RECUMEN

JUL 1 8 2014

7851 Squilax Anglemont Rd. Anglemont, B.C. V0E 1M8 July 14, 2014

Archbishop John Privett of the Anglican Church of Canada

Diocese of Kootenay and member of the Commission for "same sex marriage" or —

"Same Gender Arrangement" or "Same Gender Agreement"

Dear Archbishop John.

Thank you, for your interesting response to my letter of June 9th, 2014 where I expressed my thoughts on the difficult task of changing the Marriage Canon Law. Even as I write these words — should it be — writing a new law or including an addition to the present law?

Yes, you most certainly may share my letter as a submission to the Commission on the Marriage Canon. I understand that the correspondence would then become a public document. SEE NEXT PAGE

*

I grant you permission for you to share my thoughts on the topic of devising new words to more accurately describe a totally new concept. As mentioned in my letter – ideally the wording should be put forward by the persons who are requesting this new form of marriage or at the very least – be consulted and be a part of devising new words and play a part in drawing up new documents.

Thank you, for your consideration in sharing my "one person" ideas.

Sincerely, Melrose Scott

Mrs. Melrose I. Scott.

7851 Squilax Anglemont Rd. Anglemont, B.C. V0E 1 M8 June 9th, 2014

Archbishop John Privett of the Anglican Church. Bishop of the Diocese of Kootenay and member of the Commission for "same sex marriage".

Dear Archbishop, John.

I am a member of St. David's Anglican Church in Celista B.C. and was just reading the June High Way and the June Anglican Journal. As I read the article written by John Lavinnder on "Emerging from the Fog" - the words "It is not a matter of doing the old thing differently, it's a matter of doing a new thing" stood out in my mind and I thought what a very good idea in rejuvenating the church. I then went on to read the article by Bishop Linda Nicholls on the "Broad Consultation of marriage" when the words "from the Fog" article stood out very clearly as to perhaps a solution that could offer some help in the daunting task of changing the marriage canon church law to allow same sex marriage. Truly it would be a "Daunting Task" and then some. It may be impossible to achieve.

Ever since the debate and discussion all began on same sex marriage — I have thought that there should be new words to signify what one is talking about — "Same Sex Marriage" is something new and different from anything we have known before or certainly before anyone brought this concept into public discussion. So, why would we not develop an entirely new way to address what they are talking about? Especially since the word marriage in the Biblical sense means between a man and a woman.

Ideally, the new wording should come from the persons themselves who are requesting this new form of marriage — not from the persons to which the laws already apply. If there is ever to be a dignity and an acceptance of the entire situation — there should be new totally "present day" wording invented and accepted into the English language — gone would be the words that totally mean something different than they did back in the 1930,s and 40's. For example: words such as "gay" and "fruit", certainly did not pertain to people. Also events and words such as "Gay Pride" should be eliminated – such words do not promote acceptance, dignity or pride. I propose this idea to try and explain why the writing or trying to change a document to encompass an entirely new thought would be monumentally difficult — if not totally impossible.

Perhaps with this concept in mind, the writing of new laws could be devised with less controversy by "not trying to do the old thing differently " - "it's a matter of doing a new thing".

Yes, it may mean having two sets of laws to encompass two divergent situations. The original law could remain as is — and a new law devised to encompass the new situation.

I see that as our Archbishop you are a member of the Commission on "<u>Same Gender Combination</u>" therefore have directed this submisson to you. I hope that I have written my "one person" ideas clearly so that you can understand the concept I am trying to explain.

Mrs. Melrose Scott'

I thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Melrose Scott