

Proceedings of the 2004 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

The Committee on Journal

The Committee on Journal hereby certifies as accurate the proceedings as Printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* for Thursday, April 29, 2004, with the following corrections.

United Methodist Judicial Council Nominations are:

Laity:

P. Edwin Gausi, Liberia
Daniel F. Evans, South Indiana
Beth Capen, New York
Jon Gray, Missouri
W. Clark Williams, Virginia
Lonnie Brooks, Alaska
Daniel L. Ivy-Soto, New Mexico
Kurt Glassco, Oklahoma
David Beckley, Mississippi
Solomon Christian, Memphis
Raymond Hamill, Wyoming
Amy Valdez Barker, Wisconsin
Raymond Z. Annang,
Middle Philippines

Clergy:

John E. Harnish, Detroit
Rodney Wilmouth, Minnesota
Robert Sweet Jr., New England
Rex Blevins, Nebraska
Susan Henry-Crowe, South Carolina
Jane Tews, Desert Southwest
Dennis L. Blackwell, Greater New Jersey
Rodney G. Steele, Arkansas
Shamange Kyungu, North West Katanga
Frank Trotter Jr., Baltimore-Washington
Gloria Brooks, West Ohio

Reported by Lin Doyle
Chair, Committee on Journal
(D4, Seat 10)

**Tuesday Afternoon,
April 27, 2004**

(song)

BISHOP RUEDIGER M. MINOR: Be seated, and I would first call on our host bishop, Bishop Hae-Jong Kim, and *(unintelligible)* Brian Bauknight to greet the General Conference. Bishop Kim.

BISHOP HAE-JONG KIM: Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We welcome you all to the Pittsburgh Area, Western Pennsylvania Annual Conference of The United Methodist Church.

As a host bishop, I am very pleased to welcome you here to this wonderful auditorium, convention center, and the city of Pittsburgh. Even though I am a host bishop, I am not hosting alone. To be sure, we have a delegation from our annual conference. I'd like to have them stand at this point. Would you stand delegation, please?

(applause)

And hold your applause a little minute. And then I'd like to have all the Western Pennsylvania people, annual conference people, to stand, wherever you are.

OK, and then we are not only hosting by our conference for this time. This is a new style of hosting a General Conference. In our jurisdiction, Northeastern Jurisdiction, all the annual conferences in the jurisdiction are co-hosting because they are supporting us to host you. So at this point, I'd like to have all the conferences from Northeastern Jurisdiction to stand, and let's give them a hand.

(applause)

BRIAN BAUKNIGHT: Good afternoon, I'm Brian Bauknight. In 1964, I was a senior in seminary, came to a few weeks to the General Conference, at the then-brand-new Civic Arena. Now

in 2004, 40 years later, I find myself as chair of the host committee.

We do welcome you to Pittsburgh. We're glad that you are here. We took as our vision statement when we began that we wanted to provide excellent hospitality in the context of Christian conferencing; and we elicit the support, as Bishop Kim has already mentioned, of the other 12 conferences in the Northeastern Jurisdiction. And because it is an expensive operation to do, they have all made financial contributions to us in order to help us do that, and we're very grateful to them for that particular contribution.

We are glad you're here. The only piece of advice I want to give you is when you're outside the convention center, never try to go around the block in Pittsburgh. You will get, inevitably be lost. It's all a triangle and round hills and mountains, so don't try to find your way around the block.

Welcome to Pittsburgh. We're delighted you're here. I've been a lifelong resident, and I love the place.

(applause)

MARTHA M. ORPHE: Good afternoon. I am Martha Orphe, and I am the district superintendent here in Pittsburgh. And of course we welcome you to Pittsburgh.

As the bishop has indicated, and as Brian has indicated, we have worked hard, not only as a city, not only as a conference, not only as a jurisdiction to welcome you here; we have been working for a long time. In this area, we have a saying. It says, "Red up the house." We have been "redding" up our house for you. And that does not mean we are painting our house red. It simply means that we are preparing, we have cleaned, we have welcomed you here. And so again, we thank you for coming and giving us the privilege and the honor for you to be with us in Pittsburgh. Welcome again to Pittsburgh.

BISHOP MINOR: We thank our hosts for all the preparations. We thank you for the warm welcome. You have already in this short time been great hosts. Thank you. We look forward to a great conference.

Opening Motions

And now I call on the secretary of the General Conference, Carolyn Marshall, for the opening enabling motions.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Bishop, the roll call is the first item of business. For the delegates who will be taking from those credentials that you were presented or the credential cards that you turned in to receive your badges, the secretary of the Judicial Council, Sally AsKew, will do a written report for the Judicial Council. Daniel Church, who is the general secretary of the General Council on Ministries will provide the report for the general agencies.

The chairperson of each delegation will continue to report for the membership of that delegation, being mindful of the order of replacement of reserves. The chairperson of each delegation of affiliated autonomous and concordat churches will be reporting for their delegations.

In establishing the bar of the conference, those tables at which you are seated constitute the bar of the conference. In addition to that, there are keypads for voting on the platform to the right of the main podium for those persons who are delegates and who are on the platform at the time a vote is taken.

One of the items of business which must be cared for at the opening session is that of the election of the coordinator of the calendar. The name to be placed in operation—in *nomination*—for that is L. Fitzgerald Reist.

BISHOP MINOR: We have a nomination before us?

MARSHALL: L. Fitzgerald Reist.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. Are we ready to vote? Would the conference vote on all these enabling motions, or would you like to have this

nomination separate? *(pause)* All at once. So, are you ready to vote on the enabling opening motions? There is . . . microphone 2, please.

WILLIAM D. SCOTT (Mississippi): Point of information, bishop. William Scott, lay . . .

BISHOP MINOR: Please state your name and conference.

WILLIAM D. SCOTT (Mississippi): William Scott, lay delegate, Mississippi Conference. A point of information: I thought the question before us was to just to vote on the person who is going to lead the, not the whole set of rules and all of that. Is that what you're saying? Are we going to vote on everything in that section? I don't understand what you're saying.

BISHOP MINOR: *(unintelligible)* It's not a motion on the rules, it's just a motion that has been brought before us by the secretary of the conference.

SCOTT: OK, to elect a person? Thank you.

BISHOP MINOR: Yes. Are we ready to vote? Please vote now.

(pause)

98% yes; and 2% no. The motion has carried. [*Yes, 98%; No, 2%*]

Committee on the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order

MARSHALL: Bishop?

BISHOP MINOR: Yes?

MARSHALL: There is one more set of nominations which must be cared for at this time, although we are just ready to receive the report of the Committee on the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order. And I've also been asked to ask those persons who have served on Plan of Organization and Rules of Order during the 2000-04 quadrennium to please come to the platform at the time the chairperson, now, so that when the chairperson makes that report in a few moments, you will be on the platform.

But it is also required by our rules that the incoming, those members of the Plan of Organization and Rules of

Order for the new quadrennium be elected at this opening session. And so those names as the nominations have come are as follows: Janet Stephenson; David Bard; Mark Miller; Aida Fernandez; David Severe; Joe Whittmore; Arnetta Beverly; Elaine Stanovsky; Randolph Miller; and from Mozambique, Jose Mapsanganhe. And I apologize if I've mispronounced that.

BISHOP MINOR: The nomination is before us. Is the conference ready to vote on this nomination of incoming new members of the Committee on Plan of Organization and Rules of Order? Please vote now.

885 votes yes, which is 97%; and 28 votes no, which is 3%. These people are elected. [*Yes, 885; No, 28*]

And now I call on Dr. Jerome Del Pino, the chair of the Committee on the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order. Dr. Del Pino.

JEROME KING DEL PINO: Thank you, Bishop. Bishop Minor and members of the Council of Bishops, delegates of the General Conference of 2004, and guests, on behalf of the Committee on the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order, I wish to present this report on the proposed ways and means by which we might order our life together effectively and faithfully during this General Conference. The report before you has been developed over the current quadrennium by a committee that has worked diligently to address the specific recommendations of the previous General Conference, and to craft proposed changes that we'd be deemed to be appropriate to the work of this General Conference.

I am indebted to my colleagues who have comprised this committee, and I want to acknowledge them at this time. Not all are delegates to this General Conference, and so names may be called who may not be present among us. Nonetheless, their recognition should be made. As I call their names, I would ask that they would stand and be recognized, and that you would hold any applause of member until such time as they have all been named. They

are, Janet Stephenson, who has served as vice-chairperson; Darlene Amon, secretary; Rueben A. de Guzman; Grant Hagiya; Momo Escopan; Barbara Means; David Severe; Elaine Stanovsky; and Joe Whittmore. Please join me in expressing appreciation to them.

(applause)

I also wish to express sincere appreciation to Carolyn Marshall, secretary of the General Conference, and Gary Bowen, our business manager for this General Conference, for their effective resourcing and support of the committee.

(applause)

As has been noted earlier, this report places before the delegates to this General Conference the recommended changes and improvements formulated this quadrennium for the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order. In the main, the report makes recommendations that clarify by addition and deletion the plan for organizing the Conference structurally and ordering its deliberative and decision-making work.

After due consideration, and upon recommendation of the General Conference of 2000, the committee is recommending that the Social Principles be considered in the Legislative Committee on Church and Society.

There has been a significant rewriting and ordering, reordering, of the way in which minority reports, found on page 28, Rule 27, may be crafted and properly placed before this body. The intention of the rewriting is to ensure that in minority report is as pure as such can be and not be a pale replication of the main motion.

It is our hope that you will find helpful the additions that clarify the process for the election of officers.

I call your attention to two corrections, at least, that I know of, that should be made. First, on page 113, the left column, the second line of the first paragraph, the sentence beginning "In providing accommodation for persons

with special," now indicated as deleted, should be retained. Thus, the complete recommended sentence should read, "In providing accommodation for persons with special needs, personal assistants or interpreters may be seated when necessary with voting delegates in both committee and plenary sessions." The second correction, page 115; the right column at the top. The number six, in parentheses, should precede the words "Presiding Officers."

Proposal for Bishops to Chair Committees

As has been noted prior to the convening of this conference, the most substantive and historic change that the committee is recommending to this conference for its careful consideration is a change in the Plan of Organization that permits an active bishop in full connection to be the chair of such, of each of the eleven legislative committees. In view of the significance and consideration of this proposed change, prior to the convening of this conference, it will prove helpful to share briefly the genesis of the change, the process that informed the committee's deliberations, and the compelling reasons that ultimately led the committee to make this recommendation.

The recommendation originated with an ad hoc committee of the Commission on the General Conference in the fall of 2002. After its meeting, a request was made to the Committee on Plan of Organization and Rules of Order to share the commission's thinking with us. That request was granted, and the proposal related to bishops chairing and co-chairing legislative committees was shared with the committee. At this initial hearing, the committee did not affirm the proposal. However, it did agree to talk about other ways for elections of legislative chairs, legislative committee chairs, to occur.

In a subsequent meeting of the Committee on Plan of Organization and Rules of Order in 2003, the Commission on the General Conference requested that the committee hear a presentation by a member of the com-

mission, in order that the committee might be resourced to reconsider its previous action. The compelling reasons that were cited for recommending this historic departure from our tradition, and not church law, are that the rule change will, first, provide the best possible presiders for the sake of efficiency and fairness in the life of the General Conference. Secondly, the change would provide presiders who already know how to preside, so as to expedite the schedule and minimize on-site training of those who would otherwise be elected.

Three, the change would, at least in some measure, de-politicize the process of election. Fourth, the change would eliminate the chairship as a platform for declared, and perhaps even undeclared, episcopal candidates. Five, the change would allow all delegates assigned to committees to participate fully and freely in their representative capacity as members of annual conference delegations. Sixth, the change would make better use of bishops, whose job is to preside in the general, jurisdictional, central, and annual conferences, in accordance with Paragraph 415.1 of our current *Book of Discipline*. And seventh, the change would create further opportunity for bishops, especially central conference bishops, to be in leadership at the General Conference.

After due consideration of these and other compelling reasons, the committee reversed its earlier decision and crafted what is deemed to be appropriate recommendations to this General Conference. It is important to note, the committee's decision to make this recommendation to this General Conference is borne out of an abiding confidence that we as a church need leadership that is well prepared, and leadership that is well informed. It is also borne out of the abiding conviction that in the words of two United Methodist theologians and historians, in their recent publication *Episcopacy in the Methodist Tradition*, and I quote, "The United Methodist Church depends on its presiding officers, the bishops, to make forms of conference and

Christian conversation possible in diverse community. The bishops have an essential place in conference work. As presiding officers without a voice in the content of matters being discussed, they attend primarily to the body's own rules for addressing the issues and proposals that come before it."

Dr. Richey and Dr. Frank continue, "For the sake of the good order of the church, they, the bishops, suppress their own interests and do what they can to help the body achieve consensus for action. Through their fairness, their tone, and their choice of language, they have the opportunity to create a space in which Christian conversation and conferencing can occur."

The committee's recommendation is based not in order that the bishops might interfere in the legislative process of the General Conference; rather, it is based on the need for providing the best presiding resources to legislative committees in order to improve significantly the soul source of General Conference legislation, namely the legislative committees themselves, these committees that impact the total life and work of a global church.

At the General Conference of 2000, one committee sorted through hundreds of petitions and resolutions. That year, 38 percent of the U.S. delegates were attending their first General Conference. In 2004, it is estimated that more than 40 percent are first-time delegates. Utilizing bishops who have the most experience in parliamentary procedure in areas where they have considerable gifts would be immensely helpful in expediting the legislative tasks of the 11 legislative committees and greatly minimizing the offering of deficient legislation to the plenary session of the General Conference.

The committee affirms that there is no ambiguity in Paragraph 415.1 regarding the bishops' responsibility to preside at annual jurisdictional and General Conference. It is not church law but very strong tradition that has resulted in bishops having no role other than presiding over plenary sessions in

the critically important legislative process of the General Conference.

The committee affirms that leaving bishops in silence at General Conference in precisely the place where the conference will speak for the whole church through the legislative process is poor stewardship. The working team of bishop presider and lay or clergy vice-chair with accompanying officers will model what the church is called to be: a community of Christ seeking God's will for the future.

Bishops are elected to exercise precisely this kind of leadership in temporal as well as spiritual matters on behalf of the whole church. To this end, we now make this and other recommendations for the body to consider and act on as the Spirit of God might lead.

Bishop Minor, this completes my introduction to and review or overview of the report of the Committee on the Plan of Organization and Rules of Order. On behalf of the committee, I move its adoption.

Alternative to Bishop Chairship

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Del Pino, for your report. The motion is before us, and now I am ready to entertain discussion and whatever you have to say. Over there on the right, microphone 8.

DAVID L. SEVERE (Oklahoma): I am a member of this committee. I concluded with the minority on it, and we'd like to, some of us, bring this motion to you, Bishop. I would like to propose the first motion. If it prevails, then we have implementing language that we would recommend, if that is all right with you, sir.

BISHOP MINOR: Could you state your motion?

SEVERE: Yes. I move that all language in the proposed Plan of Organization and Rules of Order which refer to bishops presiding over legislative committees be stricken, and that all legislative committees shall be presided over by duly-elected chair from the membership of each respective legislative committee in accor-

dance with the established rules for such elections. If I have a second, I will speak to it.

BISHOP MINOR: Is this motion seconded? It's seconded. Please speak to your motion.

SEVERE: Our chair has most graciously told us, told you, exactly how the process went. There are a couple things I would add. First of all, I would like to make it clear that the bishops did not ask for this, though some have said that. This did not come from the bishops. He stated it correctly. It came from the Commission on the General Conference.

We would like to suggest that there are a number of things that we still think are not right about this. First of all, this disenfranchises all laypeople from ever chairing a committee. This is a great break with our historic tradition, and we believe that a five to four vote in a committee of something of this significance simply should not be brought to this body yet, was not ready. So we don't think that this is the wise move to make—or some of us do not—and we've put this motion before you. And if it prevails, I have implementing legislation to propose, too, sir. So I move this motion that I've just made.

Debate on Alternative

BISHOP MINOR: We heard the motion. The maker of the motion has been speaking to it. Now it's open for discussion. I see a vote over here. Are you speaking in favor?

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): I would speak against David Severe's motion.

BISHOP MINOR: You speak against the motion. We are listening to you.

MILLARD: Yes, I'd like to speak in favor of the committee's recommendation. My vision for General Conference is that we will come to the end of this time united and stronger to bear a greater witness for Jesus Christ in this world. It seems no accident that we're in Pittsburgh, the city where two rivers come together and form a stronger river; and I would hope that we could

come together as a General Conference and form a stronger denomination.

When I first came to General Conference (*unintelligible*). I was shocked when elections were done so quickly. We went in, (*unintelligible*) someone was nominated and elected, and I asked, "How did that happen?" And I was told that there's a self-selected group that makes these nominations and has the votes lined up to elect them. Didn't seem appropriate or democratic, but it is how we have done it traditionally.

It seems to me that this, having the bishops chair the legislative committees, would be preferable to having a self-selected committee do that, even though they may choose good people. It's not about the persons chosen, it's about the process that someone who is not chosen by General Conference brings in the slate for election. It seems to me that our bishops—who in their pastoral letter wrote to us, they want to do all in their power for the spirit of mutual respect and unity—to ask our bishops to be the one to help bring us together, so that by the end of the General Conference, we'll be united under our episcopal leadership as we go forward to be a stronger denomination.

If we always do what we've always done, we'll always get what we've always got. I encourage you to defeat the substitute motion and to enact the motion from the Rules Committee.

BISHOP MINOR: Over here, block B, microphone 1. Yes, we had a motion, a speech against the amendment. Are you speaking for the amendment? We are looking for someone speaking for the amendment.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): I'm doing neither, Bishop Minor. I just rise to ask that we would enact Rule 20.8, which is a call for prayer before we take a vote on this, because it is a serious choice that we're making if we, whether we choose to uphold tradition or to set a new precedent. So I would simply ask that we would re-enact, that we would enact

Rule 20.8, which is a call for prayer before this vote is taken.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you for this recommendation, and we will duly do this. Over there, mic 5. We are looking for someone speaking for the amendment.

DEBORAH A. MCLEOD (Florida): I wish to speak for the amendment.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. You have the right. Speak. You have the floor.

MCLEOD: I participated in a legislative committee in 2000 that was very ably chaired by a laywoman. I think it's erroneous to assume that there are laypersons who do not know parliamentary procedure or could not help us with process. Unlike some committees that were led by clergy, our committee was never behind. We accomplished our work in a timely fashion, and we were very ably led.

(*applause*)

I want to say that we very much appreciate the leadership of our bishops. We need the leadership of our bishops, but there are many of us that valued the shared leadership of laity with clergy; and I want to remind the General Conference that United Methodist women have been training women, laywomen, in leadership for many generations. Thank you.

(*applause*)

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. May I ask the body to withhold applause. We are here in a common work to perfect a motion and to do our work, and we should withhold applause. Over there in the back, microphone No. 8. And, we had one in favor and one against the amendment.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop Minor, I rise to speak against—

BISHOP MINOR: Yes, you are in order, Charles.

BOAYUE: Since we are discussing the amendment, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment on several grounds.

BISHOP MINOR: (*unintelligible*) We had two motions in favor, two

speeches in favor, including the maker of the motion, so I can only entertain at this moment speech against the motion. Is there a speech against the motion? Yes, the amendment. Over there. Yes sir, point of order, microphone 1.

MELVIN R. BOWDAN JR. (Kentucky): Bishop Minor, I believe other than the maker of the amendment, we've had one against and one for in discussing.

BISHOP MINOR: The speech of the maker of the amendment counts. So we had two in favor and, so far, one against; and we are waiting for another one against.

MARK A. MILLER (Greater New Jersey): Bishop, I had a question, I guess to the maker of the original motion. Would the, if we were to pass the motion and not the substitution, would the bishops then present the reports to the General Conference and plenary session? It's a question, I'm not sure if it's in the right place now, but the question is, would the bishops present the reports made by the legislative committees in the plenary session?

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you for your question, I call on Dr. Del Pino to give an answer.

DEL PINO: The bishops would merely preside. The reports to the plenary of the General Conference will be brought by those other officers elected by the legislative committee. Those persons may be either lay or clergy. The bishops will simply preside over the legislative committees in order to ensure that those legislative pieces that are needed to be brought before the plenary are in fact dealt with by the legislative committee.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. I'm looking still for one against the motion, against the Severe motion, which is an amendment. Is there, over there, against? Then please, microphone number 4. Needs to be against, yes.

SHIRLEY PARRIS (New York): I rise to affirm the motion that was made by the Rules Committee. I also am really upset about the way that the leaders of the legislative committees have tra-

ditionally been chosen, and it was very well-put by a previous speaker, who said that by the time that you reach the committee, the work has already been done. By the time you take a breath, the person has already been elected and I really do think that those elections should have more thought in them and more input from the members who are part of that committee. I would rise to support the Rules Committee in this matter.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. We have had two motions, two speeches against and two speeches in favor. I had earlier recognized Rev. Boayue, and he is speaking for the motion. Microphone 8.

BOAYUE: Yes, I'm speaking for the amendment on several grounds. If the bishops were to preside over the legislative committee with voice and no vote, breaking a tie would become a parliamentary problem and we have not received any explanation as to who could break a tie in a legislative committee.

Secondly, I have a problem and a concern as to the constitutionality of the episcopal leaders presiding over every legislative committee. Generally speaking, the bishops, while providing general oversight to the whole church, represent in a constitutional way the executive of our church, the General Conference representing the legislature. Approving the main motion without this amendment would become a pervasive control of the legislature by the executive, creating new problems. Many more problems perhaps than we envision by solving one or two.

I do not think the major motion should be approved as is. I invite us to affirm the role of laity who represent half of this assembly. Excluding them completely from leadership of legislative committees into perpetuity while this recommended change is in place is completely wrong. I urge approval of the amendment to keep the General Conference available to those elected by the church to be its delegates. If we have concerns with how we run our

own committees, I think we can go to the committees tonight and do something about it. But The United Methodist Church around the world has sent every lay and clergy delegate here to do the entire job.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. I can entertain one more speech against the—on the left. Is this a speech against the Severe amendment?

PATRICK PH. STREIFF (Switzerland-France): When I came to my first General Conference, I really saw how the bishops presided over our plenary sessions in a very well-taken manner. It would never happen, the idea to me that there should be someone else but a bishop presiding in the plenary; and I never understood why it was different for legislative committees. I think we have our bishops, who are really the leaders for presiding, in the plenary; and it would be an excellent thing to have them also presiding in the legislative committees, where we do the same work, which is the work of the General Conference. We have our bishops to do that job, and I'm strongly against the amendment and in favor of the new ruling.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you, Rev. Streiff. And now I ask Dr. Del Pino as the chair, he has the last speech before we vote.

Closing Speech Regarding Alternative

JEROME DEL PINO: Sisters and brothers, this is a very serious consideration and decision. It is one that has to do, not with issues of disenfranchisement, it has to do with leadership. Not that there are not excellent leaders both lay and clergy who constitute the body of this delegation of General Conference, that is, this body of General Conference delegates. The reality is that we in The United Methodist Church need more and more to be able to be brought together, as has been said by a previous speaker. There are less encumbrances that weigh us down, not only as we are seeing that evident in the way in which annual conferences are presided over by those whose commitment is to the whole

church, but also the way in which we are able to see how our bishops lead us in the plenaries of these General Conferences, plenaries which ultimately result in actual church law and policy.

The argument that suggests that bishops would have a conflict between the legislative and executive authority, that conflict is already evident here in view of the fact that nothing is law that comes out of a legislative committee until the plenary of the General Conference speaks. Regarding the argument that is made that bishops do not, that bishops would be conflicted in their having to break ties, I would suggest to you that the same rules that apply in the plenary session would apply in the legislative committee where bishops do not break ties in the plenary of the General Conference.

Finally, I would suggest that as we make this decision, we would be mindful that The United Methodist Church is at a defining moment in its history. That defining moment has been brought by many years in which we have endeavored to embrace the whole world. That defining moment, sisters and brothers, is related to the fact that we now have brothers and sisters here from our Central Conferences who would never have an opportunity to participate in some of the devisements that are made in advance of their ever arriving to be able to be elected to offices, much less the chairpersonship of our committees.

And so it is with this in mind that the committee believes that it is in the best interest of the future that we endeavor to embrace in the General Conference, that we would have leadership by those who have been elected to give leadership for the whole church and on behalf of the whole church's well-being. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. Before we now take a vote, let us pause for a moment. I would ask the secretary to read the motion again and then pause for a moment of discernment.

MARSHALL: The motion reads to move to strike all language referring to

bishops presiding over legislative committees.

BISHOP MINOR: Let us pray

(prayer)

Are you ready to vote on the amendment, the Severe amendment? Please vote now. [*Yes, 493; No, 418; Abstain, 4*]

The amendment has carried. Now I think I need to call on David Severe again to tell us what this means. The technical fallout of this.

SEVERE: It means Jerome's not gonna buy me dinner tonight, I can tell you that. I would come before the house (*unintelligible*) motion, the first one being only to come—be in effect in the rules for this coming, the coming General Conference because I assume that those who are going to preside for the organization are all in place; and so this would simply read in the rules that the selection of the bishops who will organize the legislative committees shall be selected by the Council of Bishops. If that process has already been done, then this motion doesn't have to be made.

The motion that will put the language back would be the following: On page 120, VIII.E.3.a—and Bishop, I have this on a disk at the desk if they want to put it on the screen, if you give us permission to do that. Yes. You'll see, 3, I'm sorry, VIII.E.3.a, page 120. You would strike the proposed language there, retain the language that's at the bottom of the page with some exceptions. The first two words, "For Organization," would be stricken. The words "And Administrative Committees" would be stricken because that's taken care of in present language that has not been challenged. And then we would have a new VIII.E.3. legislative committees read as follows:

"(a) All legislative committees shall meet for organization at such time as the Commission on the General Conference shall determine. A bishop appointed by the Council of Bishops, and an assistant secretary appointed by the secretary of the General

Conference, shall serve respectively as chairperson and secretary to effect an organization and each of the several legislative committees. The first meeting of the legislative committee shall be held as soon as possible following the first plenary session of the General Conference. The orientation of the committee followed by the election of officers shall be the order of business of the first meeting of the committee.

"(b) The election of a chairperson, vice-chairperson, and secretary of each legislative committee shall be by ballot."

The other change would come on Rule 33, page 129, subparagraph 5 and 6, where you will strike the words "vice-chairperson" each time it appears in these two statements and so that it would read "chairperson." It would then read as follows: "(5). The chairperson of each legislative committee shall coordinate the reports of the committee to the plenary. [And] (6). When the chairperson of the committee is not in harmony with the report adopted by the committee, it shall be the chairperson's duty to state the fact to the committee. The committee shall elect one of its members for the presentation and discussion of the report in the plenary. If in such a case the committee shall fail to select a representative, the chairperson shall designate a member to represent the committee and said representative shall have all the rights and privileges of the chairperson in relation to such a report."

I believe that will put back into it the language that will allow us to move forward. Thank you.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. I understand this is following the previous decision in bringing the language in order and in consonance with what we have decided in this amendment. Are we ready to vote on this new language? Then I ask you, please, vote now.

718 Yes; 166 No; 24 Abstain. And this new language is now in order. The motion has carried. Before the house is the whole report with—as amended.

Are there other amendments, other discussion? Over there, mic 4, please.

Distribution of Handouts

BETH CAPEN (New York): Thank you, Bishop. Beth Capen, New York Conference. I would move to amend on page 123, the left column, letter "C," the proposed new language, which are the words "the discretion of the Commission on The General Conference," and retain the previous language, which is "least 30 feet outside any entrance door to the plenary or committee meeting rooms," on the rationale being, Bishop, that—

BISHOP MINOR: Give me—give me a moment to (*unintelligible*) this motion seconded.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Second.

BISHOP MINOR: Then you can go ahead.

CAPEN: Thank you, Bishop. I appreciate getting the newsletters and the daily handouts from the various groups that come and spend their time volunteering to support us as delegates; and whether I may heartily agree or perhaps or only a little agree with some of the groups that are handing out materials, I have found everyone to be very courteous, to be very respectful. I've noticed that there are some delegates who prefer not to accept those handouts, and they are also treated very nicely. I think that we are an open church, and I think that's it's helpful to receive the, these papers and the opinions of all of our brothers and sisters, and I would hate for someone to be excluded by a smaller group. I think everyone should have access to us.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. We have heard the motion, and now I ask for speeches, if there are. There are? I don't see any. Are we ready to vote? To vote on the amendment by Beth Capen? Please vote now.

652 Yes; 235 No; 20 Abstentions. And the motion has carried. The original text is restituted. Over there, please, mic 2. We are back on the main motion.

On Child Care

AMY VALDEZ BARKER (Wisconsin): Amy Valdez Barker, Wisconsin Annual Conference. I'd like to make a motion or an amendment to Section 6, No. C.

BISHOP MINOR: Can you give us the page?

BARKER: Page 112. I move to retain the stricken language on pages 112 to 113, Section 6, letter "C," that reads: "accommodation for language, and physical challenges. and access to approved licensed childcare during the session at or near the site of the General Conference for children of elected General Conference Delegates. If I have a second (*unintelligible*) motion.

BISHOP MINOR: Is it seconded? Second. You can speak.

BARKER: When I first agreed to run for General Conference, I had a six-month-old; and I believed, or at least I was under the assumption that at General Conference childcare would be provided, as it is in our annual conference and other annual conferences. A couple months right before we were to come, I found out that there was no childcare, and that I was pretty much on my own with whatever I was going to do with my now 18-month-old daughter.

That was a little bit frustrating for me, because it felt like the church was saying to me I had to give up two weeks of being with my 18-month-old just to come and serve the church, and that those two weeks—as you know if you are either a parent or a grandparent—are very valuable times. She's learning a lot of different things right at this moment, and I may come home and she will know a lot more than when I left.

So if the General Conference had really intended to this being what the rules were, my belief was then, why is it not being provided now, and why do young parents—or parents—not have this opportunity of being with their children here during General Conference. So . . .

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you, the—well, the speaker's amendment is before us. I do not see requests to speak. Are we ready to vote? Excuse me. Excuse me, Dr. Del Pino.

DEL PINO: That's all right, Bishop. We are all trying to dredge our collective memory, our individual and collective memories, regarding what was really compelling about making this deletion. The notes that I have with me indicate that the committee considered this very carefully; and I believe that the issues of liability are significant for the General Conference, and I believe that also the arrangements that have been made in prior General Conferences have not been availed by those who requested them at the time of the General Conference or upon registering.

They have cost, it has been a (*unintelligible*) and a significant expense to the conference.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. Is this to this motion? Please, mic 2. (*pause*) All right . . .

SAM O. MORRIS (Mississippi): It is for the motion.

BISHOP MINOR: Yes, I have given you the floor, so you have the floor. Dr. Del Pino had already been spoken.

MORRIS: Sam Morris, from the Mississippi Conference. It's a little offensive to me to think that we would exclude parents of young children from this body because it's too much of a liability. We can make that argument for almost anything that we do with children in the church, whether it's a playground or a childcare facility or anything else. I think that that's a liability I would hope that my church would take.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. Now we need to vote. Are you ready to vote on the, while the speaker, amendment? Please vote now.

[*Yes, 581; No, 323; Abstain 10*]

581 votes Yes; 323 No; and 10 Abstentions. The motion has carried. Yes? Over there, please? Mic 1. We are perfecting the document.

On Consent Calendar

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Kevin Goodwin, lay delegate, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. I actually have three rule changes, two of which I will put as one motion; but that will come second. The first one is Rule 31, on page 129, point 3.a, referring to the number of votes it takes to not make the Consent Calendar. The proposed change is to make that 10 percent or 10 percent or 10 votes, whichever is less.

BISHOP MINOR: Just a moment. A moment, again. Which page?

GOODWIN: On 129, 1-2-9—unless the pages have changed since I wrote my memo up.

BISHOP MINOR: Can you tell us what rule you're on?

GOODWIN: 3.a . . . If somebody wants to correct my page number . . . That's right?

BISHOP MINOR: "No more than . . ." Yes.

GOODWIN: Right. Where it says, "No more than five votes," I propose, change that to "No more than 10 votes or 10 percent, whichever is less." I get a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP MINOR: Is it seconded?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

BISHOP MINOR: I, yes, it is seconded.

GOODWIN: I also was a delegate here in 2000; and I remember, if my memory is correct, of the votes that came out of, to the plenary session, the plenary session only overrode the committee once. We—and more disturbingly, was there was a lot of things that came out of committee where nobody bothered to speak up why they voted against it, which means we were voting on stuff that nobody really had enough care about to speak at a microphone as to why they voted against it in the committee. So my basic point is, especially if we want to save time, is, that'd make it a little bit harder for stuff not to come to the floor out of the committee. And

for those who are familiar with the rules, they will notice that the language that I've chosen here is the exact same language as what is required to have a minority report approved, or it's accepted.

BISHOP MINOR: Thank you. May I ask you to give your motion in writing to the secretary, also the two previous makers of the motion.

GOODWIN: I do have a second copy for her. Would she like it right now?

BISHOP MINOR: That would be just so it would not be forgotten. Now

the motion is before us. *(unintelligible)* speech against it. *(pause)* Mic 5.

EWING WERLEIN JR. (Texas): Ewing Werlein, Texas delegation. I've been to a number of the General Conferences, and I believe that this five votes has been the standard for our Consent Calendar over a long period of time. I think that's a good rule. It's not because, you know, there may be people that would not want to stand up and speak against something in the committee or even in the plenary.

The point of the matter is, we should not, without examining the legislation,

just be permitting it to become the law of the church. If there are a number of people, at least five or more in some of the committees, that oppose it, seems to me that we're not in a rush about this matter; and it's better to be careful, which I believe sets the proper tone. This is different than the 10 votes for a minority report, because when a minority report is presented, the presenters are able to take the platform. This is not true with respect to a matter that comes before the plenary with only more five votes cast against it.

(Continued with the May 3rd issue)