

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERY
REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

OFFICE OF THE MODERATOR

Dr. Kenneth Gary Talbot
P. O. Box 6321 / Lakeland, Florida / 33807

January 26, 2006

Declaratory Judgment

Jurisdictional Authority

By authority vested in the Office of Moderator under B11:6B, wherein the Book of Church Order states: *“The moderator is to be considered as possessing, by delegation from the whole body (Presbytery), all authority necessary for the preservation of order, for convening and adjourning the judicatory, the directing and supervising the operations of the judicatory and its members, according to the Book of Church Order...”* and under B11:6E, *“The moderator, during adjournment, shall function as an advisor to elders and shall be given the responsibility of administration superintendent in fulfilling the duties listed above. The moderator shall act as superintendent over his judicatory to ensure proper administration of the BCO. All officers and members should give due consideration to his counsel in respect to his responsibilities and function. The moderator in his function as superintendent shall always be received and dealt with in a Christian manner.”* Along with the petition of a super-majority of voting elders of the Presbytery, requesting the Moderator to take proper action under the authority granted to this office, the Moderator hereby exercises that authority entrusted to him from both the Book of Church Order and from the Elders of Westminster Presbytery to carry out their will in the following issues currently pending before this judicatory:

Dr. R. C. Sproul Jr., Mr. Laurence Windham, Mr. Wayne Hayes, and Mr. Jay Barfield, having taken vows of Ordination wherein they agreed and affirmed to submit the following vows as officers in the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly.

1. *Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inerrant Word of God, the only infallible rule of life, faith and practice?*

2. **Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?**
3. **Do you approve of the government, discipline and worship of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly?**
4. **Do you promise subjection to your brethren in the Lord?**
5. *Have you been induced, as far as you know your own heart, to seek the office of the holy ministry from a love to God and a sincere desire to promote His glory in the Gospel of His Son?*
6. **Do you promise to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the Gospel and the purity, the peace and unity of the church, whatever persecution or opposition may arise unto you on that account?**
7. **Do you promise to be faithful and diligent in the exercise of all private and personal duties which becomes you as a Christian and a minister of the Gospel, as well as in all the duties of your office, endeavoring to adorn the profession of the Gospel by your life, and walking with exemplary piety before the flock over which God shall make you an overseer?**
8. **Are you willing to take charge of this congregation (or specific call) in agreement with your declaration when you accepted their call? And do you promise to discharge the duties of a pastor (name office) to them as God shall give your strength?**

In the process of time, many violations of the Book of Church Order and the vows for ordination have been breached and these men in taking the above vows are accountable for their actions, teaching and practices. The biblical requirement is a minimum of two witnesses to establish a fact in evidence according to Deuteronomy 19:15: *“One witness shall not rise against a man concerning any iniquity or any sin that he commits; by the mouth of two or three witnesses the matter shall be established.”* Under D6:5D witnesses can be public, written, or oral testimony, where such issues may proceed under D6:9 of the Book of Church Order.

Session Violations

1. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church in an apology letter written to John and Julie Austin for their abuse of authority of the office of elders, having confessed and apologized for their abusive behavior in dealing with their family, brings this charge under the authority of D6:9 of the Book of Church Order, wherein, the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church comes as it's own accuser and confessor before this judicatory, which states, *“...the judicatory may proceed to judgment without full process, determining first, what offense, if any, has been committed, and, if a serious offense have been committed, what censure shall be pronounced.”* The issue at hand was a demonstration of ministerial abuse, in that, the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church, in violation

of 1 Peter 5:2-3 used their authority in lording it over the Austin family in an inexcusable manner. These unwarranted actions of the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church are considerable and constitute misfeasance, malfeasance and nonfeasance in their duties and obligations as Elders serving in the Church of Jesus Christ, under the duties found in the Holy Scripture (1 Peter 5:1-2; 2 Timothy 2:22-26) and the Book of Church Order (B3:1A; B4:8L; B4:5). The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church, having confessed its sins and short-comings as to their pastoral ministry and the careful exercise thereof, are, by their own confession and admission, guilty of said offenses. However, that is not the end to this pattern of abuse concerning the Elders of St. Peter Presbyterian Church. The Burton Family in a letter to the Presbytery testified that: *“Because of this we became more determined than ever to leave the church. R.C. and Laurence became just as determined that they were not going to let us go. They told us we had taken a vow to the Elders to stay in the church, and we could not leave unless they released us. They told us that we would never be able to join another reformed church if we were not in good standing with St. Peter and we would need their release for that to happen.”* In addition to the preceding letter, Mr. Brent Fontenot also wrote the Presbytery about the Austin Family and their treatment, stating that: *“My family and I had only been members for a month when this meeting (head-of-house-hold meeting) took place and I found it very alarming. Evidently proceedings against the Austin’s had been going on for some time and we came in at the middle of it.... Two elders spoke that night, Laurence Windham and Jay Barfield....I remember coming home that night and telling my wife that I felt as if I had been to a lynching. I also had concerns for what seemed to be an Auburn Avenue Theology persuasion in their teachings. This was enough for us to decide to leave....Keep in mind that we had been told by other families that there was a chance that the session would not allow us to leave and find another church in the area. After we returned home to Texas (Moderator explanation - Mr. Fontenot couldn’t find a job and used that as an excuse to return to Texas) we made contact with the Austin’s to find out their side of the story. After weighing the evidence and being witness to some of the abuses going on at St. Peter, we are sickened by the way this family was treated and feel like we have been misled by wolves in sheep’s clothing.”* Another individual who received some of the same type of abuse was Mr. Dennis Cochran. Mr. Cochran was not a member of St. Peter Presbyterian Church and in this way his story differs from the Austin’s and the Burton’s, but the manifestation of abuse was the same. Mr. Cochran who was under a doctor’s care, which resulted in his inability to hold employment, was told by Laurence and R. C. that if he joined St. Peter Presbyterian Church, he would have to stop taking his medication and find employment. Mr. Cochran determined to not join St. Peter Presbyterian Church and was aggressively confronted. Mr. Cochran’s letter goes on to note that the

people at St. Peter began to shun him, but later it was dropped since he was attending Abington Presbyterian Church (PCA). Another family who experienced the same abusive behavior was the Hutchison family. They were a witness to the 'shunning' of Mr. Cochran, and then found themselves in conflict with the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church.

2. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church did knowingly and willingly use the Tax Identification number of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church after leaving that denomination in violation of the Federal Income Tax Code. I have in my possession not only the use of the number by the St. Peter Presbyterian Church, but the identity of its owner, the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. Added to this, Mr. Randy Winton has written in a letter to Westminster Presbytery stating that he was told to set up a credit card processing account and the bank required him to supply a Federal Tax number. Winton writes: *"When I was asked to secure a credit card processing machine for the HSC, the bank asked me to furnish a tax i.d. number for the Study Center. R.C. told me he did not have one, but gave me one to use. If I am recollecting properly, I believe it was the denomination's tax i.d."* It was not our denominations Tax Identification Number, but the tax number of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. The Session has since sent a letter to the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARPC) at the request of the moderator asking for their forgiveness in using the number. This illegal use of the tax number continues to be of great concern because it is a matter of identity theft under Virginia state law and Federal Statute. It is also a great concern that the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church stated it was an administrative oversight by the Session in using the tax number of the ARPC. The improper or unauthorized use of one or more identifiers belonging to another person or entity for the purpose of obtaining benefits or services is known as Identity Theft. Identity Theft is a crime in Virginia, and it may occur through nothing more than the unauthorized use of another's Tax Identification Number (TIN). The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church committed Identity Theft by absconding with the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church's EIN in order to open one or more bank accounts and a credit card merchant account: *The Code Of Virginia § 18.2-186.3. Identity theft; penalty; restitution; victim assistance; states: "It shall be unlawful for any person, without the authorization or permission of the person or persons who are the subjects of the identifying information, with the intent to defraud, for his own use or the use of a third person, to: Obtain goods or services through the use of identifying information of such other person; As used in this section, "identifying information" shall include but not be limited to: (i) name; (ii) date of birth; (iii) social security number; (iv) driver's license number; (v) bank account numbers; (vi) credit or debit card numbers; (vii) personal identification numbers (PIN); (viii) electronic identification codes; (ix) automated or electronic signatures; (x) biometric*

data; (xi) fingerprints; (xii) passwords; or (xiii) any other numbers or information that can be used to access a person's financial resources, obtain identification, act as identification, or obtain goods or services.” The same principle of law is applied in *United States v. Anthony A. Nichols*, 229 F.3d 975. Further, at a prior presbytery meeting when someone ask the question about securing a tax number, Dr. R. C. Sproul Jr. jokingly stated that they should use the ARPC number, St. Peter was continuing to use it. At the time, no one really thought much of the statement, thinking it only an off the cuff remark, but we know now that they consciously were using a number not issued to their church, but fraudulently using a number given to a different ministry. Under the *Code Of Virginia § 18.2-434. entitled “What deemed perjury; punishment and penalty”* we read: *“If any person to whom an oath is lawfully administered on any occasion willfully swears falsely on such occasion touching any material matter or thing, or if a person falsely make oath that any other person is 18 years of age or older in order to obtain a marriage license for such other person, or if any person in any written declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury pursuant to § 8.01-4.3 willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does not believe is true, he is guilty of perjury, punishable as a Class 5 felony. Upon the conviction of any person for perjury, such person thereby shall be adjudged forever incapable of holding any office of honor, profit or trust under the Constitution of Virginia, or of serving as a juror.* The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has admitted to this unlawful use and therefore again come under D6:9 as their own accuser and confessor.

3. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church did in violation of the Book of Church Order, attempted to establish a daughter church (mission church) in Michigan installing Mr. Mark Dewey as its pastor. On January 26, 2003 Laurence Windham, at the direction of St. Peter Session, acted on its behalf (which it had no authority to take such an action for installing Mr. Dewey or the establishment of a mission church). Mr. Dewey’s own testimony is as follows: *“We have been a Presbyterian church from day one (a daughter church of St. Peter Presbyterian Church), though not a member of a particular denomination until this afternoon. On January 26, 2003....took vows before Laurence Windham (who was here on behalf of the session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church and had installed me as pastor the day before). Vows which included: Do you willing make a commitment before the Lord Jesus Christ and His church to be in covenant with the family of Christ The King Church; submitting yourself and your family to its doctrine and discipline as exercised under the authority of Jesus Christ; to use the talents God has given you to edify your brothers and sisters in Christ; and to be a faithful witness of the Lord Jesus Christ in our community and the World?”* Under section B10:10A of the Book of Church Order, all mission churches are

established by the authority of Presbytery and must be properly processed according to the requirements under Section B10:10. Mr. Windham nor the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church had the authority to establish a mission church, especially in a different jurisdiction (John Knox Presbytery). As to the installation of an elder, under B5:9 A “...*The Presbytery shall send at least two elders to that particular congregation of installation...*” Westminster Presbytery neither authorized the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church to establish a mission church or to install any minister thereunto. Such actions are from men who are out-of-order with the Book of Church Order and the will of Westminster Presbytery and the General Assembly of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly, the Scripture, the confession, and the Book of Church Order. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has publicly confirmed this action calling Christ the King Church a ‘daughter’ (mission) church, and an also by those in attendance at the installation and admission of Mr. Dewey, installed him without due authority. This is a plain and clear violation of the peace and unity of the church, again constituting malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance of their office and authority. An offense to those whom had taken vows to submit to their authority and uphold the system of Government of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly. Having made this matter of public notice in various documents and on the St. Peter Presbyterian Church / Highlands Study Center web site, this comes under D6:9 making the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church their own accuser and confessor.

4. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church did without permission of Presbytery seek to divide its congregation into parishes, consisting of Bristol, Mendota, and Abington. The Book of Church Order under B10:4 requires the approval of Presbytery and the assignment of qualified men to bear the offices for the proper function thereof. The dividing of St. Peter and the appointing of Jay Barfield as ‘student pastor’ is an unlawful act of the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church. Mr. Barfield is a ‘provisional elder’ who was petitioned to function at this level since Dr. Sproul and Mr. Windham would be traveling, he could assist in preaching and the sacraments of the church. This permission never extended to ‘regular’ preaching, teaching or sacraments. Under B4:2B4 the regular administration of the sacraments and preaching of the Word belong to the Pastor, and may on occasion be permitted by a ‘church governor’ B4:5B12 administer the sacraments, and assist the minister of the Word (pastor) in his duties B4:5B11. This is openly practiced and publicly noted on the RPCGA web site in clear violation of the authority of Presbytery. Again this is misfeasance, malfeasance and nonfeasance in their duties as elders and members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly. Having made this matter of public notice in various documents and on the St. Peter Presbyterian Church / Highlands

Study Center web site, this comes under D6:9 making the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church their own accuser and confessor.

5. Further, the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has admitted that they did not use the vows required by the Book of Church Order. They were ordered to do so by Westminster Presbytery according to the Minutes from the Westminster Presbytery Meeting, November 30, 2001. Under section IX. New Business: Motion: *“To commission Rev. Sproul and Rev. Windham to bring the St. Peter Presbyterian Church in to Westminster Presbytery.”* This fact was also revealed in the letter to the Austin family that they had not given the proper vows of church membership to them, nor to the congregation of St. Peter Presbyterian Church. They therefore failed to properly enroll the church into the jurisdiction of Westminster Presbytery following the procedures of the Book of Church Order B10:9B5 and B2:1D. Having made this matter of public notice in public documents this comes under D6:9 making the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church their own accuser and confessor.
6. The Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church failed to fulfill their responsibility of B10:9A that requires a Declaration of Association and By-laws to be developed and submitted to the Presbytery which explains their congregational government, relationship to the denomination, the rights of their members, and how land and tangible property will be owned and distributed upon the dissolution of the Church.
7. Lastly, the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has been in violation of the Westminster Confession, Chapter 29: Section 7 & 8, the Larger Catechism questions 166 – 177 in the improper administration of the sacrament of the Lord’s Table. **History:** While Westminster Presbytery did error in allowing R. C. Sproul Jr. (who confessed to believing in paedocommunion) to join the denomination (an oversight without malice or intent to do harm or deceive); however, he was told and warned prior to joining and taking his vows that he could not teach or practice paedocommunion. He clearly understood that our position was no different than that of the PCA, OPC or the ARPC, the ecclesiastical body from which he came to the RPCGA, both by the individual who introduced him to the denomination, Mr. Jerry Johnson, and by the Moderator of Westminster Presbytery. As well as being instructed by the Moderator at his Examination. Mr. Johnson in a letter to the Moderator wrote on December 12, 2005 that: *“...before R. C. Jr. and St. Peter’s join the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly I had numerous conversations with R. C. about the RPCGA due to my past affiliation. One such conversation took place while he and I were having lunch prior to a radio broadcast in Rural Retreat. In unambiguous terms I explained to R. C. that he would not be allowed to practice paedocommunion in the*

RPCGA (he had already agreed to this if he had been accepted in the PCA.) He acknowledged my instruction on the matter and seemed to understand. I find it hard to believe that he would now say something different.” However, it is not just paedo-communion that is at issue, questions 168 -177 of the Westminster’s Larger Catechism teaches a **‘self-examination communion’** that is, an individual must use discernment prior to coming to the Lord’s Table, while at the Lord’s Table, and then give reflection about the Lord’s Table in relation to their Christian walk having partaken of the meal. Age is not the issue, but spiritual discernment, which is not practiced at all at St. Peter Presbyterian Church (Bristol, Mendota, or Abington). Rick Saenz, a former member of St. Peter Presbyterian Church wrote to the Presbytery stating that: *“Dr. Sproul has taught a doctrine which he refers to as “age-appropriate confession of faith”, meaning that we have to take into account how the age of a person might affect their ability to verbally express their faith; i.e., an adult might be able to give a very detailed description of their understanding, while a very young child might only be able to say, “I Love Jesus.” As I recall, Dr. Sproul said that the St. Peter session had a one time accepted exactly those words as a credible profession of faith. While I was a member of St. Peter, a confession of faith was accepted from Eilidh Daugherty, who at the time was barely two years old; her mother Katie told my wife that the sum total of the confession was “Jesus Loves Me.”* Further Mr. Brent Fontenot has written to the Presbytery stating: *“There were also comments made by others in the congregation that led me to believe the St. Peter Session was in rebellion to the RPCGA. For example, at one point Jonathan Daugherty stood up (during a head-of-house-hold meeting) and said he did not understand how we (St. Peter Church) could expect the Austin’s to submit to the Session’s authority when the Session did not submit to Presbytery. Jonathan went on to say that during a particular time when was helping serve communion at St. Peter he was warned by the Elders to be cautious not to serve the youngest children that he would ordinarily serve. This was because there were visitors from Westminster Presbytery in attendance who would not approve of serving communion especially young children. Laurence Windham objected to Jonathan’s statements and said that is was only R. C. Sproul Jr. that had taken vows to not practice paedocommunion and that he hadn’t taken any vow like that. Laurence Windham also said that the Presbytery was fully aware of their paedocommunion beliefs and practices at St. Peter and that they were working with the Presbytery to sort out any doctrinal differences.”* Mr. Peter Kershaw, a practicing paedocommunionist also confirms that St. Peter Presbyterian Church allows the admission of children to the Lord’s Table without ‘self-examination’. John Austin also has written to the Presbytery clearly stating that ‘paedocommunion’ is practiced at St. Peter Presbyterian Church, which is one area of disagreement he had with the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church. Pastor Greg Poorman

who attended the 2005 Pastor's Camp also testifies of R. C. Sproul Jr. was teaching 'presumptive regeneration' and 'paedo-communion'. It is clear that the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has failed to submit to the official position and practice of this denomination and have publicly taught and practiced a variant communion position, which includes their formulation on paedo-communion. Each of the Session Members of St. Peter Presbyterian Church were given time to examine this denomination's Book of Church Order prior to taking vows and submitting to its government and worship. Further, another individual by the name of Richard posted these comments about paedo-communion and what he experienced at St. Peter Presbyterian Church on his blog site stating: *St. Peter has a different way of serving the Supper. Each family goes up and is served. The congregation sings songs while everyone goes up. Geneva was scared. It was quite different for her, so when it came time to eat the bread, she cried. I guess going up to the front, and a stranger serving her the bread, and also praying for Ashley, was too much for her. I held her in my arms, and that comforted her because she didn't have much of a problem drinking the wine. Except this time she spilled it. Oh well.* What was the occasion for such a celebration, Richard explains: *"Yesterday evening there was an ordination service for some elders and a deacon at a CRE church in Knoxville, TN. Actually, it isn't a full member church yet. We (Providence) sponsored them into the CRE, but pastoral oversight **was given to St. Peter Presbyterian Church.** Now, to take an aside, that is a wonderful thing. **St. Peter isn't even in our denomination, but they went to great effort to help this new church get started. So, last night was the ordination service at St. Peter, in Bristol, TN. It was a joint service between the three churches.** Laurence Windham began the service (prayer, singing and absolution), and then our pastor, Virgil Hurt, preached a very short sermon. **Then RC Sproul Jr., performed the ordination himself** (which I was surprised when he called all the **ordained elders and deacons** in the congregation to come forward for the laying on of hands). And then the newly ordained elders administered the Lord's Supper.(11/24/04)"* What we have is children being permitted to the Lord's Table (paedo-communion) R. C. Sproul Jr. ordaining men to the Eldership, calling for Elders and Deacons to lay hands on these men, and pastoral oversight was given to St. Peter Presbyterian to help establish this mission church. All of this in violation of the Book of Church Order and historic Presbyterian practice. Further, Laurence Windham wrote in an article of Every Thought Captive (also cited from Cartularium January 17, 2005), that *"on Sunday, my sons and daughters, ages 3 and 9 took communion. His children, same age as mine, did not take communion, but are not allowed to in their church."* It has also been reported that one way the St. Peter Session has sought to get around this issue is allowing the fathers to determine whether their children can take communion, rather than the Elders. This also would be

a violation of the Confession and the Larger Catechism and outside of the acceptable practices of this denomination. The elders of St. Peter Presbyterian Church have determined that they are paedocommunionist and, they also hold to a variant teaching and practice on communion. Unlike the mistake made with R. C. Sproul Jr., the other elders were not given the option of joining this denomination as paedocommunionist and are in violation of Motion 9 passed by the 1997 General Assembly which states: ***“That paedocommunion be declared as a position not acceptable in the doctrine and practice within our churches. That any paedocommunionists presently within our denomination be grandfathered in. No new individual may be accepted into the denomination who holds to this view. M/S/C.”*** This error is reversible with R. C. Sproul Jr. who originally was instructed that if he determined he could not refrain from paedocommunion practice, he could request to be dismissed from the Presbytery without censure. This offer was never given to any of the other Elders at St. Peter Presbyterian Church. There was no such error in relationship to the other current elders at St. Peter Presbyterian Church. Mr. Windham (conditional – provisional Teaching Elder), Mr. Hayes and Mr. Barfield (conditional – provisional Church Governor) who sought to labor in the office of elder, under the authority of, in submission to the Presbytery, by taking the vows required by this denomination in accordance with the Book of Church Order of the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly are out of accord with the denomination’s Confession and Book of Church Order. Further, on December 15, 2005 Dr. R. C. Sproul Jr., in a response e-mail to the Moderator wrote the following: ***“It appears that at least three of our four elders cannot stay in the denomination. Given that reality, we would likely look for a denomination where we can not only believe in paedocommunion, but be free to practice it. If we as a church do so, we cannot then have one elder who cannot serve the sacrament. We don't want to go, but we can't change our convictions. The particular hardship is this. We especially don't want to leave with a cloud over our heads. Could you either, having let us go, hear the complaints against us, and issue a ruling, or barring that, could you forward all those complaints to where we end up? We have had much to repent of these past few weeks. We have done so. We are sorry in turn that our failures have caused trouble for you and the presbytery.”***

In view of the request made by Dr. R. C. Sproul Jr. and given the authority of this office by the Elders of Westminster Presbytery, the following ruling is hereby issued. Considering the pattern of behavior noted above, the Session of St. Peter Presbyterian Church has proven to be irresponsible in their duties as ministers of the Gospel. They have proven they are not men under authority of this denomination because they are continually acting outside of the Book of Church Order. Their actions, in matters of writing,

teaching, articles on their web site, and practice, in each of the issues above demonstrate that they have no interest in preserving the peace, purity, and unity of the Church and its order, which includes conforming all their actions to the requirements thereof. Therefore, in order to protect the Church of Jesus Christ from any further damage and humiliation (WCF 20:4), the Moderator hereby declares the following declaration by the authority vested in this office and the expressed support of the Elders of Westminster Presbytery to carryout their will in these matters.

Judicial Action: Deposition from Office

The Moderator, by the authority of the Elders of Westminster Presbytery, herein deposes from the office of Elder, Dr. R. C. Sproul Jr., Mr. Laurence Windham, Mr. Wayne Hayes and Mr. Jay Barfield and dismisses them to the general membership of Westminster Presbytery. They are to be held for trail pending additional charges, both public and personal, that are currently being investigated. The consistent pattern of actions taken by these men are duplicitous in nature, and demonstrate that they willingly and knowingly act in an arbitrary fashion in violation of their vows of ordination and in violation of our denomination's Book of Church Order. Most importantly, their actions manifest that they lack the qualification for the ministry (1Timothy 3:1-7). It would be unwise to allow these men to continue to hold an office for which they are not qualified. They have no interest to govern themselves appropriately within this Presbyterian system of government that they vowed to submit and conform to its rules and regulations with conduct becoming ministers of Jesus Christ.

Ordered and Declared and sent to the Office of the Stated Clerk on this 26 day of January, 2006.

Kenneth Gary Talbot
Moderator
Westminster Presbytery

Sent by e-mail and registered letter on the date indicated above.