



## ANGLICAN COMMUNION ALLIANCE

**The Most Rev. John Privett**  
#201 - 380 Leathead Road  
Kelowna, BC, V1X 2H8

**Feb. 16, 2018**

**Dear Abp. Privett (cc. Canon David Jones, Abp. Fred Hiltz, Canon Douglas MacAdams and BC&Yukon Provincial House of Bishops),**

I am writing to you to address a situation that has developed over the past year, and which continues to be a matter of great concern for the Anglican Communion Alliance.

As you may already know, our vision is to be a rallying point for historic, orthodox Anglicanism in the Anglican Church of Canada. The ACA consists of those who have decided to stay within the ACC--despite many challenges, and despite the fact that many of our like-minded brothers and sisters are now part of the Anglican Network in Canada. The theme we adopted this past Fall, which will guide our work between now and General Synod 2019, is "Deepening Biblical Faith in the Anglican Church of Canada." In this theme we mean to express our broader commitment to the spiritual health of our Church. We also try to keep in mind that our purpose is both positive and uniting, as we seek to encourage whatever deepens a Biblical, orthodox faith in our church. However, sometimes this will necessarily take the form of raising questions with regard to actions within our Church.

In the last few months, the Anglican Communion Alliance has tried to shine a light on the questionable practices of our Church in regard to the Rev. Jacob Worley in the Diocese of Caledonia. Mr. Worley was elected bishop of Caledonia but, contrary to the accustomed practice, following his election by the people of Caledonia he was questioned and his past investigated until his election was overturned on the grounds that he had contravened the teaching of the Anglican Church. Many saw this as a strange irony. In recent years, how many elected and consecrated bishops have broken with the stated teaching of the Anglican Church in one way or another? It seems that if someone's actions are in line with "the direction the church is going," then it doesn't matter if they break the church's law. If they are thought to be moving in the "wrong direction," then discipline is applied. This appears to us to be a double standard. In these situations, rather than the emergence of a double standard, a sense of fairness and proportionality should have prevailed in any decisions about discipline.

The firing of Mr. Worley, only a few months after his election as bishop was disallowed, raised further questions. What did he do in a few months that he went from having a high enough esteem in his diocese to be elected bishop, to being found unacceptable as a priest? In an article in *The Anglican Journal*, Abp. Privett confirmed that "despite the bishops' decision, Worley remained a priest in good standing in the diocese" <http://www.anglicanjournal.com/articles/diocese-of-caledonia-moving-on-after-worley-decision-administrator/>. It is not hard to imagine that Mr. Worley's continued presence in the diocese was a painful and constant reminder of the events of the spring. Was his dismissal a way to deal with this? If so, we want to question this way of dealing with conflict, especially when the conflict was not initiated by Mr. Worley.

Further, there can be no doubt that the particular circumstances of this firing caused significant hardship to Mr. Worley and his family. Due to his status with Immigration Canada, he had only several weeks in which to pack up his family and leave. While he was offered a severance package based on 3 months' stipend and housing allowance, clearly this amount would not be enough to cover even half of his moving costs. Adding to this difficulty was the decision to remove him (on very short notice) during the winter season: Mr. Worley's moving truck was unable to travel the treacherous northern roads, which led to his having to abandon his belongings until a later date. Even if it were determined best that Mr. Worley find a position outside of the Diocese of Caledonia, could this decision not have been taken with more compassion and concern for him and his family?

And so, as we begin the season of Lent, we are asking for responses to several questions.

- 1) Regarding the application of Provincial Canon 4(b)vi, **can Abp. Privett and Canon MacAdams confirm** that the recently consecrated Bishops McMenamie and Skelton were subject to investigation before consecration and were found not to hold views contrary to the teaching of the Anglican Church of Canada--in particular, Canon XXI on Marriage and Lambeth Resolution 1.10 (1998) on human sexuality, to which our Church subscribes? If not, why was a different standard applied in the affirmation of their consecrations? We recognize that at this time, our Church's teaching on same-sex relationships is potentially subject to change, and that some latitude with regard to diverse views may be called for. However, this context has provoked strong reactions on *both* sides of the question. So why was more latitude not extended to Mr. Worley, especially given that he made clear that he intended no institutional break with the Anglican Church of Canada? Mr. Worley was rejected as a candidate for bishop based on views he held, whereas some other recently consecrated bishops, by allowing same-sex blessings and even marriage, actually have contravened the lawful practice of the Anglican Church of Canada.
- 2) In appealing to Lambeth Resolution 72 (1988) regarding boundary crossing, we understand that the National Chancellor and the Primate were involved in tracing Mr. Worley's movements and documentation in order to invoke the charge that he "held a view" contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican Church of Canada. **Can Abp. Hiltz and Canon Jones tell us** if this kind of investigation will also be undertaken for future bishops (or priests, for that matter) in all dioceses, when there is any question about "views" they may hold?
- 3) **Will Canon Jones comment** on the relative weight (in our Canadian Church) of Lambeth Resolution 72 and Lambeth Resolution 1.10?
- 4) **We ask you, Abp. Hiltz, Canon Jones and Abp. Privett:** On what basis is the double standard (suggested above) justified? On social media, the argument is being made that since the Church seems to be moving in the direction of same-sex marriage, the rules and Canons don't apply in the same way. Is this justification acceptable to you, as leaders of our Church?
- 5) **We ask you, Abp. Hiltz,** why those holding a traditional position on marriage should trust the process in place to consider a change to the Marriage Canon, when bishops across the country are already moving ahead with this change—and, in contrast to the treatment of Mr. Worley, are doing so without ecclesial censure?

Our goal is not to accuse or to stir up controversy. Rather, I am writing this letter to give voice to what is already being said by many conservatives across the country and to ask for clarity. An already shaky relationship was severely strained when at GS 2016 several bishops decided to proceed with same-sex marriage preemptively. The election and consecration of the Rt. Rev. Kevin Robertson in Toronto added to this confusion and strain. And now the treatment of Mr. Worley has added yet another layer of confusion and mistrust.

It is our view that it is in the best interests of everyone in our Church to have some clarity brought to these matters. This letter is first of all directed to you and those copied, and we would appreciate a personal response at the address below (if a question above is addressed to you directly). However, as this is a public matter, we may also decide to publicize this letter (and any responses)--but not before you have had time to respond, perhaps by March 31.

The Anglican Communion Alliance continues to hold our Church, and each of you in its leadership, in our prayers.

In Christ,

Sharon Dewey Hetke  
National Director, Anglican Communion Alliance

*177 Daly Cr., Napanee, ON K7R 2V6  
Email: sdhetke@gmail.com*