

Update Letter to Churches that Signed Letter to FEBPAC

January 22, 2026
Toronto, ON

Dear Co-signatories,

We thought we would take a moment to update you on the letter that we sent to the leaders of Fellowship Pacific (FEBPAC) on December 1, 2025. As you will recall, this letter asked FEBPAC leadership to consider holding off the removal of churches over disagreements on complementarianism until FEB National finished its two year process. (The FEB National Board did not sign this letter to FEBPAC.)

FEBPAC leaders received our letter and distributed it to their Regional Board, as per our request. In their reply, they expressed their opinion that our letter did not take into full consideration all the facts of the situation and invited further conversation. We were able to hold this conversation on January 15, 2026 with Ben Hall and Brent Chapman. We were grateful for our time to talk with these brothers.

It is not our purpose to relate all of what we discussed, but we do believe this conversation highlighted the following.

1. We believe that the leaders of FEBPAC are acting in good faith in their actions. They are upholding what has been the majority practice of the churches in their region for the last 20 years.
2. Our conversation confirmed to us that significant errors were made in the past that make point one true.

Once the relative statements on complementarity (the **1997 Position Statement** entitled, '*On the Gender Issue in Pastoral Leadership in Fellowship Churches,*' and the **2004 Constitutional Amendment** to clarify gender-specificity for the office of elder¹) were passed, FEBPAC Regional Board contacted FEB National Board to express "how they intended to interpret" those statements – i.e. they would limit the office of *Senior (or, Lead) Pastor* to qualified males only and women could serve in other pastoral roles. It is important to note that our FEB National Board approved this interpretation. Therefore, in the minds of the FEBPAC Regional Board, this matter was settled in 2004.

¹ Article 4.1.(a).(iii) Notwithstanding the provisions in 1.3(c), it accepts that the pastoral office in the church is reserved for qualified men recognized by the church for oversight of the doctrine and practice of the church;

It seems clear to us that the majority of Fellowship churches were unaware that FEBPAC had been granted, what we would deem to be, a kind of “leniency” on the complementarian issue. We believe this was done primarily to keep the peace and keep the BC churches in FEB National. (This evaluation has been verbally affirmed to us by multiple people on both sides of the issue, some of whom were part of those 1997-2004 discussions.)

Therefore, when a minority group of churches within FEBPAC make motions to move church practice toward the 1997 Position Statement and 2004 Constitutional Amendment, this can be framed as divisive behaviour within the Region since special permission to interpret these statements as limited to “Senior Pastors only” was granted in 2004 by the FEB National board.

While we do not agree that calling for congruence to the Statement and Amendment is divisive, we understand how it appears that way to those who believe that congruence to these statements was settled some 20 years ago.

Upon reflection, this only heightens our desire for the FEBPAC Regional Board to cease removing churches in the present while the larger issues are addressed at a National level. We are not sure what else those dissenting churches were supposed to do? They could have raised the issue for theological discussion, but almost certainly such a motion would have been defeated since the majority of FEBPAC churches believe it is already settled.

FEB National

This leads to some thoughts from us about FEB National. We believe the FEB National Complementarian Congruence Team (CCT) needs to make their work a theological issue, long before a discussion of congruence to existing statements. Current events have already proven that our existing statements are unclear enough that one region will remove a church for having a woman preach occasionally (FEB Central), while another region will laud a church for the same (FEBPAC). Clearly, we are not seeing things the same.

We strongly believe the committee must start with complementarianism as a theological issue before any talk of congruence to existing statements and bylaws. History has already proven that the existing statements are insufficient and lack precision.

To that end, it is our hope

1. The CCT will craft a clear and robust statement on complementarity that carefully presents and collates the Biblical data and provides sufficient examples of application so that member churches fully understand what is meant by the words. We need clarity as a Fellowship, not more fog.
2. Each Region will be required to state their agreement without mental reservation to said statement.

Member Churches

Churches within FEB ought to use these next two years to evaluate their own ecclesiology. The Bible recognizes only two church offices, elder and deacon. We believe it would be both prudent and God-honouring for churches to limit themselves to those offices and, perhaps more importantly, those *titles*. Clarity on each office and their roles and responsibilities is too often assumed and incorrect in our churches. Many excellent resources are easily available for churches to consult.

As for FEB as a whole, we believe this issue has exposed significant structural and operational weaknesses that have been tolerated for too long. From our perspective, authority seems to be used or withheld depending on many factors that are not clear to member churches. Regions appear to have different degrees of support and involvement with National. Funding models are unclear at best. FEB needs to figure itself out, especially how regions and National relate to member churches and to each other.

To be clear, we are simply three local church pastors summarizing our observations in the hope that our doing so might prove useful to parties on each side of this issue and throughout our Fellowship.

Perhaps the best thing we can all do is devote this matter to prayer. It is difficult for us to imagine a path forward where churches that understand complementarianism the way we do, can remain in good fellowship with churches that understand complementarianism quite differently. In our minds, it would be a clear violation of Scripture in every case for a woman to preach to men in a local church worship service. Perhaps that helps to highlight the significance of this issue.

Sincerely,

Paul Martin
Grace Fellowship Church, Toronto

Justin Galotti
West Toronto Baptist Church, Toronto

David Robinson
Westminster Chapel at High Park, Toronto