live and work and battle in Canada, is this: If you as my friends and as Anglican evangelicals in the UK allow the blessing of Same Sex Unions to be introduced in North America unchallenged and dare I say it, if the appointment of Jeffrey John, is allowed to go ahead without decisive action, Anglican evangelicalism in North America, as we know it now, will be wiped out. If **Unity** is placed before **Truth**, **then we are dead in the water.** The battle is different now. Old strategies and tactics of infiltrating the structures and talking and dialogue carved out at the first NEAC Conference at Keele in 1967, will no longer work. Our new strategies have to be backed up by **decisive action, a pre-emptive defense of the Gospel.** Only in this way will we be able to stop the bullying and the intimidation of Godly clergy by Bishops, who should know better, but are seemingly accountable to no-one; to stop the drift towards liberal revisionism that has grown unchecked, like a cancer, for over 2 generations and the appointment of Gay and Lesbian clergy and bishops in North America and the United Kingdom.

I would like in these final comments to quote from an article in the Canadian National Post, dated Thursday June 5th by Ian Hunter, a professor emeritus in the faculty of law at the University of Western.

"The eight faithful parishes reacted to the goings-on at St. Margaret's (the church where the first same sex blessing took place) this way: "The love of Jesus extends to all people, regardless of sexual orientation," their statement said: "But the

response of this diocese is a radical and unilateral departure from the teaching of Scripture and the mind of the Anglican Church. A diocese does not have the mandate to raise itself above the spiritual unity of the Anglican Communion and the authority of Scripture on which it is based." For Michael Ingham, and most of his colleagues in the House of Bishops, blessing same-sex marriages represents "progress." And, as we all know, "progress" is what we moderns are all about. No, not quite all: G. K. Chesterton, that doughty Christian warrior, once pointed out that progress is neither a goal nor an ideal. "Progress," he said, can tell us nothing about "the superlative," and it is with the superlative that Christianity is concerned. For that, Chesterton said, the Church requires above all " ... a definite creed and a cast iron set of morals." Alas, that is precisely what the Anglican Church of Canada lacks".

I like that, a definite creed and a cast iron set of morals, in other words, no idols and no immorality, instead a firm commitment to sit under the word of God and *"to contend for the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints."* Jude 3.

We are at a very significant moment in the history of the whole Anglican Communion. We as evangelical clergy and lay people in the Diocese of New Westminster are trying to **DO** faithfully, what we have to **DO**. We have not been asked to pay with our lives as Anglicans in Nigeria and the Sudan are asked to do on a daily basis in the face of rampant Islamisation. I hope and pray you too as members of **CHURCH SOCIETY** clergy and lay, will have the faith and courage to **DO** what you have to **DO**, whatever the personal cost in terms of reputation, licenses, buildings, pensions and security. May God grant us grace and the power of his Holy Spirit to do in our generation what the first Reformers did in theirs. The best is yet to be.

Rev'd Paul Carter BA MA MBA

(Paul Carter is Executive Director of the Anglican Communion in
New Westminster – ACiNW)

