

1. The reason that I suggested this meeting was that two things were brought to my attention which have greatly disturbed me and I felt that you should all know. I understand that Bro. Bartlett is back, although he has not contacted the Elders. (Has he contacted or have any of you spoken to him?)

I was informed that he returned Sunday and that on Monday he and Ona went down to Teen Challenge and fired, or had fired, five of the staff who had reservations about him .. Steve Rosar, Dave Kolbinski, one of the young ladies and two others. I also understand that they took a lawyer with them and that they endeavored to change the Teen Challenge Constitution with the intent to ultimately take it out from under the Assemblies of God. This action was not consummated because it was unconstitutional and there will be another meeting on the 28th of March to take care of this matter.

As you know his credentials were suspended, pending his appearance before the Presbyters to clear the known, plus additional allegations. The only reason the credentials were temporarily reinstated was for humanitarian reasons as a result of the plea of this board. However, reinstatement was contingent upon the fact that he promised to appear before the Presbyters on the 14th of March and that he would go away for three weeks for his health's sake. Thus he should not be in Teen Challenge or Highway Tabernacle during that time. I have verified this fact with Bro. Williams.

2. Secondly, it has been brought to my attention that Bro. Bartlett has prepared a letter and has given it to some selected couples. I understand that he has suggested to these couples that they stand up this Sunday Morning in the Service and advise the Church of their support of the Pastor, saying that the charges are all false and if Bro. Bartlett is defrocked, they will go independent with him. I also understand that if they will not stand and read this letter, then he, himself, will read this letter to the congregation.

I learned of this proposition around eleven o'clock Wednesday evening. This is an improper action on his part for several reasons:

1. Sunday Morning is a Worship Service, not a Business Meeting. We certainly do not want a repetition of the service that occurred over a year ago when it was first proposed that Bro. Bartlett be Pastor for the time being. The visitors were shocked and some of the babes in Christ were hurt because of the disturbance at that time.
2. Secondly, how can anyone truthfully say the charges are all false until all the allegations are brought to the attention of Bro. Bartlett and he has the opportunity to refute them. Also, everyone should know all the charges so they may be weighed and evaluated as to whether they are true or false.
3. Thirdly, no letter should be allowed to be read by Pastor Bartlett or anyone in the congregation before the Board has ample time to review the letter and evaluate the contents thereof. Something of this nature could possibly divide the whole church. Our Manual says that any member could be dropped from the church roll if found engaged in the disruption of fellowship by sowing discord among the brethren or in general creating trouble. This could create a grave trouble in the Church and would be a terrible thing to have in a Sunday Morning Service.

The above information is from a reliable source which I cannot reveal at this time because it would hurt the couple who in honesty read the letter to the individual.



Page two - continued

While this is not first-hand, I do have first-hand information about the same idea. The Sunday before Pastor Bartlett went away, he called the Elders and their wives to come to see him. At that time he said his papers did not mean that much to him and rather than appear before the Presbyters in order to clear his name, he would go independent. We tried to dissuade him from thinking this way and recommended that he go before the Presbyters - otherwise, it would appear that he was guilty.

Because of the nature of the above, I called Bro. Papit and told him I thought we should have one of the District Officials here on Sunday. He suggested I contact Bro. Williams, which I did. I conveyed the information to him and asked if he could be with us. He agreed that someone should be there and that he would be glad to come; however, he had a previous commitment.

I then asked for Bro. Bongiorno but Bro. Williams thought that he, too, had a commitment. He said he would make arrangements and call me back. He did call and advised me that Bro. Lewis would be there and speak for both Sunday Morning and Evening Services. He further stated that Bro. Lewis is familiar with the situation and would know what to do if a disturbance should occur. However, Bro. Lewis would like to know that the Board of Highway is back of him.

Now I know some have felt that we can handle our own problems and this would be true if it were just a church problem, but this is a District situation, which also involves Highway. Highway did not bring any charges against the Pastor. It was people from Teen Challenge who brought the initial charges. SEcondly, Highway did not give Bro. Bartlett his credentials; it was the AAsemblies of God who gave them to him. We hired Bro. Bartlett because he was an Assembly of God minister in good standing. We cannot expunge the charges. We do not even know what they all are at this time. Bro. Bartlett must appear before the Disttict Presbyters to clear his name.

This is our Church but no-one on the Board knows what Bro. Bartlett is trying to do. He has not relayed any information to any of us and some of these things could go against him.

In talking to Bro. Williams I asked him about advising us after the meeting with Bro. Bartlett on March 14th. He said they would call the Elders as soon as a decision is made. I also asked him about advising the congregation and he will come to Highway the following Sunday - an informational congregational meeting will be held following the service in which he will advise the details.