

From: Fr Dan Martins <frdanmartins@sbcglobal.net>

To: 'Jim Snell' <Fr.Jim@saintc.net>; 'Carlos Raines' <carlos@sjoaquin.net>; 'Debby Cavanagh' <debby@5cs.com>; 'Kim Robinson' <WOODSTOCKD@aol.com>; 'Michael McClenaghan' <rectormac@aol.com>; 'Tom Wright' <papa7@sbcglobal.net>; 'Yumoto, Ted' <uncleted3@aol.com>

Subject: I just remembered...

Date: Sun, 17 Jun 2007 11:19 pm

I was a little flustered at the Standing Committee meeting on Saturday when I insisted that the Diocesan Convention resolution calling for a "strategy" specifically mentioned the See of Canterbury, and then Carlos found his copy, and pointed out that it only said "the Anglican Communion." Notwithstanding the point I then made that "Anglican Communion" necessarily implies "Canterbury," it has since dawned on me that the language I was remembering did not come from the resolution, but from the constitutional change that we passed on first reading, and which will be up for final reading in (apparently now) December.

The implication of this is quite significant. The confidential and still-developing plan that we discussed involving San Joaquin and four other dioceses, tends toward the formation of a province that may very likely become part of an "Anglican" body that is not in communion with the See of Canterbury. I expressed my opinion of that prospect--with uncharacteristic bluntness, perhaps, given my status as a short-timer. But it is of enormous consequence, in that the proposed revised constitutional language specifically commits the diocese to unimpaired communion with the See of Canterbury. Any plan that involves anything else would be a violation of that very article of the constitution. Any vote on the second reading would be a vote to affirm communion with Canterbury, and to eschew any form of non-Canterburian Anglicanism. Any revision of the plan so as to allow affiliation with a "non-Canterburian Anglican" entity would necessitate a new first reading and a subsequent second reading at next year's convention.

Aren't y'all just as grateful as can be that I pointed this out?

Dan "I'm-so-outta-here" Martins