

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

The Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington was called to meet in emergent session at St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma, on Sunday, December 15 at 2pm to receive the report of the special committee on the complaint in regard to an action of the Presbytery at its regular meeting on September 10, 2019; and to address time sensitive issues not addressed at its regular meeting of November 12th, 2019.

Constitution of the Court: Mr. Gibson McIlwrath, Moderator, constituted the Presbytery with Prayer. The moderator welcomed all guests in attendance asking for them to be introduced to the court.

Attendance and Regrets

Attendance:

Ministers: Rev. Brooke Ashfield, Rev. Linda Ashfield, Rev. John Borthwick, Rev. Peter Bush, Rev. Ed Charlton, Rev. Hugh Donnelly, Rev. Scott McAndless, Rev. Kathy Morden, Rev. Kristine O'Brien, Rev. Nick Pavel, Rev. Mark Richardson, Rev. Greg Smith, Rev. Glen Soderholm, Rev. Jane Swatridge, Rev. Karla Wubbenhorst

Rep Elders: George Forsyth, Andrew Foster, Pauline Hall, Alan Israel, Walter MacNeil, Janet MacDowell (41km), David Mallet, Gib McIlwrath, Alex McNabb, Vern Platt, Sue Senior (36km)

Appendix: Rev. Linda Bell, Rev. Darrell Clarke

Alt Rep Elders: Peter DeVries

Guests: Marion Hunter – Clerk of Session, Rockwood PC

Regrets:

Ministers: Rev. Aubrey Botha, Rev. Johan Olivier, Rev. Scott Sinclair, Rev. Frank Szatmari, Rev. Mark Gaskin, Rev Alex MacLeod, Rev. Bill Bynum, Rev. Herb Gale, Rev. Susan Clarke, Rev. Michelle Yoon

Representative Elders: Les Ferrier, Lenora Arbuckle, Peggy Lennox, Bonnie Street, Gil Langerak, Ross Rowat, Frank Kivell, Joanne Baxter, Marion Hunter

Alternate Representative Elders: Erik Kabbes

Appendix: Rev. Wendy Paterson, Rev. Calvin Brown, Rev. Kees Vandermeij, Rev. George Robertson

Reason for Emergent Meeting and Adoption of Proposed Agenda

The emergent meeting was called as per the request of the business committee in response to a complaint placed before the court by certain members of the Presbytery on November 28, 2019 concerning inaction with regard to the previous complaint submitted September 19, within the 60 days stipulated by BoF section 385. In response to a request from the convenor of the Mission and Outreach Committee and the Treasurer, to deal with time sensitive financial matters, not addressed at its regular meeting of November 12th, 2019 due to adjournment (as per the Standing orders of the Presbytery); these items were also added to the agenda. In response to a request to the Sessions of the pastoral charge of Rockwood -Eden Mills, to disjoin the the two congregations, this item of business was also added.

Agenda

Moved by Mark Richardson/Scott McAndless that the agenda be adopted as amended. Carried.

Report of the Committee to Deal with the Complaints to the Presbytery (Appendix "A")

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the actions of the Moderator to establish of the Committee to Deal with the Complaints to the Presbytery be homologated. Carried

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the report of the Committee to Deal with the Complaints to the Presbytery be received for consideration. Carried

Recommendation 1:

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the first complaint be not received for the reason that it is not in a proper form.

Discussion followed. Peter Bush spoke against the motion noting that the committee's reasoning is flawed. Brooke Ashfield spoke in favour of the motion as did Scott McAndless. The recommendation was approved.

Dissent was recorded for Peter Bush, Karla Wubbenhorst, George Forsyth, Ed Charlton.

Reasons for Dissent received:

K. Wubbenhorst:

I asked that my dissent be recorded to the decision of the Presbytery to adopt recommendation #1 of the Special Committee re: the complaints, namely "That the first complaint be not received for the reason that it is not in a proper form (Reasons above)." My reasons for dissent are that in deciding not to receive the complaint (essentially finding it not to be in order) the Presbytery entered upon a consideration of the substance of the complaint, refuting the merits of its argument in the Special Committee's "reasons above," and refusing the relief the complaint requested. This it did without ever admitting that the judicial process in the Presbytery with regard to the complaint had advanced past the point of a "proper form" determination and into a question of reconsideration (ie. the refusal to reconsider). The only duty of the Presbytery at the "proper form" determination stage was to review the formal aspects of the complaint according to the criteria stipulated in Book of Forms sections 382 and Appendix A-58, 383a and 384. The complaint clearly met all these criteria.

This error in procedure has significant consequences for the complainants and for the docket of the higher court with which we now must become involved, for had the Presbytery owned up to having actually refused reconsideration and relief under the guise of the "proper form" adjudication, the complaints could now appeal on the substantial matter of their complaint. As it is, they shall have, first, to appeal on the narrower procedural matter of the complaint having been found not in order (as is their right under Book of Forms section 386.1). Then a commission will have to be struck at the higher court to adjudicate this appeal, and if upheld, the Presbytery will then be directed to take the complaint through to the reconsideration stage (or at least to the point of a motion to reconsider being invited). Failing a reconsideration by the Presbytery of its action, the complainants will again have to engage the higher court by means of appeal. The elapse of time, and the inefficiency of having to appeal to the higher court twice, when once would have done, is precisely the reason for which corrective cases were instituted -- to clear the docket of the higher courts of matters that could better be dealt with internally in the lower courts.

I am not sketching out an abstract scenario when I speak of the likely interplay between the lower and higher courts in this instance, as a case analogous to ours has just been adjudicated by a commission of the Synod of Southwestern Ontario. When this was referenced in debate the Moderator told the court that the cases were not analogous because the Niagara complaint was more complex than ours. While it is true that the initial complaint contains our grievance (that the Presbytery acted ultra vires) plus some that are additional, the appeal that the complainants subsequently brought to their Synod is exactly analogous to ours, because both Niagara and Waterloo Wellington Presbyteries have tried to deny the relief requested, by ruling the complaints

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

out of order on formal grounds, forcing the complainants to appeal under the terms of 386.1. The fact that the court did not back away from the decision it badly wanted to take to neutralize the complaint, not even when this very relevant, very recent case law was shared with the court (by Peter Bush), and not even when Mr. Bush amply demonstrated the complete inapplicability of Book of Forms section 220.1 to what Waterloo Wellington Presbytery had done in sustaining Dave Whitecross' Call, thus disabling the main hinge upon which the "reasons" of the Special Committee turned, convinced me that I might as well not even speak against the motion, since there was no ear to hear in my Presbytery -- not to reason, not to truth, certainly not to God speaking in the Scriptures or to those who, though outliers among the majority culture in Watwell, may, too, have the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 7.40).

The only thing I might have added to the debate on the 15th was the plea I had already made to deaf ears, both at the November meeting and to the Special Committee in our private meeting with them -- not to rule this out of order, but to let it proceed to the reconsideration phase -- at which Presbytery could then rightly refuse to reconsider. When a Presbyter is made to feel as if the canons of reason (as well as the canons of Scripture, as well as the Queensbury rules and the Book of Forms) cannot be appealed to, and that anything she may have to say will be to no avail, then the respect which the corrective case presupposes (people of the same collegial body able to work out their own differences internally) is truly bankrupt, and it is time to call in higher adjudication/mediation.

Karla Wubbenhorst

REASONS FOR DISSENT – Peter Bush

I dissent from the actions of the Presbytery in not hearing the Corrective Case.

The Presbytery has failed to distinguish between

- a. “out of order” (to say the Corrective Case complaint is “not in proper form” is to say it is out of order), and
- b. “not sustained” which arises after the case has been heard by the presbytery find the complaint not compelling.

To hear a Corrective Case does not mean that the Presbytery must change what it did. Hearing a corrective case invites a conversation between persons holding different views and seeking to find middle ground.

When shown that Book of Forms 220.1 did not apply to this Corrective Case, the report authors moved from talking about the process behind the Corrective Case to talking about content of the Corrective Case. In so doing, their actions indicated that they could no longer sustain the argument that the Corrective Case was “not in proper form” (“out of order”).

Therefore, the Presbytery should have heard the corrective case. In failing to do so, the Presbytery erred.

The Presbytery has also misunderstood the vision behind the creation of the category “corrective case” – the Clerks and then the Church through the Barrier Act believed that a less formal, but managed, process to resolve disputes was a wise addition to the polity of the church. A place for relatively rapid action that was light

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

and flexible was created (it was a creative approach to the increasing contentious matters before the Church) – a process unlike the heavy and structured approach of an appeal. Corrective Cases were a way to resolve things that could be resolved by talking – and the principles of Matt 18 were used to create this category. The Corrective Case approach will not solve everything – but for matters like the one before then Presbytery it should have been tried. The Book of Forms invited that the approach be tried. The Presbytery erred when it failed to try.

Peter Bush

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Fergus

Recommendation 2:

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the Presbytery apologize to the complainants for failing to deal with their complaint more promptly. Carried

Recommendation 3:

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the Business Committee consider ways of dealing more effectively with complaints so as not to create this kind of problem in the future. Carried.

Recommendation 4:

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the Presbytery, through the business committee, create an opportunity for someone to teach presbyters about the appropriate and timely use of appeals, dissents and corrective cases. Carried

Moved by Scott McAndless/Brooke Ashfield that the report as a whole be adopted. Carried

Business related to the pastoral charge of Eden Mills-Rockwood (a report of the Congregational Health Committee)

The Presbytery received the following motions from the congregations of Eden Mills Presbyterian Church and Rockwood Presbyterian Church:

December 9, 2019

A congregational meeting was held at Eden Mills Presbyterian Church on Sunday, December 8, 2019. It was moderated by Rev. Dr. Linda Bell.

This is the minute of the motion presented: It was moved by Donna Henry/ Donald Blacklock, “That the congregation of Eden Mills express to the presbytery its will to be severed from the other point in the pastoral charge of Eden Mills and Rockwood”. Carried. Passed unanimously.

December 9, 2019

The following is an excerpt from minutes of a congressional meeting held Dec 8, 2019 at Rockwood Presbyterian Church regarding a motion of severance of Rockwood and Eden Mills churches.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

Moved by John Bouwmeester and seconded by Iain Rome that the congregation of Rockwood express to Presbytery its will to be severed from the other point in the pastoral charge of Eden Mills and Rockwood. Carried. Vote was unanimous.

Recommendations:

Moved by Scott McAndless/Ed Charlton that the Presbytery homologate the actions of the Congregational Affairs committee in the appointment of Rev. Linda Bell as interim moderator, Eden Mills. Carried

Moved by Scott McAndless/Nick Pavel that the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington approve the severing of the pastoral charge of Eden Mills-Rockwood and establish the separate pastoral charges of Eden Mills Presbyterian Church and Rockwood Presbyterian Church; and direct the Clerk to notify the Sessions of the decision of presbytery to the two congregations, Assembly office and update all information and documents related to this action. Carried

Moved by Brooke Ashfield and duly seconded that the congregation of Rockwood be permitted to invite a candidate to preach for a call, Dec 22, 2019. Carried

Moved by Scott McAndless/Ed Charlton that the report as a whole be adopted. Carried

Treasurer's Report (Appendix B)

Moved by Glen Soderholm/George Forsyth that the report of the treasurer be received and considered. Carried.

The treasurer reviewed the 2020 budget with the Presbytery.

Moved by Scott McAndless/Vern Platt that the 2020 budget be approved as presented.

Discussion followed:

Moved by Peter Bush/Greg Smith that a line item entitled carbon offset, at 5c per kilometre, be added. Carried.

Moved by Peter Bush that the formula for Presbytery assessment in 2020 in Waterloo-Wellington be set as an average of the historic formula at 1.952039% of the Base.

The moderator stated that a notice of motion was required because of the standing orders of the Presbytery.

Rev. Bush gave notice of motion, then asked for a motion to adjourn to end this sederunt of Presbytery and reassemble for a future sederunt so that the motion itself might be considered. Motion to adjourn was not seconded.

Moved by Brooke Ashfield/Sue Senior that congregations within the Presbytery be encouraged to donate their carbon offset for the mileage incurred by their ministers, to the Food Grains Bank and the clerk to communicate this to the sessions of the Presbytery. Carried.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

Moved and duly seconded that the report of the Treasurer as a whole be adopted. Carried.

Report of the Mission and Outreach Committee (“Appendix C”)

Moved by Greg Smith/Brooke Ashfield that the report of the Mission and Outreach committee be received and considered. Carried

Moved by Greg Smith/Brooke Ashfield that the Presbytery provide a grant of \$18,000 to the Two Rivers mission for the budget year 2020, with the directive that the Two Rivers Leadership Team ensure that Rev. Soderholm is, at the least, being paid the minimum stipend appropriate to his years of ministry, as set out by the Presbyterian Church in Canada . Carried

Moved by Greg Smith/Brooke Ashfield that the report as a whole be adopted. Carried.

7. Next Meeting(s)

Business Committee (at Kitchener East Presbyterian – 10am) Jan 7, 2020 10am

Future Presbytery Meetings: Jan. 14 2020, 7PM – Westminster-St. Paul's, Guelph

Adjournment

Moved by Janet MacDowell that the Presbytery adjourn. Carried

The moderator closed with prayer.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church, Alma

Appendix A - Committee to Deal with Complaints to Presbytery

Committee to Deal with Complaints to Presbytery Report for December 15, 2019

This committee consists of three former moderators of Presbytery: Susan Clarke, Brooke Ashfield and Scott McAndless (convener). The committee met on Monday, December 9, 2019 within St. Andrew’s Hespeler Presbyterian Church and heard the complainants. Three were able to present themselves: Janet De Groot, George Forsyth, Karla Wübbenhorst.

History

Upon the reception of the second complaint, this committee was formed by the moderator (homologation of action pending!) in order to meet with the complainants and prepare a report to guide the Presbytery.

Terms of reference

This committee was struck to deal with a **corrective case** (not a dissent or an appeal) and so the committee is absolutely limited in its powers to the process laid out in the Book of Forms 381-392. This process may only be used to address alleged irregularities or errors committed by a court. This process cannot be used to review the actual decision of a court, that is what an appeal is for (See Book of Forms 93, 318.4, 392, 395), but only the procedural steps undertaken (or mistaken or untaken) by a court. Therefore, we are limiting our comments and recommendations accordingly.

The committee was put in place specifically in order to deal with the second complaint. But, since considering the second complaint necessarily leads us to consideration of the first complaint, we have not left it out of our discussion.

The complaints must speak for themselves, of course. But we would summarize them, for simplicity’s sake, as follows.

Complaint #1: Presbytery acted in a fashion that was *ultra vires* (acting beyond its legal power and authority) by processing a call to a certain minister.

Complaint #2: Presbytery did not respond to complaint #1 in a timely manner.

Complaint #1

Was the Presbytery acting *ultra vires* in processing a call to the Rev. David Whitecross, an ordained member of the Presbytery in good standing, to a congregation in another Presbytery of this denomination. On a basic procedural level, the answer seems clear. The Presbytery does have the power to process calls and it is the only court of the Presbyterian Church that has the authority to do so. The Book of Forms is clear that the Presbytery may decline to sustain a call but it also lays out what grounds may be considered and they are limited to “the numbers dissenting from a call” or “because the stipend promised is less than the minimum required.” (220.1) The Presbytery’s interest, in other words, should be in the support for the call in the congregation and the support of the minister in the new charge.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

The complainants, do not cite any of the above in saying that the court acted *ultra vires*. Their contention is that the court operated outside of its power and authority by knowingly processing a call to a minister in a same sex marriage (because the Rev. David Whitecross has engaged in a marriage that is not presently approved by the Presbyterian Church in Canada). At this time, the church does not sanction such marriages. One could certainly argue, therefore, that Rev. Whitecross is presently living contrary to the Standards and Subscriptions of The Presbyterian Church in Canada. But the argument that the presbytery should not have sustained the call for this reason is incorrect. The Presbytery can only refuse to sustain a call, if it fails to meet one of the two aforementioned reasons. If David Whitecross is not living according to the standards of the church, it is a matter for a disciplinary action.

The Book of Forms does provide a process for dealing with someone who had committed what is called “An offence.”

347 An offence is anything in the doctrine of practice of anyone subject to discipline that is contrary to the Scriptures or the Standards and Subscriptions of The Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The Book of Forms is clear that the correct manner to deal with such a charge is through disciplinary action (345 ff). Such a procedure is necessary because it gives every opportunity for the accused to defend him or herself against any charges that are made. Given that David Whitecross's marriage was known by several individuals for a considerable amount of time before he ever received a call to serve in the church, the correct approach for anyone who was concerned about his life and example would have been for them to put forward a disciplinary charge. To bring up such a matter in the midst of the processing of a call was unfair to the person being accused.

For these reasons, the committee believes that the first complaint did not come in the proper form and therefore the Presbytery could not have received it. We suggest that the first complaint should have been answered in this form

Complaint #2

The second complaint has to do with the failure of the Presbytery to address the first complaint in a timely manner. On the surface, this complaint is entirely valid. The Book of Forms is clear that, when a complaint is received, the Presbytery must give a response within 60 days of receiving the complaint (385). The court did not do this and on this basis it could certainly be argued that the Presbytery should grant the prayer of the complaint.

The committee would, however, make one note. When the Presbytery adjourned its regular November meeting, there was a motion on the floor of Presbytery very similar to the conclusions that the committee has made above. If that motion had passed or perhaps had even been voted on, it would have answered the requirement of acting in a timely manner.

The committee would, however, make note of what actually transpired at that the meeting. When the Presbytery adjourned its regular November meeting, there was a motion on the floor of Presbytery very similar to the conclusions that the committee has made above. If that motion had passed or been voted on, it would have answered the requirement of acting in a timely manner.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

Despite the best of motivations and intents, it is the committee's opinion that the second complaint is valid. There is little that we can do in order to satisfy the complainants, however. We should acknowledge the error of the Presbytery and apologize.

Recommendation 1: That the first complaint be not received for the reason that it is not in a proper form. (Reasons above)

Recommendation 2: That the Presbytery apologize to the complainants for failing to deal with their complaint more promptly.

Recommendation 3: That the Business Committee consider ways of dealing more effectively with complaints so as not to create this kind of problem in the future.

Recommendation 4: that the Presbytery, through the business committee, create an opportunity for someone to teach presbyters about the appropriate and timely use of appeals, dissents and corrective cases.

Report as a whole.

Additional Documents:

Complaint vs Watwell action of September 10, 2019 – received Sept.19, 2019

To the Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington,

We, the undersigned, hereby lodge a complaint against the Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington for its decision in the following matter: "That the call to the Rev. David Whitecross be sustained as a gospel call and presented to the Rev. David Whitecross," adopted September 10, 2019.

We, the undersigned, seek redress for the reasons that the Presbytery acted ultra vires in this matter, given that until such time as the Presbyterian Church in Canada passes into law the legislation proposed this year under the Barrier Act, or some other legislation remitted through the Barrier Act at a future date, the Presbyterian Church in Canada continues to understand marriage as it is defined in our subordinate standards (as between a man and a woman), which standards our ordained ruling and teaching eldership vow to uphold. Even though it was clearly made known to the Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington before the vote was taken in this matter that the Rev. David Whitecross is married to a man, the Presbytery chose to act in anticipation of the General Assembly of 2020 which may (or may not) legislate that the Presbyterian Church in Canada upholds two parallel doctrines of marriage (as between a man and a woman or as between two persons), and therefore in so doing, the Presbytery acted prematurely, insubordinately and ultra vires.

We the undersigned, request the following relief in this matter: that the Presbytery's action in sustaining the call to the Rev. David Whitecross be declared null and void until such time as it may properly be sustained, which is to say when and if the legislation pending under the remits, or other such permissive legislation, becomes the law of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

We, therefore, ask you to take such steps as will correct this matter and resolve it for the health and welfare of the church and the glory of God.

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

Signatories:

The Rev. Karla Wubbenhorst, Mr. George Forsyth, The Rev. Alex MacLeod, Mr. Les Ferrier, Mrs. Janet deGroot.

Complaint re: inaction on correspondence item 19-148 – Received November 28, 2019

To the Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington,

We, the undersigned, hereby lodge a complaint against the Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington for its delinquency through inaction in the following matter: failure to deal with correspondence item 19-148 (ie. the original complaint submitted by us, September 19, 2019), according to Book of Forms section 385-385.3, and within the 60 day time limit stipulated in 385.

We, the undersigned, seek redress for the reason that Business Committee, though made aware in an email from the Presbytery clerk dated September 22, that a complaint had been received, and that this matter related to sections 385-385.3 of the Book of Forms (quoted in full in the email exchange) did not review the complaint until November 5, or bring it before Presbytery until November 12, a mere 5 days before the sixty-day time period elapsed on November 17.

Whereas Book of Forms 385-385.3 envisions a minimum of 2 Presbytery sederunts to fulfill the procedures outlined (3 if the Presbytery agrees to deal with the matter as a corrective case, as notice of motion must be given for a motion to reconsider), it might have been foreseen that beginning to deal with the complaint only on November 5, and bringing it before Presbytery only on November 12 did not allow enough time for the complaint (or its authors) to be dealt with in the just, sober and respectful way our Book of Forms requires. The meeting of November 12 was adjourned at the hour when a unanimous vote to continue the meeting past 10pm was required according to the Standing Orders of the Presbytery. The Presbytery erred in not, in this instance, continuing past 10pm, or perhaps striking a Presbytery commission so that this matter could be dealt with within the 60 days, seeing that the foreseeable consequence of adjournment with time-sensitive matters left uncared-for, was this delinquency through inaction.

We, the undersigned, request the following relief in this matter: 1. that the Presbytery, through the Business committee, make use of the power-to-issue in matters of general administration granted to that committee at the November 12th Presbytery meeting, to satisfy the steps, with respect to the present complaint, outlined in Book of Forms section 385 and 385.1, that it do so under the procedural guidance of the 5 past General Assembly moderators currently on the constituent roll of Waterloo Wellington Presbytery or on its appendix (Linda Bell, Mark Lewis, Wilma Welsh, Herb Gale, and Peter Bush), and that it do so in advance of a specially called Presbytery meeting to be held not later than December 17, 2019. 2. that the Presbytery, in an emergent meeting, not later than December 17, 2019 be thus prepared to act on Book of Forms section 385.3 (ie. to consider whether, in response to the present complaint, it is willing to take steps to address its inaction in not dealing with our original complaint within the 60 day time frame). 3. If Presbytery is willing to address its inaction with respect to our original complaint, we would ask that it do so by striking a Presbytery commission consisting of the 5 past General Assembly moderators who will execute the Presbytery's responsibilities with

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
 Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
 St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

regard to the original complaint, namely adjudicating whether it is in proper order, meeting with the complainants in order to ascertain whether they are willing to withdraw the complaint, and deciding whether they can and are willing to grant the relief requested.

We request that the Presbytery commission present its judgment to the next regularly scheduled Presbytery meeting on January 14, 2020. 4. If the emergent meeting (not later than December 17) declines under section 385.3 to address the inaction, or if it resolves to address the inaction in some other way than by striking a commission of 5 past General Assembly moderators, the complainants request that the Presbytery devise a way of still resolving the matter of the original complaint finally at the Presbytery level not later than January 14, 2020, a date already 118 days from the date the original complaint was received, and 58 days beyond what the Book of Forms considers a reasonable length of time for Presbyteries to deal with complaints.

We, therefore, ask you to take such steps as will correct this matter and resolve it for the health and welfare of the church and the glory of God.

Signatories:

Rev. Karla Wubbenhorst, Rev. Alex MacLeod, George Forsyth, Janet DeGroot, Les Ferrier

APPENDIX 'B' -TREASURER'S REPORT TO WATERLOO-WELLINGTON PRESBYTERY DEC 15. 2019

[See PDF's provided with the report]

Financial Report to September 30, 2019

The general fund monthly financial report to September 30, 2019 is on the following page. The report is very much in line with what would be anticipated to this point in 2019 and there are no issues of concern. This report also shows the operations of the other funds, especially the development fund.

Also please find a statement of financial position to September 30, 2019 with a comparison to Year-end of 2018. This statement shows the proper balances in each fund. Please note that the Development Fund has a balance of \$1,122,217 of which \$679,280 is loaned out to congregations, leaving only \$442,937 to be used against the remaining commitments as set out by the the Committee of the Whole Meeting held at Gale Elmira in March 2017. Most of these commitments support congregational planning for renewal, missional church planting or next generation ministry efforts.

There are outstanding requests for over \$1,300,000 in loans for financial support for building infrastructure and repair issues. Obviously, there are not enough funds to meet all of the requests. It will be the difficult task of the new presbytery Finance and Property committee to discern the best way forward in this situation. Congregations cannot be guaranteed support until this new committee has completed its deliberations

As reported to the May 2019 presbytery meeting that we encountered a loss from our PCC consolidated fund investment due to a very adverse 2018 last quarter, especially in December. Also noted there had been a very strong positive market rebound in both January and February of 2019 and this was reflected in the Q1-

Darrell Clarke, Clerk – clerkwatwell@gmail.com

Emergent Meeting of the Presbytery of Waterloo-Wellington
Sunday, December 15, 2019 – 2:00PM
St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Alma

2019 report from the PCC consolidated fund with a gain of close to 6.8% in Q1-2019 alone, which translates to over \$46,000. The Q2-2019 reflects a smaller gain than the first quarter of 1%. The 3rd quarter results will not be known until mid-November.

Also following is the proposed budget for 2020 at a rate of \$24.50 per unit

Respectfully submitted,
George L Myers, Treasurer

To reach me: George L Myers, 671 Woolwich Street #709 Guelph ON N1H 3Y9 519-823-2378
glmyers1945@gmail.com

Recommendation #1 Receive the Treasurer's Report

Recommendation #2 Approve the 2020 Budget.

Recommendation #3 Approve the report as a whole.

APPENDIX C - Report of the Mission and Outreach Committee

Presbytery of Waterloo Wellington
Emergent Meeting December 15, 2019

Unfinished business:

Moved by Rev. Greg Smith
Seconded by Rev. Scott Sinclair

Recommendations:

1. To receive and consider.

2. That the Presbytery provide a grant of \$18,000 to the Two Rivers mission for the budget year 2020, with the directive that the Two Rivers Leadership Team ensure that Rev. Soderholm is, at the least, being paid the minimum stipend appropriate to his years of ministry, as set out by the Presbyterian Church in Canada .

3. Report as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,
Rev. Greg Smith, Convener
Mission & Outreach Committee