

FIFTH SEDERUNT

ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTED

On Tuesday, June 8, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. (EDT), the Assembly met pursuant to adjournment. The Moderator constituted the Assembly with prayer.

ECUMENICAL AND INTERFAITH RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Assembly invited M. Sams, convener of the Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations Committee, to address the Assembly. He brought to the court's attention news of an attack against a Muslim family in London, Ontario. Two recommendations were placed before the Assembly.

Recommendation EIR-ADD 1, A.J.R. Johnston moved, duly seconded, that in light of the recent directed attack against a Muslim family in London, Ontario, leading to the death of four and critical injury of the fifth family member, it is moved that the Moderator of the 2021 General Assembly send a letter of condolence and encouragement to the National Muslim-Christian Liaison Committee: condolence for this attack that is a visible sign of an underlying evil; encouragement for the committee's ongoing dialogue and work. Adopted.

Recommendation EIR-ADD 2, A.J.R. Johnston moved, duly seconded that, acknowledging that we have not spoken up against all acts of racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, gender-based violence, homophobia and transphobia within and outside of our own church, it is moved that sessions and presbyteries actively and deliberately reach out to local communities of faith, cultural groups and advocacy groups to build a community that is life-giving and liberating for all through dialogue and community work. Adopted.

(cont'd on p. XXX)

COMMITTEE ON REMITS (cont'd from p. XXX)

Discussion resumed

Discussion on Recommendation REM-002 resumed.

Recommendation REM-002 adopted

Recommendation REM-002 was adopted as follows:

That Remit B, 2019 regarding definition of marriage be approved and that this become the law of the church.

Remit B, 2019 re Definition of Marriage

The Presbyterian Church in Canada holds two parallel definitions of marriage and recognizes that faithful, Holy Spirit filled, Christ centred, God honouring people can understand marriage as a covenant relationship between a man and a woman or as a covenant relationship between two adult persons. That congregations, sessions, ruling and teaching elders be granted liberty of conscience and action on marriage.

Vote Count

A record of the vote count on Recommendation REM-002 was requested by two commissioners.

Approve 136 Disapprove 76

Dissent

Recommendation REM-002: E.A. Chan and J.A. Soong.

Dissent with Reasons

Recommendation REM-002: R. Basingthwaighte, S.K. Bell, C.D. Cameron, E.M.W. Charlton, D. Chung, A.M. Cornell, K.I. Cowan, I.B. Cunningham, J.D. de Groot, J.F. Douglas, B.J.W. Ferrier, C.L. Hamilton, H.R. Han, B.A. Hunter, J.T. Hurd, D. Jennings, D. Kallender, R.A.J. Kennedy, J. Khang, J.W. Kim, O.E. Kim, D. Krunys, S. Kwon, A. MacMillan, A.I. Marnoch, B. Mattinson, C. Nam, H.C. O'Reilly, M. Ryu, F. Saleh, A.D. Sutherland. (p. XXX)

Recommendation REM-003

J.R. Bannerman moved, duly seconded, that Remit C, 2019 re Ordination of LGBTQI Persons (Married or Single) be approved and that this become the law of the church and that the Book of Forms be amended accordingly.

Immediate Vote

S. Kwon moved, duly seconded, that the Assembly take an immediate vote on Recommendation REM-003. Defeated.

(cont'd on p. XXX)

INTERNATIONAL GUEST

The Moderator welcomed international partner, the Rev. Dr. Takuze Chitsulo. Dr. Chitsulo is the Principal of Zomba Theological College in Malawi.

The Rev. Blair Bertrand, The Presbyterian Church in Canada mission staff in Malawi, introduced Dr. Chitsulo to the Assembly.

Dr. Chitsulo brought greetings to the Assembly on behalf of Zomba Theological College in Malawi and Central African Presbyterian Church noted that was able to earn his doctoral degree because The Presbyterian Church in Canada generously supported him through International Ministries. He said the assistance, “You and I are not strangers, but partners. I come to you as a living connection – someone who has been helped and someone who has had your Moderator (the Rev. Daniel Cho) to our home. We also have partnership with the Women’s Missionary Society. When the Executive Director, Sarah Kim, came to Malawi, we talked of a restored building project – a women’s hostel that we wanted to finish for our female students. They decided to fund it to completion. That partnership has allowed women to get a theological education. Because of our partnership with the PCC we have one of the best theological libraires in Malawi. The PCC provides consistent grants that allow those who work at the college to keep on doing their good work. For this, we are deeply grateful. Since 2017, the Rev. Dr. Blair Bertrand has been doing a great job as a lecturer and as the director of research and education quality assurance. Moderator, I give thanks to God for the partnership between the PCC and Zomba Theological College.”

COMMITTEE ON REMITS (cont'd from p. XXX)

Discussion resumed

Discussion on Recommendation REM-003 resumed.

Immediate Vote

R.A.F. DeSandoli moved, duly seconded, that the Assembly take an immediate vote on Recommendation REM-003. Adopted.

Recommendation REM-003 adopted

Recommendation REM-003 was adopted as follows:

That Remit C, 2019 re 2019 regarding ordination of LGBTQI persons (married or single) be approved and that this become the law of the church.

Remit C, 2019 re Ordination of LGBTQI persons (married or single)

That congregations and presbyteries may call and ordain as ministers and elect and ordain as ruling elders LGBTQI persons (married or single) with the provision that liberty of conscience and action regarding participation in ordinations, inductions and installations be granted to ministers and ruling elders.

Vote Count

A record of the vote count on Recommendation REM-003 was requested by two commissioners.

Approve 130 Disapprove 83

Dissent

Recommendation REM-003: E.A. Chan and J.A. Soong.

Dissent with reasons

Recommendation REM-003: S.K. Bell, C.D. Cameron, D. Chung, A.M. Cornell, K.I. Cowan, J.F. Douglas, B.J.W. Ferrier, C.L. Hamilton, H.R. Han, B.A. Hunter, J.T. Hurd, D. Jennings, J.W. Kim, O.E. Kim, D. Krunys, S. Kwon, W.C. Lee, A. MacMillan, A.I. Marnoch, D. May, C. Nam, H.C. O'Reilly, M. Ryu, F. Saleh, A.D. Sutherland. (p. XXX)

Additional Motion

L.B. Skinner moved, duly seconded, that the church investigate the establishment of a separate theological synod for churches which hold to a biblical definition of marriage and other theological matters deemed deeply important to them.

Amendment

A. Kay moved, duly seconded, that the words “a biblical definition of marriage” be struck from the Additional Motion and inserting the words “the definition of marriage prior to the passing of Remit B”. Adopted.

Additional Motion, as amended, read as follows

That the church investigate the establishment of a separate theological synod for churches which hold to the definition of marriage prior to the passing of Remit B and other theological matters deemed deeply important to them.

Immediate Vote

G. Ross moved, duly seconded, that the Assembly take an immediate vote on the additional motion. Adopted.

Additional Motion, as amended, defeated

The additional motion, as amended, was defeated.

Dissent with Reasons

Additional Motion: S.K. Bell, E.M.W Charlton, B.J.W. Ferrier, D. Krunys, S. Kwon (p. XXX).

(cont'd on p. XXX)

ADJOURNMENT

The Moderator adjourned the Assembly with prayer, to reconvene on Wednesday, June 9, 2021 at 12:00 p.m. (EDT), of which public intimation was given.

FIFTH SEDERUNT – DISSENTS

Commissioners asked that their dissent be recorded as follows:

Recommendation REM-002

R. Basingthwaite: Remit B contradicts Scripture, as it nowhere describes marriage in any other terms than as being the covenantal commitment between one man and one woman. Remit B contradicts the clear teaching of our Confessional Statement (WCF 24:1). Remit B asserts that two very different definitions of marriage can coexist side-by-side. The Moderator ended debate with speakers waiting to be heard, without a 2/3 majority vote.

S.K. Bell: I cannot support this remit for two reasons. First, I do not believe that the scripture supports the recognition of same-sex romantic relationships. Though I would like to fully embrace same-sex marriage, I cannot find satisfactory Biblical justification for doing so. I humbly recognize that some day the Holy Spirit speaking through the Bible may show me otherwise. God is a God of love and grace, but also of justice, holiness and righteousness. We all fall short of the glory of God and no sin is greater or lesser than another. I do not purport to be any better than my LGBTQI brothers and sisters, but I cannot say that something the Bible says is sin is to be embraced and celebrated. Two contrary definitions of marriage cannot both be compatible with scripture. The second reason for my dissent is that I do not believe that the members of the PCC are ready or capable of living out the spirit of this remit and accepting one another as faithful, Holy Spirit filled, Christ centred, God honouring people. I have seen too much judgement and condemnation from both sides of the issue to believe that we can truly honour one another's freedom of conscience. I believe that for many affirming people this remit is just a step to a goal of full inclusion and the exclusion of those with a traditional view of marriage. Our disagreements go much deeper than sexuality and should be recognized as such.

C.D. Cameron: I dissent from the decision of the Assembly concerning Remit B first of all because of the inherent suggestion that mutually exclusive definitions of something can both be true. Additionally, the remit enshrines, as one definition of marriage, something which runs counter to the Scriptures which we all acknowledge as the canon of all doctrine by which Christ rules our faith and life. This definition also runs counter to the subordinate standards which all commissioners accepted as part of their ordination vows. Support for the Remit enshrined experience over

revelation, and perpetuated the condition, already present within the denomination, as attested by the comments of commissioners, in which each does what is right in one's own eyes (Judges 21:25).

E.M.W. Charlton: After listening to the many people give their reasons for and against, and my deep respect for my brothers and sisters in Christ, I hear the pain that this remit will cause by bringing such diverse sides together in a way that is going to perpetuate continued harm to multiple people. I don't think this is a Christ centered way for us to move forward in love. I am worried that this remit will continue to stall the good work that all of our congregations want to do no matter what side we may be on. I also experienced the insincerity that would become our status quo. Another issue that the debate was halted prematurely and out of order not having the prescriptive 2/3's majority needed to go to an immediate vote. The other issue is that we are verging into territory that we have said that we were trying to move away from. This decision creates a system of forcing the will of the majority onto another group of people. This is continuing on colonial reasoning thinking that has caused harm.

D. Chung: I love and believe LGBTQI people should be welcome to worship in our churches, but sadly, I find all are not welcome in the PCC. How can people like myself safely and passionately express our traditional Christian faith in the PCC, rooted in the rich, primary and subordinate standards of the PCC? There is no current way. As an ordained minister, I performed my first wedding years back, with the family, we talked about farm life and Asian beetles. The father of the groom a night before the wedding that I officiated at, hurtfully said to my face, "yeah, and you brought them here!" in response of "Asian beetles" damaging crops. On another occasion, I was pulled over by police for racial profiling. My congregation agreed but nobody took my cause further. While serving TFE in college field placement, an Elder approached me and said, "David, we'll make you into a presbyterian yet". I already belonged to a Korean PCC church for many years and single headedly, this comment erased my identity. There's no place for myself and others sharing my views to worship freely and safely in our current PCC and there should be a letter of repentance, a structure for re-education/resources, a safe place to share our stories and places to affirm and uphold our traditional views freely, and without discipline and harm. This is not the PCC I once loved and appreciated and I have lost many years of hurt and I've been silenced.

A.M. Cornell: This remit is not supported by scripture. Those who suggest otherwise are interpreting scripture through human eyes, rather than striving to do so through the eyes of Christ, with the Holy Spirit as our guide. The parallel understanding of marriage is faulty logic. If two people are truly filled with the Holy Spirit, then how can each hold different definitions of such a sacred institution? This remit is like the reply from Chief Priests and the scribes when Jesus asked them if John's baptism was from heaven or from man. They couldn't give a straight answer, so Jesus walked away. This remit is the church in Laodicea, neither hot nor cold, so the Lord spat it out. This remit will not achieve its goal, which is to keep the denomination together. It was written as a last-minute compromise – a noble attempt to broker some sort of détente between nations. The LMA listening exercise provided overwhelming evidence of the unbridgeable division. There is a growing desire for gracious dismissal or separate theological courts and many have already departed. Those who want a denomination which stands for full inclusion are not happy either; they will continue to campaign until it happens. The only reasonable action is to vote no and then to get on with answering the several dozen overtures which are calling for separate theological courts – which would allow both sides the freedom to believe and live according to their conscience without interference.

K.I. Cowan: Based on the inspired word of God, I cannot support Remit B and therefore request my dissent be recorded.

I.B. Cunningham: There is a theological chasm within The Presbyterian Church in Canada. It is a chasm not only of the interpretation of the Word of God, but our understanding of sin, of salvation, of discipleship and of God's will for us. Inclusion is only a surface symptom of that divide. On one side of the chasm stands what is apparently a majority of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, on the other side a large minority, including almost every congregation that is not part of the dominant culture within the PCC. This divide cannot be papered over with a mere "freedom of conscience clause". Remits B and C are no solution. The Church must face reality and reconsider how or if we might truly continue as one Church.

J.D. de Groot: I voted my conscience, and with the direction that my congregation asked me to vote on their behave, we believe in the truth of scripture and fear God more than the world.

J.F. Douglas: The adoption of this REMIT is in conflict with my understanding of scripture.

B.J.W. Ferrier: Neither God nor the Holy Spirit are double minded. Hear, now, what the Spirit of the Lord says to this Church body. "Because you have allowed this to ferment in your midst. Because you have not purged it and focused

on Holiness and Righteousness and Truth but have exchanged the Knowledge of God for the wisdom of this world, what I spoke through my servant Paul is now in effect in your midst. Because you have exchanged the knowledge of God for the wisdom of men I have given you over to a depraved mind to do what ought not to be done. You have rejected my judgments which are unto life and chosen to be your own source and, in so doing, have embraced death and corruption. I know who are mine and I know the suffering you will inflict upon them and the chaos that will overtake you and cause your house to be divided such that it cannot stand. For a time you will relish your so-called victory but I am not mocked. A man, a church, reaps what it sows and you have sown to your flesh and from it you will reap destruction. You will rejoice while those whose hearts are mine will weep but your rejoicing will turn to cries of woe as those with whom you have allied yourself, in an attempt to be like the world, turn and trample you under their feet..." (continued in dissent of REM-003).

C.L. Hamilton: I can appreciate that Remit B offers a compromise with regard to the pastoral issue of marriage. However, should a same sex couple approach me and request that I officiate at their marriage, and I refuse based on liberty of conscience, despite my carefully worded and compassionate/loving delivery – such words of refusal could be considered offensive and pave the way for a charge of discrimination based on sexual orientation due to violation of the Human Rights Code. For this reason, I believe as a Minister of Word and Sacrament that I am vulnerable to such legal action.

H.H.R. Han: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

B.A. Hunter: I refer to Jesus teaching, Matthew 19: 1–12 regarding heterosexual marriage, confirming Genesis 2: 23–25, and for those who cannot accept this teaching for whatever reason are to live as eunuchs. This is for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake.

J.T. Hurd: The debate on this remit was arbitrarily ended by the moderator proceeding to take an immediate vote while several commissioners, including the undersigned, were in the queue to speak, and thus prevented from addressing it. Since the adoption of the remit pertained to a matter subject to Barrier Act procedure, any attempt to cut off debate is usually and properly undertaken through a motion to take an immediate vote which requires a two-thirds' majority vote of commissioners at the Assembly, which in this instance was neither sought nor achieved. The remit asserts a definition of marriage not rooted in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of faith and manners. The remit affirms a definition of marriage at odds with the confessional position of the church expressed in our subordinate standards — both in the Westminster Confession of Faith and in Living Faith. The remit asserts that two definitions of marriage can co-exist in the church without comprehending the impact of such co-definitions on the very nature of the relationship between Christ and the church, for which, according to Scripture, marriage is said to be an illustration. The remit undercuts the basis of union of The Presbyterian Church in Canada. The remit represents a departure from historic teaching of the holy, catholic Church and therefore may be seen as following a divisive course, contra the vows taken by elders and ministers to seek the peace and unity of Christ throughout the holy catholic Church.

D. Jennings: With the restriction on dissents and their word count (contrary to the Book of Forms), I only have 250 words to express a principled disagreement with Remit B. I dissent first of all because the mutually exclusive definitions of something cannot both be true. More fundamentally, the Remit's acceptance of same-sex marriage is contrary to Scripture and contrary to the subordinate standards which all commissioners accepted as part of their ordination vows. Separately, the Assembly by adopting Remit B causes profound legal risks and damages for those who wish to exercise their liberty of conscience and action without the Assembly accepting responsibility to bear such financial burdens on behalf of the servants of the church who are to be afforded such liberty. Those risks have been identified by constitutional experts Kuhn LLP and Miller Thomson in legal opinions distributed throughout the denomination in November 2019 and, to a lesser extent, the opinion of Supreme Advocacy LLP in May 2021.

D. Kallender: This remit goes against the teachings of scripture. We cannot interpret scripture to mold to what society wants.

R.A.J. Kennedy: I dissent from the decision of the Assembly concerning Remit B first of all because of the inherent suggestion that mutually exclusive definitions of something can both be true. Additionally, the remit enshrines, as one definition of marriage, something which runs counter to the Scriptures which we all acknowledge as the canon of all doctrine by which Christ rules our faith and life. This definition also runs counter to the subordinate standards which all commissioners accepted as part of their ordination vows. Support for the Remit enshrined experience over

revelation, and perpetuated the condition, already present within the denomination, as attested by the comments of commissioners, in which each does what is right in one's own eyes (Judges 21:25).

J. Khang: It was said during this assembly that the approval of Remits B and C is but a step towards full inclusion. Full inclusion means the exclusion of Presbyterians who are traditional, biblical, orthodox, who believe in the lordship of Jesus Christ, the supremacy and authority of the Word of God, the exclusivity of Jesus being the way, the truth and the life, and who submit to the stated subordinate standards. It was obvious from the floor of the court that freedom of conscience for those who hold to the traditional view of marriage will not be an option and that this will happen much sooner than later; namely, the complete eradication of any evidence of traditional views from the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

J.W. Kim: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

O.E. Kim: The Bible clearly says that marriage is a covenant between a man and a woman. As a teaching elder, I cannot preach against the Scriptures. Adding a contradictory definition of marriage will prove that our church fears the secular cultures and trends instead of standing by the biblical truth. Definitely, we are called to love our neighbours and love God as well according to the example of Christ not by our own desire. May God the Creator judge this!

D. Krunys: Two definitions of marriage is a house divided against itself. The debate was an exercise in watching people talking past each other. How we can both say and action is a sin and a blessed expression of who they are is contradictory. Clear doctrine is needed, even if it results in a clear partition within the church.

S. Kwon: I believe that the spirit of the remits is to create space for people who believe in different definitions of marriage. However, without any clarity into the implications and confidence in the “freedom of conscience” as explained by the single legal opinion (due to the existence of multiple legal opinions that disagree with the given one) it is impossible to vote on Remit B. Additionally, the discussion on the floor showed that the remits are NOT a permanent solution, but rather just a first step, or interim measure, on the path to full inclusion, and thus the freedom of conscience is not offered in the spirit of truthfulness. As such, it becomes the first step in the changing of the doctrine to the full inclusion of the LGBTQi to the exclusion of those who hold to the traditional definition of marriage. I strongly dissent to Remit B.

A. MacMillan: Profound Theological and Scriptural dispute with this remit.

A.I. Marnoch: Remits B and C, 2019 attempt to hold together two definitions of marriage that are not parallel but are anti-parallel. They do so with the clause that all parties are granted liberty of conscience and action. I don't see how we can exist as one body with these terms. The definitions of marriage contrast with one another and feelings on both sides are so strong that two crews cannot co-exist with such fundamental differences. I don't think that liberty of conscience and action will be granted in practice. We need to either choose one or the other, split if need be, and find ways to work together as separate bodies but within God's one mission; or, continue the discussion to see if there is another way forward.

B. Mattinson: My dissent is first and foremost for biblical reasons. The Church Doctrine Committee presented to the 2018 General Assembly that, “there is insufficient exegetical, hermeneutical and theological support for a change in the denomination's doctrinal position on human sexuality. The traditional teaching of The Presbyterian Church in Canada is also consistent with that of most of the global church and is the near unanimous view of Christian history...alternative arguments on human sexuality are not sufficient to justify a change in the church's teaching.” (“Sexuality Overtures, Committee on Church Doctrine – 2018”, page 5). A colleague once said, “I know what the Bible says, but...” For me there is no “but”! I take my ordination vows very seriously, including the promise to uphold not only the Scriptures, but also the subordinate standards which this remit contradicts. I realize remit B endeavours to keep unity, however, this remit would isolate the PCC from the overwhelming majority of global Christianity and ethnic congregations within our denomination. All our African, Arabic speaking, Korean, and Chinese churches (to name a few) will be forced to leave the PCC or compromise their understanding of Scripture. Plus, this remit will cause stress for individual congregations and ministers as they discern which definition they will adhere to, this will create division. One last concern I have, is whether the promise of freedom of conscience and practice included would actually hold up in a court of law.

C. Nam: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

H.C. O'Reilly: I dissent from the decision to approve REM-002 because I do not believe, listening to the debate, and aware of the general tone of debate and communications on social media leading up to and following the approval of REM-002, that this denomination is able or willing to do what it has agreed to do. Thus the recommendation has been adopted lacking the integrity of will to fulfill it, which is not in keeping with our basic commitments as Christians.

M. Ryu: I don't agree that Remits B and C are biblically or theologically correct.

F. Saleh: I dissent the approval of Remits B because I believe the redefinition of marriage as described in Remit B is clearly contrary to the word of God, which clearly defines marriage as only a relationship between one man and one woman. It is shocking to me that PCC, compromises and accepts to change its long-established orthodox doctrine on marriage on no Biblical foundation and in contradiction to its subordinate standard and previous confessions of faith. My heart is broken that PCC has allowed the new secular perspective of marriage to shape its perspective instead of the word of God. Adopting Remit B will negatively tarnish our calling to the Arabic speaking people who culturally do not accept same sex marriage. It will render our ministry ineffective to the people whom God has positioned us uniquely to reach out and witness to them in Canada (NA), middle east, and beyond. For me and my church, this too can't be a matter open for compromise. A vote cannot change strong faith convictions. A vote cannot change deep rooted culture. The culture of the majority cannot be forced on the minority. I do not speak just of my own, but I represent the unanimous view of our entire church: pastors, session, and congregation of all ages, including our precious and vibrant youths and young adults (100 or more). I also believe I present the view of most, if not all, of Middle Eastern Presbyterians here in Canada and in the ME.

A.D. Sutherland: Marriage is a sacred relationship, not to be entered into lightly. What marriage is and how has been defined by scripture, and through scripture and faith in the teaching in scripture, the model of marriage is uplifted to be the model for our relationship with Christ. To make a change – while calling it love – and redefine marriage as something other than Christ, our Lord and head, states is to reject the covenant of the marriage the church has been given in Christ. Yet, what is more – if there could be more – this is issue is divisive. To accept or reject this Remit is to invite division, and before this ever came before us an effort to bring the denomination together in unity and mutual support no matter the outcome. We proceeded on a divisive course. Have we violated our ordination vows?

Recommendation REM-003

S.K. Bell: I cannot support this remit for the ordination of people in an active same-sex romantic relationship. I believe in the truth expressed in the 1994 statement on human sexuality that same-sex attraction is not a sin, but when acted upon it is contrary to the teachings of scripture. Ordaining those in active same-sex relationships would condone what the Bible calls sin. Though each of us is plagued by sin in our lives, our ultimate goal should be to recognize it, denounce its hold on our lives and seek to live in the transformation of the gospel. This remit asks of us to condone and even celebrate what God has not blessed. While the remit offers liberty of conscience in theory, I am not confident that this will play out in practice in the PCC. I know already of incidents where call processes have been interfered with even before the remits passed. I believe that there are deep theological divisions within the PCC that have presented themselves through the issues of human sexuality. They need to be recognized and acknowledged. We cannot pretend that we can all get along when the divisions run so deeply. It makes this remit disingenuous when applied to real life in the church.

C.D. Cameron: I dissent of the decision of the Assembly concerning Remit C as it runs counter to the Scriptures which we all acknowledge as the canon of all doctrine by which Christ rules our faith and life. In scriptural terms, it calls darkness "light" and sin "righteousness" (Isaiah 5:20). It ignores Jesus' own warning that those who ignore God's instruction and teach others to do the same will be least in the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 5:19); by adopting this Remit, we have voluntarily placed ourselves in the position of least. Additionally, this Remit creates the destructive and divisive condition in which Presbyters are expected to minister and function together when the legitimacy of not only the theological position but, indeed, the ordination of others is in question.

D. Chung: There are very severe legal implications involved that have not been heard or expressed and were in cue to be presented, but never came across the floor. Canadian human rights affairs seem in opposition to freedom of conscience and liberty when it comes to church theological matters and thus, we may have freedom of conscience, but Canadian courts of laws can and will impose their legal powers to the detriment of any holding a traditional view on marriage and ordination.

A.M. Cornell: Liberty and conscience of action only extends to participation in ordinations, installations and inductions. This is inadequate. As worded, this remit would compel a minister who is affirming to work alongside someone who does not share their views. This will not provide a healthy spiritual environment in our courts.

K.I. Cowan: Based on the inspired word of God, I cannot support Remit C and therefore request my dissent be recorded.

J.F. Douglas: The adoption of Remit C is not in agreement with my understanding of scripture.

B.J.W. Ferrier: Prophetic Word, continued from REM-002 dissent: "...Then you will cry out to me and I will not answer you because you have chosen to be the source of your supply and wisdom. Wisdom will laugh at your downfall. Your downfall will come as a result of the hardness of your heart so that you will not repent. Though your mouth will cry out to me, the pride in your heart will keep you from turning and being healed. To those who are mine I say this, trust in me. Whatever they threaten you with; when they take your buildings and your properties; when they threaten you with financial hardship or removing their protection from you and not supporting you against the machinations of this world, do not worry. Am I not able to save? Do I not have all the wealth of the nations to give you? Am I not seated in Heaven on my Throne, sovereign over all?. Do not fear but submit yourself to me in the Fear of the Lord and in Righteousness. Seek first my Kingdom and I will add to you all that you need to not only survive but to thrive and prosper. The more they threaten you the more my power will be with you to protect and defend you from all that is to come. Remember that my rewards are to those who overcome, not to those who seek to escape." This is what the Lord says to this Body.

C.L. Hamilton: I can appreciate that Remit C offers a compromise with regard to the clergy who are not in support of the Ordination of LGBTQI elders or clergy. However, should I refuse to participate – based on liberty of conscience – despite my carefully worded and compassionate/loving delivery – such action of refusal to participate could be considered offensive and pave the way for a charge of discrimination based on sexual orientation due to violation of the Human Rights Code. For this reason, I believe as a Minister of Word and Sacrament that I am vulnerable to such legal action. I also believe that this recommendation will fracture our denomination leading to irreparable damage. I do not feel that my voice was heard. During this assembly – numerous stories were told of the hurt felt by LGBTQI persons in the Presbyterian Church in Canada but those opposed had no opportunity for their stories to be heard or told.

H.H.R. Han: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

B.A. Hunter: I believe that scripture is clear on the point that same sex attraction is not a sin; although Jesus does turn things up a notch by teaching that even thinking about committing a sinful act is sin. I can accept the ordination of teaching and ruling elders who identify as gay or lesbian who live a single, celibate life, as Jesus teaches that this is the only acceptable alternative to heterosexual marriage in Matthew 19: 1-12. He confirms Genesis 2: 23-25. This is for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. How many years elapsed from Creation to AD 30-33 when Jesus gave us this steadfast teaching? It stood the test of time then, in spite of an ever changing world and society. How many years have elapsed from AD 33 to June 8, 2021? It has now not stood the test of time in the PCC because of secularization of the PCC for the sake of inclusivity in an ever-changing world and society that no longer believes in absolute truth. The PCC has what happened in the day of the Judges, "there was no king on the throne of Israel so the people have done what seems right in their own eyes." The PCC has dethroned the King and has done what seems right in their own eyes by accepting Remits B and C.

J.T. Hurd: The summary of the listening exercise undertaken at the direction of the 145th General Assembly as reported to the 146th General Assembly gives ample evidence that the proposal of Remits B and C, 2019 elicited a decidedly negative response from a vast number of people, calling into serious question the wisdom and usefulness of the remits. The results of the presbyteries' consideration of Remit C, 2019 under the Barrier Act as reported indicated that one-third of presbyteries encompassing an aggregate one-third of presbyters expressed disapproval of the remit. The provisions for liberty of conscience and action stated in the remit are insufficiently grounded in current ecclesiastical and civil law. Mutual accountability and collegiality within presbyteries and the harmony and peace of the Church and its effective witness will be adversely affected as a result of the adoption of this remit.

D. Jennings: With the restriction on dissents and their word count (contrary to the Book of Forms), I only have 250 words to express a profound disagreement with Remit C. I dissent of the decision of the Assembly concerning Remit C as it runs counter to Scripture and takes a divisive course. By limiting liberty of conscience only to ordination, induction, and installation it does not really address how those with principled differences deal with one another in

everyday activities within congregations and presbyteries. Also such liberty is only granted to ministers and elders and does not address the needs of members, adherents, congregations, presbyteries, synods, and specialized ministries. Separately, the Assembly by adopting Remit C causes profound legal risks and damages for those who wish to exercise their liberty of conscience and action without the Assembly accepting responsibility to bear such financial burdens on behalf of the servants of the church who are to be afforded such liberty. Those risks have been identified by constitutional experts Kuhn LLP and Miller Thomson in legal opinions distributed throughout the denomination in November 2019 and, to a lesser extent, the opinion of Supreme Advocacy LLP in May 2021.

J.W. Kim: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

O.E. Kim: I believe that the Bible clearly says "marriage is a covenant between a man and a woman." On this belief and conscience, ordination of LGBTQ+ is not acceptable for me. I totally accept the idea that everyone should be welcomed regardless of sexual orientation, but we are called to be holy as God the Creator. This leads us an arena of spiritual warfare, fighting against unholiness in patience and hope. Therefore, the suggested ordination will discourage many Christians no more fight for holiness. It's not gaining but losing the ground of Christian Faith.

D. Krunys: Practice flows out of Doctrine. While we have had reports over the last several years describing different understandings of human sexuality, none of them have been adopted as our doctrine of the church. At this assembly we have decided to change our practice, presumably in the expectation that at some point we will adopt doctrine to make sense of it.

S. Kwon: As someone who holds to the traditional definition of marriage as between one man and one woman, the ordination of elders and ministers who identify as LBGTQI who are married (that is, in a same-sex relationship) would be contrary to my beliefs on marriage. I believe that all are called by the gospel to come to Christ, to lay down our crowns, our desires, our idols and our sins before the cross, that they may be crucified with Christ. This invitation to the good news of Jesus is for all, including LBGTQI individuals, but the required response is also required of all. We must all be transformed into the likeness of Christ as revealed in His Holy Scripture. Acceptance is not the same as affirmation. Affirmation of a person is not the same as the affirmation of that person's sin. We can accept all without affirming where they fall short of the standard of God. We can affirm God's call and invitation to receive Him, without affirming that their sin and rebellion against God and His Word (which we ALL do) is in fact righteous and holy. I would in fact accept, participate and advocate for the ordination of an LBGTQI minister or elder who has committed to live a lifestyle in line with traditional biblical views of sexuality. However, those who call good what the Bible says is sin is not something I can assent to.

W.C. Lee: As someone who holds to the traditional definition of marriage as between one man and one woman, the ordination of elders and ministers who identify as LBGTQI who are married (that is, in a same-sex relationship) would be contrary to my beliefs on marriage. I believe that all are called by the gospel to come to Christ, to lay down our crowns our desires, our idols and our sins before the cross, that they may be crucified with Christ. This invitation to the good news of Jesus is for all, including LBGTQI individuals, but the required response is also required of all. We must all be transformed into the likeness of Christ as revealed in His Holy Scripture. Acceptance is not the same as affirmation. Affirmation of a person is not the same as the affirmation of that person's sin. We can accept all without affirming where they fall short of the standard of God. We can affirm God's call and invitation to receive Him, without affirming that their sin and rebellion against God and His Word (which we ALL do) is in fact righteous and holy. I would in fact accept, participate and advocate for the ordination of an LBGTQI minister or elder who has committed to live a lifestyle in line with traditional biblical views of sexuality. However, those who call good what the Bible says is sin is not something I can assent to.

A. MacMillan: Profound Theological and Scriptural dispute with this remit.

A.I. Marnoch: Remits B and C, 2019 attempt to hold together two definitions of marriage that are not parallel but are anti-parallel. They do so with the clause that all parties are granted liberty of conscience and action. I don't see how we can exist as one body with these terms. The definitions of marriage contrast with one another and feelings on both sides are so strong that two crews cannot co-exist with such fundamental differences. I don't think that liberty of conscience and action will be granted in practice. We need to either choose one or the other, split if need be, and find ways to work together as separate bodies but within God's one mission; or, continue the discussion to see if there is another way forward.

D. May: There is much more listening and discernment needed to achieve church unity on this remit.

C. Nam: I disagree with Remit B and C because they are biblically theologically violated.

H.C. O'Reilly: I dissent from the decision to approve REM-003 because I do not believe, listening to the debate, and aware of the general tone of debate and communications on social media leading up to and following the approval of REM-003, that this denomination is able or willing to do what it has agreed to do. Thus, the recommendation has been adopted lacking the integrity of will to fulfill it, which is not in keeping with our basic commitments as Christians.

M. Ryu: Remits B and C are biblically or theologically correct.

F. Saleh: I dissent the approval of Remit C because I believe the ordination as described in Remit C is clearly contrary to the word of God, which clearly defines marriage as only a relationship between one man and one woman. As I already expressed in my dissent to Remit B, it is shocking to me that PCC, compromises and accepts to change its long-established orthodox doctrine on marriage on no Biblical foundation and in contradiction to its subordinate standard and previous confessions of faith. My heart is broken that PCC has allowed the new secular perspective of marriage to shape its perspective instead of the word of God. Additionally, this Remit creates the destructive and divisive condition in which Presbyters are expected to minister and function together when the legitimacy of not only the theological position but, indeed, the ordination of others is in question. This will further contribute to the environment of divisiveness within the denomination, a matter already witnessed and evident in our current deliberations. Further, it will call to question the legitimacy and acceptance of such ordinations by our Middle Eastern ethnic population who are of the strong belief this to be in direct contradiction to the word of God. A vote cannot change strong faith convictions. A vote cannot change deep rooted culture. The culture of the majority cannot be forced on the minority.

A.D. Sutherland: Ordination is a decision made by God. Recognizing God's authority over our person is fundamental in our call as ministers and leaders in God's Church. We mistakenly call it 'our call' or place the authority over the vocations of Christian ministry chiefly on our shoulders and jurisdiction. This remit does not a change in God's authority, it simply affronts it. The denomination has sought to openly accept the practices of what the Bible repeatedly and consistently identifies as sinful, to make them not simply permissible, but that they are displayed in those who will be authorities in the church; practices and behaviours the Bible deems sinful are now promoted. What we have done is introduced uncertainty, especially for candidates for ministry. Will their gender identity, sexuality, theological view, or relationships affect the reception of their call, their studies or their acceptance to congregations and missions? How will the church protect the freedom it proposes when Human Rights Commissions are poised to assert against views it deems [not the church] anti-inclusionist, or label homophobic? Will professors of our colleges be afforded such freedoms? Without answering these questions before the passing of these remits, and without ensuring the protection of the vulnerable, we are leading the lambs we are charged to love, feed and care for to a precipice. Further, because we have not sought to bring the church to some unity before these decisions were made, we have gone the course of division, a fracturing of an already fragile church.

Additional Motion

S.K. Bell: I dissent from the decision to deny this motion. Many congregations, pastors and members now find themselves feeling set adrift by the passing of Remits B&C. The majority of non-Anglo church in the PCC are now feeling abandoned. The issues that have faced the church around human sexuality have their roots in deeper theological issues such as the interpretation of scripture, the Lordship of Jesus Christ, the sovereignty of God and our very understanding of the gospel. Because of this, many feel that the theological basis of the PCC has shifted without our consent. Our ordination vows have been broken by the PCC. Like a broken marriage, there is a need for a gracious separation for the good of both parties. I protest that the Assembly Council broke faith with the 2018 GA by not presenting the report on Gracious Dismissal which made the call for alternative structures more necessary. Denying a way to stay within the PCC and creating a new structure based on theological conviction is one more example of colonialism and control by a dominant group. This is not the way of Jesus. If the church is truly committed to grace for one another, there would be a way made to create a safe place for people of differing theological perspectives to fully follow Jesus and carry out the ministry they feel called to. Defeating this recommendation was wrong as it was not simply a denial of the request, but a denial to even discuss it.

E.M.W Charlton: After hearing the pain that is felt and lived right now and the need for a time of healing, after seeing also the practise of not wanting to listen and saying that there is a desire to listen, after also seeing how the history of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has gone, I believe that it is best to create at least two separate bodies with a shared resources to provide for places of healing, for being able to focus on ministry in our diverse contexts. We need to remember that the Presbyterian Church in Canada is made up of at least four divergent branches of Presbyterianism

that at one time felt a need to separate but later felt a need to join back together. This recommendation would have set the ground work to expedite the needed healing and strengthening to be able to one day join together again.

B.J.W. Ferrier: We owe our Korean brothers and sisters in the Han-Ca presbyteries the courtesy of a clear answer - will we grant their request or not. Their petition on racism confronts our lack of listening or responding to their clear requests over the past 5-6 years. Overtures 1 and 75 ask for immediate action by THIS Assembly. It's time to provide a clear answer in principle for them and others who have respected our process but yearn for this separation. Thus, I dissent that we not at least investigate this matter.

D. Krunys: It is clear our current system is not serving our needs. Many presbyteries are partisan battle grounds. Only on a very few items has that division not been evident at this assembly, leaking over into even which items we will discuss. It becomes clear that 2/3 of the assembly is hoping 1/3 will go away, rather than work on a solution to remain together.

S. Kwon: Numerous people who voted for the remits had stated that the remits were not an ideal goal, but an important stepping stone, or first step towards full inclusion. Therefore there is a need to discuss and investigate theological synods in order to live out the remits and create a polity and structure that reflects the remits. Roberto Sandolini was out of order in accusing those speaking in favour for even bringing up this recommendation, citing fear-mongering. He also did not address the moderator and was speaking directly to those he was accusing. And he was not called out of order. The lack of a desire to think about the practical implications of the remits and create a structure that reflects the remits shows that this is not a genuine desire to remain as one denomination with parallel definitions of marriage, but an interim state until full inclusion and full inclusion only is adopted.