

16 October 2010 Forward in Faith National Assembly

Report by Adrian Vincent (updated January 2013)

On 16 October I attended the second day of the Forward in Faith National Assembly as an observer. There were about 500 people there and I was warmly welcomed.

Forward in Faith is the worldwide association of Anglicans who are unable in conscience to accept the ordination of women as priests or as bishops.

The 2010 Assembly's audio files no longer appear to be available on the FiF website, however, you can read the transcripts of three of the talks via the below links

1.) The address by Bishop John Broadhurst, Chairman of Forward in Faith.

This illustrates the strength of feeling by this constituency on this matter.
A transcript is an appendix to this report.

2.) The address by Fr Jonathan Baker.

This illustrates how the provisions for those opposed, in the draft legislation to permit the ordination of women to the episcopate, will not meet the needs of that constituency.
A transcript is an appendix to this report.

3.) The address by Bishop Jack Iker, Bishop of Fort Worth, Texas.

In 2007 and 2008, the Convention of the Diocese of Fort Worth, including Bishop Jack Iker, voted to remove all reference to The Episcopal Church (of the USA) from their conventions and canons. 48 of the 56 parishes in the Diocese voted in agreement. The cutting of that formal link was because they did not want to be associated with the liberal direction that The Episcopal Church had been taking (e.g. The ordination of a practising homosexual as a bishop; permitting churches to bless same sex unions; and discriminating against those who do not agree with the ordination of women).

The Episcopal Church has responded by suing the Diocese and saying that the church buildings do not belong to the Diocese or their congregations, but belong to The Episcopal Church. The Bishop currently has three law suits against him.

I believe this is a warning for the Church of England. We must avoid a situation where the Church of England introduces the ordination of women to the episcopate with insufficient provisions for those opposed, with the result that those opposed disassociate themselves from the formal Church of England structures, and we then have costly legal action over who owns and has a right to worship in the church buildings of the parishes that have so separated themselves.

A transcript is an appendix to this report.

16 October 2010 Forward in Faith National Assembly
Address by Bishop John Broadhurst, Chairman of Forward in Faith.
Transcribed from the audio file on the Forward in Faith website by Adrian Vincent.

“[...] I intend to resign as Bishop of Fulham before the end of the year, that is to facilitate my replacement. [...] I expect that I will enter the Ordinariate when it’s established. [...]”

Where are we now? We were promised an honoured place in the Church of England. That promise was made by archbishops and others many times. Where is the honoured place? And has that promise been honoured? I mused on that yesterday and I thought an honoured place could be a nice marble tomb next to the altar. Because I really do believe that promise, as it’s evolved has proved to be a deceit.

I’ve been digging back through past Synod documents. I was on for 27 years I think and I’ve got some bits and pieces that I really want to read to you. House of Commons, 29 October 1993, Michael Alison who was Second [Church] Estates Commissioner, and this was when the women priests Measure was going through:

“Recognising the divided views in the Church on the issue, the remainder of the Measure provides an elaborate and comprehensive set of safeguards designed to ensure that those who in conscience cannot accept the ordination of women as priests are not asked to act against their conscience” (and then talking about [Resolutions] A and B, he goes on to finish that section by saying) “these are continuing provisions without limit of time, built in, permanent, parochial safeguards.”

Well, he was wrong, wasn’t he? Because the Synod has decided that their word to Parliament, and Parliament’s word to us, shall be turned into a lie.

And then I come to the Synod. Firstly I’ve got the Archbishop of York, John Habgood:

“I turn finally to the question why an Act of Synod, rather than legislation? ...This is a point that has recurred again and again in the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and on which some people in the Synod continue to feel strongly. There are short answers based on practical considerations. It is possible to have an Act of Synod now and swiftly without legislation” (mind you if it had been a Measure they would have got rid of that anyway, we fought and fought for a Measure) “here then are two legal safeguards. What the Act does over and above is to express intentions, but the legal safeguards are in the appointment of the PEVs.” (It was inconceivable that bishops appointed by the Queen could be abolished by the Synod. But the Synod’s taken that power to itself. Again, an honourable man, turned into a deceiver by the Synod, and certainly Michael Alison and John Habgood were honourable men.) “Is the Act of Synod” (John Habgood went on) “enough, can it be trusted? An overwhelming endorsement of this Act would send a message that we mean what we say. Such an overwhelming endorsement would be difficult to undo.”

Extraordinary. And then again Michael Alison in the same debate, this is all in November 9th 1993:

“I must tell the Synod” (said Michael Alison) “that it really was touch and go whether the Ecclesiastical Committee would wish to go down the line of a third Measure” (that’s a Measure for the Act of Synod) “it needed really only a tiny handful of my colleagues on the Ecclesiastical Committee to decide on the balance of safety and security that the benefit of doubt had to be given to those who were pressing for a third Measure and specific legislation” (and then he goes on about in the end they decided not to do that) “we still managed to persuade the critical number in the Ecclesiastical Committee, very much with the assistance of the Archbishop of Canterbury and York when they came to the Ecclesiastical Committee to advise us and give evidence” (and then it goes on) “it was an act of faith on the part of the Ecclesiastical Committee that you would give our cherished minority” (that’s us) “this Act of Synod in good faith and in good heart and with sweeping and heartfelt approval and support.”

That’s the history of where it was, just a few bits and pieces out of a very long saga. As some of you know, I appeared before the Ecclesiastical Committee for three days when they met in 1993. Archbishop Habgood and Michael Alison were honourable men, but the last Synod would happily turn them into liars and deceivers. I really do believe it is quite outrageous.

[...] When the past is pointed out, the revisionist majority will say, and have said, they’re not bound by the promises and legal pledges of their predecessors. But in the real world, that attitude would lead to court, fines and even imprisonment. The managing director of a company is bound by what his company has decided and pledged in the past. [...]

One of the peculiar things about Parliament [...] the last committee to be appointed is the Ecclesiastical Committee. I intend to write to it on your behalf, when it’s appointed, I’ll be pointing out that the pledges it extracted from the Church and from the Synod – and that’s the way round it really happened, Frank Field stated that publicly and got slapped on the knuckles, and David Silk who is here who was a member of the Standing Committee will I’m sure agree with me that the leaders of the Standing Committee went to Parliament and were told what Parliament would and would not pass. I’m going to write and point out that the pledges it extracted and the answers it received are now to be set aside, and the financial compensation Parliament had insisted upon is not even mentioned this time. [...]

Many people were horrified by the atmosphere in General Synod in February last year and again this July. The deterioration in charity and concern is particularly seen in the House of Clergy. The new House of Clergy lack charity and concern; it’s actually dominated by a kind of liberal and feminist agenda, which is determined to see us off. The Archbishops’ proposal would have got through if the Bishops and Laity had voted for it alone. There is something really quite concerning about the House of Clergy – often poorly trained I have to say in the new Church of England – that presumes to disregard pledges, promises, faith, principles and has no concern for others. If I treated women priests in anything like the manner in which the liberals in the Synod propose to treat us, I would be publicly castigated, and quite rightly.

Synodically the very best hope that we’ve got is that the legislation will not get through this time, giving us another five years of attrition, in my view that is a very unattractive future, but it’s the best hope that we’ve got synodically.

When Forward in Faith was set up 17 years ago, it was the result of a meeting of all the catholic societies who appointed a large committee who foolishly elected me as Chairman

[...] Our demand was then and is now for an ecclesial solution. We set out the communion document which is about our relationship with the Church of England and how we responded to the problem in which we found ourselves, and we've consistently argued for living space. For living space which meant jurisdiction. We didn't get it, we got the flying bishops and me, it's actually a second best, but we've made it work and under God it has worked and it's given us a good period of life and joy.

“What do you want?” I've been asked by people on the other side. Well they know. Our requirements and our theology were clearly set out in the book *Consecrated Women*. No one can be in any doubt about what we need or where we stand. It's been argued at revision committees, it's been argued in Synod, it's been argued in documents, it's been presented fearlessly in *New Directions*. *New Directions* has stalwartly put our view before the bishops and the Synod and the whole Church for 15 years. *New Directions* is sent to every bishop and every member of Synod at your expense, they all get it, they know exactly where we are and what we want. [...]

I do feel that I must mention [...] the Society which was launched at the Sacred Synod. [...] I am not hostile to the Society of St Wilfred and St Hilda, but I do feel as your Chairman, with your agenda, I must raise some health warnings. In 1992 the only bishop who came out and batted for us was Noel Jones, Bishop of Sodor and Man, and most of the other catholic bishops at the time disappeared, let us get on with it. I can only welcome the fact that my brother bishops now seem to want to do something for this constituency. But that said I am concerned that this was without consultation [...] and I would say to those bishops if they really want this society to work, and perhaps it is the only chance to address the society model through the Church of England, they really have to talk. Forward in Faith is willing to service it, they are using our address, but this hasn't been discussed by your Council and doesn't reflect a change in our policy. We will continue to support it and to service it But there are some serious questions underlying future policy:

- With the PEVs gone, if the Measure is passed, what guarantee is there that there will be any orthodox bishops in the Church of England in ten years time? And if there are, what guarantee will there be that they've not been consecrated by women bishops amongst others? That's a very serious question.
- Secondly, how can a priest in the Society take an oath of allegiance to a woman bishop, even if he's cared for by the Society? That's a very serious question.
- Are the bishops sponsoring the Society willing to act outside the law if necessary? I've been very criticised in the past for saying “if you don't give it, we'll take it”, I meant it, if they had not given us the PEVs we would have taken it in 1994. Is that where they are now?
- And there are questions about how the Society functions. Forward in Faith has always been a presbyteral and a lay organisation. How will the Society respond to its members? It can't just be bishops and a supporting club. [...]

I wish the Society well, that's not pious words. But if it fails to deliver jurisdiction and ecclesial security and a real vision of unity with the greater Church, it will be a deceit. Forward in Faith is about an ecclesial future with a vision of unity and truth. It's not about somehow continuing to survive as persecuted members of the Church of England. [...]

I want to say a little word about America and Australia. I'm sure Bishop Jack and Michael will tell you about America where most of Forward in Faith there is involved in the new Anglican province. It's an appalling saga of litigation, persecution and destruction, and be under no illusions, our enemies could not care if our churches closed. They would rather they were turned into nightclubs or mosques, than that they were inhabited by orthodox Anglicans who defy them. That's honestly the truth of what's happening in the States, you can see it quite clearly and I have to say there's a bit of that in this country too.

In Australia, most of Forward in Faith Australia, which is a much smaller organisation, is committed to the Ordinariate, most of it, and there is a rather different dynamic there. But in the Church in Australia you've seen exactly the same. Ross Davis and the last Bishop of Ballarat, both driven out, Ross resigned two weeks ago and become a Roman Catholic. They've both stood on this platform in the past. Driven out, and what terrifies me, driven out after a breakdown, because people get broken psychologically and personally by an evil institution and I've seen that so often.

And if I look at Scandinavia where our friends are, most of the people that have come to this assembly in the past are no longer members of the Church of Norway, or the Church of Sweden. They have been driven out, by the institution which is in decline.

There is a message there for us and it's about our determination. I fear for our catholic and Anglican heritage. I have a great love for the Church of England and I've been ordained in it 44 years. I have loved the Church of England and I have sorrowed as I have witnessed its rapid deterioration. Even twenty years ago no one could have imagined then that it would be where it is now. All of us have the question facing us, [...] what matters is how we live our vision, our faith, the gospel, with integrity? And how is the Christian faith in this country best served, and how do we responsibly play our part? That is a crucial issue facing every single priest and lay person, how do we responsibly play our part? God bless you all as you play yours.

16 October 2010 Forward in Faith National Assembly
Address by Revd Jonathan Baker, Secretary of Forward in Faith.

Transcribed from the audio file on the Forward in Faith website by Adrian Vincent.

“[...] This is the first time that we’ve met since the last group of sessions of the General Synod and since the Measure to ordain women to the episcopate was passed through its Revision Stage, and committed for consideration by the dioceses [...]

Rather than go through all the detail of the Measure as it now stands, the only thing I need to do really is to sum it up as a mess and entirely unsatisfactory for us. The Measure that was committed for consideration in Revision was pretty hopeless from our point of view, it was certainly amongst the weaker of the options offered by the Manchester Group, and we were dismayed of course when the General Synod chose to go forward on a course that was by Code of Practice and did not contain any of the arrangements for which we have long argued.

In the Revision Committee, on which I served with the Bishop of Beverley and Father Simon Killwick from our organisation, the Measure got worse. The things that were there that may have been some help to us, particularly the provision for the appointment of special suffragan bishops who would undertake declarations not to ordain women to the priesthood or to participate in their consecration to the episcopate, and that those bishops would be available to minister to parishes who asked for them, that provision was withdrawn in the course of a particularly difficult series of meetings of the Revision Committee in October and November last year. The Revision Committee at that point reached this dreadful hiatus, hit this brick wall, at which because of the parts of the Measure that had been knocked out, often by very small majorities on the Revision Committee, and usually at least on one significant occasion very late in the day, the Measure really couldn’t be taken forward at all. And so the Archdeacon of Greenwich and Lewisham [the Venerable Christine Hardman] a member of the Revision Committee, essentially went away and wrote what was to all intents and purposes a new Measure, one which I think would never have got the necessary majorities at First Consideration if it had come to the General Synod in that form. And so it was that the July Synod received that Measure from the Revision Committee, received the Report of the Revision Committee which made it quite clear that, although you don’t have minority reports from Revision Committees, that the three members of the Catholic Group on that Committee, and two of the evangelicals - Angus MacLeay from Rochester Diocese and Lorna Ashworth from Chichester – were deeply unhappy and indeed deeply opposed to everything that the Revision Committee had recommended.

And so that Measure came to Synod in July and there were three substantial amendments from members of the Catholic Group:

- one to restore the idea of the creation of new and additional dioceses for those unable to accept the sacramental ministry of women in the presbyterate or episcopate;
 - one to make arrangements based on the transfer of some measure of jurisdiction;
- and each of those fell, but interestingly gained about a third of the vote of the whole Synod, which particularly in the case of additional dioceses was really no mean achievement.
- and then we came to the now notorious amendment proposed in the names of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. That offered us, we thought on the Catholic Group, some hope for the future. We never said it was all that we needed, we never said it did the trick, but we said it was something that we could work with and take forward and improve, and perhaps provided us with the hook on which to hang some measure of

jurisdiction. And as Bishop John said in his speech just now, that amendment, although passed by significant majorities in the House of Bishops and in the House of Laity, fell by five votes in the House of Clergy, and so the Convocations voted against their Archbishops.

And that is where the Measure now stands, committed to the dioceses. Where, as we know, it cannot be amended, it can only be agreed or rejected by each diocese. But the dioceses are allowed, if they wish, to pass so called ‘following motions’ which may express the mind of a particular diocesan synod and which at later stages perhaps in the House of Bishops some attention may be paid to those following motions. And then we think in July 2012, following Final Drafting in the previous February, the Measure will return to the General Synod for Final Approval. [...] To gain the approval of General Synod the Measure requires a two-thirds majority in each of the Houses of Bishops, Clergy and Laity. That is the factual summary of where we’ve got to. [...]

To just say a word about the present round of synodical elections. [...] My understanding is that the Catholic Group has well and truly held its own, which is no mean achievement in the present context, and that we have more evangelical friends, especially in the House of Laity than we had in the last Synod. So that’s one context in which to view where we are. [...]

To respond a little to what Bishop John said [...] I entirely share the view that the present Measure is completely inadequate and that the broken promises issue is absolutely critical and inescapable that the Church of England is made to face up to what it’s contemplating. [...]

If we got to the point where the Measure was passed in its present form and that was that, let me be absolutely clear, that as far as we were concerned that would be the end of the story. I think it’s very important that we hear that, and as Father David Houlding has said on a number of occasions, that we recognise that up to this point we have failed in delivering what we wanted to deliver in the General Synod. There’s no getting around that or getting away from it.

I also want to agree with every one of the hard questions which Bishop John about the Society now coming into existence [...] if those very hard questions are not satisfactorily and thoroughly answered, so that: jurisdiction; assurance of ministry; assurance of episcopal succession; all those things are guaranteed, not just promised or dangled or suggested, guaranteed, then that also is a hopeless and pointless journey.

Let me reflect also about what Bishop John said about the coming to birth Ordinariat. I think we need to be equally clear on that, that the initiative of *Anglicanorum Coetibus* is not something that we embrace, if we feel that is our vocation and calling, because of the disastrous state of the synodical process. It has to be a positive move for full communion, for full unity, with the See of Peter, with the Holy Father, with the Roman Catholic Church. And if it’s not that, I think I would want to say for anyone it’s not for you, or it’s not for you now. It’s that positive move, not a response to the collapse of our synodical aspirations.

So I think we hold those three things together: the inadequacy of the present Measure; the hard questions which Bishop John put to the Society; and the positive agenda for *Anglicanorum Coetibus* as that Apostolic Constitution has been unveiled. [...]

There are I think three very honourable reasons why there is still a vocation and a calling to go on with this process to see where the journey ends.

First of all for the sake of the Church of England, because we need to go on saying to the Church of England, as Bishop John says, that it looks like it might break its promises, that it looks like it might deliver something completely inadequate to what it knows to be the requirements of this faithful part of its own life. So for the sake of the Church of England, which has not got this remotely right, we need to go on saying the things that need to be said.

Secondly for the sake of the ecumenical vision, for the sake of that full ecclesial communion with the See of Peter, of which *Anglicanorum Coetibus* is such an important part of the landscape now, and in many ways is prophetic and the first fruits of that wider vision. When the Holy Father came on his visit, he spoke to the Bishops of his own Church about *Anglicanorum Coetibus* as part of that journey towards full ecclesial communion between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. And we are the only people taking that vision seriously. It may be that we are in a dreadful place as far as the fulfilment of that vision is concerned, although you might argue we are in no worse a place than 1833 or 1649 or any other date you want to mention, but there still is a vocation to pursue that vision, even if it means singing the Lord's song in a strange land.

Thirdly there is the reason of truth. The things that we have said are not just convenient, or not just provisional, or not just dependent on arrangements, but part of the Gospel truth, continue to be as true today as they've been through any part of this process so far.

So for all those reasons I would say there remains, at least until the answer to the first two questions which I posed about this Measure and about the emerging Society are answered, there remains an honourable vocation for continuing down this road. There equally of course now, because we live in such a changed landscape from a year ago, there now emerges the honourable vocation, the courageous vocation, the exciting vocation, of taking the path of being in what our bishops have come to call the 'first wave' of *Anglicanorum Coetibus*. Anyone contemplating that, doing that and leading that, is going to have a place in history as a pioneer of a hugely important reconvergence of catholic Christianity in England and of the coming to fruition of the ecumenical process. Everybody is wrestling with their own consciences, their own ability to make decisions and to make them now, their obligations and responsibilities to this Church, their aspirations for a greater future. Everybody is struggling with all of that at this time. We've heard from Bishop John again about the lack of charity in the House of Clergy in the General Synod at this moment. I think that's absolutely true. I want to end this first outing as Secretary of this organisation with my own reflection on charity [...] Homer Simpson when becoming a Catholic said to his mother who was worried about this development, he said, "mother, the little stupid differences are nothing compared to the big stupid similarities". Let's all try and keep that as our motto today and tomorrow.

16 October 2010 Forward in Faith National Assembly
Address by Bishop Jack Iker, Bishop of Fort Worth, Texas.

This was transcribed from the audio file by Mary Ann Mueller of www.virtueonline.org on October 30, 2010. The full transcription is published on the website:

http://listserv.virtueonline.org/pipermail/virtueonline_listserv.virtueonline.org/2010-November/011485.html

The below is a shortened version of the full transcription, I have deleted references to audience applause etc. Adrian Vincent, January 2013.

“Good afternoon everyone, and thank you for this opportunity to speak to you briefly and share in your Assembly. As I was listening to your conversation yesterday afternoon, it struck me that it was very similar to the conversations of course, that are going on in my own diocese.

When Stephen (Parkinson) asked me if I would speak briefly this afternoon I said: "Well, what would you like to talk about?" He said: "Oh, tell them about the litigation. You should get some good laughs out of that." [...]

I stand before you as the most sued Anglican bishop in all of North America. I'm presently named in three different suits in three different courts in two different counties, but all for the same offense, for standing firm for the historic faith and order of the undivided Church, and not allowing the Diocese of Fort Worth to compromise that by a relationship with the General Convention religion of The Episcopal Church.

As I'm in three suits, because I haven't had access to the Internet today. There may be another one out there I haven't heard about. I've been away from the office.

I tell my clergy, somewhat in jest and somewhat in grief, that I seem to spend more time now with groups of lawyers than groups of priests. Almost every day I am in conversation with one of our attorneys. We have engaged six different law firms to respond to the litigations brought against us.

Let me just summarize them briefly. The first one was brought against us as individuals -- what they called the "former leaders" of the Diocese of Fort Worth -- by three plaintiff parties. (1) The Episcopal Church; (2) a group calling themselves "the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth," and (3) calling themselves "the Corporation of the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth."

Our response to the court was The Episcopal Church could sue us, but no group calling themselves "the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth" or "the Corporation of the Diocese" could sue us because that is who WE are. And you can't sue yourself.

Through a long series of hearings we eventually went to Appellate Court where we won the ruling that the people who had sued us in the name of the Diocese and the Corporation were unauthorized to do so. That the attorneys filing the pleadings had not been engaged by the Diocese and the Corporation and so their pleadings were to be stricken.

So they had to re-plead, and this time they are pleading in the name of The Episcopal Church and in the name of various individuals who would like to claim positions of leadership in the Diocese and the Corporation. It's basically the minority group that voted against our (diocesan) Convention's decisions of 2007 2008 to remove all references to the General Convention of The Episcopal Church from our Constitution and Canons.

That vote on those two occasions, by the way, was over 80%. So that in 56 congregations in the Diocese, 48 remained with the Diocese and eight have remained with The Episcopal Church. Of the 110 clergy in the Diocese I'd say all but about 23 or 24 have remained with the Diocese, the others have been the minority group going with The Episcopal Church. And that litigation is still active.

Then the second suit we were drawn into, believe it or not, one of the most historic churches in the Diocese - St. Andrew's in downtown Fort Worth - had been left a major bequest by a famous artist who had died and had left in her will that when her artwork was sold it would be distributed among three different charities, one of them her home church - St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in downtown Fort Worth.

They (St. Andrew's) had received two bequests from the trust fund when this rump diocese was formed. And they (the rump diocese) wrote a letter to the trustees saying: "Don't send it to St. Andrew's anymore, they left The Episcopal Church, and they have forfeited their right to that bequest. Send it to us instead and we will hold it in trust for them that they are in the midst of reorganization."

In that case the judge was convinced that since the previous suit had been filed before that one, that that should be abated and wait until the original suit is resolved. So that one is on hold.

And then to my amazement, a couple of weeks ago, my press secretary (Suzanne Gill) called me at home one evening and said: "Do you know you were sued in federal court today personally?" and I said: "No, what for?" and she said: "Well, let me read it to you..." And we actually heard about this by being posted on a blog by a liberal blogger from TEC.

And a group, guess what they call themselves? "The Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth" the same group that was kicked out of court in the original suit with the same attorney representing them has sued me for trademark and copyright name infractions. That I am unlawfully using the name "the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth" "the Corporation of the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth" and I am no longer allowed, in their claim, to use the Great Seal of the Diocese. Well, that's on my ring and I only use it as the Bishop of the Diocese. And so we have filed a countersuit - which has just been filed these last few days - asking the federal court to dismiss those charges, based upon the fact that Appellate Court has ruled that this attorney who has sued us once before in the name of "the Episcopal Diocese of Fort Worth" is unauthorized to do so. And then we are filing a countersuit for malicious prosecution and harassment of me by taking me through the federal court system.

They're, of course, wanting to punish me personally and have me pay for their legal fees and reparations for the "damage" I have done to them by using their seal and name and so on. And we, likewise, are going to ask them to compensate us for having wrongfully brought us to court and paying whatever damages the court thinks we are due.

So please pray for us, it's very distracting. It's consuming in terms of time and energy. And one of the things that's most consuming, of course, is money. And the Diocese of Fort Worth, up until this recent lawsuit, which was filed in federal court, has spent over one million dollars in attorney's fees defending ourselves.

It's expected that whatever happens in the first go around will get appealed to the Appellate Court in Texas, and whoever loses on the Appellate Court will appeal to the Texas Supreme Court. So our attorneys and corporation managers have estimated that we'll probably, before this is over, spend between three and a half to four and a half million dollars in litigation.

So pray for us that we don't get consumed by all that and we can remain focused, as we must be, on the mission of the Church, building up the Body of Christ, reaching out to the world, to the unchurched in the Name of Christ, and so on.

The last thing I'll say is that the (Anglican) Ordinariate option is very much on hold for us because all the property in the Diocese is involved in this litigation. So there is no way we can talk about releasing a congregation with assets and building property and go into the Ordinariate until the final decision of the courts in Texas about who actually owns the property.

In the meantime, as recently as Tuesday, I had another priest come to me to say to me he can't remain and he was going to be resigning and being received into the Catholic Church. So that brings a total number of five of our young priests, some of our brightest, most gifted, who since the Ordinariate concept was announced, have decided they can't remain. They're going to go individually, with their families, into the Roman Church.

So that's where we are, and thank you very much for your steadfast partnership in the Gospel with us. Do pray for us as we pray for you.”