

Thursday afternoon, May 6. The Judicial Council does not have the final action of the General Conference pertaining to the two referrals for declaratory decisions made on Thursday afternoon, May 6, nor does the Judicial Council have sufficient time to research and deliver opinions on them. Therefore, the two items referred will be Docket Items 1 and 2 for the fall, 2004, meeting of the Judicial Council. Signed, John G. Corry, President, and Sally Curtis AsKew, Secretary.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK, thank you. I want to turn now to the Committee on Calendar and Agenda.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Thank you, Bishop Lyght. In the morning we will be taking up a number of items, housekeeping items and other such things as well as conference business and the order of the day, after lunch, will be the GCFA report. The reason for that is, they have met late into the night, they're meeting, and they need time to repair-to prepare their report. The agenda committee has met and has made this decision to establish it as an order of the day, first thing after lunch, at 2:30. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. Then, Committee on Presiding Officers.

PAUL J. EXUM-FERNANDEZ (California-Nevada): Thank you, Bishop Lyght, and members of the General Conference, this is my last report. Presiding tomorrow morning from the Chicago Area, Bishop Joseph Sprague. And then, in the afternoon, from the Nashville Area, Bishop William Morris. And then, finally, in the evening, from the Portland Area, Bishop Ed Paup.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. Now, I see a card here. Do you have a question for information? Please go to mic 1.

BETTIE W. STORY (Illinois Great Rivers): I have a motion, Bishop. Bettie Story, Illinois Great Rivers Conference. I'd like for us to suspend the rules so that we can extend the time until 11:00 tonight to continue our business.

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, you don't have to suspend the rules. You can just make the motion.

STORY: I make the motion.

BISHOP LYGHT: Is there a second? Alright. The motion is that we extend the time until 11:00 P.M. Are you ready to vote? [*Yes, 298; No, 573; Abstain, 8*]

Please vote now. Alright, the motion is lost.

We are ready now to adjourn, and I am going to turn to Bishop Daniel Arichea for the closing prayer.

(prayer)

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you for your sweet spirit and your wonderful cooperation tonight.

(applause)

Friday Morning, May 7, 2004

Morning Worship

BISHOP C. JOSEPH SPRAGUE (Chicago Area): Alright, friends, I believe we're ready to come to order. Please make your way to your seats. We have much to do as you know so well. We have a long day's journey into the night. Therefore, I respectfully request that we work together in such a way that we will forego meandering unduly among the superfluous in order that we might focus on the substantive. And to that end with your cooperation and support, I shall seek to move us with dispatch to the point of decision making and vote taking. May this day be for God's church a day of holy conferencing. Let me suggest very briefly what we will seek to do and how we will seek to do it.

There are several items that will come early; two resolutions: including one that will address the issue of the unity of this body and of The United Methodist Church. There will be elections for the GCF&A, and after the usual and customary other agenda items, we will move quickly then to the legislative committees. The agreement

today is that these committees will begin with those items left on which the committees have voted concurrence and also those items that have been lifted. We will move as quickly as possible among the committees on those two matters and then later, as time permits, move to items of non-concurrence.

As we invite now, the Committee on Calendar and Agenda to come, I would invite you to be in a time of prayer with me. And as we move to that time of prayer, surely I think we would want to say that sometimes we go to church; on other times and occasions we have church. And today, as a result of Bishop Moncure's leadership ably assisted by the musicians and the liturgists, we had church. And for that, we are grateful. Let us pray.

(prayer)

Alright, if the committee will come, please.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Good morning, Bishop Sprague, Council of Bishops, and delegates. Bishop Moncure, you have put a song in my heart. And it's with a song in my heart that I tell you this is my last agenda report. Bishop Sprague did most of our calendar work for us, and so I'm not going to reiterate what he's already told you. We have much work to do. We will have an "order of the day" after lunch for the GCFA report. At the end of this morning's session, we will address the calendar items, because we recognize that you have not had time to look over what has been published this morning. I am going to call on Gere Reist, however, in just a minute, so he can tell you about the mistake that's in your *DCA* this morning, and that you'll be receiving some new ones.

But, before I do that, many of you have given me words of appreciation to me, and I am grateful for those. But I think you need to know that we have had a very hard-working committee that has been very faithful. And I want them—I want you to recognize them this morning. First, Michal Abdulai from Sierra Leone, Per Endre

Bjornevik—Bjornevik from Norway, Candace Carter from Eastern Pennsylvania, Kenneth Chalker from East Ohio, Theodore Collier from Missouri, Junifen Gauuan from Northeast Philippines, Kristina Gonzalez from Pacific Northwest, Hee-Soo Jung from Wisconsin, and, of course, Gere Reist and our facilitator, Jay Vorhees. Please thank these people.

(applause)

And now, Gere, if you'll come and tell us about our *DCA*, this morning.

L. FITZGERALD REIST: Thank you, I'm Fitzgerald Reist, coordinator of the calendar, member of Central Pennsylvania Conference. I would draw your attention—this is going to be very confusing, folks, so bear with me very patiently—to p. 2086, 2086 in today's *DCA*. And, get out your pens, because we have a little work to do. Page 2086 in today's *DCA*, if you will look at the facing page, you will see that it is not numbered. The correct number for that page is not 2087; the correct number for that page is 2096, 2096.

If you turn the page over, the correct number is 2095, 2095. The facing page, with the title, "Report No. 19," is p. 2094, and, if you flip that page over, it's 2093. The facing page to that one is 2092. When you turn that page, it's 2091, 2090 is the—is the number for Revised Report No. 8, p. 2090. Revised Report No. 5, "Episcopal Fund," is 2089. Revised Report No. 1, "World Service Fund Budget," is p. 2088, and the Revised Summary on the next page is p. 2087. Corrected editions will be printed and distributed to the delegates. We wanted to make sure that you an opportunity to look at this material in the proper sequence; and so, for the rest of the morning, when you're looking at this report, you will have to do it as if you were Hebrews.

I draw your attention to p. 2097, where the special consent calendars that are published in today's *DCA* begin; and I'm going to suggest to you a motion that we consider this consent calendar—the Special Consent

Calendars A-92, B-92, C-92—at the end of the morning session, so you have a chance to review them. This is the first time they were published.

There is a correction on A-92, and that is the removal of Item 1119, 1119, because you took an action to indefinitely postpone consideration of that item. We apologize. As you're aware, at 1:00 in the morning things get a little blurry. So, remove 1119 from Special Consent Calendar A-92. If you would make that motion.

MASSEY: Bishop, I move approval—of the—I move that we approve the consent—Special Consent Calendars A-92, 93—B-92, and C-92, at the end of this morning's session.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is properly before us. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 836; No, 12; Abstain, 5*]

Thank you, you have sustained the motion.

REIST: If you will turn in the *DCA* to p. 2016, p. 2016, Special Consent Calendar A91, A91; Calendar Item 1078, Calendar Item 1078 has been removed from Special Consent Calendar A91. I know of no other corrections to that calendar.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, with the—

MASSEY: *(unintelligible)* I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar A91 with the exception of 1078.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 840; No, 13; Abstain, 2*]

You have sustained the motion. Thank you.

REIST: Special Consent Calendar B91 is on p. 2017. I know of no corrections to Special Consent Calendar B91.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar B91.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: It is before us. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 839; No, 10; Abstain, 1*]

The motion carries. Thank you.

REIST: Page 2018, 2018, Special Consent Calendar C91, Special Consent Calendar C91. I know of no corrections to Special Consent Calendar C91.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar C91.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before you. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 841; No, 11; Abstain, 3*]

The motion is sustained. Thank you.

REIST: I'm happy to present to you, again, John Brawn, who has, I think, an interesting graphic for you to look at as we consider where we are in the process.

Status Report

JOHN BRAUN: I'm John Brawn, your legislative coordinator. I'm a layperson from the California-Nevada Annual Conference. My scoutmaster used to tell me that some people couldn't see the forest for the trees. I've got no idea what that really means, but I do know that many of you have been focused for the last four days on specific issues and specific calendar items. Let me see if I can break you away from the details and give you a "bird's eye view" of the world of legislation. Can we start the video, please?

Take a deep breath. Inhale. Exhale. Whatever happens today, the secretary's staff would like to remind you to continue breathing. Each green square represents one calendar item. In particular, they represent calendar items that have been placed on the consent calendars. You've already voted on these items when you approved the consent calendars. In every case, you supported the legislative committees' recommendation. As of right now, there have been about a 171 of these.

Now, let's look at the items where you voted on the floor to support the committee's recommendation. They're shown in bright green. And you voted along with the committee's recommendation 220 times so far. In five cases you have not followed the committee's recommendation and you have chosen to refer the calendar item to some kind

of board or agency. These are colored orange. There have been 9 instances where you voted to amend the committee's recommendation with motions from the floor or by accepting the minority report, and I've shown these in yellow. And, I'm sure you all clearly remember you voted against the committee recommendation on 3 calendar items. Now, I've only marked these in red because I'm running out of colors. Oops! We're looking at the trees again.

Let's step back and look at the General Conference forest. Have you noticed the missing section? Yes, these 69 calendar items are your number one priority today.

You enacted a rule change yesterday which limits the time on any one calendar item to 30 minutes. At that rate, you have about 35 hours to go.

Here's another way to look at it. You have spent more than 41 hours on calendar items since Saturday morning, and you have moved through 237 of these. This works out to 10 minutes per calendar item. If you can just sustain that rate one more day, you'll have finished 30 of these 69 remaining items by our scheduled adjournment. And, what will become of those left behind?

I pray you all have safe travels as you return to your homes, your families, and local churches. For, I believe, that those are the places where the church's rubber meets the road. Thank you.

(applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you very much.

(applause)

Alright. If the Commission on Central Conferences would come, please, and make your report. The Commission on Central Conferences.

Alright. As the commission is coming, I've been asked to make an announcement, an explanatory announcement. One of the delegates from the church of Mexico has been challenged about his right to vote. Mexico has a Concordat with the right

to vote; and therefore, the voting by the delegate has been appropriate. Alright, commission, please.

Commission on Central Conferences

BISHOP NKULU NTANDA NTAMBO (North Katanga Area): Good morning, Bishop. Good morning, everybody. The petition is coming from the Central Congo Central Conference. Because of the growth of more than 37 percent of membership, they are asking for two additional bishops. The total number of bishops for the Central Congo will become three by this action. The Commission on the Central Conference itself decided in the meeting on Thursday morning that the whole matter shall be referred to the newly created committee to study the episcopacy. We invite the General Conference to support the motion of the committee.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The motion to refer is before us. Are you ready to vote? As many as would support the motion; please vote yes; those who do not, vote no. Let's vote now. *[Yes, 812; No, 42; Abstain, 9]*

You have affirmed the motion to refer. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP NTAMBO: The second item is Calendar Item 1505, which was removed from the Consent Calendar C06, Item No. 1505; p. 2020 in the *DCA*; Resolution No. 41611 on p. 1760 of the Advance *DCA*. The resolution is to add Cote d'Ivoire to West Africa Central Conference. The Commission on Central Conference Affairs recommends to refer to the executive committee of the Commission on Central Conference Affairs together all to work with the General Board of Global Ministries and the West Africa Central Conference toward the inclusion of the church in Cote d'Ivoire into the West Africa Central Conference.

The rationale is: We would like to give appropriate time for the West Africa Central Episcopal Area. Excuse me. We would like to give appropriate time for the West Africa Central Conference to fix its boundary of annu-

al conferences and also to fix the episcopal areas. The respective board in the committee to whom the matter shall be referred is helping to monitor the process so that we can report to the next General Conference the inclusion of Cote d'Ivoire into the list of the countries belonging to the West Africa Central Conference as well as about the episcopal leadership elected for the new area. This process will follow the provision as stated in the *Book of Discipline*, Paragraph 537.3, 537.6, 537.10.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. So it is a motion to refer. I see a card in the back. Mic 6, please. Mic 6. It's a motion to refer that is before us.

RONALD BRETSCH (North Central New York): Thank you, Bishop. Ron Bretsch, North Central New York. Bishop, is a motion to substitute in order?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: It is.

To Include Cote d'Ivoire in Central Conferences

BRETSCH: I move to substitute this petition as follows: In *Discipline* Paragraph 535.3 that Cote d'Ivoire be added to the West African Central Conference and the West Africa Central Conference is authorized to elect a bishop to serve as its episcopal leader in a new Cote d'Ivoire Episcopal Area. The Cote d'Ivoire Episcopal Area is responsible to set up and fully fund its own Episcopal Fund during the 2005-2008 quadrennium with no funding from either GCFA or the Episcopal Fund of The United Methodist Church. Further, the annual conference within the Cote d'Ivoire Episcopal Area shall be represented at the 2008 General Conference with two delegates—one lay, one clergy. Finally, the Commission on Central Conference Affairs in consultation with the Council of Bishops and the Connectional Table shall bring enabling legislation to the 2008 General Conference in order to include the Cote d'Ivoire Episcopal Area in the Episcopal Fund of the UMC at that time.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Is there a second? I hear the second. Alright. Would you like to speak to the amendment to the motion to refer?

BRETSCH: Thank you, Bishop. Last week the General Commission on Central Conference Affairs met with and discussed the 1.2 million Methodists who are in Cote d'Ivoire. Their leadership—six individuals were with us. The church in Cote d'Ivoire is organized. It has agencies. It has its structure. It has foundations in British Methodism from which it departed in the 1980s. It is seeking to be admitted into our United Methodist family.

I do not know how to say the following as generously as I perhaps would like. We were encouraged not to bring that motion to the floor of the plenary for fear that it might be defeated. Many of us in the general commission were uncomfortable with that. We would not like to wait four years. Here are brothers and sisters in Africa, a very large number, who are knocking at our door seeking admission.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Is there a speech against the amendment, is there a speech against? Right. Bishop, would you like to speak, please.

BISHOP NTAMBO: With your permission I will ask Bishop Bolleter to come to speak about it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes. Bishop Bolleter.

BISHOP HEINRICH BOLLETER (Central and Southern Europe Area): We understand very well the intention of the maker of the motion. We understand that we want to go forward towards the inclusion of Ivory Coast in The United Methodist Church. But, I would like to remind you that by this motion which is now before us we will clearly touch the rights of the Central Conferences; because, until now, the Central Conference, the West Africa Central Conference had no opportunity to vote about the fact if they would like to integrate Ivory Coast or not. And it's their right to do that. It's not ours. So we should go through the process we promoted by referral so that things can

be done slowly but lead us to the end of the integration. For us, this is no question.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. I'm going to put the question now on the amendment. Prepare— Point of order? What is your point of order please? Mic 8, mic 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, we have the opportunity to have two speeches for and two against. When you asked for a speech against, since my speech would be for, I waited to give the other side an opportunity. They didn't take the opportunity, but I do have a speech in favor of which will lay some things to rest that have been said by the committee that I do not—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: The point is well taken. Proceed to speak, please.

BOAYUE: Thank you, Bishop

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Name of your conference, please.

BOAYUE: Thank you. The West Africa Central Conference is willing to have Cote d'Ivoire. They will meet this year to do that. If this General Conference blocks their will by not authorizing them to do this, they will not have the opportunity to do it not knowing the will of this conference. That's the first point. While I want to proceed and if anyone wants to refute that, the willingness of the leaders in West Africa, I think the bishops from West Africa are here and can speak for themselves.

Now, Cote d'Ivoire is a well developed church. The disciplinary provisions for it to become a mission of The United Methodist Church have already been implemented by the General Board of Global Ministries, which is also supportive of the work in Cote d'Ivoire. The president of that church is here and is seated among the bishops of the church. He has not been granted as yet an opportunity to bring greetings to us. I will hope that that will not continue until the end of this conference. Thirdly, the Cote d'Ivoire church offers United Methodism a new day.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Time to sum up, please.

BOAYUE: They are willing to fund all of their operations throughout the next quadrennium and the two delegates to 2008 will not encroach upon the current distribution of representation from any annual conference. I urge strong support of this to extend the mission in West Africa, a region encroached upon by other religions and to strengthen our unity around the world.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, thank you. The chair apologizes to the house for hurrying. We've had two speeches for the amendment and one against. Does anyone else care to speak against the amendment? I think we are ready to vote. Please prepare now to vote on the amendment. [*Yes, 597; No, 273; Abstain, 21*]

Alright, the amendment has passed and now, as amended, the resolution is before us. Are you ready to vote? Yes, I see a card here in the center, please. Mic 3, mic 3, please.

Statement on Congo

YEMBA G. UNDA (East Congo): Yemba from East Congo.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: May we have translation please.

UNDA [*Simultaneous interpretation*]: Yemba from East Congo. I would like to speak right now. I did not come here as a tourist but I came here to participate in the conference, excuse me, Bishop. After we've finished speaking about Ivory Coast, I would like to have an opportunity to speak about the Congo.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We'll have to work that into the agenda in an appropriate way at an appropriate time and it wouldn't be now. Thank you. Alright.

UNDA [*Simultaneous interpretation*]: Excuse me, Bishop, this petition has been sent three times. We have an issue with the Congo that we would like to bring forward.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, why don't you try that now then, let's see? Go ahead and try it.

INTERPRETER: Go ahead, please, Yemba.

UNDA [*Simultaneous interpretation*]: We have a large problem concerning our country of Democratic Republic of Congo. Our country is made up of 11 provinces covering a very vast territory under the jurisdiction of only one bishop. He has worked very hard. He is a man that we have great respect for because of his dynamism. In his area there are more than 600,000 United Methodist believers. Communication is very, very difficult in our country. We have had five years of war in our country during which we have not been able to come together. In our episcopal area our bishop works as hard as ten bishops here in the United States, excuse me for making this comparison, but, our church has grown by 37 percent in this last quadrennium. The realities that we are experiencing in the Congo are very, very different from what the church in America is experiencing.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: You must sum up now, sir, please.

UNDA [*Simultaneous interpretation*]: Please don't put this off until the next General Conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Thank you very much and may we have your name again for the record, please.

UNDA: Yemba Unda

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you very much. Alright, as amended, the work of the Central Conference Commission is before us. As many as would support it, vote yes, those who would not, please vote no. [*Yes, 672; No, 164; Abstain, 15*] And it did pass. Thank you very much.

And now the resolution on the Sudan, you will find it on p.2012. Jay Williams and Brent Salsgiver were the makers of this resolution and we would ask them to present. At mic 4 please, mic 4.

JAY WILLIAMS(Western New York): Good morning. I ask you to turn your attention to p.212 in your *DCA*.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Name and conference please

WILLIAMS: Yes, Jay Williams,

Western New York Annual Conference, and I'm joined by Brent Salsgiver from Central Pennsylvania Annual Conference. The text of the petition is there for your reading and I hope you've had time to review it. I'd like to move its adoption and, if I have a second, will speak briefly to it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a second? It is seconded, please.

WILLIAMS: Brothers and sisters of this General Conference, we are here some ten years after the gruesome massacre of more than 800,000 people in Rwanda, ten years after we claimed, after we failed on the claim that we would never again allow a genocide to occur in the world. Brothers and sisters, by the time our jurisdictional conferences end in July and August, some 750,000 people more might die in the Sudan. The Sudan is a place where both Brent and I have traveled and have seen first hand people murdered, villages burned, villages raided and women and children killed. I think it would be a shame for us to leave this General Conference while another genocide is happening in our midst. Brothers and sisters, over the past five or six years already more than 2 million people have been killed in Sudan. Five million more have lost, have been displaced from their homes. So, we believe it is imperative for the church to stand up and be a witness, to make a bold statement that we will not sit idly anymore as people are killed, as our brothers and sisters across the world are murdered and maimed and beaten and killed. So, I now invite my brother Brent to speak more.

BRENT SALSGIVER (Central Pennsylvania): It was during a two week trip in Sudan that I was able to get a glimpse into what some of these women and children go through. It had started as a normal day. We were flying into a village, when we had to stop, because we had heard the village was bombed. Growing up, there are some things you need to experience. A first date, Christmas morning, a bombing is not one of them. I was able to sit with

children who had seen their parents killed due to this bombing. This is something that no child should live through, and yet that was two years ago. When I read—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Time to sum up, please.

SALSGIVER: the petition that Jay and I go through I cannot imagine how many more children had that horrific first experience and, unless we do something, how many more will have it day in and day out. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, the resolution is before us. Is there a card?

(*end of tape*)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: The motion is before us. Is there a card? It appears as if you are ready to vote. Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 860; No, 28; Abstain, 4*] You have supported the motion; and, given the nature of that resolution, I would invite the body to be in a moment of prayer. Let us pray.

(*prayer*)

Alright. We turn now to our secretary for a matter of elections. May we have the mic, please. Microphone for the secretary. Still need the mic.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: On pp. 2085 and 2086 in today's *DCA* are listed announce—are listed nominations from the Council of Bishops for the General Council on Finance and Administration, the episcopal nominations for the General Board of Global Ministries, and, then, those council nominations that by disciplinary provision must be elected by the General Conference to the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits.

On the top of p. 2086, there is one correction and then two additions. Under "Southeastern," these nominations were brought to us as corrections—or updates, really—because of our vote on the Living Into the Future from the other evening. The nominations had to be adjusted from those which had previously been printed.

Call your attention to the top of p. 2086. What is listed there as "No. 9"

under “Southeastern,” please replace the name of John Collett with the name of Lynn Hill from Tennessee. Lynn Hill. Then there are two additional nominations to make the 11 from the Southeastern Jurisdiction. They are Daniel Taylor, Daniel Taylor from Holston, and Ellen Peete from Memphis, Ellen Peete from Memphis. The rest of the nominations, as they are printed, are correct.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The slate is before you. Please prepare to vote. Vote now. [*Yes, 852; No, 30; Abstain, 8*] Those nominated have been elected. Thank you.

Now, I would like to seek the will of the body. All of us know that there has been much discussion, significant pain all over the house among all of us about matters related to the unity of The United Methodist Church. While many of us were sleeping, the Spirit was not. Neither were many of our colleagues, representative of many different theological points of view. As a result, two leaders of our church, who are not members, not delegates of this General Conference, have requested, and others who have worked with them have requested on their behalf, permission for Drs. Bruce Hinson—pardon me—Bruce Robinson—Robbins, I know Bruce well, pardon me—Bruce Robbins, and Bill Hinson, to come and stand before us in order that a statement might be made.

Would the body grant permission for these two leaders of our church to come, stand before us, and make a statement? If you would, vote yes. If you would not, vote no. Let us vote now. [*Yes, 718; No, 186; Abstain, 7*] You have welcomed the two brothers, and I would invite them to the podium with gratitude to the house at this time.

BRUCE ROBBINS: Good morning. Sisters and brothers, I’ve been asked to give an account of some informal and remarkable conversations that have occurred this week that may help put in perspective some of the discussions of amicable separation; and I’ve asked Bill Hinson to be with me to help cor-

rect and refine any of this—these personal observations of the conversations that I’m making.

In one of the legislative committee meetings last week, Judicial Administration, two of the delegates, Laura Easto of Baltimore-Washington Conference, and Derik Hines from West Ohio, found they were voting sometimes on opposite sides of the issues; and they began talking among themselves. And as one of them put it, “God got under our skin and suggested that there might be, must be, a better way.” They came to several groups. They came to the General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns and to Just Peace, and they asked for some help in trying to sort through these thoughts of theirs. The two co-chairs of a task force of the commission, Greg Stover and Janice Love, became involved; and they were able to make contact with some of the leadership of organizations of the church representing differing perspectives on this issue; organizations such as Good News and the Confessing Movement and Methodist Federation for Social Action and Affirmation. And it led to a conversation on Monday night of approximately 20 persons representing the leadership of these organizations.

There were several hours of deep discussion that occurred. I would call it a holy conferencing. There was criticism and there was acknowledgment of the ways that we write and characterize one another. It felt like the conversation was just beginning when we were past midnight and needed to adjourn. We suggested a hope to meet on Tuesday as well and had tentatively set a time at lunch to meet. We wanted to see if the Holy Spirit may enlighten any of us during the night.

Tuesday morning was difficult on the floor, as you may remember. The noon meeting itself was fairly brief. Many persons had other obligations that did not permit them to come, particularly from some of the more liberal organizations represented. However, in that discussion, some informal propos-

als were made of how we might proceed at General Conference rather than the contentious debate, which we were experiencing. Some people felt that some form of holy conferencing of all of the delegates could be arranged. Others looked to some kind of separation, perhaps, that could be amicable and just amongst us. And others looked to trying to create some kind of space that would help us move forward. These were all suggestions, informal suggestions at the table. Several of them had papers and writing that accompanied them, and one of those or two of those papers were distributed among the group gathered there with never an intention that they would be far more widely distributed. One of those papers was a suggestion some of you have seen on amicable separation. There was no consensus reached in the group whatsoever. It was an informal brainstorming discussion that we had.

On Thursday morning, Bill Hinson had addressed the Good News breakfast and spoke of the pain that he observed and experienced in that meeting, indeed pain that was shared with each of us as we heard the deep divisions that occurred among us and the very differing perspectives we represented. His perception of the pain was there, and some suggestions of perhaps a separation were made at that time. That caught on and you know all the discussions that occurred informally during the day about that and suggestions of a possible resolution, as well, that never had serious intention, I believe, of coming forward.

I believe that everyone at that table of those informal conversations, and I believe that many of you are seeking the discernment of the Holy Spirit to find out what is the authentic unity we seek as United Methodists gathered together. And I want to take this opportunity also to thank Laura and Derik for the risks they took to try to find a different way and come before us and risk what are some difficult and—conversations for us to have.

And I want to close by just reminding myself and us of the prayer of Paul

in Ephesians that God is at the power—who by the power at work within us is . . .

BRUCE ROBBINS: . . . to close by just reminding myself and us of the prayer of Paul in Ephesians that God is at the power—who by the power at work within us is able to accomplish abundantly far more than we can ask or imagine. And, I think, as a result of these conversations, there is a greater hope among many of us that the Holy Spirit may speak to us as we try to move forward to discern what is the way that God wills for The United Methodist Church.

Thank you. I hope these comments are helpful to you; and I turn to Bill, if you have anything you'd like to add.

BILL HINSON: Thank you, Bruce. Any authentic struggle toward wholeness must be marked by integrity at every point along the way. And, I deeply appreciate Bruce Robbins' spirit and his willingness to come and make this statement and clear the air of rumor and innuendo as he explains how this paper came to be circulated on the floor of General Conference. I find that very refreshing and very helpful and am deeply grateful to this wonderful spirit.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We are extremely grateful to the two of you and to those persons named who I would invite to stand at this point, those who have been a part of this dialogue, hoping to bring us to this point. The names that Bruce called, would you stand please?

(applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Now, on behalf of the Committee on Agenda, I would like to turn to mic 4 to the Reverend Dr. John Schol, who brings a resolution for the body that has passed muster. That is to say, it comes through the process of the Committee on Agenda. And, as John is coming, again, we thank these two brothers for what they have done on behalf of us. Can we greet them with gratitude.

(applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. Mic 4 please. Mic 4. Please identify yourselves as you speak, if you would.

KRISTINA J. GONZALEZ (Pacific Northwest): I'm Kristina Gonzalez, Pacific Northwest Conference, lay, Western Jurisdiction.

JON R. GRAY (Missouri): Jon R. Gray, lay delegate from the Missouri Conference, South Central Jurisdiction.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I'm Mary Alice Massey, lay delegate from the Florida delegation, Southeastern Jurisdiction.

BEATRICE FOFONAH (Sierra Leone): Beatrice Fofonah, lay delegate, Sierra Leone Annual Conference.

LUIS F. REYES (Northern Illinois): Luis Felipe Reyes, Northern Illinois, clergy, North Central Jurisdiction.

JOHN SCHOL (Eastern Pennsylvania): John Schol, Eastern Pennsylvania, Northeastern Jurisdiction. We, from the global church, move before you today the following: "As United Methodists, we remain in covenant with one another, even in the midst of disagreement, and affirm our commitment to work together for a common mission of making disciples of Jesus Christ throughout the world".

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. The resolution is before us. Would you like to speak?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it speaks for itself, Bishop.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Does anyone—I do see a card. Yes, please? Mic 1. Mic 1.

DARREN R. CUSHMAN-WOOD (South Indiana): Bishop, there are—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Please identify yourself.

CUSHMAN-WOOD: Darren Cushman-Wood from South Indiana.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you.

CUSHMAN-WOOD: Yesterday—I speak in favor of this to send a clear message to our local churches, because

in South Indiana, there are people that are deeply disturbed about what is going on here. On our delegation, I know that we hear often all of this talk about schism. I rise to speak against it purely on a personal level, because for myself, I do not know where I would choose, that doctrinally I am conservative as they come. But on my ethics, I am as liberal as you are; and I feel that that seeming contradiction comes out of my Wesleyan tradition and what I've inherited from The United Methodist Church. Maybe I need to have an adjustment in my heart between my doctrines and my ethics, but that kind of surgery needs to be done by whom John Wesley called the Great Physician. I do not trust the surgeons who are in this room to perform that surgery on me or on my local congregation, so I urge us to send this very clear message of unity back to our local churches.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. That is a speech for the resolution. Yes? Please, mic no. 4; and then I see others standing. Mic 4.

STANLEY R. COPELAND (North Texas): Bishop, Stan Copeland, North Texas Conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes.

COPELAND: I want to say that in the course of our legislative committees and in the course of debate on this floor, I've often found myself feeling like I was in the sea of distrust and drowning. And in the last few minutes, what has happened here, to me, has been monumental for our church. What Bruce and Bill have done together before us and what we have just heard in the form of this resolution, I think is huge for us.

I long for the day when we come to General Conference and we deal with matters concerning genocide in the Sudan with a strong voice, and when we uplift the mission of our church in all that we do unashamedly. Not discounting the conflict in our midst. We have to deal with that, but I dream of the day when the symbols of our sacraments are not politicized but are lifted

up as what brings us together as one body, making disciples of Jesus Christ and dealing with the issues that we face in this world with passion and in the mission and Spirit of our Lord.

I support this.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you very much. I see a card in the back. We've had two speeches. We can have two others. If there is a speech against, I need to entertain it now. Is there speech against? Yes. Here, mic 2, and then I'll come back here. This is a speech against. Mic 2.

WILLIAM T. MCALILLY (Mississippi): Bishop, actually this is more of an amendment than a speech against.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. It is in order.

MCALILLY: I would amend that—since I don't have the resolution in front of me—I'm Bill McAlilly, Mississippi Conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Thank you.

MCALILLY: There is another voice in this General Conference that is—was not represented at this table that I might like to speak to and add to the dialogue if I can figure out a way to do that. My amendment would basically be that I would amend the resolution that those of us who are neither on the right or the left be included at the table. And I'd like to speak to that if I get a second.

(applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right, then, let's hold the applause. I think there is joy in many hearts. Let's hold our applause—

MCALILLY: And I also. OK

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes, please. Let's—we'll try the wording. Let's hear your speech.

MCALILLY: And I also would like to thank Brothers Robbins and Hinson for their statement. There's another group in our denomination, some of whom are delegates here; others who are faithful United Methodists who are

not represented nor identified with any coalition. We are, as Bishop Coyner wrote a few years ago, "the Methodist middle." We are not organized and have no other agenda, save offering Christ to a hurting world. This group includes women, men, children, youth, lay, and clergy, maybe even a couple of bishops. Together with those of differing viewpoints, faithfully serving United Methodist churches, we serve small, medium, large churches. We serve in agencies. We serve throughout the church. We teach Sunday school. We serve in food pantries, clothes closets. We build Habitat houses and serve worldwide through United Methodist Volunteers in Mission. We have a passion for evangelism, and we seek to lift up Christ to persons who are hurting and who are lost and who need the grace of Jesus Christ.

However, more often than not we are silent; and, perhaps, that is our sin. Silent as other voices speak. Perhaps we're gripped by fear, fear that if we speak, we will be labeled as the opposition. Fear that we are incapable of preventing our church from being pulled apart at the seams. In our efforts to be faithful collectively, we all of us have created the vision with little hope of ever—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: You need to sum up, sir, please.

MCALILLY: I pray that we can find a way to hold the tension of the opposites; and I would submit to this body that if those of us in the middle can contain those on both sides of the equation, we might be able to find the unity for which we seek. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

(applause)

Alright. I saw a card in the back. Mic 8. This will be the final speech. The way the resolution is framed, it's very difficult to amend it with the speech given. I'm going to treat the speech given as an affirmation and as a plea that those who will embrace this in ongoing work will clearly hear and

engage, if that is all right with the gentleman who has just spoken. All right. This will be the final speech, and then we will vote. Yes?

LONNIE CHAFIN (Northern Illinois): Thank you, Bishop. Lonnie Chafin, Northern Illinois Conference. Bishop, I've been United Methodist all of my life. My family's been United Methodist since when there were Methodists, the first Methodists in Virginia, included someone from my family. This—I've been thinking since I became a General Conference delegate about my grandmother who would eat oatmeal for a week to save money to build schools in Africa, who sacrificed time and energy and resources and everything to build this church. And I feel that I have been given an ark from my grandmother and those who sacrificed and gave and dedicated themselves to this church before; and I have a duty to that ark to carry it forward into the future.

Bishop, I was on the Faith and Order Committee, and you can be sure there was great diversity in opinions; but I tell you I could see that as one person spoke, evidence in their speech was a life of grace. And then someone else would speak, the completely opposite side of the equation, and, even in their voice was the evidence of grace, that they knew a life of the Spirit. I think Wesley says that's all we need to be a church. All we need are people who know grace, who love the Spirit and can be one in the Spirit and unified in that

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Time to sum us, please.

CHAFIN: gift by God. So I would encourage us, let's carry the ark forward. Let's be one.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Thank you. Prepare to vote please. We've had the four speeches. Point of order.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Prepare to vote please. We've had the four speeches. Point of order. What is the point of order, please? Mic 1.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop Sprague—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Tell us who you are, please.

WILKES: Beverly Wilkes, Illinois Great Rivers Conference. And I rise to invite us to enact Rule 20.8, which is the call for prayer. When you vote, there's a sense of win and lose—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you.

WILKES: —but we are a win here.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you very, very much. In fact, we have already prepared for prayer in that Barbara will lead us in a song prayer. Let us sing together, and then we will vote.

(song prayer)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Amen and amen. As we wipe the tears from our eyes and yet touch the joy that the Spirit is placing in our hearts, let us prepare to vote. Let us vote now. With gratitude to God and to the many who worked so hard, your vote is an overwhelmingly affirmative vote. [*Yes, 869; No, 41; Abstain, 8*]

We're going to move to recess, but it's not going to be a movement to recess as has characterized our life thus far; but rather, on behalf of my colleagues in the Council, I would like to say to you, the peace, precious peace of Jesus Christ our Lord be with you. Let us be in recess for 20 minutes; and in the midst of this time, let us share the precious peace of Christ with one another, especially with those with whom we know there are and have been disagreements. Let us allow the balm of Gilead to soothe our wounded hearts. We are, brothers and sisters in Christ, in recess.

(music)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, as our musicians continue to sing and to welcome us back to this space, please find your seats and invite those outside to do the same.

(music)

Alright, thank you very much. Please take your seats and let the conference be in order—let the conference

be in order. We'll turn for a presentation of a special guest. Bishops Ntambo and Martinez are going to escort to the podium a special guest who will address us very briefly. Bishops.

BISHOP NKULU NTANDA NTAMBO (North Katanga) Yes, Bishop, thank you. When the spirit moves, we have to say amen.

It's a great honor and appreciation to present to you, Rev. Benjamin Boni. Rev. Benjamin Boni is president of The Methodist Church in the Cote d'Ivoire. And I want, with your permission, for the body to congratulate and welcome Rev. Benjamin Boni.

(applause)

And we want him to say something, so can someone translate it in English?

BENJAMIN BONI (Ivory Coast): [*simultaneous interpretation*] First of all, in the name of the delegation that is here with me, I would like to give thanks to the Lord, our Father God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In the name of The United Methodist Church of Ivory Coast, I would like to express to you my profound gratitude to the bishops, to the pastors, to the lay members of this General Conference. Thank you for accepting us. We would like to talk about the mission of the Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. May the Lord help us to be bearers of light, the light of Jesus Christ to all the world. Thank you to all of you for your prayers of support. We thank you, thank you, thank you in the name of Jesus Christ.

(applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: You would want to know that not only the resolution you passed but also that various conversations around that resolution will be available for you this afternoon in printed form so that you might take not only the resolution but the discussion surrounding it home with you. I see a card here at mic 8, please..

HIRHO Y. PARK (Baltimore-Washington): HiRho Park, a clergy delegate from Baltimore-Washington

Conference. I want to ask for the moment of a personal privilege, Bishop.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, go ahead.

PARK: I want to make a motion on the war in Iraq.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: If this is a new resolution, you would have to move suspension of the rules.

PARK: I want to ask for the suspension of the rules.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, suspension of the rules, in order to entertain a resolution about Iraq. Is that true?

PARK: Yes.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. It is not debatable. Are you ready to vote? This is a motion to suspend the rules. It takes a two thirds vote. If you would prepare to vote, please vote now. I'm sorry, the suspension does not pass. There is not a two-thirds vote for it. [*Yes, 355; No, 205; Abstain, 1*]

PARK: Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, let's turn now to the higher education legislative section, please.

DAVID BECKLEY (Mississippi): Thank you, Bishop Sprague. I am David Beckley, chair of the Higher Education and Campus Ministries Legislative Committee. We have 11 items this morning. Bishop, 2 of these items come to us as being lifted from the Consent Calendar. Before we present our items, we want to express thanks to this committee as we hope and pray that this will be the last time we will be before you at this General Conference. So, on behalf of the officers that were duly elected and the subcommittee chairs, we express our thanks to the members of the Higher Education and Ministry Committee. Our petitions this morning will be presented in the following order: Rev. Judy Sands, Dr. Maggie Jackson, Dr. Rebekah Miles, Rev. Gary Henderson, and Rev. Laurie Haller. They will come in that order, Bishop.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

JUDITH A. SANDS (Central Texas): Our first petition can be found in the *DCA* on p. 1753, 1753. It is Calendar Item 1076, 1076. It can be found in your *Advance DCA* on p. 1158. It is Petition No. 41424. The committee voted concurrence as amended. Before I begin with the petition, I would like to mention something that could clear up some confusion later. You are looking at p.1753 in the *DCA*, Calendar No. 1076. On the second column, on 1753, you'll notice the phrase "Replace 315.4b". It's about a third of the way down that column. I'd like to clarify that. It replaced paragraph 315.4b in the petition. In the *Discipline*, it deals with paragraph 315.4a. Just so there will be no confusion on that point. The legislative committee was interested in... was concerned about the length of probationary time plus the complexity. For that reason, we amended this petition in this way. We deleted, in No 1, at the bottom of the first column on 1753, the phrase "In the theological school or service setting appropriate - approved by the District Committee on Ordained Ministry." We did not feel that attendance at a theological school constituted a proper service setting. Then, we amended the service requirement. The third amendment that we made was to place the beginning of the probationary period one-half way through the theological studies in a Master of Divinity degree; including one-half of the basic graduate theological studies. We then amended the notarized statement dealing with any possible convictions of felonies, that sort of thing, misdemeanors or any written accusations. The committee recommended concurrence.

BISHOP SPRAGUE : Alright. It is before you. I see a card right here at the front, mic. 3.

SHEILA R. CUMBEST (Mississippi) Sheila Cumbest from Mississippi, clergy delegate. I just had a question about an insertion of one of the paragraphs into the amendment. It says "a candidate for ordination as elder shall", and so forth. What about deacons who

are also being commissioned?

SANDS: That's in another legislative sub-committee. We did not deal in our sub-committee with deacons.

CUMBEST: Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. I see cards back on my far right. Mic. 8, please. Mic. 8. This before us is the report of the committee.

Laurie A. Haller (West Michigan): My name is Laurie Haller, I'm from West Michigan. I move an amendment to Calendar Item 1076 on p. 1753 on the *DCA*. It will also be necessary to have before us Petition 41424 on p. 1158 in the *ADCA*. The amendment has two parts. First, on p.1158, I move deletion of the words in bold print: "one-half of the studies of", in the renumbered paragraph 315.2c; also deleting the words: "one-half of the studies of" in the renumbered paragraph 315.3c.1. At the bottom of the first column on p.1158, deleting the words: "one-half of" in renumbered 315.3c.2; and deleting the words: "one-half of the" in 315.5c. Then, on p. 1753 in the *DCA*, I move to delete the proposed new language of 315.4b, and substitute the current language of 315.4a of the 2000 *Book of Discipline* which reads: "A candidate for ordination as an elder shall have received a Master of Divinity or its equivalent from a school listed by the University Senate." If I have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Is it seconded? It is seconded. Go ahead.

HALLER: I do not believe it is a wise idea to allow candidates for elder to have only completed one-half of their studies for a Master of Divinity degree because that means that they will begin preparing their materials after only one year of seminary. In the experience of our own conference Board of Ordained Ministry, many candidates are not able to adequately complete the requirements of the board, even after they have finished a Master of Divinity degree. I shudder to think how candidates will fare if they haven't even had a theology course or a preach-

ing course before they appear before the board. Some of those who voted for this petition in the Higher Education and Ministry legislative sub-committee have argued that, if elder's candidates can go through the board process half way through their seminary experience and are told to wait, then their seminary professors can work with them in their final year to address their weaknesses before they reappear before the board. I calculated that our Board of Ordained Ministry spends an average of 200 hours per candidate on reading their materials, interviewing them and spending time in discernment. I would contend it is tremendous waste of the time and energy and resources of conference boards when candidates are not truly ready and adequately prepared. I believe seminaries are called to prepare candidates before, not after, they appear before the board. When that happens, it's a better experience for candidates as well. One last thing; if we vote to allow candidates to go through the probationary process after completing half of their seminary education...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Please sum up.

HALLER: ... this may not shorten the probationary period, which was a primary intent of the petition. According to Calendar Item 1078, which is appearing next, probationary members will still have to serve a minimum of three years following completion of their educational requirements. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Alright. The amendment is before us. Yes, over here please, mic. 1. Mic. 1, tell us your name and whether you are for or against.

RODNEY STEELE (Arkansas): Rodney Steele, clergy, Arkansas, against the amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you.

STEELE: One of the biggest issues that seminarians face is loneliness. This new process goes back to a previous process where they began to relate officially with the conference through the conference Board of Ordained Ministry, which has the money and

resources to visit them and help them, which the district committees do not have. It's not that the district committees don't care, they can't keep up. And so, the students feel adrift from their conference. We need to connect with them, help them, nurture them; not make them feel abandoned; which the amendment will do.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We've had a speech for and a speech against the amendment. Is there a speech for the amendment? A speech—Here in front please, mic. 4, to your left as you exit. Mic. 4, a speech for the amendment. Give us your name and conference please.

JOEL GARRETT (Western Pennsylvania): My name is Joel Garrett. I am from the Western Pennsylvania Conference. I am completing this quadrennium having served as the chairperson of our Board of Ordained Ministry. I have served 16 years out of the last 25 on our Board of Ordained Ministry. Over that period of time, there has been a growing concern about those who have graduated from seminary; about their inability to articulate what they believe, either in written and oral form. This year, out of 13 candidates for full membership, we did not approve 5 for that very reason. We were very concerned about the lack of time that they put into preparing their answers and preparing for their interviews. I would be very concerned about granting them elder's orders and full membership in seminary when they come to a point of completion at that point, and then, what type of accountability do they have? I think it's better that we keep the checks and balances where they are and leave the *Discipline* the way that it is and that we approve this amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We've had two speeches for the amendment and one against. We can receive another speech against. Yes, the person in the center, yes, standing now. If you would, mic 3, please. Mic. 3. Must be a speech against— No, I'm sorry, the person in the floral covering.

(laughter)

PAT BEGHTEL-MAHLE (North Texas): I'm Pat Beghtel-Mahle, North Texas Conference, and I rise to speak against the amendment. I think it's a good idea to go back to where we were before, half way through seminary. It gives the boards and the seminaries a chance to work together for a student's good. And it gives the student an opportunity to have all the help that they need for the good of the church; that we, together, can have the best ministers possible when the boards of ministry and the seminaries can work together for our ministry.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The speeches have clarified the issue for us. Let's hear from the chair and then we will proceed to vote.

SANDS: As I said, our concern was for the length of time of the probationary period and for the complexity. What we are calling for in this petition is commissioning half way through seminary, rather than at the end of seminary.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, we are ready to vote. I see a card. Is this for information? We are ready to vote on the amendment. Mic 5, please.

JIM M. WELCH (Texas): Bishop, Jim Welch from Texas. Just a question of Rev. Sands. Isn't this petition related to commissioning?

SANDS: Yes. I believe that's correct...

WELCH: I think

SANDS: ..what I just said.

WELCH: ... there was a mistake in one of our brother's presentation...

SANDS: Yes.

WELCH: ...assuming that they would be ordained as elders...

SANDS: That's...

WELCH: after receiving one-half of the seminary degree.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, that's...

WELCH: This is for commissioning...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright

WELCH: ...and election as probationary members.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: That's...

SANDS: Exactly.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Alright, I believe you are ready to vote. Please prepare to vote and vote now on the amendment. [Yes, 347; No, 458; Abstain, 12]

The amendment does not pass.

The main motion is still before the house. Are you ready to vote? Yes, over here please, Mic 1. The main motion is before us.

JAMIE JENKINS (North Georgia): Jamie Jenkins, North Georgia, clergy delegate. A question of the chair of the committee.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes.

JENKINS: A couple of comments were made regarding the length of probation as being a primary concern for this petition. I just wonder if you could address that. Will probation still remain 3 years including that last year of seminary or will probation now be a potential 4 years if the person should be commissioned in the middle of their seminary career.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, question for information.

SANDS: That issue is covered in our next petition which was lifted from the Consent Calendar.

JENKINS: May I speak to that then, Bishop?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: You surely can.

JENKINS: One of the difficulties in dealing with the legislation, as we all have experienced, is that so often we do it in a fragmented and pragmatic way as opposed to looking at it holistically. It would seem to me to make more sense if we were to deal with the whole thing at once which we obviously cannot do. A part of my concern is that if we move to commission persons after half their seminary, basically at the end of their second year and we don't change the disciplinary require-

ments for probationary membership, instead of shortening the period of time as the presenter seemed to suggest that we are doing, we actually are lengthening the period of probation. And one of the concerns that I have heard most from folks who are interested in moving commissioning earlier is that we, in fact, shorten the total time of the ordination process.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I think you are moving to speech making now, sir.

JENKINS: And, so therefore, I would, would speak against this because we are in effect lengthening probation by a year if a person chooses this route.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, that's a speech against the main motion. Now have we had 2. Yes, that is in order, right. Is there a speech for? Yes, mic 3. We are on the main motion. We defeated the amendment. We are on the main motion. We have had 1 speech against; we now will receive a speech for.

WILLIAM (SCOTT) M. CAMPBELL (New England): Thank you, Bishop. Scott Campbell from New England. This is just a question for the person who brings the report. In the last paragraph, I note that there is a requirement that felonies, misdemeanors be reported on an appropriate form. I am particularly concerned to know whether misdemeanors relates to the following material concerning sexual misconduct or child abuse or would that also include such items as conviction for an act of civil disobedience or conscience? I just want to know what that is tied to, please.

SANDS: The misdemeanor referred to every kind of misdemeanor. If you will notice the comma after "misdemeanor". The others are written accusations of child abuse and sexual abuse. Our feeling was that, even though some misdemeanors may be minor, we trusted our boards of ordained ministry to determine that.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a speech for, a speech for. Yes, the gentleman standing. Mic 3, please.

CHARLES A. BENDER JR. (Greater New Jersey): Bishop, Charles Bender, Greater New Jersey Annual Conference. Referring to the same section, I would like to amend by placing the words "and their disposition" after the words "written accusations."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Would you help us again to know exactly where you are, please?

BENDER: In the language under the 315.112, it reads "detail on any conviction for felony or misdemeanor or written accusations." I would add to those words at that point, the words "and their dispositions."

SANDS: Bishop, we would accept that as a friendly amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: It has been accepted. It is in the text. Yes, please, mic 2.

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard from South Indiana. I am a bit confused, Bishop. I wonder if the presenter could tell us, if we adopt Calendar Item 1076, will it increase the length of time before a person can be ordained or will it decrease the length of time? We have had speeches saying it will do both and I would like to support the decrease of the length of time. We have 6 seminarians from our church who are in seminary or in the process. They are very frustrated with the very long length of time it takes to get through this system. I would like to support decrease but I don't know if voting for this would do that.

SANDS: The length of time was a concern for our committee as well. We felt that moving commissioning to the middle of seminary would have the effect of attempting to shorten the length of time. That ultimately will be decided, however, by the vote on the next petition.

MILLARD: So in the next petition, you are proposing to lengthen the time. Is that correct?

SANDS: That will be up to the annual conference, I mean, General Conference.

MILLARD: But your proposal from committee is to lengthen the time in the second proposal.

SANDS: That was the proposal from the committee.

MILLARD: So we should vote for this one and against the next one, if I'm right, Bishop..

SANDS: Up to you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Over here on my left. Yes. Mic 1, please.

TERRY L. CLARK (Illinois Great Rivers): Terry Clark, Illinois Great Rivers. Referring to the middle column, the bold print that is to substitute, ¶315.4B, the word "its equivalent", Bishop, I am asking what does that mean and, in light of the answer, I may have an amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

SANDS: I'm sorry. I am not understanding the question. What does what mean?

CLARK: What do the words "its equivalent" mean?

SANDS: That's an extremely good...oh, United Methodist seminary or its equivalent. There are many seminaries which are listed by the University Senate which are not specifically United Methodist. We want to include those seminaries as well. Does that answer your question?

CLARK: Well, it answers the question. Why did you just not say "seminaries approved by the University Senate?"

SANDS: That's a very good question. It would have meant the same thing, would it not?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Is that an amendment?

CLARK: I move that as an amendment the words "from a United Methodist seminary or its equivalent" be stricken so that the words would be "one-half of the basic theological studies be done from a seminary approved by the University Senate."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a second to the amendment. Do you care to speak to it? Alright, the

amendment is before us. Do you wish to speak to the amendment? Yes, please. Mic 1 again. The amendment is before us.

JANE N. BROOKS (North Georgia): Thank you, Bishop, Jane Brooks, North Georgia Conference. Bishop, I'd like to speak against the amendment. I believe that what is referred to there by the language "equivalent" is not the seminary, but the degree, the equivalent of a Master of Divinity degree. And so I speak against the amendment for that reason.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a speech for the amendment? I see a card, for the amendment, is there a speech for the amendment. I see none. Would the chair like to speak?

SANDS: Yes, I would. My understanding of this petition was that we were not trying to funnel every single student into United Methodist seminaries. They're pretty much overwhelmed as it is. We were considering all the schools listed by the University Senate.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, let us proceed to vote on the amendment. The vote has been called. Mic 8, please.

CHARLES BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, I'm sorry. Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference, I was waiting for another speech against. I was trying to honor your request for a speech for first.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, go ahead.

BOAYUE: I rise to speak against the amendment very strongly. The speaker just before me hinted at why we should oppose this amendment. The equivalent of a Masters of Divinity degree from a University Senate approved seminary means that the disciplinary paragraphs that refer to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry to make some determination as to whether a person with a Masters of Divinity from a seminary that was not approved, as to whether some of the courses done there, or all of them, would be acceptable. The *Discipline* allows for both the General Board of

Higher Education and Ministry and conference Board of Ordained Ministry to make some judgments there. Removing that would jeopardize theological ordinations all over the world. Keep in mind, that seminaries in Africa, for example, are not all approved by the University Senate which really has functioned historically within the United States. So I strongly urge the defeat of the amendment which was well intended but would do much, much harm.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, Chair jumped the gun. We've had a speech on each side. We can have one more speech on each side. Yes, please, mic. 8. We're on the amendment.

ELLIS CONLEY, (West Virginia): Ellis Conley, clergy, West Virginia Conference. In an attempt to clarify this issue, I'd like to offer an amendment to the amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

CONLEY: I'd like to—I move to take the words "or its equivalent" from line 6 in that paragraph and move it to line 3 in that paragraph. So, it would read, "a Master of Divinity degree or its equivalent." If I get a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is it seconded?

CONLEY: I think that's the intention of the language in this paragraph. I think it will clear up our confusion and help us to move forward quickly.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, the amendment to the amendment is before us. Is the house ready to vote?

JUDITH A. SANDS (Central Texas): May I have a word?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes, please.

SANDS: The intent of the committee was not to funnel every single United Methodist, every single theological student through a United Methodist seminary. We simply do not have enough United Methodist seminaries to do that. There are many theological schools that are listed by the University Senate and we wanted to leave open the option of students to

attend some of those seminaries. I would—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Go ahead, you can finish.

SANDS: Yes, I'm finished.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, we're going to vote now on the amendment to the amendment. Yes, please? Mic 7.

DENNY WHITE, (Western North Carolina): I thank the chair. My name is Denny White. I'm from Western North Carolina. It's with really sincere regret that I disagree with my sub-committee chair, the gentle lady from Texas; but the point here is that the issue has to do with—the clergy woman from North Georgia said it—it has to do with the degree. The amendment to the amendment just offered is precisely correct. The issue is whether one has an MDiv. degree or an equivalent, and the words really need to be inserted "as determined by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry." If you have your *Discipline* around, you will see what the current language is in Paragraph 315.4a: "A candidate for ordination as an Elder shall have received a Master of Divinity or its equivalent." You get that? "or its equivalent from a school listed by the University Senate." The intent of the legislative committee is to insert the words: "about United Methodist schools," but not to suggest that the equivalency relates to the school but rather to the degree. So in the sense that we've sort of always done it this way, I rise to support the amendment to the amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a speech then against the amendment to the amendment? Is the house ready? Yes, please, mic. 4, mic. 4. We have used 29 of our 30 allotted minutes on this Calendar Item. Mic 8, please, mic 8.

J. F. LACARIA, (West Virginia): Jeff Lacaria, West Virginia Conference, clergy. Just for the maker of the amendment to the amendment; question for clarification. He moved up "or its equivalent." Is there another "or" still retained at that place so it's "a United

Methodist seminary or other school approved by the University Senate?"

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, that's a question. Could that be answered by the maker quickly, please? The answer is yes. The answer is yes. Let us proceed to vote on the amendment to the amendment. Please prepare to vote and vote now.

(pause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The amendment to the amendment passes. [Yes, 700; No, 141; Abstain, 16] and we're ready now to act on the amendment? Does the chair wish to speak?

SANDS: I've forgotten what the amendment is. Would you please—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. If you are a confused as I am, probably everyone else is nearly so would the Secretary remind us where we are, please.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: Deletes: "from a United Methodist seminary or its equivalent." The sentence would read: "Basic graduate theological studies from a seminary listed by the University Senate."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Would you care to speak?

SANDS: I think everything's been said.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Please prepare to vote. And vote now on the amendment. The amendment passes. [Yes, 510; No, 327; Abstain, 17] And now the main motion with amendments is before us. Does the chair wish to speak?

SANDS: Yes. I think everything's been said, Bishop.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Prepare to vote. And vote now. You have sustained the committee with the amendments. [Yes, 668; No, 179; Abstain, 10] Thank you. Next item please.

SANDS: The next item is again found on p. 1753, in your *DCA*, p. 1753

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Point of order? Yes, what's your point of order? Mic. 1, please mic 1.

WALTER L. KIMBROUGH (North Georgia): Bishop, Walter Kimbrough, clergy delegate North Georgia. We were unclear with the reading of the amendment. It didn't appear to be what we had approved as the amendment to the amendment. And we want to make sure it's the amendment to the amendment that was approved.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Are you questioning whether we voted it or whether the language reported to the house was accurate?

KIMBROUGH: Whether the language that was reported to the house was the accurate rendering of the amendment to the amendment that we voted approval—concurrence on.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. May we hear that, please? In fact, may we hear that which we just supported, please?

CAROLYN MARSHALL: Yes, Bishop. That last one just got here. I believe it would then read: "or its equivalent" should be removed. So it would be: delete—I can't tell what this is—I move to move the words. What it says is I move the move the words "or its equivalent" from line 6 in paragraph. Replace 3516 to line 3.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Can the maker help us, please? The maker of the amendment to the amendment that was passed. Mic. 8, mic. 8.

WHITE: Yes, Bishop. I apologize for my poor writing. It was intended to read: "I move to move the words "or its equivalent" from line 6 in the paragraph; replacing paragraph 315.6 to line 3.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. While you are there, would you read for us how you understand what you put before us—how that would read; and let the house check if that is in their understanding that which they just approved. Let's be sure, and thank you over here for the point of order. That was very helpful.

WHITE: In the middle column, p. 1753: "A candidate for ordination as an elder shall have received one half of his

studies toward a Master of Divinity degree or its equivalent, including one-half, then there's a comma, including one-half of the basic graduate theological studies from a United Methodist seminary or from a school listed by the University Senate.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Is that the understanding of the house?

CONLEY: Yes, yes.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Let us proceed to the next item.

SANDS: Our next item is found again—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Can we have the mic at the podium, please.

SANDS: Our next item is found again on p. 1753 in your *DCA*. It is Calendar Item 1078. It was removed this morning from the Consent Calendar. It can be found in your *Advance DCA* on p.1162. It is Petition No.40680, 40680. The committee recommends concurrence with amendment. The amendment is to delete "under fulltime appointment" and replace it with "following the completion of educational requirements for full connection."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. It is before us.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes. You are in the center, mic. 3, mic. 3.

ARTHUR JONES (North Texas): Bishop, I have an amendment, if that's in order? Arthur Jones, North Texas Conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes.

JONES: I move that we strike "3 years following completion of education requirements" to "2 years." If I have a second, I'll speak to that.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: It is seconded.

JONES: My name is Arthur Jones. I've wanted to be a United Methodist pastor since I was three years old. It will take me until I'm 29 to be ordained. Now for those of you who are over 29 that seems like a short period of time. But for those of us who are just 19 through 20, in a month, that seems like forever. We are in a crisis right now

of pastors; of needing people who are coming into seminary, coming in and being good passion for Christ. And we think in the time saying we don't trust you enough, we don't trust all the things that we—we don't trust all the requirements we put up before you; we don't trust our seminaries that are educating you. Bishop and members of this conference I really plead that we decrease this time because I honestly believe that that's one of the things keeping people from joining our seminaries; keeping people from joining our ministry. Because, honestly, 29—it seems like a long time from now. Thank you

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We have an amendment, here in the center. Yes, the person standing with the card in her left hand. Mic 7. Is that closer? Mic 7? All right. *(pause)* Mic 7. The amendment is before us.

HEATHER M. ELKINS (West Virginia): I speak in favor—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Tell us who you are, please.

ELKINS: Heather Murray Elkins, West “By God” Virginia—

(laughter)

ELKINS: —and Drew Theological School. I speak in favor of this amendment. There are many sitting in this body as clergy who came through in a system that allowed them to be in service in that shorter length of time, and we think we turned out fairly well. Because we represent a partnership between the local church, the annual conference, the United Methodist seminaries, you in those bodies—annual church—local church, annual conference—send us Christians, and we help prepare them for United Methodist ministries. It's a partnership that could be trusted. And while we're on the subject of United Methodist seminaries—I believe I speak for all 13—we have lots of room. We can take everyone you send us. So I urge you to consider lifting a bar, for we are eager to receive those good United Methodists that the church is prepared to send us.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. We've had two speeches for the amendment. We need speeches against the amendment. I recognize the person here in the center. Mic 5, please. Mic 5.

JOHN W. EDGAR (West Ohio): John Edgar, West Ohio. I speak in opposition to the amendment; and it is, for me, very much a matter of time. I'm in my seventh year as a district superintendent, and I am amazed at the amount of time that the leadership of our annual conference has to invest in dealing with people who were ordained elder and became full members of our annual conference who are not gifted or truly able to serve effectively in ministry. We need three years in a probationary period to insure that we know whether or not the folks who we have commissioned and are allowing to serve full-time are folks to whom we want to guarantee an appointment for the rest of their career.

It is an issue of time, but the time it takes to remove a person when they are not effective but have become an elder is enormous. The time to repair the damage to a church that is being served again and again by incompetent folks who we couldn't get rid of because we moved too quickly to ordain them is a waste of our time. We want three years so we can make sure the people we ordain are ones we want to serve in our midst for 30 more years. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We've had two speeches for the amendment and one speech against. Is there another speech against? Yes, in the back, please. Mic 6. Mic 6. Must be a speech against the amendment.

THEODORE SMITH (Virginia): Ted Smith, Virginia Conference. Yes, Bishop, a speech against. We do need to consider this, and part of what we need to consider is the time it takes to form and shape a person who can think theologically. That takes time. If you shortcut the process of forming and shaping a pastor who can think theologically and implement that in the local setting, that shortcut process leaves the church with a person who

has not received all the preparation and skills and talents that our church is capable of giving them. As my brother has said, we see the results then when our clergy are ill-prepared to make disciples for Jesus Christ.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We've had the two speeches on either side. We'll turn to the chair and then proceed to vote.

JUDITH A. SANDS (Central Texas): I do agree with the last speaker. We—our sub—our legislative committee felt very strongly that it—we needed the extra time in order to complete the work of thinking theologically that was begun while our candidates were in seminary.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The amendment is before us. I believe you're ready to vote. Please prepare to vote now. [*Yes, 430; No, 441; Abstain, 8*] Alright, the amendment does not pass, and so the main motion is before the body. Anyone care to—yes, please. Mic 3, mic 3.

THOMAS E. CHOI (California-Pacific): Bishop, Tom Choi, California-Pacific. I've a question. The language following “the completion of education requirements for full connection as opposed to being in full-time appointment.” What does that mean?

SANDS: That means that the residency period would begin following the completion of seminary. Does that answer your question?

CHOI: Well, OK.

SANDS: OK.

CHOI: That does.

SANDS: OK.

CHOI: I mean, that seems obvious; but if I were to complete my seminary requirements, did nothing for three years, does that mean I'm eligible to—for full connection?

SANDS: Most annual conferences have a residency program that at the current time is three years in length.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The motion is before us. Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 670; No, 193;*

Abstain, 18] You have sustained the committee. Thank you. Next item, please.

SANDS: Thank you, Bishop.

MAGGIE JACKSON (East Ohio): Maggie Jackson, East Ohio, lay delegate. *DCA* p. 1843, 1843; Calendar Item 945, 945; Subject, Support and Scholarships; Petition No. 41400, 41400; *ADCA* p. 1218, 1218.

The recommendation is non-concurrence. The vote present, 7 to 8—in favor of, 7 to 8. The rationale: It is believed that notification is sufficient in documents through our church to inform persons on the availability of scholarships, information from the General Board of Higher Education, as well as through the seminaries themselves. And so our committee is recommending non-concurrence, to not add additional data to the *Discipline*.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The recommendation for non-concurrence is before you. Are you ready to vote? Alright. Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 826; No, 44; Abstained, not available*] Committee's recommendation for non-concurrence is sustained. Thank you. Next item, please.

REBEKAH L. MILES (Arkansas): Rebekah Miles, Arkansas. Friends, I have three calendar items to present. The first two are found on p. 1755 of the *DCA*. Number one, my petition is Calendar Item 1102. Again, that's 1755 of the *DCA*, Petition No. 40915, found in the Advance *DCA* on 1175. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. I see a card in the back, please. Mic 8, mic 8.

MARK R. HOLLAND (Kansas East): Thank you, Bishop. Mark Holland, Kansas East, clergy. I would encourage your supporting the committee's overwhelming support of this petition. The petition is to allow clergy reporting of child sexual abuse, either by reason of conscience or because it's mandated by the state or other legal entity. It does not mandate clergy reporting, but it allows it. Currently, our *Discipline* says that "The United

Methodist Church—clergy in The United Methodist Church are charged to maintain all confidences inviolate, including confessional conferences—confidences." That's in Paragraph 332.5 of *The Book of Discipline*.

The Judicial Council has ruled on this a number of times and have said in part, and I quote, "The law of the church is that confidential confessions to the clergy remain confidential. Church law does not except confessions of child abuse from this absolute duty of confidentiality." Judicial Council Decision 7888936.

Brothers and sisters, there is something of an absolute duty that we have that is greater than the confidence of clergy. We have an absolute duty to the children. And considering the number of problems that denominations, including our own, have had with child sexual abuse—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Please sum up.

HOLLAND: —thank you—there must be a place where clergy can step outside of that and report it. If a man comes and says he is raping his 12-year-old child and he's not ready to get help, under the current *Book of Discipline*, I could lose my credentials if I call the police. Friends, I've not yet met a clergy who would not give up their credentials for that child; and I pray I never do. But we have to—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you.

HOLLAND: —open the door.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you.

HOLLAND: Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. Is there a speech against? Against? Yes, in the front, please. Mic 3. A speech against—the petition?

DAVID L. RICHARDSON (California-Pacific): David Richardson, California-Pacific Annual Conference, and I speak against concurrence. I know children and I value mandated—"mandated reporting" in the secular helping professions. However, I also value the sacred nature of the confessional, and I'm not willing to give it up. The litigation—the legis-

lation removes professional discretion—unlike my predecessor, who spoke just before me—for us, especially in California. And it will take away from me the opportunity of making decisions of conscience and my own professional integrity, with regard to the confessional, with regard to issues of pastoral care. We will all be "mandated reporters" on all matters related to abuses or neglect of children, regardless of the circumstances.

In the state of California, our Supreme Court has upheld the confessional and not extended mandatory reporting for—to the confessional because, precisely because, of our historic stance, as a church. We cannot be forced to divulge the confessional. This action would remove the foundational support of the confessional and it concerns me on more than ecclesiological level. I think the litigious nature of this matter causes me to fear future "deep pockets" actions against us, if we are forced as pastors to be—to make this mandated reporting.

The petition, almost ident—actually, actually identical, was adopted by the Ohio West—West Ohio Conference two years ago.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Time to sum up, please.

RICHARDSON: And the Judicial Council did not uphold—uphold that. They quoted Martin Luther, and I would lift this up for you, when he was asked to confess, or to bring forth the confessional, and he said that the confessional was to me—was to God, it was to Christ, and if the person—if I have to say that I heard it, I'd have to say "no," but it would be up to Christ speak on behalf of that. I think we need to keep that confessional sacred.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. We've had a speech for and a speech against. Is there a speech for, please? Yes, in the back, mic 5, yes, sir, please. Mic 5.

STEPHEN P. WENDE (Texas): Steve Wendé, the Texas Annual Conference. I rise to speak passionately for the amendment. It is not coer-

cive, it is—it allows the pastor to follow his or her own conscience, except when the state mandates. Sisters and brothers in Christ, kids come first. Somebody pretty famous said it would be better for you to have a millstone put around your neck and thrown into the ocean, than to hurt one of these little ones. I think his name was Jesus. I speak in favor of this motion.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a speech against? A speech against, yes, here, no I'm sorry, behind you I see a person, yes. Mic 5. No, I'm sorry, the one behind you without a jacket. Mic 5, please.

HAKAN ENGLUND (Sweden): Bishop, Hakan England from Sweden. I would like to propose an amendment to this...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

ENGLUND. ..because this is something that would cause problems for us in Sweden. I would like to amend this to delete the word "or," so it would read "in cases where 'mandatory reporting' is required by civil law." Just delete the word "or."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, is there a second? Is there a second? Alright, I heard a second. You may speak.

ENGLUND: In Sweden, if I say anything that has been told to me in confidence, I could be accused according to civil law. So it's the opposite to this. So that's why I would like to—to delete the word "or," so it would make it possible for those to report where it is mandatory. Where it is not mandatory, you still keep the confidence, because I thin that is what we are required to do as ministers. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, the amendment is before us. Does anyone—yes, back here, mic 8. We're speaking to the amendment. It should be a speech against. Is it a speech against the amendment?

MARK R. HOLLAND (Kansas East): Yes, yes, bishop.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

HOLLAND: Mark Holland, Kansas

City, clergy, again. Kansas currently does not require me to report as a clergy. It still maintains the clergy confidence. But I answer to a higher law. And that higher law is God, and the mandate from God to protect the children does not matter what the state of Kansas says. I must have permission from my church to protect the children. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, we've had one speech for, and one speech against the amendment. Would this be a speech for the amendment? Yes, please, mic 7. Mic 7.

DANIEL IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Daniel Ivey-Soto, New Mexico Annual Conference. I am against any change in the pastor-penitent privilege, however, if we're going to open the door, let it be only where it is required by civil law. In my law practice I deal with a number of different issues. I deal with people who are finding themselves in a difficult situation and they're looking for help. And yet, they have no one to turn to. They have no one to turn to because if they go to a psychologist, the psychologist must turn them in. They have no one to turn to because if they go to a doctor, the doctor will turn them in.

I don't want our pastors being cops. I don't want parishioners feeling like they can not turn for help to the very people who are supposed to be their spiritual guides. If we're going to open this at all, let it only be where it is absolutely required by law, and under no other circumstance, whatsoever. This is damaging to our congregations, and frankly, it is damaging to the relationship that pastors have with their congregants. Thank you, very much.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, we can receive one more speech against the amendment. Yes, please. Mic 4. Mic 4.

SAMUEL PURUSHOTHAM (New England): I'm Sam Purshotham, from the New England Conference. I needed a clarification from the maker of the motion. I want to know whether the final amendment would include the

word "suspected."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, that's a question for the gentleman who made the amendment.

PURUSHOTHAM: Yes, and I'd like to follow with a subsequent question.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Hold, alright. Would the maker of the amendment return to mic, please. Mic 5. Alright, question?

PURUSHOTHAM: The question is what are the safeguards against false accusation. Because the way it is written now, even if somebody is falsely accused, that is open to be revealed to other people. And I was wondering whether that would be fair to the accusee.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, you're close to debate, but let's give the brother in the back a chance to respond.

ENGLUND: Yes, bishop. I was only deleting the word "or." Of course, if—if the law requires you to—to tell, you should to that, but otherwise it should stand, just as it is. Just delete the word "or."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, does anyone wish to speak now, against the amendment? Against the amendment. Yes, yes please on the aisle, mic 4, mic 4. This will be the final speech before we turn to the chair.

TSHIBANG KASAP 'OWAN (North-West Katanga): (*simultaneous interpretation*) Kasap 'owan, North-West Katanga Annual Conference. We need to understand what we are teaching to our students and what they are practicing in the churches. As a seminary professor, what we teach in our seminary is that we need to guard confidentiality, because now we were talking about the counseling aspect of our ministry. If someone comes to me and tells me what he is involved in, if he has had a relationship with a girl or with a woman, and he comes to confess this to his pastor, I believe that my role as a pastor is to help him, so that he can have a change in his life. I don't see that it would be a healthy thing to being him to the justice of the state. I believe

that we need to keep the confidentiality of our counseling ministry. I am not in agreement that we would bring out into the open what a person has confessed to his pastor.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, we've had the two speeches for and the two speeches against the amendment. We'll turn to the chair and then we will vote on the amendment.

MAGGIE JACKSON(East Ohio): Friends, I urge you to vote against this amendment. There are many states where people are required—mandated by law to report, when it doesn't simply involve child sexual abuse, but other kinds of abuse. In addition, I think more importantly, there are places in the life of a pastor when they feel called by conscience and not just by law to report. As our *Discipline* currently reads, a pastor who is—feels required by conscience, does not have that freedom to report. This change simply gives them the room—even if they live in a state where it is not mandated by law—it simply gives that pastor the room to respond to their conscience and to do what they feel is right, to protect the children in their care.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, let us proceed now to vote on the amendment. Please vote now. [*Yes, 335 ; No, 53, ; Abstain, 14*] The amendment does not pass, and so the main motion is before us. We can entertain one more speech against the main motion. Is this a speech against the motion? Yes.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: The amendment does not pass and so the main motion is before us. [*Yes, 335; No, 53; Abstain, 14*] We can entertain one more speech against the main motion. Is this a speech against the motion? Yes, please, mic 3.

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): Jim Ehman, East Ohio. I'd like to take this away from it being confessional versus children. That's not the issue. The issue is whether our church will protect confidentiality. In my other life, when I'm not being a lay church bureaucrat, I'm a lawyer. I don't do this type of work, but all lawyers deal with the fact that

they are told things in confidence by their clients that maybe the world is better off knowing in this particular case. But the presumption is, it is; we keep confidences the same way clergy do, because if the confidence goes away, people won't talk. It's up to an individual clergy person whether they decide they want to violate the confidence that's there. But whether it's a child abuser or someone else who comes along they're not going to talk if they know they're required to be turned in.

The second thing is this is badly worded for even what the chair wants to accomplish. "Except in the cases of suspected child abuse." It puts the burden on the individual person to ask, when has this risen to the level of suspected child abuse? And then if the decision is made, and I don't have enough information to suspect, do I suspect? The parents, the other family, it opens the pastor up to the second guessing of somebody else. Each pastor is subject to...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Sum up, please.

EHRMAN: Each pastor is subject to civil law in each state, which is different across the nation. It's adequately dealt with and the whole thing should be rejected.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, let's turn to the chair.

REBEKAH MILES: I urge you to vote for this petition. The committee, the committee voted for it after long discussion by a margin of 68 to 15. Let me just say a few things in response to our, the final speaker, the last speaker. I do think the role of the attorney and the role of the pastor are very different. The attorney has an important obligation to that client. The pastor has an obligation to a wider array of people in the church and in the community and a special obligation to protect children.

Yes, indeed it is tough for a pastor to make that call when, if the pastor can't decide if, if child abuse is definitely happening. That's up to the court to decide and the police to decide; that's

not for the pastor to decide. But the pastor has to make a tough call: Am I going to report or not? And I simply say that what this change does is it gives the pastor the right to listen to his or her own conscience and even perhaps the call of God to do what this person thinks is right, to protect children, to protect the vulnerable in his or her community.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, I believe you're ready to vote. Question? Alright, mic 1. There is a question. Mic 1 please.

BRIDGETTE D. YOUNG (North Georgia): Bridgette Young, North Georgia clergy. It's a procedural question for the rest of the day. In situations where we've had amendments on top of amendments, could we have either a summary or a reading of the original motion before we take the final vote? That would be very helpful in knowing what we're voting on.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Fine, thank you, thank you. Alright. Let us prepare to vote, and let us vote now. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 575; No, 303; Abstain, 13*] Next item, please.

MILES: Item No. 2. I think this one's simpler. P. 1755 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1104, Petition No. 41439, and that's 1175 in the Advance *DCA*. The committee recommended concurrence by a vote of 70 to 16. And this simply clarifies the language; it simplifies the language.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. Is the house ready to vote? Prepare to vote and please vote now. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 827; No, 37; Abstain, 17*] Thank you. Next item please.

MILES: This is my third and final petition. P. 1849 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1470, Petition No. 40027. That's 1193 in the Advance *DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. And this is simply an amendment that would—if a person in good standing goes to another denomination and that person does not have any charges against them, there's no problems, then that person would not have

their credentials defaced. That's the practice of many other denominations when people come from other denominations to our church, they bring their ordination credentials and we recognize them. So we recommended by a wide margin the concurrence with amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, are you ready to vote, and the house understands? Alright, please prepare to vote and vote now. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 822; No, 46; Abstain, 2*] Thank you. Next item, please.

GARY R. HENDERSON (East Ohio): Gary Henderson, clergy member of the East Ohio Conference. I invite your attention to *DCA* p. no. 1849, 1849; Calendar Item 1482, 1482; Petition No. 41524, 41524; your *Advance DCA* 1180, 1180. The recommendation from committee with amendment is concurrence. The vote is 55, 21 against, 3 abstentions. Rationale: this petition would simply grant the right of sacramental privileges to retired local pastors in connection to the church where they have their membership.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. Are you ready to vote? I see a card, yes, mic 7, please, mic 7.

CHARLES D. WHITE JR. (Western North Carolina): I think the chair, I believe...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Tell us who you are...

WHITE: I'm sorry, Denny White, Western North Carolina. I believe the spelling of the word is rites, not rights.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you sir. Alright, is the house ready to vote? Please prepare to vote, and let us vote now. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 781; No, 79; Abstain, 4*] Thank you. Next item, please.

HENDERSON: The *DCA* p. no. is 1850, 1850; Calendar Item 1483, 1483; the petition number is 41010, 41010; the *Advance DCA* is 1145, 1145. The recommendation from committee is for referral to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. The vote was

63, 14, and 2. We agreed as a legislative committee that the language of this committee relative to the local pastor was sufficiently gray enough that it needed to be referred to the General Board.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is a motion for referral. Are you ready to vote? Please prepare to vote and do so now. You have sustained the recommendation. Thank you. It is referred. [*Yes, 853; No, 21; Abstain, 2*] Next item, please.

HENDERSON: The *DCA* p. no. is 1850, the same page, 1850; the Calendar No. is 1484, 1484; the Petition No. is 41446, 41446; *Advance DCA* 1180, 1180. The recommendation from the legislative committee is for concurrence. The vote was 41, pardon me, 44, 31 against, 2 abstentions. The gist of this petition would grant the opportunity for local pastors to be appointed to extension ministries.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, the motion is before you. Yes, please, mic 3, mic 3, please.

MATTHEW G. JOHNSON (Western Pennsylvania): Matthew Johnson, Western Pennsylvania Annual Conference. Bishop, I rise to speak in favor of the recommendation of the committee on several bases. The first is our basic mission statement as a church. We are called to make disciples of Jesus Christ and to do this completely and to do this fully, we need to have people with ministerial and Methodist presences outside of our churches. Throughout our land and throughout the world there are places that are in need of this; prisons, and local community outreach centers. places that need to know the gospel of Jesus Christ. We've an opportunity to allow local pastors who've been licensed and trained by the church to be a presence in the place where we desperately need it.

I know of a man in our conference who has faithfully served the church for the last 18 years, many of which as a local pastor. He's been given the opportunity to be the head chaplain at a

state correctional institute, but at this point he can't do that because it would require him to be appointed to an extension ministry. We need to allow these people who have faithfully served the church and who've done so very, very well, who have gifts and graces that will grant that and help that to do this in a way that will make disciples of all people not just the people inside of our doors. Let's utilize people for their calling and their gifts fully and completely. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Is there a speech against? Yes, please, mic 1, and I saw a card over here then. Alright....

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Speech against. Yes, please mic 1, and I saw a card over here then. Alright. Mic 1

DAVID T. GROUT (Kentucky): David Grout, Kentucky. Point of clarification. What would be the sacramental privilege implications for these local pastors? For example, in a prison, my understanding is they have sacramental privileges in the local church to which they are appointed. What would be the implications for sacramental privileges?

GARY R. HENDERSON (East Ohio): If I understand your question this petition specifically addresses retired local pastors. Pardon me. May I hear the question again please?

GROUT: Simply what would be the implications for sacramental privileges if a local pastor is appointed to a prison or another chaplaincy program?

HENDERSON: He would have privileges is the implication of the petition.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Is there a speech against. Yes, over here on my far left. You didn't think I had a far left, its way over there. [*laughter*] Mic 1 please. We've had a speech for.

JANIE E. JENKINS (North Georgia): This is a speech against. Janie Jenkins, North Georgia Conference, clergy. I rise to speak against the recommendation. I affirm what the previous speakers said in terms of the value of the local pastor

and the absolute dependence that we have upon persons who feel that role. However, the role of the local pastor in—while appointed to a local congregation, as I understand it, could have sacramental rights in a prison or in some other place, because the words just above what the words were stricken here in the *DCA* are that they are “served to sign—” “assigned to serve people within or related to the community being served.” When we extend the appointment rights and privileges to local pastors to any extension ministry, I think we open a Pandora’s box that we have not yet even begun to consider and we blur the lines continually in terms of the reason, the purpose, and meaning of ordination. I just think this is an idea that has not had enough thought, and we’ve not considered it. Local pastors in the local church is a wonderful and absolutely necessary thing. Local pastors appointed to extension ministries, which could include all kinds of things, could create an enormous additional workload for the Board of Ordained Ministry—

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Like to sum it up please

JENKINS: —and for the bishop and the cabinet to determine in terms of credentialing and appointing. Bad Idea

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We’ve had a speech for and a speech against. Is there a speech for, please? In the front row, please, a speech for. Mic 1. Is this a speech for? Mic 1.

ROBERTO L. GOMEZ (Rio Grande): Roberto Gomez, Rio Grande Conference. I chair the Board of Ordained Ministry in the Rio Grande Conference. In 1996, the General Conference did away with associate members, clergy associate members. That has made it very difficult for our conference to have people who will move to their relationship where elders and full-connection people will not serve. This new paragraph will help us not only have local pastors with churches but will give those people who would informally be the social members to do extension ministries.

Not only in prisons, but you can think of hospitals and campus ministries. We have less and less elders coming out in full connection. We need more local pastors to help us out, not only local church settings, but extension ministries. I support and ask you to support this paragraph.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you. Was there a speech against? Yes, right in front of me. Mic 3, please. This will be a speech against, and then we’ll turn to the chair.

SHELLEY BROOKS (Central Texas): Question. Shelley Brooks, Central Texas Conference. In the *Advanced DCA* on p.1180, as we look at this petition, toward the bottom of it, No.7, there is an entire paragraph relating to student local pastors that is struck through. May I ask how this affects the voting rights and supervision of stupid student local pastors? Excuse me—

(laughter)

I did not—student local pastors. I was one at one time.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: So the question is implication for student local pastors. Is that the question?

BROOKS: Yes, and their voting rights, because this Paragraph 7 addresses that.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Would the chair like to—

HENDERSON: Let me by confession say that I don’t have the whole paragraph section memorize, but I do not believe this is the only place in *The Book of Discipline* that addresses the voting prerogatives of the student local pastor. I would stand to be corrected on that matter. So I don’t think by implication they are now without vote. If I can be clearer.

BROOKS: OK. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. We need a speech against. Yes, I see here, please. Mic 4, mic 4. Speech against. Then we will proceed to the chair and then go.

MARY ELIZABETH MOORE

(California-Pacific): Mary Elizabeth Moore, California-Pacific. I move that this petition be referred to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, and if I have a second I’ll speak to it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Please.

MOORE: The implications of this petition are vast. It affects our understanding of ministry, elders orders, deacons orders, and lay ministries, all of which are involved in prison ministries, hospital ministries, and so forth. I think that we need deliberation, careful deliberation, of these matters over a period of time before we make a change such as this. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, there’s a motion for referral. Is there one who would like to speak against referral? Yes, sir, please, mic 1. This is a speech against referral.

BRIAN K. JARMAN (South Indiana): Brian Jarman, South Indiana. This petition came from the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. I believe they’ve already looked at it, and I believe they’re trying to answer a need in our churches. I think we all agree that the local pastors serve a good purpose in our church; but we don’t agree on what we should give them to represent themselves and to help them share the burden that others are not willing to share. I speak against referral.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Is there a speech for referral? In the back, I think a person standing with the floral jacket. We’re on the motion to refer.

MARGARET ANN CRAIN (Northern Illinois): Margaret Ann Crain, clergy, Northern Illinois Conference. I, too, would like to encourage us to think about referral. I’ve been distressed as an ordained deacon listening to much of this conversation that seems to forget that we have persons who are called to this specifically to these kinds of ministries that link church and world. They prepare themselves carefully, they listen to the voice of God, and they claim that identity; and I just don’t want that to be for-

gotten in this conversation, so I would urge referral back to the board where all of our orders and our levels of licensing and so forth can be a part of the conversation. Thank you

BISHOP SPRAGUE: All right. We've had two speeches for referral one against. We can receive one more against. Is this against referral, please? Yes, all right, mic 5. We'll hear this speech, turn to the chair, and then go.

WAVERELY SMITH (Virginia): Waverely Smith, Virginia Conference. This actually happened to me. I wish we would not refer this. We need some immediate action on this. I'm a third-career person, was a local pastor, and then was called to position on the conference staff; and then we find out later that through the *Discipline* I was not allowed. So I've been on the five-year hold on my education as a local pastor but serving our conference for the last five years as a lay person. Just vote against referring this, and let's take some action now.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Let's turn to the chair. I'm sorry, we've had the two speeches.

GARY R. HENDERSON (East Ohio): I would speak against referral for a number of reasons. One I do want to remind this body that this comes to us from the referring entity, the Board of Higher Education and Ministry. The other point I would like to make, and particularly as I've been a part of this community for the last two weeks and have had lots of opportunity being dialoged with local pastors who've been a part of this process though standing on the outside of the bar in terms of voting privileges, that this is an urgent matter and to refer it, in my own language, simply means another method of study. I think we need to do something now, and we have that opportunity today.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The vote is on the motion to refer. Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 304; No, 569; Abstain, 6*] You have not referred, so we are back to the main motion; and we are in need of one more

speech against the main motion. It has to be a speech against the main motion. Yes, here in the greenish-blue shirt, please, yes. Coming toward mic 4. It's a speech against the action of the committee.

BARRIE M. TRITLE (Iowa): Barry Tritle from Iowa. It is not a speech against. It's a motion to amend. By adding after what's in the material: "When appointed to an extension ministry a local pastor will identify a church conference to report to and have as a secondary appointment."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Would you tell us again where that is—so just help us; and then read it one more time, please?

TRITLE: Well, it would be right at the end of what has already been placed in here by the material, and it says, "When appointed to an extension ministry a local pastor will identify a church conference to report to and have as a secondary appointment."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Would you like to speak to that?

TRITLE: Yes.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I heard a second. I'm sorry. Yes.

TRITLE: I believe it's important that we use local pastors and extension ministries; but I do believe they need to have a church conference that they connect to and report to and are accountable to. And I believe we need to extend the ministry for the local church to these extension ministries that exist; such as jails, chaplaincies, etc.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The amendment is before us.

GARY R. HENDERSON (East Ohio): Bishop?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes.

HENDERSON: If I may speak, I would consider that a friendly amendment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Well, it is the property of the house. I think we must go ahead. Would this be a speech against the amendment? Point of order, yes, please, mic 3, please.

PAULA J. WHITBECK (Central Texas): Paula Whitbeck, Central Texas Conference. I still go back to the question about Paragraph 7, about student local pastors. There are two other petitions that dealt with Paragraph 7. That was petition—or Calendar Item 1474 and 1475. Both were voted non-concurrence and probably went on the Consent Calendar because there's less than ten votes. So my question is, why is the language in Paragraph 7 struck in this particular petition? Because the affect of doing that now is that you are granting voting rights to student local pastors.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Can someone help with that back here?

HENDERSON: I would have to defer, Bishop, to someone from the Board of Higher Education and Ministry to respond.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I think there's a gentleman at mic 7 who can help us.

DENNY WHITE (West North Carolina): I thank the chair. My name is Denny White from Western North Carolina. I have a theory that we all come to General Conference with a certain number of chips that we can play. I think I've about played all of mine; but some have played even more than they came with.

(laughter and applause)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Just help us with information.

WHITE: In any case, Bishop, I will try to answer. The other day, as I recall, we passed a constitutional amendment which yet remains to be ratified by the annual conferences; but if that is approved, it would place the membership of clergy members in the constitution for the first time in our history. And in that definition of who the clergy members are, that part of the constitution would now read, if approved, "All of the members in full connection, all the probationary members and associate members, and all, *all*, of the local pastors under appointment, without exception." I suspect that the intent of the general board in offering this dele-

tion of Section 7 was somewhat in the nature of enabling legislation, which would help, you know, to implement the amendment which they had proposed and which this house has approved.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Does that help? Alright. Well, we're on the amendment that was made from the delegate from Iowa. We had a speech for. Now we can receive a speech against. Yes, I see a person with, yes, a blue shirt and a yellow card. That identifies about half the men in the house. Thank you, sir, mic 8.

GRAYSON L. LUCKY (Oklahoma): Thank you, Bishop. Grayson Lucky, Oklahoma Conference. I would like to amend the amendment for the purpose and for keeping our responsibility in baptism within the church. While persons may be appointed as local pastors to serve an extension ministry, they are not in themselves the church. And to baptize persons in extension ministries without—in keeping with our practice and theology of baptism, a person's not baptized in a vacuum. So my amendment to the amendment would be, if there's a conference—charge conference or church conference to which they must relate, then I would amend the amendment by saying, "It will be in that same church conference to which all persons baptized will be members of the church to which that conference is being reported."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Would you try that again, the language, please. I think I understand the intent, but let the house hear the language again please.

LUCKY: OK. One more time from the top. I—a baptism in an extension ministry is not to baptize a person in a vacuum. There is a church to be represented. There is a church to be a part of. The local pastor who is in that extension ministry and who is there on behalf of the church is not the church in totality, and there is a relationship—a body—to be baptized into a body. And so if the local pastor is to be responsible and accountable to a church confer-

ence with a membership, then I'm assuming I would want to encourage the conference to consider that persons baptized would be made part or be received as members into the same church conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. The amendment to the amendment is before us. Yes, the gentleman about to stand, please. Mic 1, please, mic 1. This is on the amendment to the amendment.

JOE W. KILPATRICK (North Georgia): Bishop, would it be in order to move that we suspend the rules and vote on all that is before the house on this issue?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yes. it would.

KILPATRICK: I so move.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. It takes a two-thirds vote, if you would suspend the rules in order to vote on all that is before the house. Please prepare to vote, and vote now on suspension of the rules. [*Yes, 795; No, 47; Abstain, 2*] Alright. And now we also—it is sustained.

Now we also need to vote on the motion to vote. So if you are ready to vote on the motion to proceed to vote on the various items, please vote now. [*Yes, 757; No, 72; Abstain, 7*]

Alright. You are ready to vote, and we will move first to the amendment to the amendment, and would the secretary help us with that? I was asked earlier for clarity and then proceeded not to be clear. I apologize for that.

CATHERINE MARSHALL: (*Unintelligible; spoken off-mike*) when appointed to an extension ministry, a local pastor will identify a church conference to report to and have as a secondary appointment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: This would be the amendment to the amendment. You don't have it yet.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: I don't have it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We don't have it either.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: Don't have it.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Don't have it? Would the maker, again, of the amendment to the amendment, give us, not the rationale, but just the wording, please? Not the rationale, the wording.

LUCKY: This is an extension of the amendment. The persons baptized in extension—a person who is baptized by a local pastor serving in an extension ministry, the person so baptized will be received and recognized as a member of the church to which the local pastor is being accountable and reporting to.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Thank you. That is before us. Please prepare to vote on the amendment to the amendment as just stated. Let us—oh, the presenter, I'm sorry. Presenter? Would you care—would you care to speak? I'm sorry.

HENDERSON: No, I do not.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Now let us proceed to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 462; No, 368; Abstain, 17*] Alright. The amendment to the amendment did pass.

And now let's hear the amendment on which we will vote, the original amendment. Let's hear this from the secretary, and then we will proceed to vote.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: "When appointed to an extension ministry a local pastor will identify a church conference to report to and have as a secondary appointment."

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Chair? Mr. Presenter, yes, what's your point of order? Mi. 3, please.

JANET R. ELLINGER (Wisconsin): Janet Ellinger from Wisconsin. I don't know if I'm hearing this language correct, but what I'm hearing is a second appointment; and I don't know that you can be appointed to two appointments at one time. So if you could clarify that.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Yeah. It's secondary rather than second. It's a primary and a secondary.

ELLINGER: I find that equally confusing.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Let's

hear from the chair, please.

HENDERSON: I would also find it confusing

(laughter)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Are you ready to vote on the amendment? Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 405; No, 442; Abstain, 21*] Now we go to the main motion. The amendment did not pass. The main motion is before us. Would the presenter like to speak, please?

HENDERSON: I would simply like to urge your support of this recommendation.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Let us prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 577; No, 278; Abstain, 10*] Alright. You have approved the recommendation of the committee.

And I need to call now to a mic, for a matter of clarification, Cody Collier. Where is Cody, please?

[Yes, 577; No, 278; Abstain, 10]

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, you have approved the recommendation of the committee. And I need to call now to a mic for a matter of clarification, Cody Collier. Where is Cody, please? Please, Cody, mic 2, please. This is a matter of clarification on consent calendar items. Cody. Mic 2.

THEODORE C. COLLIER (Missouri): It's a motion, bishop—Cody Collier, clergy, Missouri. I would move to place all the calendar items that have 15 or fewer dissenting votes from the committee to the consent calendar.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Is there a second? I hear it. Do you wish to speak?

COLLIER: Just to simply expedite our time at this point.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, does anybody wish to speak against? I see a card here, near the center, mic 3.

HOLLY GRANT (East Ohio): Holly Grant, East Ohio. I was just wondering, if this is done, when are we going to have a chance to look at these items and ...

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I'm sorry, we cannot hear you. Would you please tell us, again, who you are?

GRANT: If this is accepted, when are we going to have a chance to look at them, pull them out, and vote on them?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: There would be time this afternoon.

GRANT: To pull them out of the books that we have already and publish them as—OK, thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Let's turn to staff for—for clarity.

FITZGERALD REIST: I can announce them when we begin—excuse me, Fitzgerald Reist, coordinator of the calendar—I can announce them when we begin the afternoon session, and we would have the afternoon session for you to communicate with the office to remove them, and I could announce those removals at the beginning of the evening session.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Does that answer the question? Alright, are you ready to vote? Yes, I see a card. I'm sorry, pardon me. Alright, over here. Just a moment, please, I—I failed, yes, please, in the blue, mic 1, and then I'll come back here. Mic 1.

CHARLENE R. BLACK (South Georgia): Bishop, Charlene Black from the South Georgia Conference. Bishop, could you please remind us what will be the dispensation of petitions, the dispensation of petitions, which have not been acted upon at the close of this General Conference? Thank you, so much.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, yes, again. May we have staff comment on that, please? Disposition of petitions on which we have not acted at the end.

REIST: By the rules of our General Conference, at the close of conference, any petition which has not been acted upon will die.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, I passed over a person, I said—yes, yes, please, mic 2. We've had a speech for the 15, and now is this a speech against?

VICKI M. BRENDLER (Greater New Jersey): Thank you, bishop, it's a question. Vicki Miller Brendler, Greater New Jersey. How does this affect those petitions that were pulled off the consent calendar with 15 signatures, yesterday?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: My understanding would be, subject to correction by the staff, that this becomes the decision of the body at this time—hence forward, but we cannot—cannot behave retroactively.

BRENDLER: So they would need to be pulled off, again?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Correct me if I'm wrong, please.

REIST: At the present time, the rules you've adopted require 15 signatures to remove. Those that were removed with 15 signatures, will remain removed unless you take further action.

BRENDLER: Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, thank you. Are you ready to vote? Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 786; No, 76; Abstain, 11*] Alright, you have sustained the motion, thank you. Let's go to the next item, please.

DAVID BECKLEY (Mississippi): This is the final calendar item that I have for you. It is—it can be found in the *DCA* on p. 1929, that is p. 1929, Calendar Item 1519, 1519. The Petition No. is 41449, 41449. The recommendation from committee is concurrence with amendments, and I'll say a word about that in a moment. The vote was 56 in favor, 18 dissenting, and 3 abstentions.

Allow me to say a word about the material before you. It would be important for you to turn in you Advance *DCA* to p. 1146; the title is "Associate Membership." If you have your *Discipline* also in hand, to the Paragraph Section 300. The 300 paragraphs address the meaning of ordination and conference membership. The amended petition that is before you would be a new paragraph inserted after Paragraph 346.

Allow me to say a brief word, as I

understand the intent of this petition. It comes to us from the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. It reintroduces to this body, associate membership into the annual conference. It is a process by which Local Pastors can move to that status of Associate Membership and continue even into Full Membership, if you read the entire body of this petition. I think that is all I need to say for now.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. Are you ready to vote? Please prepare to vote and vote now. [*Yes, 747; No, 97; Abstain, 12*] You have sustained the committee. Thank you. There is one more item from Higher Education. We'll receive it—deal with it, then turn to matters of announcement, and shortly thereafter, be in recess for lunch. Yes, yes, please.

Laurie A. Haller (West Michigan): My name is Laurie Haller. I'm from the West Michigan Conference and I have the pleasure of presenting the final item from our legislative committee. It is found on the *DCA*, p. 1849, Calendar Item 1473, Advance *DCA* p. 1217, Petition No. 41350. The title is "voting privileges." The committee recommends concurrence. The vote was 58 for; 16 against; 1 not voting.

In order to be fully functioning members of the Board of Ordained Ministry, it is necessary for Associate Members or Local Pastors who have completed the course of study to be able to vote, not only in the Board of Ordained Ministry, but in the Clergy Session as well. In addition, this is a clear issue of justice; since lay members on the Board of Ordained Ministry can vote, then the Associate Members and Local Pastors who have completed the course of study ought to be able to vote as well.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, it is before us. Are you ready to vote? Let us proceed to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 752; No, 119; Abstain, 6*] You have sustained the committee, thank you. And now we'll turn to the secretary.

Oh, pardon me. I'm sorry, Mr. Chair? Pardon me, very...

BECKLEY: Bishop, we just want to say thank you. This is our last report.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Oh, how wonderful....

(*applause*)

BECKLEY: We thank the committee for their hard work.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: And we thank you.

BECKLEY: The committee sub-chairs and vice-chairs for their work. Thank you and God bless you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I see a card here, in the front. Please, mic 4, mic 4.

JAY WILLIAMS (Western New York): Jay Williams, Western New York Annual Conference. I'd like to offer a motion before we break.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Try it.

WILLIAMS: I move that there be a "Young People's Address" at the 2008 General Conference, to be delivered by a person selected by the Division on Ministries with Young People. If I can get a second, I'll speak to it. (*shouts of "second"*) Thank you.

(*laughter*)

Brothers and sisters, there's been an incredible celebration of the gifts of youth and young adults at this General Conference. We've been celebrating youth and young adults through the creation of the Division on Ministries with Young People, through the affirmation of youth and young adult leadership, both here on the plenary floor, in committees, and throughout the life of this General Conference. So I think it would be—as we continue to dream a church, as we continue to fulfill the prophetic words of the prophet Joel, who says that your young people shall see visions, that a "Young People's Address" at the 2008 General Conference would compliment the words offered in the Episcopal and the Laity Address.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, the motion is before us. Yes, please, mic 3,

is this—let's see what you have, yes.

JULIUS C. TRIMBLE (East Ohio) Bishop, it is a privilege motion—just one minute.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Let's deal—let's deal with this first, please. We have a motion for a young person—a young adult—to speak at the next General Conference. Does anyone wish to speak against that? (*laughter*) If you do, you better eat in the next town. Let's proceed to vote, please, on the resolution. Let us vote now. [*Yes, 775; No, 78; Abstain, 3*] You have passed the resolution and, yes, yes, this gentleman, mic 2. We're going to have to move, now, friends. We have much work to do.

EUSTELIE: Thanks, bishop. My name is Carlos Eustelie from the Methodist Church of Peru. I move to present to the Lord expressions to The United Methodist Church. We want to express for all the General Conference that we are grateful to be here. We want to say thanks for your invitation to be here. We learn many important things that we are going to transfer that knowledge to our church. For everybody, the bishops, the members, the lay, and for the leaders, also, and friends, thanks for your invitation.

(*applause*)

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you, very much. Alright, let's turn to the—oh, yes. Mic 3, please. Mic 3, mic 3. We'll turn to the Committee on Agenda in just a moment.

TRIMBLE: Julius Trimble, East Ohio Conference. Bishop, would it be in order to read a resolution in regards to the war on Iraq?

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We can't. There was an attempt, earlier, to suspend the rules in order to do that and the rules were not suspended. Therefore it would not be in order.

TRIMBLE: Well, at that time, there were several hundred of the members not present. We just voted on a motion without suspending the rules—to have a young person speak at the next General Conference.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I'm going to proceed in this way. I'm going to ask the house for your guidance. If it is a positive vote to entertain the motion to suspend the rules, then we will entertain a motion to suspend the rules. So if you would give THE permission to the chair to entertain a motion to suspend the rules, in order that a resolution relative to Iraq might be heard, please vote "yes;" if you would not grant that privilege, please vote "no." Please vote now. [*Yes, 426; No, 437; Abstain, 8*]

BISHOP SPRAGUE: I'm sorry. The only option you would have would be to take the resolution to the Committee on Agenda to see if they might get it on the calendar. All right there was somebody over here to whom I promised the floor. Yes, All right, and then we're going to move to, to the Committee on Agenda next. Mic 2.

CHARLES E. LIPPSE (Holston): Charles Lippse, Holston Conference, just a question, bishop. Am I correct that we have not yet acted on today's Consent Calendar.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We're just about to do that.

LIPPSE: Um, Well, then bishop, may I ask you to help me? I have a request for a personal privilege of addressing the matter of peace in the Holy Land, that is on the Consent Calendar, and I would like to have the personal privilege of making a brief statement in that regard.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: That would be very difficult. I think the way to do it would be through the usual process. Would you describe what that would be please?

L. FITZGERALD REIST: In order to take a separate action on any item on the Consent Calendar by our current rules you would need to move to suspend the rules to remove something from the Consent Calendar, well I'm sorry was it already voted, I was in another conversation.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: We have not voted.

REIST: We have not voted, you

would have to move to suspend the rules to remove the item from the Consent Calendar in order to debate it, to make a speech

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. Let's move to the Consent Calendar and if you wish to attempt that I, we will recognize you. Alright?

REIST: If I may before I move back to the Consent Calendar there's a clarification for the good of body on p.2016, 2016, Calendar Item 1098, Calendar Item 1098 appears on the Consent Calendar. It was voted non-concurrence on the floor; it appears on the Consent Calendar in error. I have already alerted the Committee on Correlation and Editorial Revision to this item and by the action of our rules, Rule 8a2b on p.1529, the floor action takes precedence over the Consent Calendar action. So those of you that have concern about that item, it is dealt with in that manner.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright.

REIST: If you will turn to p.2097, p.2097, Special Consent Calendar A92, A92, please remove from that Consent Calendar, Calendar Item. 1119, Calendar Item 1119; it appears in the first column at the bottom of the page. With that correction the calendar is correct as far as I have knowledge.

MARY ALICE MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar, Special Consent Calendar A92, with that exception.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright it is before you. Be ready to vote. Please prepare to vote now. [*Yes, 834; No, 23; Abstain, 6*] You have sustained the request. Alright. Next item please.

REIST: On p.2098, p. 2098, Special Consent Calendar B92, B92, please remove the first item, Calendar Item 707, 707. It is removed by our rules as a GCFA report. With that correction the Calendar Items are correct to the best of my knowledge.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar B92 with that exception.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: It is before

you. Please prepare to vote now [*Yes, 842; No, 10; Abstain, 4*] You have sustained the recommendation. Alright .

REIST: On the facing page p.2099, p. 2099, Special Consent Calendar C92, C92 is correct as far as I am aware.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar C92.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. It is before us. If you're ready to vote please proceed to vote now. [*Yes, 848; No, 7; Abstain, 3*] You have sustained the motion and now the gentlemen at mic 2. I promised the opportunity to seek to suspend the rules. Gentlemen with the striped tie please. Mic 2,

LIPPSE: Bishop, I would request we might suspend the rules in order for me to make a brief statement in regard to a resolution that is on the Consent Calendar, very brief comment.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: And it relates to which issue please?

LIPPSE: To the matter of peace and justice in Israel, Palestine.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright. As many as would suspend the rules will vote yes; those who would not will vote no. It takes a two-thirds vote. Let us vote now. [*Yes, 314; No, 492; Abstain, 2*] I'm sorry, sir. Alright. Let's turn to Carolyn Marshall, our secretary. I'm sorry, one more announcement; pardon me.

REIST: Yes. Regular Consent Calendar A10, appears on p.2100, p. 2100, Consent Calendar A10. To the best of my knowledge it is correct as printed. However, we did not announce that we were considering it at this time. I would call upon Mary Alice Massey if she would to move to suspend the rules so that you may consider it at this time.

MASSEY: I move to suspend the rules so that we can consider Calendar A10 at this time.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: A motion for suspension is before us. If you would support the motion vote "yes;" if not vote "no". Please vote now [*Yes, 786; No, 78; Abstain, 3*]

Alright. And now we can proceed.

MASSEY: And Bishop we would like to make an announcement. Oh, excuse me. I move the approval of the calendar, Consent Calendar A10.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: OK. A10 is before us. Please prepare to vote and vote now [*Yes, 838; No, 28; Abstain, 4*] You have sustained the motion. Yes.

MASSEY: We would just like to make a brief announcement. Many of you have asked for the printing of the resolution that was offered this morning and approved. I am told that that will be available in this afternoon's *DCA* that will be printed. Is that correct, Gere?

REIST: It will be printed as a separate piece not in the *DCA* but will be available for distribution as far as we're aware at this time.

MASSEY: Thank you. That concludes our report.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Alright, thank you. Carolyn.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: A Reminder that the interjurisdictional committee on episcopacy will meet at 12:45 this afternoon, in Rooms 320 and 321. The following annual conferences are requested to please pick up your items from the GCCUIC Booth, Baltimore, Washington, North Texas, Detroit, Peninsula Delaware, North Indiana, Greater New Jersey, and Rocky Mountain. Following the afternoon session the executive committee of GCFA will meet in the GCFA office, for the purpose of acting on nominations. Yesterday we did take the offering for marshals and pages; a note has come this morning wanting to know if there is way of extending the opportunity for us to share our gratitude with these persons in a monetary way. If you would like to make either an initial contribution to that endeavor or an additional one please take it to room 329, room 329 by noon today, hardly possible is it, during our lunch hour, and otherwise you may mail a check to GCFA with it properly indicated as to be added to the offering for marshals and pages. Two notes have come as far

as Black clergy women meeting now, and I'm going to use the rules of the General Conference which say that the last action or that that is taken on the floor is the one that prevails. Please announce that the Black clergy women of the United Methodist Church, I presume those in attendance here, will meet for lunch in rooms 315 and 16 instead of the Carlton due to the weather. From the Judicial Council referral made to the Judicial Council referring a declaratory decision on Thursday evening May 6th—the Judicial Council does not have the final action of the General Conference pertaining to the referral for declaratory decision made on Thursday evening May 6th, nor does the Judicial Council have the sufficient time to research and deliver an opinion on the referral. Therefore the item referred will be docket item three. For the fall meeting, fall 2004 meeting of the Judicial Council. Signed, John G. Correy, President; Sally Curtis AsKew, Secretary.

And finally as we break today the communion service as similar to that which has been held each day we have gathered will be held around the altar here in the center of our Plenary section

And, finally as we break today the communion service as similar to that which has been held each day we have gathered will be held around the altar here in the center of our plenary session. But, we simply want you to know that Bishop Olsen and Bishop Ott will be presiding at the communion service. There is an error in the *DCA* and Bishop Warner was the one who presided yesterday. That ends the reading of the announcements.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Thank you, let's turn back to staff...

L. FITZGERALD REIST: I have been asked to remind you that I will read the list of those items that will go on the consent calendar at the opening of the session this afternoon. They will not be distributed in written form due to the time limitations. But, I will read it to you this afternoon as clearly as I can, so please be prepared to make note

of that so you will know if you wish to take action to remove anything from the consent calendar. Thank you.

BISHOP SPRAGUE: Just a word of gratitude to my colleagues behind me Bishops Tuell and to Yeakel. And, also, a word of appreciation to the House for a rather incredible morning. Also, an apology, it was suggested that when a gentleman from Mississippi spoke so eloquently not only from his head but from his heart about the broad middle of our United Methodist Church that I was somewhat dismissive in my attitude and comment to him. That was surely not my intent, we had eye contact, and I thought that we were of one heart and one mind. If I were in anyway, in anyway, dismissive of the middle, or any other portion of the church, I humbly apologize. That is neither my nature nor was it my intent. We are in recess until 2:30.

Friday Afternoon, May 7, 2004

BISHOP WILLIAM MORRIS: If we will take our seats we will begin the afternoon's session... I want to call us to order and welcome us to our convention center once again. And, as we begin this particular session, I ask us to bow in prayer, and at the conclusion of that prayer, we will be led in response that we will sing. Let us in be in an attitude of prayer now, silent prayer, let us pray.

(prayer and song)

BISHOP MORRIS: Thank you. We do have an order of the day, but there are a few things we need to care for before we turn to the order of the day. I am going to turn now to our secretary, Miss Carolyn Marshall, for some recognition.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: I would ask that those persons who have served on the secretarial staff would join me here on the center platform. Even as it takes a village, it also takes a staff in order to have a General Conference move smoothly. There's lot of work, as you are all aware, that has

gone into the preparation and the carrying out of our time together, and that for which you expressed appreciation to the secretary of the General Conference earlier this week didn't happen because the secretary of General Conference did some work. It happened because there is a staff that just makes that individual look fairly good. And, so we are deeply grateful, and I want all of you to be aware of those persons who have given so much of themselves and their time and who they are and whose they, are in service to all of us. I am going to start off on my right, your left, with L. Fitzgerald Reist, fondly known to all of us as Gere, spelled Gere, who is serving as the Coordination of the Calendar and has, and whom you elected as the secretary of the General Conference. Geri, we're deeply grateful to you. I would, also, ask that...

(applause)

Thank you for that expression of your appreciation, and I would ask now that you would hold your applause until all of these individuals have been introduced. You'll get tired of clapping otherwise. Next, is Mille House Cowan whose has been the Office Manager; Jay Voorhees, whom you have seen working with voting and many technical things; Gary Graves, the Petition Secretary. John Brawn, who brought us... who created the original PET system for calendar-ing our petitions, and has continued to work and help us refine through this new process.

CAROLYN N. MARSHALL: Randall Porten, who has been a very intricate part of that technical staff and his wife, Susan Brumbaugh, who was here for the first week and then had to go home. Preston Price, Chris Hudson, Gwen O'Bannon, Delila Cruz, now I am getting behind here myself. Aren't I? Vim Porterfield, Jerry Molley, and Darrell Tate. They have been absolutely, absolutely wonderful. I can tell you something that would make you even more appreciative of each one of them. Simply know that they all have attend-

ed to all of their duties and have been there almost before I asked for anything. You have been served well.

(applause)

Milly, I would like to have you join me here, please. She didn't bring any Kleenex and I didn't give her the butterfly ones that I spoke about earlier. Milly Hilth Cowen was the Office Manager in the General Conference before your present Secretary of the General Conference was elected. In putting together that first staff, I made contact with her and she agreed to serve us in Louisville. Well, it's has been a "yes" ever since. And, so Milly we want to say "thank you" because you have been at this even longer than I have. This says "In appreciation of 20 years of service to our church, the General Conference of the United Methodist Church recognizes Milly Hilth Cowen for her service as Office Manager at the past 5 General Conferences, May 2004". Milly, with deep appreciation and our love.

(applause)

MARSHALL: Again, thank you all.

Consent Calendar

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we will turn now to hear from the Consent Calendar. Gere.

L. FITZGERALD REIST: Fitzgerald Reist, Coordinator of the Calendar. If the slide will be placed up, please. I will begin these Special Consent Calendar A93, Calendar Item 540. It was Committee Item LC2 and appears on p. 1644 of the *DCA*. May I suggest that instead of flipping pages to find them that you use your note pads to record this? You will get it faster. If I could have the second slide please?

Special Consent Calendar B93, Calendar Item 1430, Committee Item C084 appears in the *DCA* p. 1843. Calendar Item 1436, Committee Item CS185, appears in the *DCA* p. 1846. Special Consent Calendar B93 continues with Calendar Item 1493, Committee Item LC82, appears on *DCA* p. 1852.

If I could have the third slide, please.

Special Consent Calendar C93, Calendar Item 468, Committee Item CS16, appears on *DCA* pp. 1637 and 1937. Calendar Item 543, Committee Item LC6, appears on *DCA* p. 1644. Special Consent Calendar Item continues with Item 1081, Committee Item HE57, *DCA* p. 1753. Calendar Item 1084, Committee Item HE68 appears on *DCA* p. 1754. Calendar Item 1086, Committee Item HE70, appears on p. 1754. Calendar Item 1444, Committee Item CS205, appears on p. 1847. Calendar Item 1454, Committee Item CS222, appears on p. 1848. Calendar Item 1458, Committee Item GA136, appears on *DCA* p. 1848. Calendar Item 1464, Committee Item GA206, appears on p. 1848. Calendar Item 1481, Committee Item HE277, appears on *DCA* p. 1849. Calendar Item 1489, Committee Item JA 80, appears on *DCA* p. 1851.

These are the items that are on consent calendars from the special calendar this morning. You have until 6:00 this evening to get the forms into the office so that I can record them, so that I can present it to the body at the opening of our evening session. I want to take a moment to thank Mike Cunningham from the Publishing House staff without whose help I could not possibly have gotten this done in time. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we thank you. As we return now to our orders of the day we will have some bishops who will need to make presentations and, also, some staff persons will need to be involved in this. And the chair would entertain a motion that we have a mission to speak and to present. If someone would move that? It is a second. Alright, it is probably before you now. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now.

[Yes, 715; No, 31; Abstain, 10]

(pause)

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, permission has been granted. I will turn now to the Board of General Council of Finance and Administration; I will turn to the president of that particular coun-

cil, Bishop Alfred Norris.

GCFA Report

BISHOP ALFRED NORRIS: Thank you very much, Bishop Morris. Bishop Morris, my colleague bishops, members of the General Conference, and guests. The responsibility of GCFA is to present the General Conference a financial plan for mission and ministry. We believe that the plan we are bringing reflects the will of the General Conference and the ability of our 36,000 jurisdictional conference churches to remit their share of the apportioned general funds voted by this General Conference. GCFA has been working with many of you and for all of you in developing this funding plan for 2005-2008 that is now before you for consideration. As Sandra Lakore, our General Secretary, reminded you in her financial state of the church report 9 days ago, the process of developing the budget recommendation included every, I am sorry, included early intentional dialogue with annual conference leadership.

Our council was engaged at several points in the process with our colleagues at the General Council on Ministries, and the individual general agencies as the recommendations for funding the program agencies through the World Service Budget were established. Over the winter and early spring of this year, we met with many of your delegations to help you better understand why the budget recommendations you received prior to General Conference were being made.

The total amount we are now recommending to be apportioned over the next quadrennium is \$612,500,000. The GCFA agreed in principle with the Financial Administration Legislative Committee that apportionments significantly greater than \$612 million would ask too much from our local churches that could result in lower collection rates that would frustrate those engaged in ministry and mission at all levels of the connections.

Well, why not less than \$612 million? The denomination needs, and

wants growth, a change and direction; a new beginning. An emphasis on our core value making disciples of Jesus Christ led GCFA to recognize the danger of weakening ministries that have been referred to us that were central to that core value: Igniting Ministry, strengthening the black church, youth ministries. It is through the efforts of these three initiatives that we can change the direction of this denomination toward growth, financial strength, and expanded mission and ministry for the poor and disadvantaged. We must invest in the future to have any real expectation of growth. To reduce the level of resources available to these ministries would be to say no to the future, and to say no to our core values.

As you prayerfully and carefully take action on all these proposals for the 2005-2008 general funds, I ask that you be mindful of the commitment you each are making to go back to your home church and interpret the general apportioned funds of our church and assist in raising the funds to meet these financial promises we are making together. Several members of our council are assisting me with these presentations this afternoon: Bishop Robert Fannin from the Birmingham area; Jonathan Holston, clergy delegate from the North Georgia Conference; Peggy Sewell, reserve lay delegate from the Rocky Mountain Conference; and Donald R. House, lay delegate from the Texas Conference. I have asked each of them to move individual reports and to respond to any remaining questions you may have. Reports numbered 1-16 will be found in the Advance *DCA*, Volume 2, Section 1—the red-covered volume. Reports numbered 17 and 18 are in Volume 3; the GCFA Report in the black covered-volume of the Advanced *DCA*. GCFA's final reports are on pp. 2087-2096 of today's *DCA*. Bishop Fannin.

World Service Fund

BISHOP ROBERT E. FANNIN (Birmingham Area): Good afternoon. The World Service Fund on pp. 505-509 in the Advance *DCA*, Volume 2,

Section 1; and the revised World Service Budget is found on p. 2088 of today's *DCA*. I want to mention that after this report was printed for flexibility, and in consultation of Strengthening the Black Church, we are recommending that they be moved to the other ministry section of the World Service Budget. Allowing them to meet in September, and in consultation with the transitional process, determine their permanent location. This change does not change the bottom line. GCFA's considerations of the World Service Fund began with a strong message from the Final Administration Legislative Committee seeking a maximum for this fund. As a consequence of the actions of this General Conference, a total of over \$44 million in additional referrals have been referred to GCFA. To honor the declaration of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee and the commitment of our own council, everything cannot be funded at the levels requested. GCFA, in consultation with the agencies—and I want to emphasize that—GCFA in consultation with the agencies chose to focus on the core values for ministries funded throughout World Service.

Seeking other sources of funding for other important ministries. By focusing upon our core value making disciples of Jesus Christ, we seek to strengthen the denomination, making more funds available for new ministries in the next quadrennium. Prayerfully, we want to use the limited funds available this quadrennium to build for the next quadrennium so greater expansion of new ministries will be possible. The total recommended for the World Service Fund is \$323,465,000. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report 1.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we will have response now.

TRACY R. MERRICK (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop, on behalf of Financial Administration Legislative Committee, I would like to report the following. I am Tracy Merrick, chair of that committee. If the body will follow along and make sure we are in the same

place with all this information, it will be helpful. Please turn to *DCA* p. 1751, Calendar Item 1053, which is the action of the legislative committee. In order to understand, this we would also recommend turning to Advance *DCA* page 505, Petition 41565. Let me repeat that: *DCA* p. 1751, Calendar Item 1053; in the *ADCA*, Petition 41565.

So that the body understands the flow, the budget presented by GCFA that was in the Advance *DCA* material for the World Service Budget was at a total \$296,633,000. As the legislative committee worked on this budget, they had some value-added information that they thought to include in Calendar Item 1053. If you look at that, you will see that they amended the budget and had some recommendations for both GCFA and the General Conference. The legislative committee felt strongly that this budget needed to be kept at a moderate level, and their recommended total was \$323,965,000. If you look at what is on p. 2088 in the *DCA*—I know that you are moving back and forth here a lot but this is important—as Bishop Fannin indicated, the current GCFA recommendation after receiving the Financial Administration Legislative Committee Report and the actions of the General Conference, their total is \$323,465,000.

You'll notice that there are many similarities, not just in that total, but in the items included therein. Although the Financial Administration Committee has not met since we completed our work on Saturday, I have polled a number of members of that committee and there seems to be general agreement that the GCFA reported changes for the World Service Budget are consistent with the actions of the Financial Administration Committee, and as a result, I would like to move on behalf of the committee, the the substitution of the budget information for the World Service Fund, which is found on p. 2088, for the actions of the legislative committee, Calendar Item 1053.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright it is before you now and as indicated in

substituting World Service Budget on p. 2088, for 1053. Alright, it's before you. I recognize a person here from the mic 2, please.

*From Igniting Ministry
to Global AIDS*

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard, clergy, South Indiana Conference. I was on the Financial Administration Committee that worked on this budget, and Tracy, I know that you indicated that this held a basic principle, but there's one place where the principles were not held. If you look on p. 2094, of the revised today's *Daily Christian Advocate*, there's a place where we made a significant change which I'd like to call our attention to. Under "Igniting Ministries" the proposal from the legislative committee—actually the proposal adopted here when we presented the Igniting Ministries Campaign—on item No. 2, 2094, was \$22 million. GCFA is now recommending \$25 million, a three million increase.

If you look across the page to Item No. 10, "United Methodist Global AIDS Fund," we approved this two days ago at \$3 million—Item No. 10, on p. 2095. GCFA is recommending that we reduce... that World Service Funds not be used for funds not be used for this and only Advance Specials. So in effect, what's happen, the Global AIDS Funds which we approved for \$3 million two days ago, that \$3 million has now been shifted over to the Igniting Ministries Campaign. I think that's a significant shift from what we approved here as a General Conference two days ago. And I would like to move, if it's in order Bishop, that we adjust these figures in a new way. Is the motion in order amendment?

BISHOP MORRIS: Yes, give it a try.

MILLARD: I recognize Igniting Ministries as very important, and it's a place that we unite in; and perhaps we could have a compromise. I would move that we raise the Igniting Ministries Campaign to \$23 million, from \$25 million to \$23 million, and

the Global Aid Funds from \$3 million to \$2 million. It keeps the total the same; it shifts even more to Igniting Ministries. But it seems as... if we have said that Global AIDS is a major issue for us to do battle around in helping to make an AIDS-free world, we need to put some money into it—not just Advance Special money, Advance Special gifts—without any means of raising the Advanced Special mean almost nothing. So my motion is to reduce Igniting Ministries to \$23 million and to increase the Global Aids Funds to \$2 million from World Service, which would hold the bottom line at the same level; it just shifts within the funds.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright is there a second? Is there a second to this amendment? Alright, do you wish to say anything else to it, speak for it? OK, it is before you. You've had one speech for the particular amendment that was presented to you in terms of funds. Is there a speech against it? Alright, I recognize this person, first row, to come to mic 4 please. Name and conference please.

ARNOLD A. RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): Arnie Rhodes, Western Pennsylvania Conference. I rise to speak against the amendment and to retain the recommendation by the General Commission on Finance and Administration. The Igniting Ministry is becoming more of a vital ministry for us as United Methodists. It enables us to interpret to our communities, and to our culture, the essence of the ministry and mission of The United Methodist Church. Over the last four years, we have seen significant growth in the life of our congregations who have used Igniting Ministries as a way and means of interpreting the gospel in their community. And persons have responded by coming to The United Methodist Church with "open hearts, open minds, and open doors." To put this into perspective, our sister denomination, the Southern Baptist, have asked for \$100 million for their Igniting Ministry Campaign because they have realized through what we

have been doing, the significant of interpreting to our culture...

BISHOP MORRIS: You need to start summing up, sir, please.

RHODES: Thank you... our culture the means of reaching out. So I would say that this is a fine compromise, which maintains the ministry of Igniting Ministry as well as our ministry for the Global AIDS Campaign.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright is there a speech for? Alright, in the middle here, mic 1.

DARREN E. CUSHMAN-WOOD (South Indiana): Darren Cushman-Wood from South Indiana. I was the subcommittee chair in Global Ministries that crafted this, and I can say that we worked in cooperation with Financial Administration to create this amendment. So there's a lot of consensus and a lot of unity between those two legislative groups, and bringing this to the floor of General Conference, which we voted with a very strong support just the other day to do this.

To give you some background about what we found that we are doing robust work for AIDS through our Advanced Specials, but it is not enough. And if you know anything about the Advanced Special, to say that we're going to raise \$8 million through the Advance Special is a meaningless goal. That is impossible for any Advance Special to raise \$8 in 4 years. So it has to have apportionment dollars. Also I would urge you not to see this as placing Global AIDS Fund in competition with Igniting Ministries. My own church has benefited from Igniting Ministries, and we support it wholeheartedly. But what we are saying is that we, as American United Methodists, we also need to be able to give a little; and we need to have some real, concrete, tangible ways of expressing that we want to save lives. And by undergirding all of our Global Ministries with this AIDS fund is going to help us save lives in significant ways, and I don't think it's too much to ask that we give us a couple of television commercials...

BISHOP MORRIS: You need to start

summing up

CUSHMAN-WOOD:...so that children can live.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, thank you. I need a speech against. Alright, I'll go to the back, the first hand. I think it's a green jacket, I'm not sure. Yes, Mic 7.

DAWN M. HAND (Western North Carolina): Bishop, members and friends, sisters and brothers of this...

BISHOP MORRIS: Name and conference please.

HAND: Dawn Hand, Western North Carolina Conference. I rise to speak against this amendment. I know that there are lots of mission and ministries in which this conference participates. The funds could be used in a myriad of ways, but there again, I rise to speak against this. Igniting Ministry is perhaps one of the greatest gifts that our church has been given in quite some time, and we need to take advantage of that. We need to take advantage of us four years ago overwhelming supporting this, and we're at a prime time in the life of this General Conference to push this ministry forward. We have measurables in place that we can show you how this money has been spent and spent effectively. We probably have hundreds of people in here that can stand up and tell you how their church has personally benefited from Igniting Ministries. People that were on the verge of committing suicide are in the church because sometime in the late evening they saw a commercial that spoke to their hearts and they saw that the words of this church, "open hearts, open minds, and open doors" was available for them. I urge you to defeat this amendment and to help continue this ministry. We need these funds...

BISHOP MORRIS: Need to start summing up.

HAND: ... so that we can help.

BISHOP MORRIS: Thank you. We've had two speeches for, two speeches against; and it's time for us to vote.

TRACY R. MERRICK (Western

Pennsylvania): Yes, Bishop. I would simply add that the goal here was to put the substitute in front of the body so that we had one budget to work with from the World Service Fund standpoint, and then we could work on perfecting it.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright the motion before you for \$23 million in terms of Igniting Ministries; \$2 million in terms of United Methodist Global AIDS Fund. Let us prepare to vote. Please vote now as the light appears. *[Yes, 474; No 369; Abstain, 6]*

Alright the amendment is sustained.

MERRICK: Bishop, we would move the amended version of the substitute.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright the amended version... alright, the substitute is before you now. Mic 2, mic 2.

BRIAN SUTTON (Kansas West): Bishop, Brian Sutton from Kansas West. Just a quick question. Under the Division on Ministries with Young People, in 2007, their budget drops. Is there a reason for that?

BISHOP FANNIN: What we have, the processes we've used, is to consult with the general agencies and then in that process, determine that these ministries, for the most part, will be covered under their existing budgets. We did not want to create anything beyond the budget, and the funds that have been moved have been moved so that this ministry might be done in another way. For example, the Igniting Ministry's budget, as you noticed, we combined the three budgets.

BRIAN SUTTON (Kansas West): Right, but is there an increase each year, and then it increases in large amount in 2008? I was just wondering if it's a misprint or if it actually is \$1,615,000.

SANDRA KELLEY LACKORE: That's a good question, sir. The distribution of the budgets over the quadrennium is simply for apportionment purposes. You'll know that there's a—notice that there's a significant increase in 2008. The increase in 2008 is to enable them to prepare for General

Conference when they would be making presentations. That's simply a distribution of their money over the—it doesn't affect their total budget, it just distributes it in relation to other funds.

SUTTON: OK. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. Again the amended budget's before us. I'm going to go all the way in the back. Last person in the back that has on red, if you'll come to mic 5, please.

*Reduce Program Agencies
Proportionally*

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Bishop, members of the conference, Jim Harnish, Florida. Concerning the petition before us, I move that the World Service Fund for 2005–2008 be set at \$300,666,000, which will indicate an eight percent increase over the quadrennium, and that the proposed reduction of \$22,805,000 be allocated proportionately among the 23 line items of the program agencies on p. 2088. And, if there's a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP MORRIS: Is there a second? Alright. Speak to it.

HARNISH: Thank you, Bishop, members of the conference, I'm deeply grateful for the way GCF&A and the agencies have worked together on this budget; but I appeal to you on behalf of the 34,780 local congregations, and particularly on behalf of the 36,000 congregations that will be responsible for 50 percent of this budget, to consider reducing this amount. The proposed budget reflects a 16.2 percent increase over the quadrennium. For every million dollars of the World Service Fund that's printed in the *DCA*, on the average, every conference takes home \$16,657. Our *Discipline* clearly says that the local...

BISHOP MORRIS: Brother Harnish, you'll need to sum up.

HARNISH: ...that the local church is the primary place of mission. Although our giving through the apportionment system is a primary source of mission support, it's not the only one. On behalf of St. Jude, the patron saint

of lost and hopeless causes, I urge you to support this amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a speech against? Alright, mic no. 4. Gentleman here, mic 4. Did you have your card up? Alright. I guess not. Is there a speech against? Alright. Go to mic No. 3. I recognize the person all the way in the back. Yes. You're standing halfway up. Mic 3. Speech against.

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): Jim Ehrman, East Ohio, member of the Financial Administration Committee. I speak against the amendment on the grounds that we have bargained this whole thing through quite well. The statistic about the increased apportionment percentage is correct; however, we need to bear in mind that that apportionment increase is large because we asked our agencies to spend down their reserves and look to other sources over this last quadrennium, so that the percentage of the increased budgets for these various agencies is quite small, or is the three percent, or whatever that they've talked about. It's not this 16 percent for the agencies.

We have the capability of raising this money based on the information given to us, of percentages, of money—of dollars being asked for the general church from the local church. That percentage will be down over this quadrennium compared to the last quadrennium. We are—we can do this; and we should do this, and we should not mak... respond by cutting the general church just for the sake of cutting. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a speech for it now? Alright, I'll go back to mic no. 5, please. This has to be a speech for.

THOMAS L. SALSGIVER (Central Pennsylvania): Tom Salsgiver, clergy member, Central Pennsylvania Conference. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment. Indeed, the general agencies have spent down their reserves, but most annual conferences have almost no reserves; and it becomes critical for mission and ministry in the local church and the annual

conference not to have such a large increase in apportionments year after year. The reality in Central Pennsylvania was that it was one of nine conferences that have been able to pay 100 percent; however, we have not increased our annual conference budget beyond .5 percent, so we can pay 100 percent of the general church apportionments. But with a large increase, we won't be able to do that anymore. I urge fiscal responsibility and vote for the amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. Is there a speech against? All right, I'll go back to (*unintelligible*) again. Yes. Mic 5, please. Speech against.

GIL C. HANKE (Texas): Gil Hanke, Texas Conference. I want to remind this body that the general agencies have already had a budget process in which they came together for an asking, and that asking has been reduced. It went back. It was reduced again. It came back. It was reduced again. This is not—this is a collaborative process among all the general agencies and the agency of this church. This budget reflects what they need to do the ministry and mission of this church, and I urge you to defeat this amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: We understand your deep concern; however, as the last speaker indicated, this has been a long process of consultation and sharing with one another. I know it seems as if items have been cut out or items have been shifted; but, in reality, we have put together, with the assurance and commitment of the agencies, to produce ministry and place a foundation, an order that will allow us in the future to continue to grow and change. I would also say that if such an amendment would pass, that it needs to be evenly distributed across the *whole* World Service, not just the agencies because part of this is our commitment to not having things in the budget and outside the budget. Everything's in the budget; and, therefore, because of the action of this General Conference, a

great amount has been added to this particular total.

We plead with you, because of our great commitment and study and the resources we've used, to defeat this amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. The amendment is before you. The terms of \$300,666,000; and of that, \$27,805,000 would be distributed to 23 items. Amendment? \$22,805,000 of the allocated apportionment among the 23 line items for program agencies and other ministries listed on p. 2088 of the *DCA*. That is what is before you, which you'll be voting on. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 404; No, 428; Abstain, 8*]

The amendment is lost.

OK. The... alright. Yes. Alright. Go to mic 4. It is still before you as amended with the \$23 million and the \$2 million. Yes.

Only 10 Percent Increase

KARL K. STEGALL (Alabama-West Florida): Karl Stegall, Alabama-West Florida Conference. I move that the World Service Budget for the 2005–2008 quadrennium reflect a ten percent increase over 2001–2004, and that the proposed reduction be allocated proportionally across the World Service Fund.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a second? Alright. Speak to it.

STEGALL: I rise to speak on behalf of all the silent voices of lay persons in the middle, who fill our pews on Sunday morning, and give so generously of the offerings in our respected conferences. If we do not reflect fiscal restraint in the percentage increases in our general church funds, how can we go back home to our respective annual conferences and encourage our lay people in the pews to act responsibly, in giving sacrificially to our general church funds that do not show fiscal restraint? I am now serving in my 21st year as senior pastor of the First United Methodist Church of Montgomery. When we adopt a budget in our local church and conference, we establish

parameters; we analyze statistical data; we establish priorities; and we adopt a budget that challenges our people but also clearly communicates fiscal responsibility. It is very hard when we limit percentages of increase through our lay staff, limit expansion of our program budgets in our local churches, pay increasing healthcare costs. And to know that General Conference comes in with a 16.2 percent increase over four years—that is fiscally irresponsible, I feel personally. And I would ask you to adopt this particular motion as the compromise.

MARLENE CUMMINS (Illinois Great Rivers): I am one of those people who sit in the pew and help to pay this, as does my church. I speak in opposition to this. Our local church budget has not held this kind of line nor will it hold that kind of line. We are a growing church and we continually seek ways to meet the staffing that we have in my local church. But, I am also grateful to be a United Methodist and to be part of a whole lot of other things. By doing this, by seeing the needs in front of us, my local church always does more than just its budget because when we see needs out there that God calls us to be a part of, we respond locally and my local church will respond to this increase. I urge you to defeat this amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, is there another speech for? Alright, I will come again to mic 2.

VINCENT WALKUP (Tennessee): Bishop Morris, Vin Walkup, Tennessee Conference with a question. The motion is for 10 percent increase; can someone give us a dollar amount related to that 10 percent increase? And, what the bottom line figure would then be?

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, this is a question then? Correct?

WALKUP: Yes

BISHOP FANNIN: Rough calculation is \$27.8 million over the quadrennium, which would bring the total to \$306,227,900.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, I will recognize the lady standing. Mic 7,

please. Which is it a speech for?

To Compare With Receipts

JULIANNE BRITTIAN (North Carolina): I too served on the Finance and Administration. I think we all want to do all the good that we can. But, one figure I want the conference to be aware that has not—I think—been said in the discussion here is that though this represents one percentage over what we asked for, it's quite a different story when we look at the percentage we are asking for over what we received. Now, that figure was given us in the small finance book on p. 1424, and when the total budget was \$485 million that was going to be a 22.2 percent increase over what our churches gave in the past quadrennium. With the current asking, it's going to be over a 27 percent increase over what they gave. I just think we, in asking for this, are pre-determining that our churches will fail again. And, when we come back in 4 years and their payout is even lower, we will beat them up again—even though they've given more money, even though they have restrained from raising not just their pastor's salary...

BISHOP MORRIS: Start to sum up, please

BRITTIAN: But their custodians, their secretaries, and their other lay workers. Let's don't destine them to fail.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, is there a speech against? Alright, let me go over here to mic 8.

FRANK TROTTER (Baltimore Washington): Part of my portfolio back home is to chair the stewardship center and foundation, and we study a lot of the factors that makeup for a healthy financial picture on the annual conference level. And as we all know, the budget is based on general church apportionments. For an annual conference to achieve and to pay a 100 percent of its apportionments is the goal for all of us. But, leadership is crucial, especially episcopal leadership. And, I don't know what the difference is

between one bishop and the other. But, we have been fortunate for the past 7 consecutive years to have a leader who has helped us to pay a 100 percent of our apportionment in Baltimore Washington. And, in no small part, that is due to his track record that he brought from the two areas before that. And this is Felton Edwin May, who retires this year. And the church is going to miss bishops like Felton May and others. It seems to me that we need to do whatever we can to strengthen our bishops, to learn whatever there is to do about the best positive philosophies, Christian theology that we have. I am not... if there is such a thing as a remedial or episcopal apportionment school. But it would be great to be able to send all of our bishops to find, the very best, help that they can get to help us to raise this. It needs positive impetus from the very top of our church and with God as our...

BISHOP MORRIS: You need to start summing up now.

TROTTER: Yes sir. With God as our help, with our bishops in front and leading us positively, I think we can accomplish all things in Jesus Christ.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, this is probably for you now

MERRICK; On behalf of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee, I would like to share. The committee believed as it worked through the budget and came up with a number that they felt comfortable with for the World Service Fund, there was a balance between existing ministries conducted by the agencies of this great church and additional ministries represented by some of those creative offline budget items that needed to be added. And, they believed that the number of this magnitude was one that our church should adopt.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, the motion before you is a 10 percent increase proportionally distributed. And, please prepare to vote. Vote now, as the light appears. [*Yes, 444; No, 403; Abstain, 11*]

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it is sustained. The chair will remind you that we are coming close to the time limit we put on this particular committee reporting, but the amendment did pass. We passed the 30 minute mark which we set as a house. OK, as a point of order. Mic 8. Gentlemen in the back, coming out...

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Oh, Bishop, I was in back of him, so we shall be back.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, I was pointing to the one in the far back. It is the gentleman with the glasses on.

BOAYUE: Oh, the one with the glasses on was Ed. I was in back of him. I will yield to whichever one you chose. I was in the far back of him.

BISHOP MORRIS: But, I recognized him though.

FRANK L. DORSEY (Kansas East): Bishop, if it is an order, I would like to defer to Ed Kail in the Iowa delegation.

BISHOP MORRIS: Would you repeat that please?

DORSEY: I would like to defer to Ed Kail in the Iowa delegation. He is a delegate to the General Conference and I would like to defer to him. He has been trying to speak and he hasn't been recognized and I wanted to give him the opportunity to

BISHOP MORRIS: But, if he's not member of General Conference he can

DORSEY: Yes, he is. He is a member of the General Conference right here.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, let's give it a try. In other words, you giving the mic to somebody else? Is that it? Mic 4 Name and conference please.

EDWARD A. KAIL (Iowa): I want to thank Brother Dorsey for this privilege. I speak a word, a faithful protest, in that the will of the General Conference in supporting Town and Country Ministries appears to have been subverted in the process—with the last motion that we presented with an only 10 percent increase spread proportionally across what is listed on

1088. There is still no listing of Town and Country Ministries. We are prepared to take cuts in our proposals, cuts in what was passed by this body, but it appears now that they have disappeared. I think there is a matter of justice here, particularly if our core value is making disciples because as the *Discipline* says that making disciples...

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, pardon me, I am saying that you are speaking to a report that is not before us. So, the chair will have to rule you out of order. It has been called to my attention that the report is not before us. World Service is before us for one.

KAIL: I am sorry bishop, but the Town and Country Plan was a part of World Service, and I just want to protest that it doesn't appear anywhere. Some will say it is in the GBGM budget, but that just means now we are now in a position of being in triage with all the other pre-existing programs. I learned at a previous General Conference, an African proverb...

BISHOP MORRIS: When we come to 19, you can amend it there. Alright, the report is now before you with the amendments.

BISHOP FANNIN: Bishop, I move GCFA Report 1 as revised on p. 288, as amended.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it is before you. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now as the light appears. Report 1, as amended. [*Yes, 655; No, 192; Abstain, 11*]

Alright, it is sustained. Yes, what is the point of order?

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): I raise a point of order concerning the last vote we took. It was my understanding Tracy Merrick was offering the report from the Financial Administration Committee to substitute for Report 1. We never took a vote on substitution so far as I know. We have been amending the report from Financial Administration up to this time. I would ask if you would review the actions and make sure we did indeed take action on the Financial

Administration Committee Report before we voted on Report 1.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. The last vote was to adopt the substitute. It is now the main motion, which is before us. Alright. Yes, mic 5.

Length of Debate

MICHAEL WACHT (Florida): Bishop, I'd like—my name is Mike Wacht, lay delegate, Florida Conference. I make a motion to suspend the rules so that we can continue conversation, continue perfecting the budget. I think this is too important for us to limit to a 30-minute discussion, and I'd like to make an amendment to the budget.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. You're moving to suspend the rules, to extend the time, and continue to speak to this. Is that correct?

WACHT: Yes, sir.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a second? Alright, it's properly before you to suspend the rules and continue the conversation around this matter. It's non-debatable, and it takes two-thirds vote. Please vote now when the light appears. [*Yes, 435; No, 403; Abstain, 4*] It fails.

We now have the main motion before us. Yes? Alright, no. 2

JEREMIAH J. PARK (Greater New Jersey): Jeremiah Park, Greater New Jersey Annual Conference. Bishop, it is my understanding that we adopted a rule yesterday that all other items will have limit of 30 minutes, except the report from the General Financial and Administration. Is it correct?

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. We stand corrected. You're correct. That's true, so it still is the main motion. It's still before us. Yes, right here. Mic 2.

Relation Between Reports 1 and 19

REINER STAHL (Germany South): Reiner Stahl, Germany South. I would like to ask a question referring to Point 9, "Global Educational Fund." Because we like to speak as a global church, and I was very disappointed about the refer-

ral, which was made by the GCF&A; I would like to ask, what can be expected when here is established this point as a goal for a World Service Special?

BISHOP FANNIN: Global Education Fund?

BISHOP MORRIS: I think that's what it is, yes.

BISHOP FANNIN: It's in No. 19, which is not before us; but...

BISHOP MORRIS: Gere Reist informed me what we're doing is taking one report at a time, and what's happening is that you're bringing up various other reports. We're still on World Service, which is essentially before us, you know, as amended, as the main motion. So we need not bring in other, you know, reports. Those reports will come up. They will come before us. What we need to do now is to vote on the report which is before us. World Service is the main motion. Yes? Alright, I'll come to you. OK.

JOON-SIK PARK (West Ohio): Joon-Sik Park, clergy delegate from West Ohio Conference. I'd like to make an amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

PARK: That we will go back to \$22 million funding for the Igniting Ministry, and that we allocate \$425,000 for Town and Country—County Ministry. Town and Country Ministry.

BISHOP MORRIS: Your motion is to allocate \$25,000 for Town and Country?

PARK: No. \$425,000 as it was requested.

BISHOP MORRIS: That's still another report. That's Report 19.

PARK: Then let me just make an answer (*unintelligible*)

BISHOP MORRIS: When we come to Report 19, then you can deal with it. We are still dealing with the World Service report, which is No. 1—

PARK: OK then, let me just change my amendment in terms of going back to \$22 million in terms of funding for Igniting Ministry, right on 23. Is it in order?

BISHOP MORRIS: No. I mean it's

out. We've dealt with that one. Alright. Was someone over here that wanted to—alright. We're still dealing with World Service, Report No. 1.

JANE ALLEN MIDDLETON (New York): Bishop, Jane Middleton, New York Conference. I have a feeling you're going to tell me to go to 19, wait for 19; but what I want to do is to move \$1 million to implement the holistic strategy on Latin America, Caribbean, and Africa, to reflect the action of this General Conference in approving that as a special program.

BISHOP FANNIN: That is in Report 19.

BISHOP MORRIS: That's still Report 19. You want—I want to ask—again, what we're dealing with is World Service, Report No. 1. Most of you are bringing up things from Report 19, and we're still dealing with No. 1. Yes?

MICHAEL D. MCCURRY (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, I'm Mike McCurry from the Baltimore-Washington Conference. I have a question for the chair about Report No. 1. Would the impact of holding increases across the board for ten percent make it—for all practical purposes—impossible to consider further reports, because they were all premised on the number that you have presented to us? We're going to be in the business here of going through this report and robbing, most likely, from Igniting Ministry, which cannot go below \$25 million for it to be effective, if we're gonna precede in the fashion that the body has now put us in. I think we're in a world of hurt, and I'd like some explanation of how you would propose to commence with these further reports, 'cause I don't know how you're gonna do it.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, two, if I might answer that question in two answers. One is the increased amount for Igniting Ministries was due in part to the merger of three programs: the Igniting Ministries' core, the youth program, and the Central Conference communications. Those three were put together for the increased amount. So if

you reduce that, you've already reduced that in one amendment, in the substitute. If you continue to reduce that, that's, of course, a very serious consideration. And then the next thing is if we go beyond this, we're talking about more money outside of budget. In other words, if other programs are considered down the—in the rest of this report, you would have to add that money outside of budget or reconsider this budget to make those adjustments.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. The subject is before us now as a main motion, and the chair is going to call for a vote on it. It's probably before you now. Please vote now as the light appears.

BISHOP FANNIN: Wait, is this the main motion?

BISHOP MORRIS: Yes.

Closing Statement

BISHOP FANNIN: I'd like a comment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. OK.

BISHOP FANNIN: I would like to call on Dr. Don House to make our closing statement.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

DON R. HOUSE (Texas): What I would like to do is show you a few slides if I could. Could we put up—? I'm sorry, but could we put up the Don House slides? There we go. What I wanted to do is give you a background as to why the recommendation for the amount of money came forward from both Financial Administration and from GCF&A. This is an important story. What it shows you there are two lines. The black line shows you the growth in income per capita in the United States; and you can see that it has grown over time, and the shaded bars are points in time where we had economic recession. And you can see during those periods of time where you have the shaded bars that income per capita either stabilized or decreased. That's what happens during recessions.

The other line is the pink line, and that is giving per member in The

United Methodist Church; and you can see over that period of time, from 1973 to about 1995, that those lines are virtually identical, which is saying that whenever income per capita grew, giving to The United Methodist Church per member grew as well. They were hand in hand. But it was in 1995 that you began a gap. In 1995, you can see the pink line has grown faster than the black line. It is during that period of time that giving per member in The United Methodist Church grew faster than income per capita. Now that's a blessing to our denomination. It means that something happened in 1995 and has continued. Even the economic recession for 2000 and 2001 did not disturb that trend. The rate of increase that we are projecting in The United Methodist Church, given this gap—and we expect it to continue—is an increase in giving per member, or the total expenditures in the local church, of 5.8 percent.

Now, if you'll go down to the next slide. This next slide shows you the share of the pie in United Methodism that has gone to the general church; and you can see over the period from 1973 to the year 2002, the share of the dollar that is handled in the local church that has gone to the general church has been declining. In 1973, it was 4.25 percent of the dollar went to the general church; and by 2002, it had dropped to 2.25 percent. It's on a decline, and we recognize that climb—that decline, and the budget that is being recommended continues that decline.

If you can go to the next slide. The next slide shows you the base percentage that would be used in the apportionment formula; and as it declines, so does the share of the pie that goes to the general church. So what we have projected for you is that the general church continues to shrink over the next quadrennium as a share of the dollars. But in terms of the dollar amount that is projected, the \$612.5 million, we are finding that there are dollars going through our local churches and they're increasing in spite of a decrease in membership. And for that reason we

are expecting the collection rates not to decline at all, and that giving to the church is going to continue to grow faster than per-capita income. We will be in a period of economic growth, and we believe very strongly that the dollars within the local church will be there. But the share of the dollar that goes to the general church will continue to decline within the budget that is recommended.

Addressing Questions

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we have been confirming and we are past the break. We're going to take a break and we're going to try to reconcile, if possible what has been coming from the floor. Namely, recommendations around report No. 19, and to see if there is some way in which we can work with what you've been bringing from the floor in conjunction with what came as World Service Report No. 1. So let us be in recess for... Let us be in recess for twenty minutes and try to get back, at least, by ten after. The Committee on Agenda will meet during the break behind the curtain. Thank you.

(break)

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, thank you, thank you so much for bearing with us, and I'm going to turn to Bishop Fannin now to make the final statement. We'll get in our places now. Will you please be seated?

Is this an inquiring question for information? What is it sir? We have ended the area of debate on the matter. It is before us now for the part of voting, and I'm turning to Bishop Fannin in terms of a closing statement.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You ready?

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, he says. You have a question, mic no. 3?

BONNIE I. MARDEN (New England): Hello. Bonnie Marden—

BISHOP MORRIS: Please, everyone be seated so you can hear.

MARDEN: Bonnie Marden, New England Conference. I would like to

ask if the presenters could share with us the implications of this amendment that was adopted. I believe there may be some confusion in the house about the impact and the extent the decision that we made. If you could help to clarify. We've made a major decision that will impact the lives of individuals who work for this...the general church level and I think that we're not aware of the impact of that decision.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, I would ask the chair to speak to the impact of that.

BISHOP FANNIN: You're referring to the motion that the substitute—now on the floor—to the main motion, excuse me, that's on the floor with the 10 percent increase?

MARDEN: My understanding is that that would probably eliminate half of the staff and a number of our general agencies, and we'd like us to get educated before we move forward.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well it would be very difficult to give you the actual amount of staff that would be affected directly. However, for example, you know it's very important to realize that we feel very strong about the original budget on 2088, p. 2088. Because that is a negotiated budget, and what we're experiencing up here is that there's a tendency to add to that budget rather than take away. So I just think that, at this point, all we can say to you is that this would greatly impact the ministry of the church—if this motion passes. And so that's all we can say at this point. It would affect some decisions.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, there's another question. We'll entertain it; then I think you need to vote. I think it's... mic no. 3.

JOHN PHILIP WOGAMAN (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop—

BISHOP MORRIS: Mic 3.

WOGAMAN: Yes, Philip Wogaman of the Baltimore-Washington Conference. A related question: What would be the implications and the effect of voting down what we now have before us? What would we then

have to be working with if we were to do that? I think many people are confused about that.

BISHOP MORRIS: The question is what would be the results if you voted the motion down. Were would we be?

BISHOP FANNIN: It's our understanding that if you were to defeat the motion that is presently before you, we would return to Report No.1 on p. 2088, and that would begin, be once again, our recommendation to the General Conference.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, I think the house is ready to vote now. Is there further question? Do you have a question? Mic 8, mic 8. You're standing at 8 sir.

Reconsider 10 Percent Reduction

WILLIAM C. SMITH (South Carolina): I'm Bill Smith, South Carolina Delegation. I would like to make a motion to reconsider that last vote. I'm not sure I knew what I was voting for. And I've talked to a number of people... I thought I was voting on the main motion, but it turns out I was voting on a motion to reduce by 10 percent, which I was not for. I'd like to make a motion for reconsideration.

BISHOP MORRIS: On which side did you vote? Did you vote for it?

SMITH: I voted for the motion to reconsider. I voted for the motion to reduce it by 10 percent, but I was not aware that that's what I was voting for. I was confused. I thought I was voting for—

BISHOP MORRIS: But you voted in favor and now you—

SMITH: I voted in favor—

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, then the motion to reconsider is before us. Is there a second? Alright, where is it coming from? Oh, Yes. Were you seconding? Is that what you were doing? Oh, OK, alright.

OK, the motion to reconsider is before us now in terms of looking at this again, and I think we're all aware of what that's about. I'll ask you to ahead on and vote. Vote now as the

light appears. [*Yes, 525; No, 259; Abstain, 5*].

Alright you voted to reconsider.

(applause)

OK, let me go to the person to my right, here, mic 4. Name and conference, please.

SAMUEL PURUSHOTHAM (New England): This is Sam Purushotham from the New England Conference. Most budgets have certain costs which are fixed, which cannot be lowered. Does the—do the makers have such a figure, which says that these items are fixed and therefore they cannot be reduced, and what that amount would be? There would be something that I can work with.

BISHOP FANNIN: I'm going to call on Sandra Lackore, of the general secretary because that is a basic accounting question.

SANDRA LACKORE (Treasurer): I feel like I'm being set up, Bishop. There are fixed costs all through every budget that's before you. In the World Service Fund, there are fixed costs both within the agencies budgets and also below the line in areas such as pension and salary aid and in the cost now to implement the Connectional Table, which you have put in place. All of those things would be affected in terms of fixed costs.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Let me—

BISHOP FANNIN: We do know, Bishop, that because of the reserves being gone, and because of the trust fund being gone, that this would actually represent a decrease in the income.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we're dealing now, of course, with the Stegall motion terms of the \$306 million; and we reconsidering it, talking about it. Let me go to my left all the way over to the end of the aisle. I think you have on a green shirt. Come to mic 1.

And that was a question. Remember, we're dealing with the Stegall motion. We're going to need to take some action on this, so you need to take some action on this, so need to stop speaking

for or against it, unless you have inquiry or questions. Yes, or amendments. Mic 1, please,

CHESTER R. JONES (Arkansas): Bishop, and delegates, Chester Jones, clergy, Arkansas Conference. I want to speak in support of the budget that was recommended by GCFA. All agencies went through a long process to bring in a bare-bones budget. And if we talk about reducing this to 10 percent, it means that we're going to have additional layoffs in terms of what has already been done because of spending down reserves. But the impact of what we are doing here is going to really hurt Global Ministries where many of the racial-ethnic plans are lodged. I tell the General Conference, I've been a superintendent: the money is there. You can ask Bishop (*unintelligible*) and Bishop Wilke, in my district we found the money, because I told—I asked people for the money. Money is not a problem, in all places. I'm just saying...

BISHOP MORRIS: You need to start closing.

JONES: One of the things—the last thing I want to say to the General Conference, something my mother taught us—big families, share croppers out on the farm—but she taught us in terms of the church; if God cannot get his money through you, he'll quit—God will quit sending it to you. And one of the things—the last thing I want to say, I'll go with any—the IRS has audited me three different times. And every time, the one thing they wanted to know: How could you give that much money to the church?

BISHOP MORRIS: You need to close.

JONES: And I told them, you know they—I would keep my receipts for the church in a Kroger sack, and at the bottom of that Kroger sack, I had all the church's receipts...

BISHOP MORRIS: Dr. Jones, you need to close your speech, sir. Alright, I want to go back to there. Is there a speech for? I need a speech for. That's a speech against. Alright, lady right here. Mic 7.

ANN GAIL WORKMAN: We're way in the back, and somehow we've lost our way. We just have a question. We aren't sure whether we are considering the budget, World Service Fund budget, which is on p. 508 in the Advance *DCA*, or if the numbers we are working with are the ones found on p. 2088 in today's *DCA*. There are some discrepancies in those figures, and we would just like for the house to be very clear what their looking at.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

BISHOP FANNIN: You are dealing with the figures in today's *DCA*, 2088, because we've, of course, been working with all the agencies and all the entities since yesterday.

BISHOP MORRIS: Yes, mic 4.

Moving to Report 19

DARLINE D. BALM-DEMME (Iowa): Darline Balm-Demmel, clergy from Iowa. It's apparently a question, because we're talking about Report 1, but everything in Report 19 is a part of the budget in Report 1. Isn't that correct?

BISHOP FANNIN: It's in different places. What we decided—I guess that's yours, Bishop Morris—that you had called for Report 1. It was in the order for the agenda for the day, and we're on 1.

BALM-DEMME: My question is, if we adopt 1, then how can we deal with what's in 19, which is a part of the budget which is in Report 1?

BISHOP FANNIN: You would be either adding or subtracting from the budget.

BALM-DEMME: We'd have to reconsider it, wouldn't we?

BISHOP FANNIN: That's correct.

BALM-DEMME: So every item—so items... I move that we deal with Report 19 before we deal with Report 1.

BISHOP MORRIS: Chair says that is a speech against. Alright, is there a speech for the Stegall motion?

BALM-DEMME: Well, it's a motion—to amend what we're doing.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

BALM-DEMME: I suggest that we start with Report...

BISHOP MORRIS: Are you making that as a motion?

BALM-DEMME: Yes.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. OK. Your motion is to start with Report 19. There's a second. Is there any discussion on that? Alright, it is properly before you now. As many as would vote to move to Report 19, please indicate by voting. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 599; No, 214; Abstain 15*]

Alright, we move to Report 19. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: I draw your attention... I draw your attention to p. 2094 in today's *DCA*. You will notice that Item 1 is the Central Conferences' Communications Initiative.

GCFA recommends funding in the amount of \$1 million, and that was included in the revised Report 1, in the sub-line entitled, "Other Ministries, United Methodist Communications, Central Conferences, Continuing Igniting Ministry Media Campaign."

GCFA recommended funding in the amount of \$25 million to be provided as showing in the revised Report 1. In the same place that I mentioned a moment ago, based on the funding level, the goals and objectives outlined in Petition No. 40266 will need to be adjusted.

Item No 3: Igniting Ministry Youth, GCFA recommended the amount of \$500,000 to be provided as shown in revised Report 1, under the same area as before, called "Igniting Ministries Youth."

Item No. 4: Division on Ministry with Young People. GCFA recommends total funding in the amount of \$6,333, 000 to be allocated to the Division on Youth line item of the World Service Fund. This amount is derived by combining allocations to the Shared Missions Focus on Young People in the amount of \$3,100,000; United Methodist Youth Organization

in the amount of \$900,000; The General Board of Discipleship in the amount of \$733,000; and an additional \$1,600,000.

This recommendation is in Report 1: National United Methodist Native American Center. GCFA recommends funding in the amount of \$232,000 to be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries as shown in revised Report 1, for the purpose of merging the National United Methodist Native American Center with the Native American Comprehensive Plan during the 2005–2008 quadrennial.

Town and Country Ministry: GCFA recommends, based on the fact that there is in the General Board of Global Ministries \$620,000, recommends no additional funding in response to this request. Remaining amount could be placed in the General Advance if necessary.

Initiative on Strengthening the Black Church for the 21st Century: GCFA recommends funding in the amount of \$2,100,000 to be allocated as shown in Report 1. GCFA also recommends that oversight for this initiative be assigned to the General Board of Global Ministries. That's not correct. We did change that. It's going to be in the other ministries, as I mentioned in my earlier report. That will be removed from the Board of Global Ministries to the other ministries so that they might meet in September, and in consultation with the Transition Process, choose their location.

Wholistic Strategies on Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean: GCFA recommends no funding for the coordinating of the Wholistic Strategy initiative, recognizing that as we consulted with the general agencies, there are \$43 million in their budgets in this arena, this area.

Global Education Fund: GCFA recommends no additional funding in response to this request, and recommends further that the additional funds requested be established as a goal for World Service Special. We are very, very interested in global education. We

have made a commitment for at least three quadrennia, if my memory is right, to Africa University, as Africa University becomes more self-sufficient, which it is doing through its establishment of an endowment. Then we could move more in the direction of global education.

United Methodist Global AIDS Fund: GCFA recommends that \$8 million be established as a goal for General Advance Special. In making this recommendation, GCFA recognizes that there are currently a number of Advance Specials that fund this ministry.

Task Force to Study the Episcopacy: GCFA recommends funding in the amount of \$147,000 to be provided as shown in revised Report 5, which is our contingency.

Artificial Insemination: GCFA recommends no funding for this study at this time.

In Defense of Creation: GCFA recommends funding this study from the interest earned on the corpus of the Methodist Corporation Trust for this quadrennium in an amount of \$132,000. This recommendation is consistent with the recommendation in Report 16, which we have not dealt with at this time.

Study of Men in The United Methodist Church: GCFA recommends funding in the amount of \$35,961 to be provided from the World Service Contingency Fund with GCFA's Department of Research and Analysis, providing research support to the General Commission on United Methodist Men.

Inclusiveness in General Board and Agency Representation: GCFA recommends funding the additional costs associated with increased central conference membership on agency boards from World Service Contingency in an amount equal to the difference between the current cost of decreased jurisdictional membership and the related increase in central conference membership for up to two meetings annually during the quadrennium.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. OK. Mic—go to mic 4.

Impact of Past Actions

ARNOLD A. RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bishop. Arnie Rhodes, Western Pennsylvania Annual Conference. Point of inquiry is that early on this afternoon, there was an amendment made, which passed, referring to Report No. 9 when we were on Report No. 1 in regards to Igniting Ministry and to the United Methodist Global AIDS Fund. And I would like to know if that action was in order.

BISHOP MORRIS: Well, the chair was at the time which you were dealing with World Service Fund, I think, was in order at that particular point; but we didn't proceed with that. And where we are now is the house really wants to look at No. 19, because that was constantly coming up in terms of the Report No. 1, and that's what we're doing now.

RHODES: OK. Well then—

BISHOP MORRIS: What we've done is suspend action in terms of \$306 million to hear this.

RHODES: OK. I understand that, Bishop; but also in the reporting, they haven't—have reported the \$25 million and also the Advance Special.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

BISHOP FANNIN: It is our understanding that when motion came in our discussion here that those reductions were superceded by this motion of a ten percent increase. So I gave the full amounts. We—I understand that we're back at that point and would be a ten percent increase through the whole line.

RHODES: Well, Bishop, I'd like to say that amendment was out of order because it came out of discussion of Report 19 when we were not on 19.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK, thank you. Alright. Let me go back to this side. The lady who's coming to mic 5.

ANNE L. BURKHOLDER (Florida): Anne Burkholder, Florida Conference, clergy. Bishop, I move that we accept Report No. 19 as a whole.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a second? Alright. Is there a discussion? Point of clarification. Where was that? OK, no. 4, then I'll come back to the middle.

SUE B. MULLINS (Iowa): Sue Mullins, laity, Iowa. Bishop, members of the committee, my understanding is that the body voted on that amendment; and it was accepted. And so the first time that we voted on Report No. 1, it was presented to us as Report No. 1 as amended, which says to me that the money for the Global AIDS Fund and the corresponding effect on Igniting Ministries was seen as an action of this body.

BISHOP MORRIS: It was amended. The first amendment did pass; but then we had another amendment, which was defeated. And then the final amendment which was passed was in terms of the ten percent increase. And what we have done in terms of where we are is we are reconsidering this to look at Report No. 19. And that's where we are. OK, let me come back to this section here. Mic 2.

REINER STAHL (Germany South): Reiner Stahl, German South. Bishop, once more, I would like to draw our attention to Point No. 9, Global Education Fund. I have a question; and depending on the answer, I would like to make an amendment. The question is: this fund was before the plenary with an amount of about \$10 million. Then it was reduced to \$4 million, and we heard from reports from Eastern Europe, especially from Russia but also from the other countries: Czech, the Balkans, and so on. Now there is a great need for theological education of pastors and leaders in the church. This was a program which had begun some years ago. It was effective, but now it should be continued. So I would like to ask, what can be expected if this issue becomes a goal for a World Service special?

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. I assume that's a question, but where we are is we're dealing with Report No. 19. The motion was to accept No. 19 as

a whole, and we really need to have speeches for or against this motion. Alright. Let me go back in the back here. Gentleman standing with the blue shirt. We need to have speeches for or against. Now we had one speech for. We need to have a speech against, accepting 19 as a whole.

STEPHEN P. TAYLOR (South Carolina): Bishop, Steven—

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. Point of order? Mic 5.

BURKHOLDER: Bishop, I merely made the motion. I haven't spoken to it.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK. It's all right. Go right on.

BURKHOLDER: This is Anne Burkholder, Florida, clergy. It's important for us to take this report as a whole. Different piece of—pieces of it are referred to other reports. We can't get into the other reports until we deal with these issues. So if we'll go ahead and deal with this report in its entirety, we can move on to the other reports that are before us.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. That's still a speech for. I need a speech against. I go back to mic no. 7.

TAYLOR: Bishop, Stephen Taylor, South Carolina, clergy. Sensing what this body has attempted to do, and we've gotten entangled, I know we have a motion to accept this as a whole, I would like to offer an amendment to that motion.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

TAYLOR: Is that appropriate? I would amend that motion by changing the figure in the Item 2, recommending funding in the amount of \$23 million. Also changing the figure in Item 10 to \$2 million appropriated.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Give me those again.

TAYLOR: Changing the amount in Item 3—no, I'm—excuse me, Item 2 to \$23 million appropriated, and changing the figure in Line 10 to appropriate \$2 million as a line item. And with a second, I would like to just make a brief statement.

BISHOP MORRIS: We are voting—I have to rule that out of order because what the motion before us is is to deal with this as a whole; therefore, we have to decide to vote it up or to vote it down.

TAYLOR: This is just a second level amendment to a motion that's properly on the floor, Bishop.

BISHOP MORRIS: Yeah. OK. Let me go to this side, and I need a speech against. Alright. Mic no. 1.

Look at Whole Budget

BRIAN K. JARMAN (South Indiana): Bishop, Brian Jarman, South Indiana. I think we need to vote this down for the following reasons: If we try to look at these total budgets piece by piece, we're not gonna find out what we want when we come to the end. If we look at it from a total perspective, the total budget, every thing—World Service, episcopal, administrative—is a 12 percent increase for this quadrennium. When we take a look at the World Service Fund, that's a 16 percent increase this quadrennium. The Episcopal Fund is a 27.5 percent increase this quadrennium. The Administrative Fund is a 13 percent increase this quadrennium. I would submit that if we do not look at our total goal of where we want to be when we're all said and done, we will continue to amend our ministries to death when our support structures may be overspending. I would ask why we are spending over \$4 million a year on administrative costs for GCF&A. I recommend we have to look at this as a total budget at some point—however we have to do that parliamentarily—to get our final goals, to take this home and do our work back home. We cannot continue to look at it piece by piece. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. I need a speech for Report No. 19, vote it as a whole. Is there a speech for? Alright. Right back here. Mic 4, I guess, yes.

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Bishop, I am Arthur Jones's father from North Texas. Scott Jones to those

who know me. I want to suggest to this General Conference that we are trying to act as a budget committee; and when 1,000 people do that, it gets to be very, very difficult. And if we're not careful, we will do nothing else today. Therefore, I'm going to be voting for no changes in Report 19, and if necessary, move that we go back to a revised GCFA Report No. 1 unamended.

I was on the Financial Administration Committee. That report does not have everything I wanted. It's bottom increase of 12 percent for all seven funds, 12 percent increase over four years is roughly 3.5 percent a year. That's a little higher than I worked for in the committee, but I'm prepared to accept that as a reasonable compromise to accept the things that have been funded in a reasonable way and to understand that GCFA has done a tremendous job of negotiating with the various agencies involved and looking at our mission. And so I would urge the house, let's support Report 19 unamended and report the revised Report No. 1 as it came to us this afternoon, unamended. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. I need a speech. All right. Back on this side. Young man. Yes. Toward the aisle. Mic 1 please.

KARL R. KROGER (Dakotas): Karl Kroger, Dakotas, lay. Can I defer to Kent Millard please?

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Go ahead. Alright. I missed you. I'm sorry. What was your motion? Did you make a motion in your speech? Oh. OK

MILLARD: Bishop?

BISHOP MORRIS: Go ahead. Alright.

MILLARD: I'm Kent Millard from South Indiana.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

MILLARD: Earlier today when we were looking at Budget Item No. 1 on 2088, there was an item on the—under Other Ministries entitled "Igniting Ministries Core" with a total of \$25 million. When we were considering that item, I made a motion that we

reduce that to \$23 million. That motion passed. It passed at the time we were considering revised Budget 1. It passed by the house. I, furthermore, made a motion that we add two other ministries—the item of the Global AIDS Fund at \$2 million, which would be a new item under that Other Ministries category on 2088. When I made those motions, they were under the rubric of Report No. 1; and they passed the house. I find it difficult to understand why now CFA is reporting those numbers as if those motions had not passed, and they have in fact passed. I think if you check the records, both of those motions passed; and they were appropriate because they were on revised Report No. 1 under Other Ministries. I would like to get clarification from GCFA if in fact they agree that those motions passed the house and have adjusted the budget at that point.

BISHOP MORRIS: All right. Was this a speech against or not, sir? Are you—it's a matter of inquire?

MILLARD: It's a question before the house because if in fact those motions are ruled not to have succeeded, then it will affect how we vote on Report 19.

BISHOP MORRIS: Was this a speech against or not, sir; are you just—a matter of inquiry?

DONALD R. AVERY (Louisiana): It's a question before the house because if, if, in fact, those motions are ruled not to have succeeded, then it will affect how we vote on Report 19. So we have to have an answer to those question if those motions were, in fact—

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

AVERY: —valid and passed.

BISHOP MORRIS Go ahead and answer. Alright. Point—is there a point of order? Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is, is it not correct that we were in the process of perfecting the report by amendment? No. 1.

BISHOP MORRIS That was correct, and so, therefore, what you—what was

approved was superceded by the ten percent, which is what I think Brother Avery's referring to. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And we never got to the point of acting on the entire report.

BISHOP MORRIS That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Therefore, we did not perfect that report, so all of those actions were left pending—

BISHOP MORRIS: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: —when we left that to go to 19?

BISHOP MORRIS: That's correct. I still need a speech against, and the motion is for us to consider No. 19 as a whole. That's what we're dealing with. Is it a speech against? The gentleman right here. Right here, yes. Suspenders on.

JOSEPH TOM PRICE (Baltimore-Washington): Thank you. Thank you, Bishop. Would a point of clarification be in order? I'm sorry. Tom Price, Baltimore-Washington Conference. Bishop, Tom Price, Baltimore-Washington Conference. Would—I have two points of clarification I wonder if they would be in order, sir.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Go ahead.

PRICE: Alright. The first one is on No. 5. I was on the General Administration Committee and the subcommittee on missional focus, whatever it was. But—

BISHOP MORRIS: I'm afraid I'm going to have to rule that out of order. We need a speech against, sir.

PRICE: It's not a—I was asking, sir, if I could have a point of clarification.

BISHOP MORRIS: We need a speech against, sir. Alright. Young lady in the back the pink—pink top, standing. A young man. OK, I'm sorry.

D. BENJAMIN ADAMS (North Carolina): Bishop, those are fighting words from where I come from. That's alright. I'll forgive you.

BISHOP MORRIS: Yeah.

ADAMS: Ben Adams, North Carolina Conference. Yeah.

BISHOP MORRIS: Did she apologize? I just couldn't see that far.

ADAMS: I get it all the time. Thanks. I got to defer to Sam Wynn; he's been back here for awhile. I guess you just haven't been able to see him; but I defer to Sam Wynn, if that's OK. Thank you. Ben Adams, North Carolina Conference, by the way.

BISHOP MORRIS: What did he say?

Last Speech on Report 19

SAMUEL WYNN (North Carolina): Thank you, Ben. Bishop, I have a concern in reference to—

BISHOP MORRIS: Are you speaking against?

WYNN: Against, yes.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

WYNN: No. 5.

BISHOP MORRIS: Name and conference, please.

WYNN: Sam Wynn from North Carolina. Bishop, It's my, I serve on the GCF&A legislative committee. In regards to Item No. 5, there has been no consultation whatsoever—

BISHOP MORRIS: That's not before us. What is before us is the whole motion, not to defend any parts of the motion.

WYNN: I'm speaking against the entire report because of this specific concern, because there's been no consultation; and in merging two entities together. I mean, in light of that, how in the world can you vote on something when you haven't brought two groups together to deal with consultation? This will only bring about additional division in our community when we have tried this morning to bring unity in our church. We need to look at this very seriously, and I would ask that we not vote on this entire report until these matters have been taken care of.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Thank you. We've had two speeches for and two against now. Let us cast our vote in terms of whether you want to vote for No. 19 as a whole or whether you care

not. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 609; No, 254; Abstain, 9*] Alright. It is approved, and now it is before you to vote on this as a whole. Yes? Report No. 19 will be before us to vote. We voted to do this. We voted . . . yes.

JAMES L. BRANSCOME (Virginia): Jim Branscome, Virginia Conference. Why I've been trying to get attention to get a question. How much in Report 19 is being funded from the World Service Project? It's—at looking at it you can't tell.

BISHOP FANNIN: Approximately, and we do reserve that right, approximately \$40 million.

BRANSCOME: Bishop, we have \$585 [million] in the regular budget; and—and they presented a budget of a cap of \$612 [million]; it doesn't add up. There can be only \$27 million in Report 19.

BISHOP FANNIN: It's already in the budget. It's in the report, No. 1. \$40 million is in Report No. 1, already included.

BRANSCOME: Already included? So, so, OK.

BISHOP FANNIN: You hear—? OK.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. We need to vote on No. 19 now. We agreed to vote on it as a whole. If you would approve or not approve No. 19, please vote now when voters' light appears. [*Yes, 693; No, 178; Abstain, 10*]

Alright. It's been approved, all of 19.

Alright. Now we're back to the ten percent. (*pause*) Alright. We voted to reconsider the ten percent, and we also have just approved Report No. 19, which means we're reconsidering the ten percent, and if we affirm that ten percent, what it means is that the—Report No. 19 will be affected by that ten percent.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to make a—

BISHOP MORRIS: You wanna say something?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (*unin-*

telligible) the statement when you get ready to (*unintelligible*).

BISHOP MORRIS: I want to take two speeches for or against. Let me go here.

Reconsider No. 1 Without Amendment

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Bishop, Scott Jones. If it's in order, I'd like to try a motion that might help clarify exactly where we are and move us on.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

JONES: I move reconsideration on all of the actions related to revised Report No. 1 for the purpose of moving Report No. 1 unamended as the main motion before us. If I can have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

JONES: In my earlier speech, Bishop, I made the reference to the fact that we were trying to act as a committee of the whole. It seems to me that that has led to confusion. A number of us want that number to be lower. A number of us want it to be higher. A number of us have particular things that we think should have been funded in different ways. We have now dealt with Report 19; and, again, I would like the chance to vote on revised Report No. 1 unamended. And, therefore, I move that we reconsider it in order to get to that point.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. You are saying reconsider Report No. 1. Is that your motion?

JONES: Yes, sir. Revised Report No. 1.

BISHOP MORRIS: Revised Report No. 1. OK.

JONES: I think it's on p. 2088.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alrighty. OK. That's before us to reconsider now, that report. Is there—that's a speech for. Is there a speech against? Yeah, I know. Alright. Back. We've had one for. I need a speech against the reconsideration now.

MARK O. FENSTERMACHER (North Indiana): Bishop and friends,

my name is Mark Fenstermacher. I'm from North Indiana. I'm a pastor who serves a church that pays 100 percent of its apportionments. I'm a pastor who believes in the power of God to perform miracles, and we call our people to faithful stewardship; and it's a joyful thing to do that. Before the break, I was not confused about what the body had done; and I would vote—I would encourage the delegates to maintain the earlier action by staying with that ten percent. On the last morning of our annual conference session last year, a brother stood up and recommended a 20 percent decrease in the budget of the North Indiana Conference. If we uphold our earlier action for the ten percent level, that is still an aggressive budget; and you need to understand that's not all that God is doing. God is at work in the local church. So I had clarity before the break. I encourage us not to reconsider this—not to vote for this proposal that's before us but to maintain our earlier action for the ten percent.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. Is there a speech for? Alright. Mic 2, please. The lady, yes.

YOUNGSOOK C. KANG (Rocky Mountain): Youngsook Kang, Rocky Mountain Conference, clergy. I support that the revised Report No. 1, by the GCF and A as un-amended. As stated several times by different members of the conference, including Bishop Fannin, this report is the outcome of consorted efforts among different boards and agencies. As far as I understand, it took more than a year. This budget reflects the core value of funding mission and ministries through World Services. This budget will enable mission and ministries and programs which have been entrusted by the denomination through the General Conference. As a women delegate said earlier this afternoon, we as the church can support and carry out this budget, as we have faith in God whose name is "God of Abundance". Thank you

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we need that motion that was just made please, seconded.,the desk informs me. I need

a speech against now. Alright in the back, mic 7, I guess it is.

JULIANNE BRITTAIN (Western North Carolina): Jan Brittain from Western North Carolina Conference. I have an opinion on this; however, I really just want two pieces of information made clear here. We fought four years ago to require GCF and A to include in their reports and their requests, not only the percentage increase over what they asked for, but the percentage increase over what they got. They did that in one place and one place only, and that page has not been referred to from the front. Now, this is my point, I've worked with budgets for schools, homes, churches, and businesses. I never set a budget based on what I hoped I would have and that's what we've done. All I want you to know is that if we go with the \$612,000,000, we will be asking our churches to give us 27.7 percent more than they gave us last time. And, one other little fact, that 22,000,000 approved last quadrennium for items outside the regular funds were just included this year, so there was a \$22,000,000 increase before we ever started with this. I just want that information out for the body.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, we are at the point now of voting. I want to ask the secretary to read the motion that is before us so we can know what we are voting on.

MARSHALL: Scott Jones'motion is. I move reconsideration of all motions related to revised Report No.1 from GCFA for the purpose of moving revised Report No. 1 as the main motion before us.

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes I would just like to say that our guiding principals, as we work through this process, was to respect the budget process, to invest in the future, respect for agencies and their missions in ministry, affirm the work and advise the Financial Administration Legislative Committee and to keep everything in the budget. I would strongly support this amendment.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright it's before you now. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now as the light appears. [Yes, 558 ; No, 316 ; Abstain,10]

Alright, the number prevails. What is before us now is the World Service Report, as amended. Okay, I think you're ready to vote. I think we're ready to vote on that now, and it is before you. Yes, mic 4.

JONES: My apologizes, Bishop, Scott Jones from North Texas again. Did you misspeak? My intention was that if we now have before us revised Report No. 1, from GCFA as un-amended in its original form.

BISHOP MORRIS: Yes, that's what we're voting on

JONES: Thank you, bishop.

BISHOP MORRIS: Yes, I'm clear. Alright, it is before you, Okay, mic 8.

CHARLES L. JOHNSON (South Carolina): Charles Johnson, South Carolina, and I have a question I would like to ask. My question is, did I understand Bishop Fannin, to say earlier that if we vote to give the agencies 10 percent more then they were apportioned last quadrennium that will be a decrease from the amount of monies they had available to them. And in light of the fact that some used reserve, and the benefit trust was also available. Am I correct?

BISHOP FANNIN: I did say that, but I'm calling Dr. Don House to flesh that out for us.

DON HOUSE: Yes, that's my understanding, because we spent \$35,000,000 last quadrennium from spending down reserves and from the benefit trust. Now, that was a gift, a Christmas gift from the budgeting process last quadrennium. So, when we're looking at apportionments last quadrennium and comparing them with apportionments this quadrennium, if all we do is look at apportionments, we're ignoring the spending levels that we authorized last quadrennium. What it seems to be is more important if we're looking at what's going to happen to mission and ministry at the general

church, is to look at the spending levels last quadrennium and the spending levels this quadrennium if that's our focus.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it's before you now. Yes, mic 1. Is the matter inquiring?

JOHN EDGAR (West Ohio): John Edgar, West Ohio. I move everything that is before us.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK, Alright, ready to vote as many as would approve or not approve this motion indicate. Yes.

Procedural Question

FRED BREWINGTON (New York): Bishop, thank you, Fred Brewington, New York Annual Conference. I would raise a point of order. You have in response to my brother that came back to the mic indicated that we were voting for this un-amended. The motion to reconsider requires two thirds which was 66.whatever percent. We got 63 percent, so I just want to be clear on what we're voting on. We have in addition, as a point of order, we also have a second layer behind that which is the motion to reconsider, which has not been fully voted on, the 10 percent motion. We have never voted on that. We only voted on the reconsideration of that issue. That motion has not been properly dealt with.

BISHOP MORRIS: The thing which is before us is a revised report and in terms of 10 percent. That was lost in terms of the last motion which takes precedent. Let me ask the secretary to read the motion since you seem not to be clear on what we're voting on.

MARSHALL: Move reconsideration of all motions related to revised Report No. 1 from GCFA for the purpose of moving revised Report No. 1 un-amended as the main motion before us.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, that's before us now. I think the house is ready to vote. Please vote now, as the light appears. It has been sustained. [*Yes, 590; No, 277; Abstain, 13*].

Alright, let me come up to mic 1..

DAVID R. GROUT (Kentucky): David Grout, Kentucky, a point of order. Did we not just vote twice on the same thing, resulting in overturning the first election? Did we not vote once not receiving a two thirds vote on the reconsideration. Then to be instructed by you to vote again on the reconsideration, and now we get 68 percent?

BISHOP MORRIS: Reconsideration is the majority vote, it is not a two thirds vote. Ready to move to the next report.

Ministerial Education Fund

LEWIS J. HOLSTON (North Georgia): Jonathan Holston, North Georgia, clergy. Ministerial Education funds located on p. 510, *ADCA*, Vol.2, Section 1, Ministerial Education Fund p. 510. The recommended total apportionment of \$113,130,000 for the 2005-2008 quadrennium represents the same amount as the current quadrennium. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 2.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright

TRACY R. MERRICK (Western Pennsylvania): Tracy Merrick, chair of Financial Administration. Would you please turn in the *DCA* to p. 1749, Calendar Item 1034. That particular calendar item represents the action of the committee dealing with a petition, which is found in the Advance *DCA* on p. 510. It is Petition 41566, the GCFA Report dealing with a Ministerial Education Fund. In this case, the action of the Financial Administrative Legislative Committee represents concurrence with the report coming from GCFA as it is printed in the Advance *DCA*. So we would move concurrence.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. I believe you're ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. Please vote now. [*Yes, 769; No, 60; Abstain, 13*]

Alright. You have sustained the committee. Thank you.

LEWIS J. HOLSTON (North Georgia): Bishop, I'll move Report No. 2.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

Black College Fund

HOLSTON: The Black College Fund is located on p. 511, 5-1-1.

BISHOP MORRIS: Jonathon?

HOLSTON: Yes?

BISHOP MORRIS: It's Report No. 3. You said No. 2. It's No. 3.

HOLSTON: Excuse me. Report No. 3, Black College Fund. Excuse me. P. 5-1-1. Report No. 3. The recommended total apportionment of \$45,128,000 also will not increase over the current quadrennium. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 3.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright.

MERRICK: On behalf of Financial Administration, I would refer you to p. 1749 in the *DCA*, once again, to Calendar No. 1035, which deals with the Black College Fund, as Jonathon mentioned, which is found in the Advance *DCA* on p. 511, Petition No. 41567. Once again, the legislative committee agreed with the petition submitted by GCFA, and we voted concurrence.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. I believe you're ready to vote. It's where? OK. Alright. No. 4. Thank you.

FRANK E. FALVEY (New England): Frank Falvey, the New England Conference. I noticed that most of this funding goes with current expenses. My question is, somewhere in the future—20 years, 30 years—will we have strengthened the searching historical black colleges to a point that if there is other educational needs somewhere else in the world, the colleges, that we would be able—that those colleges would be financially strong enough that we could change the funding to some other priority?

HOLSTON: I'm glad you asked that question. Yeah, we would—are able to pay the apportionment 100 percent, and these schools would be able to receive their monies and their support in which they would be able to be sufficient to move forward. But because we're not able to do that, this money's not being asked as any increased, but it's asked to

fund, funding for the schools that they may be able to be assisting of the students who are there, and to be able to move forward. What we would hope to do is that we could increase the amount of support that would be coming forth from this particular fund.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. I think the report is before you. Please vote now. Please vote as the light appears. [Yes, 782; No, 55; Abstain 3] Alright, thank you. Next report.

Africa University Fund

HOLSTON: Bishop, Report No. 4, Africa University Fund. It's located on pp. 512 and 513 of your Advance *Daily Christian Advocate*. Africa University Fund, Report No. 4, pp. 512 and 513. The \$10,100,000 of apportionment support recommended for the next quadrennium also is the same amount as what was approved for the 2001-2004 quadrennium. In addition, the report recommends a goal of \$10 million be established as a World Service special gift for the next quadrennium to be used for permanent endowment funds. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 4.

BISHOP MORRIS: Thank you. Alright.

MERRICK: On behalf of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee, I refer you to *DCA* p. 1749, once again. Calendar Item 1036, which does reference the Africa University Fund in the Advance *DCA* on p. 512, Petition No. 41568. Once again, the legislative committee supported the petition as submitted by GCFA and voted concurrence with that petition.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright it is before you. Please vote now. Vote as the light appears. [Yes, 804; No, 37; Abstain, 3]

The committee report is sustained. Next report.

Episcopal Fund

PEGGY L. SEWELL (Rocky Mountain): The Episcopal Fund. Please turn to p. 513 and—through 521 of the Advance *Daily Christian*

Advocate, Vol. 2, Section 1. The revised budget is on p. 2089 of today's revised *DCA*. As noted in the announcements on p. 5 of the Tuesday, April 27th *Daily Christian Advocate*, on p. 518 of the *ADCA*, Section 4, titled "Travel Expense," Paragraph No. 4 is to be deleted. Your referrals earlier in this General Conference mean that the current disciplinary language affecting the Episcopal Fund is retained. The recommended funding level for the fund for 2005-2008 provided for the current number of bishops eligible for election in the jurisdictional conferences. \$147,000 is being added to the budget to cover costs of the study on the episcopacy. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommended Report No. 5 as corrected.

BISHOP MORRIS: Peggy, (*unintelligible*). Peggy, it's time to ...

SEWELL: I'm sorry. Just a minute. I need to finish.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

SEWELL: OK? Including the revised summary on p. 2089 of today's *DCA*.

BISHOP MORRIS: Are you speaking to this?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (*unintelligible*)

BISHOP MORRIS: OK.

PENNEY SCHWAB (Kansas West): On behalf of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee, the original petition was in *DCA* p. 18—or the original action was *DCA* p. 1848, Calendar Item 1456, Advance *DCA* p. 513, Petition 41569. As amended, as your attention was called to p. 2089, the Episcopal Fund, we would concur because this is not new money.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK. This is before you. Please vote now. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 744; No, 101; Abstain, 7] You have sustained the committee. Next report please.

General Administration Fund

DONALD R. HOUSE (Texas): The General Administration Fund that is presented in pp. 22—522 to 524 in the

Advance *Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol. 2, Section 1. The revised budget is on p. 2089 of today's *DCA*. This fund provides important financial support for several administrative responsibilities of our denomination, including the cost of our General Conference. The budget has been adjusted by \$147,000 reduction of the contingency reserve line. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 6.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, please vote now.

PENNY SCHWAB: The report of the Legislative Committee, Calendar Item 1037 as amended in today's *DCA* p. 2089, Petition No. 41570. General Administration Fund, we recommend concurrence because of the action that we just took on the Episcopal Fund, these two balance out. Thank you.

BISHOP MORRIS: Now it is before us. Please vote now; vote as the light appears. The committee report is sustained. [Yes, 763; No, 85; Abstain, 9] Next report.

Interdenominational Cooperation Fund

HOUSE: The Interdenominational Cooperation Fund, found on pages 525-527 of the Advance *Daily Christian Advocate*, Volume 2, Section 1. This fund provides our basic support for ecumenical agencies through which The United Methodist Church participates in God's mission in cooperation with other Christian communities. The proposed funding level for 2005-2008 was developed after GCFA considered recommendations from the General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns developed in consultation with the Council of Bishops. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 7.

SCHWAB: On behalf of the Financial Administration Committee, *DCA* p. 1749, Calendar Item 1038, Petition No. 41571, Advance *DCA* p. 525, the committee recommends concurrence; there are no changes.

BISHOP MORRIS: OK, this is before you. Please vote now; vote as

the light appears. Committee's report is sustained. [*Yes, 752; No, 85; Abstain, 6*]

Apportionment Formula

HOUSE: The Apportionment Formula found on pp. 2090-2093 of today's *Daily Christian Advocate*. This is the revised version of what you received in the Advance *DCA* reflecting a total of \$612.5 million for the General Fund's budget for 2005-2008. With a full implementation of the new apportionment formula that was adopted in the last General Conference, it places new responsibilities on the General Conference. In particular, the General Conference has to adopt net expenditure projections for the next quadrennium as well as the calculation of the base percentages that would be used to then calculate the apportionments from 2005-2008. The net expenditure projections take into account two important things; the declining membership but, also, that gap that I showed you on that beautiful graph earlier that shows that we expect a continuation of the growth end-spending among our local churches at a rate of 5.8 percent as an annual rate. This is indeed a blessing. This is the report from GCFA, no. 8.

FRANCISCO ESTRADA (Rio Grande): Bishop, Francisco Estrada, Rio Grande Conference. Report 8 from GCFA is found in your *DCA*, page 1751, Calendar Item 1054, Petition No. 41572 it is also in the revised Report of GCFA in today's *DCA* p. 2090, in the Advance *DCA* p. 528, Report 8. The committee voted and recommends concurrence with this report.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it is before you. Please vote, vote now; vote as the light appears. The committee report is sustained. [*Yes, 783; No, 69; Abstain, 7*] Thank you.

General Church Offerings

BISHOP NORRIS: Bishop Morris and members of the General Conference Report 9, Sunday School General Church Offering found pp. 530-532 Advance *DCA* Volume 2, Section 1. We are recommending con-

tinuation of the current Sundays with general church offerings for the 2005-2008 quadrennium. This is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 9.

ESTRADA: Turn to p. 1748 in the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1032, Petition No. 41573. There is a report in the Advance *DCA* page 530, Report 9 of the GCFA. The committee voted and recommends concurrence.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it is before you. Get ready to vote. Please vote now; vote as the light appears. The committee report is sustained. [*Yes, 780; No, 62; Abstain, 7*]

Next report. Thank you.

BISHOP NORRIS: Report 10, Audit and Review, pp. 532-533 Advance *DCA*, Volume 2, Section 1. This report is before the General Conference for information only. Bishop, this is GCFA's report 10.

ESTRADA: In your *DCA* p. 1623, Calendar Item 278, Petition No. 41574, and as mentioned on pp. 532 and 533 on the Advance *DCA*. Report 10 the committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, it is before you. Please vote, please vote now as the light appears. The committee report has been sustained. [*Yes, 788; No, 41; Abstain, 13*]

Next Report.

BISHOP NORRIS: Report No. 11, Directives for the Administration of the General Funds, pages 533-535 Advance *DCA* Volume 2, Section 1. This report provides the necessary authorization for GCFA to administer the general funds of the church as well as funding the efforts of United Methodist Communications on behalf of the General Conference to promote general church funds throughout the church. Bishop Morris, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report 11.

ESTRADA: In your *DCA* p. 1723, Calendar Item 707, Petition No. 41575, p. 533 in your Advance *DCA*, and the committee affirms and concurs for the ministry of administration.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright, the report it is before you. Please vote

now; vote as the light appears. [*Yes, 783; No, 51; Abstain, 7*]

The committee report is sustained.

BISHOP NORRIS: Report 12, the Equity and the General Agencies, pp. 535-539 Advance *DCA*, Volume 2, Section 1. This informational report updates the General Conference on the pay equity evaluation and monitoring process which the 2000 General Conference directed GCFA to initiate. Bishop Morris, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report 12.

MYRON F. MCCOY (Northern Illinois): Myron McCoy, Northern Illinois Conference, Financial Administration Secretary. You can find the report *DCA* p. 1623, Calendar Item 279, Petition No. 41576, Advance *DCA* p. 535. Members of the Financial Administration Committee moves concurrence with the report.

BISHOP MORRIS: The report is before you. Please vote now; vote as the light appears. [*Yes, 785; No, 48; Abstain, 9*]

The committee report is sustained.

Referrals from 2000

BISHOP NORRIS: Report No. 13, references from previous General Conferences found on pp. 540-542, Advance *DCA* Volume 2, Section 1. Each General Conference usually refers several items for GCFA to work on and report back to the next General Conference. This report provides an update on referrals we received when General Conference met in Cleveland in 2000. Note that items 1, 2, and 3 are informational. Item No. 4, on p. 541 would authorize the immigration task force to continue its work into the next quadrennium. Costs for the task force would be covered by the participating agencies. Item No. 5, on pp. 541 and 542 would authorize GCFA to conduct further studies during the 2005-2008 quadrennium on specific issues related to the manner in which connectional ministries are funded in our church. The connectional ministries studies would be covered by the General Administration Contingency Fund line

item. Bishop Morris, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report 13.

MCCOY: Financial Administration's action is on p. 1623 of your *DCA*, Calendar Item No. 280, Petition No. 1577, Advanced *DCA* 540. The committee moves concurrence with the report

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. Please vote now. Please vote as the light appears. [*Yes, 779; No, 54; Abstain, 7*].

The committee report is abstained, next report.

BISHOP FANNIN: Item 14 Budget of the General Council on Finance and Administration, pp. 542 to 544, in the Advanced *Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol 2. Section 1. Bishop Morris, this is the operating budget of the GCFA. It represents a 12.7 percent decrease in our budget the first year of the quadrennium, and reflects a 7.34 percent increase over the entire four years. This is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 14.

MCCOY: The Financial Administration's legislative committee's report is on p.1749, Calendar Item 1039, Petition No. 41578, in your *Advance DCA*, 542. We move concurrence with the report.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. Please vote now. Please vote as the light appears. [*Yes, 754; No, 73; Abstain, 9*]

The committee's report is sustained. Next report.

BISHOP FANNIN: Report No. 15, Income from the Board of Trustees, found on p. 545 *Advance Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol. 2, Section 1. Our report includes a recommendation in the last paragraph, which would allow GCFA to continue to dispense income from the Board of Trustees' undesignated funds as part of the World Service receipts for distribution beginning with the 2005-2008 quadrennium. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report 15.

LEWIS J. HOLSTON (North Carolina): The action of the legislative

committee can be found in your *DCA* on p.1623, Calendar Item No. 277, Petition No. 41579, in your *Advance DCA* No. 545. We move concurrence with the report

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. Please vote. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 764; No, 52; Abstain, 9*]

The committee's report is sustained next report.

BISHOP FANNIN: Report No. 16, Reports Presented With Other Agencies, found on p. 545 in the *Advance Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol 2, Section 1. Report 16 contains two informational reports made jointly with the General Council on Ministries: report of the Methodist Corporation Trust and the report on General Agencies Headquarters and Staff Location. Bishop, this is GCFA's recommendation for Report No. 16.

TRACY R. MERRICK (Western Pennsylvania): The report of the Financial Administration Committee can be found on p.1623. Once again, it is Calendar No. 281. In the *Advance DCA*, the GCFA report is on 545; and it is Petition No. 4150. As in other cases, the committee agreed with the report of GCFA and voted concurrence.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. The report is before you. Please vote. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 761; No, 59; Abstain, 11*] The committee report is sustained. Next report.

MERRICK: Bishop, this concludes the work of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee; and I'd just like to make one comment regarding the committee and its work. Great deal of appreciation is due to the leadership of the group: Penny Schwab, vice chair; Myron McCoy, secretary; Francisco Estrada; Joe Huffman; and Ewing Werlein, as sub-committee chairpersons; and Don House who served as vice chair of one of the committees; and the secretaries; Jim Berner, Dorothy Tatem, and Cynthia Weems. And it was a great group to work with; they showed leadership in taking responsibility for the funds, as

you've heard during the course of this conference. Thank you very much.

(*applause*)

BISHOP MORRIS: Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you. Report No. 17, JustPeace. *Advance Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol. 3, p.1537. Bishop Morris, Report 17 contains the informational report of "JustPeace." I move acceptance of GCFA Report No. 17.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. OK. It is before you. Alright. If you'd approve the report—and approve, it please vote. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 750; No, 54; Abstain, 14*] It is approved.

BISHOP FANNIN; Report 18, The United Methodist Church Foundation, found in *Advance Daily Christian Advocate*, Vol. 3, p.1539. Report 18 contains the informational report of The United Methodist Church Foundation. Bishop Morris, I move acceptance of GCFA Report No. 18.

BISHOP MORRIS: Alright. It is before you. Please vote. Please vote now as the light appears. [*Yes, 768; No, 44; Abstain, 11*]

It is approved.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you. I turn to Bishop Norris.

Conclusion

BISHOP NORRIS: Bishop Morris and members of the General Conference, this concludes the reports of the General Council on Finance and Administration. And if you will permit me just one editorial appendage: Glory Halleluiah!

(*applause*)

BISHOP MORRIS: We are at that point of moving toward adjourning, and I want to turn to Dr. Brian Bauknight—I believe—who has a presentation to make; and we'll turn to announcements and closing prayer. Dr. Brian Bauknight. He's the chair of the Host Committee. We welcome you.

BRIAN K. BAUKNIGHT (Western Pennsylvania): I'm one who believes

deeply in the theology of spiritual gifts. My number one spiritual gift is the gift of administration, and I try to put that at work. We put together the Host Hospitality Team. I think we got the right people, in the right place, at the right time, for the right reason; and I'm proud of each one of them, and I'm proud of them before you. My second spiritual gift is encouragement, and I really try to encourage them to do the best job they could; and I think we achieved our goal. I hope we've achieved our goal of excellent hospitality in the context of Christian conferencing.

(applause)

Two pieces of information for you. Number one is Klondikes originated in Pittsburgh. Alright? That's why you had them yesterday. The second thing is when you adjourn tonight, if you adjourn on time, we're going to provide fireworks for you. Over at PNC Park, it's fireworks night and it starts at 10:00. So if you finish at 10:00 you'll get a great fireworks display as you leave General Conference. Thank you very much.

(applause)

BISHOP MORRIS: I want to turn now to our secretary who has some announcements.

MARSHALL: Two announcements. First one is that the Society of St. Andrew thanks all of the delegates and bishops who participated in, or supported, the potato drop last week through their fasting and gifts. Together we help the 120,000 of Pittsburgh's hungry.

(applause)

Paragraph 2, we also invite all United Methodist to observe "Hunger Awareness Day," June 3rd, through prayers and gifts to those in ministry to the least of those who are hungry. Thank you. And this one is an announcement that the Young Adult room will be closing after the dinner break, and so please get all of your belongings out of there. That may apply to some other rooms, too. Just be

aware of where your materials and other belongings are.

BISHOP MORRIS: I want to—OK. Mic no. 1.

WALTER L. KIMBROUGH (North Georgia): Bishop, just a question. I did have for a good speech earlier but didn't have your attention, but I just have a question now. Could we receive the report of how much monies we gave to those persons who've served us? I understand there were two times or two opportunities to give; and these are persons who have in my estimation, served us exceptionally well. And normally we do give offerings, and I'm just wondering how much did we give and how does that compare with four years ago?

BISHOP MORRIS: I turn to the secretary.

MARSHALL: Do not have that figure now. We'll have it by, when we come back.

BISHOP MORRIS: She indicates she does not have it now, but she'll have it when we return. I want to express my deepest appreciation to Bishop Davis and Bishop Bashore for the wonderful way in which they supported me in terms of being in the chair. I also want to thank you for your graciousness and for your patience and the way in which you stayed with things until we were able to move them through. And I thank you for that kind of spirit. I want to turn now to Bishop Marion Edwards of the Raleigh area who will give us our closing prayer. We'll be in recess until 7:30.

BISHOP EDWARDS: Let us pray.

(prayer)

Friday Evening May 7, 2004

BISHOP EDWARD W. PAUP: Let's please take our places and be in order for our final session of the 2004 General Conference

Thanking Hosts and Others

As we gather this night, we want to take this moment to express our thanks for the leadership and the hospitality

extended to us by our host bishop. And so I would invite Bishop Hae-Jong Kim to come forward, and will you recognize as you acknowledge him that you are also acknowledging his staff (*applause*) and all those who helped to receive us in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Bishop Kim.

BISHOP HAE-JONG KIM: Thank you so much. It has been our privilege and joy of hosting the General Conference. It is not just myself, but Brian Bauknight that was greeted by you this evening earlier and other staff members who have been helping here. I don't know how many of those who are from the Western Pennsylvania helping with this General Conference are still here, but I'd like to see our delegation. Would you stand Western Pennsylvania delegation?

(applause)

And anybody who has helped along the places. I don't know how many of us are there, but would you stand? I don't think I can see anybody here. But anyhow, this is our last session of the General Conference; and may God bless you and thank you so much for visiting our town. And it's been a good experience to have you with us. May God bless you. Thank you.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: We know that as we have gathered here that we have been offered to General Conference in the various capacities we've been serving by family members and other places around the world. Colleagues in our churches—lay and clergy alike—who have been holding us in prayer, even as we have been reminded of circumstances of family and friends while we have been here together in Pittsburgh. We continue to be held in prayer by them this night, even as we hold them in prayer.

And as we pause for this time of prayer at the opening of this session, I want to say that I have been taught so very much by God through my three daughters. Carol and I are blessed with three daughters, and our oldest daughter

ter is one who is severely visually impaired to the point of being legally blind; and we have learned much through her about what it means to see with the eyes of the soul. And I want to share with you, therefore, a prayer that, in fact, comes from her favorite hymn, "Open My Eyes That I May See." Let us be in prayer.

(prayer)

We will, this evening, be receiving presentations related to remaining calendar items, and having some opportunities for recognition. Let me share with you that it will be my preference that the person who is trying to—trying to receive my attention that she or he might go to the microphone would be the one lifting the card and not having persons ask to defer to another speaker. I will do my best to pay attention to the house and to those who wish to have attention and would really prefer that we handle it in this manner.

Let me also indicate to you that we will have some opportunities of recognition through the course of the evening and certainly want to give thanks to God for those who have served us in this way.

I see a card here, yes, please. Mic 1.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Kevin Goodwin, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. One of the best things we've done today was the unity statement. Is it possible for the General Conference staff to post on the Web site a copy of the slide that we saw when we came in with the unity statement on it, so we would be able to download that and use it at our own annual conferences? 'Cause that's one of the best positive statements that are going to come out of this General Conference.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. I could share with you that you will receive some information about the use of that statement in just a short time, so we will respond to that request. Thank you so much.

Now as part of our recognition this evening, we do want to give thanks to God for those who have been serving

as interpreters in this General Conference, persons providing translations as well as signing. And would you join with me in thanking God for the service of these people in our midst?

(applause)

We may be standing up and sitting down much this evening, but I want us also to take a moment to recognize the business manager's staff. You know, there are so many persons who serve us behind the scenes, and we don't always have the chance to thank them in person; but we do want to acknowledge the ways in which they have been available to us and truly have been a gift to this General Conference. So for all of these persons and all others who have been behind the scenes in supporting the work of this General Conference, once again, join me in giving thanks to God for their ministry.

(applause)

Now I would like to call on David Severe, who would like to lead us in a moment of recognition and would ask him to come to mic no. 8.

Recognition of GCOM

DAVID L. SEVERE (Oklahoma): Thank you, Bishop. David Severe, Oklahoma. In keeping with our action and the concern that I raised yesterday, I would like to read the following resolution: "Whereas the General Council of Ministries came into being in the 1972 General Conference and has guided the programmatic vision of the denomination for 32 years. And whereas that vision has been given voice by United Methodist leaders, both lay and clergy, volunteers and professionals, elected from every annual conference, and dedicated staff, all of whom have made indelible impressions on the history of our church. And whereas the General Council on Ministries has been led by four servant leaders as general secretaries: Dr. Paul Church, from 1972-1976; Dr. Ned Dewire, 1976-1986; Dr. David Lundquist, 1986-2000; and Dr. Dan Church, 2000-2004. And whereas several bishops, general secre-

taries, and strong lay leaders have risen from its ranks to bless the church. And whereas the dedicated staff of GCOM has performed outstanding service to annual conferences, directors of connectional ministries, the Worldwide Advance for Christ and His Church, and many other units of the church. And whereas this General Conference by its action has decided to end this unit of the church and transfer its powers and prerogatives to a new entity. Therefore be it resolved by the 2004 General Conference that we express profound thanks and appreciation to all those who have been part of the General Council on Ministries. Those who have been its general secretaries, staff, and members, who have faithfully served the church in these last 32 years.

It's signed by myself, David Severe, from Oklahoma; Jay Brim's from Southwest Texas; Joe Whittemore, from North Georgia; Lonnie Brooks, from the Alaska Missionary Society; W.C. Wyman Jr., from the Western North Carolina Conference; David Jones, from North Georgia; and Andy Langford, from Western North Carolina; Rodney Steele, from Arkansas.

We put this before you and ask that we stand and that we appropriately acknowledge our appreciation of all those who have been a part of this unit.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. I will take your response as affirmation of the resolution and invite us into a time of prayer. Would you join me in prayer?

(prayer)

Thank you. And now I turn to our secretary, Carolyn Marshall, to provide us information and lead us in the election of members to Archives and History. Carolyn?

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Yes. Before I do that, may I report on the offering, which I promised—

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, please.

MARSHALL: Yes. Before I do that may I report on the offering which I

promised I would do at the beginning of this session. The offering for marshals and pages to date comes to \$12,200. It is a token of our appreciation but certainly does not come close to even beginning to defray the expenses that Sandra Lecur said as we were getting the figures together—just tell them it's not enough. But anyway, we are grateful to you for your expression of gratitude.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you.

Archives and History Elections

MARSHALL: Now the nominations from the Council of Bishops for the General Commission on Archives and History. Alrich Shuler and Seymoia Jamie from the Central Conferences. Neil Thrift, Florida; Ann Streete Wimberly, North Georgia; Remelus Connell, Arkansas; Danny Moss, Oklahoma; Robert Williams, New Jersey;

William King, North Carolina; Stephen Yale, California-Nevada; and Juan Carlos Mayorga., Wisconsin. Those are the nominations, Bishop.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you very much. It is my understanding these are before us for a simple yes or no vote. Nominations for Archives and History provided to the body from the Council of Bishops. We will take a moment for translation, inviting you to prepare for vote. Please vote now. We may try again. Prepare to vote. Please vote now.

There we have the results. Thank you very much. We have elected these persons to Archives and History. [*Yes, 782; No, 20; Abstain, 9*]

We will, of course, not have the opportunity to thank everyone who has been in service in this church in various capacities at the general church level, but we do want to take a moment to give our appreciation to the outgoing members of the Judicial Council and thanking them for their commitment and hard work. And these persons include John Corey, President; Rex Bevins, Vice President; Sally Curtis AsKew, Secretary; and Sally Brown

Guise. Would you join me in thanking them for their service to the church in this way?

(applause)

Thank you very much. We are soon to enter into consideration calendar items but I would like to turn to Gere Reist to lead us now in providing some information about the resolution from earlier in the day and also leading us in considering the consent calendar. Gere.

L. FITZERALD REIST: Thank you. Fitzgerald Reist, coordinator of the calendar. The transcript of the verbatim has been photocopied and many of you have received copies of those from the DCA post. We are also running photocopies even now so that they will be available for distribution, hopefully before we adjourn or to be picked up at the door on the way out if you don't already have one. It has also been posted in its entirety, not just the resolution but all of the transcript, has been posted on the web page, so that you can go to the website and download all of the conversation we had around that resolution and have that available for use in your churches on Sunday.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much.

REIST: You are welcome. If I could have the first slide please. Mary Alice, if you're out there, could you at least go to the microphone so you can make your motion for me. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes. Please mic 5.

Consent Calendar

REIST: Let me introduce first consent calendar A93 which is up there. This is the only one on that calendar is Calendar Item 540, 540.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I move approval of calendar A93, A93.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. That is before us. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 780; No, 27; Abstain, 10*]

Thank you. You have approved this consent calendar.

REIST: On Special Consent Calendar B93, Calendar Item 1430 was removed by the required number of

signatures. Calendar Item 1430 is listed up there but it is not on the Consent Calendar at this time. The only two items are Calendar Items 1436 and 1493. That is, you will be voting on Calendar Items 1436 and 1493.

MASSEY: I move the approval of special Consent Calendar B93 except the first item which they took off the screen. I don't know what the number is.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. We removed that which was 1430. Prepare to vote please. Please vote now. Thank you. You have approved this Special Consent Calendar. [*Yes, 798; No, 17; Abstain, 8*]

REIST: Special Consent Calendar C93 is correct as I shared it with you earlier in the day. That would cover the following Calendar Items. 468, 468; 543, 543; 1081, 1081; 1084, 1084; 1086, 1086; 1444, 1444; 1454, 1454; 1458, 1458; 1464, 1464; 1481, 1481; and 1489, 1489. These are before you in Consent Calendar C93.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar C93.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Special Consent Calendar C93 is before us. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. Thank you. You have approved Special Consent Calendar C93. [*Yes, 792; No, 26; Abstain, 7*] Alright. That completes these special consent calendars and we now turn to calendar items that will come before us at this time. First, to a Judicial Administration and turn to Judge Gray.

JOHN R. GRAY (Missouri): Thank you, bishop. John R. Gray, Missouri Conference. Bishop Paup, and the members of the General Conference. In compliance with the prioritization request of the Committee on Agenda in Calendar, we will present two items at this session that represent committees' consideration involving concurrence. The items will be presented by the Rev. R. Wade Paschal of the Oklahoma Conference and Daniel Ivey-Soto, Esquire, of the New Mexico Conference. On the chance that the hour grows late and time turns its back

before the remaining item, remaining one item are brought before this conference later this evening, I want to publicly thank my committee: my vice chair, Rev. Danita Anderson Wilkins; secretary Ben Bowden, Esquire; and all the hard working members of the committee. Rev. R. Wade Paschal of the Oklahoma Conference.

Complaint Procedure

R. WADE PASCHAL (Oklahoma): Our item, our agenda item is 1492, 1492 in *DCA* pages 1851-1852; you can find this petition on p. 1196 in following in your *Advanced DCA*, Petition No. is 40960. Again pages 1851 and 52 of your *DCA*, pages 1196 following in your *Advanced DCA*, Petition 40960. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

The original petition comes from the Council of Bishops. It offers further definition of language about just resolution. That language was already in the 2000 *Discipline*. To this the committee has added a timeline. The *Discipline* has allowed, allows for timely handling of complaints, without defining what timely means. Several petitions voiced this concern and ideas from these petitions are incorporated into the timeline. In addition, some of the members of our committee who participate in as lawyers and judges in the secular version of just resolution supported the idea that timelines helped push parties towards resolution. It should be noted that the timeline allows the parties to extend this time sequence if needed. The amended petition seeks to create a system that is both just and provides real resolutions.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. It is properly before us. You will note again that the committee recommends concurrence as amended. Does anyone wish to speak on this calendar item? Seeing no hands, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 802; No, 32; Abstain, 5*]

Thank you. You have sustained the committee.

DANIEL A. IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Bishop, members of the General Conference, the last item to come from the Trial Sub-committee is a transparency of church trials that will be found in your *DCA* on p. 1842, *DCA* p. 1842; Calendar Item 634. There is no amendment printed there so the text that you're looking for is in the *ADCA* on p. 1347, in your *Advance Daily Christian Advocate* p. 1347; Petition No. 41246, dealing with Paragraph 2708. Again Petition No. 41246. This is a paragraph that describes whether or not church trials will be opened or closed. Currently, the standard for the church is that these trials will be closed unless they are opened by the presiding officer of the trial, which is the bishop conducting the trial. This petition seeks to reverse that so that the church trial would be open, unless it is closed by the presiding officer, the bishop conducting the trial. It comes with a recommendation of concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. That is properly before us. Does anyone wish to speak? Yes, please. Here in the back. Mic 8.

Postpone Indefinitely

KURT G. GLASSCO (Oklahoma): Good evening, Bishop. Kurt Glassco, Oklahoma. I happen to be a member of the Judicial Committee and a member of the Trial Sub-committee, and I'd like to make a motion to postpone indefinitely. If I have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a second? I hear a second. Please go ahead.

GLASSCO: I have some concerns over this and for my fellow committee members. I want you to know that Daniel and I have discussed this before I made this objection. My first concern is over the confidential nature of issues that will come out as it relates to a pastor. There may be things that come out that shouldn't come out and be generally known about the pastor that could harm the pastor later in his—in his or her ministry. The second is, we're—we're dealing with victims or persons

that may have been victims of abuse. We may be dealing with small children. The complainant needs some confidentiality, and I think the way that the current procedure is is best suited for protecting that victim or complainant. And finally, I believe that the presiding officer is in the best position to make a determination as to whether the proceeding should be open or closed; and we should leave that to the discretion of the presiding bishop at the trial on a case by case basis.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. This is a motion to postpone indefinitely. It is debatable. I consider that, therefore, one speech for this motion. Is there one who wishes to speak against postponing indefinitely? Yes. Please, here. In the back. Come to mic 6, please.

ALVIN J. HORTON (Virginia): My name is Al Horton. I'm a clergy member of the Virginia Conference. I would urge us not to postpone this. We're living in a time when too many people see closed trials, closed sessions, as something that would cause us to wonder what's going on behind the closed doors. Our church—my local church was in—has recently had to go through a church trial of a former pastor; and it was very troubling for the church, because with a closed trial then they only heard one side of the story. And it was very hurtful for our congregation and for the individuals involved. It's time for us to see the light of day. The, the investigation process should be confidential. The trial should be open.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. We have one speech for, one speech against postponing indefinitely. Speech for? Yes, please. Right here, mic 3. Thank you.

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): Thank you, Bishop. James Ehrman, East Ohio. It's important for the body to realize that this is not what determines whether a trial will be open or closed. It has to do with the initial presumption. If a person is charged for the confidentiality of both, of things that may go on—and this may involve

abuse, it may involve, you know, the pastor and the choir director—it's easier if you start out with the presumption that the trial will be closed. And if it needs to be opened, to have someone ask to open it as opposed to the trial, the situation beginning and then having someone ask to close it and have the presiding officer decide it should be closed. That raises more questions among the community, I submit, than if it starts out closed and it remains closed. There are just some things where it's not as important for the general public to participate in the soap opera what's—of what's going on than to have a real resolution between the complainant and the person who's being charged. The families can always be there, either way, for both parties; but it's how we start out and how hard it becomes to close it if we start out with the presumption it should be open. We shouldn't postpone this.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there another speech against postponing? Yes, please, right here in front, mic no. 1.

WILLIAM S. HATCHER (South Georgia): Bill Hatcher, lay, South Georgia. Bishop, I move the suspension of the rules in order that we might vote on all that is before us.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This takes two-thirds vote. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 755; No, 90; Abstain, 4*]

Alright. Thank you. You have suspended the rules. Now by a rule, however, we give Daniel one last statement, so please...

IVEY-SOTO: Thank you. As my Brother Kurt Glassco indicated, he was on this sub-committee. I will note for the conference that the issues that he raised tonight to the conference were not issues that came up during the discussion. These are issues that I think have surfaced since this matter first came out of the committee. This is a petition that twice has been pulled off the Consent Calendar to make sure that the body would be able to consider it. And, and I, I believe it is so that those

issues that were raised could be heard by the body. Nonetheless, the position of the committee is for non-concurrence. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Now we will consider first the motion to postpone indefinitely this calendar item. Yes, please.

IVEY-SOTO: Sorry. I'm sorry. Concurrence. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you for clearing that up for us. Let's now go to postponing indefinitely; that's the motion before us. It is by majority vote. Please be ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 444; No, 401; Abstain, 7*]

Alright. You have postponed indefinitely this calendar item. Thank you very much.

GRAY: Thank you very much, Bishop. We maybe have—be back with one more item.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, we will look forward to your return. Thank you. That means we have completed all the rest of the work, and so that will be a good sign. Alright. Let's turn now to Local Church. Deborah Kieseey.

DEBORAH L. KIESEY (Iowa): Yes, I'm Deb Kieseey, chair of Local Church Committee. We have one item to present to you this evening. Our vice chair, Virgilio Vazquez-Garza, will be presenting that this evening.

VIRGILIO VAZQUEZ-GARZA (Southwest Texas): Bishop, General Conference, please turn to *DCA* p. 1852, *DCA* p. 1852; Calendar Item 1496, *Advance DCA* p. 1354, *Advance DCA* p. 1354; Petition No. 40656, Function of the Local Church. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. That matter is properly before us. Do you wish to speak on this matter?

The matter is properly before us. Do you wish to speak on this matter? Seeing no cards, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 738; No, 95; Abstain, 6*]

Thank you. You have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

KIESEY: Thank you. Those are all the items for us to present this evening.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Thank very much. We turn now to Carolyn, General Administration. Thank you, Carolyn Johnson. Welcome.

CAROLYN JOHNSON (North Indiana): Thank you. Carolyn Johnson, lay, North Indiana. Bishop and members of the conference, we have two calendar items, and these two will complete the work of General Administration. They are both constitutional amendments and I will call upon Elaine Stanovsky to bring the first one and then our chair, Ed Tomlinson, to bring the second one.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you.

ELAINE J. W. STANOVSKY (Pacific Northwest): Good evening. If you would turn to *DCA* p. 1752. 1752. That's Calendar Item 1072. 1072. This is a constitutional amendment. The petition is I'm—sorry—No. 40509 found on *ADCA* p. 894. p. 894. Petition No. 40509. You may really want to look at your *ADCA*. This adds a new sub-paragraph to Article 1, Paragraph 57. The existing language in that paragraph becomes sub-paragraph 1. The new language in bold becomes sub-paragraph 2.

The intention of this petition is in the case of a constitutional amendment if it becomes ratified by the requisite number of annual conferences, then enabling actions taken either by the General Conference or the annual conference anticipating the constitutional amendment can become effective at the time that the ratification is announced. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. You have that matter before us now. Do you wish to speak on this issue?

STANOVSKY: I should say this was a unanimous recommendation.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Alright, I see no cards. I invite you to prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 806; No, 32; Abstain, 2*]

Alright, the two thirds majority necessary has been received. You have

sustained the work of the committee. Thank you.

Inclusiveness of the Church

EDWARD K. TOMLINSON (North Georgia): Ed Tomlinson, North Georgia. p. 1848 of the *DCA*. p. 1848 of the *DCA*. Calendar Item 1466. Calendar Item 1466. Petition No. 40353. *ADCA* p. 893 and it is important that you turn to p. 893. This petition is also a constitutional amendment, and a two-thirds majority vote of the conference is required. The General Administration Legislative Committee by a vote of 55 to 6 recommended concurrence. It was voted to submit this petition to legal counsel for review. Legal counsel stated its implication may create problems as the prohibition of psychological evaluations in the Board of Ordained Ministry proceedings. Again, the committee voted concurrence without the benefit of the legal counsel. Therefore, I would move to amend by deleting the words “or mental” in the two places it appears in the petition on p. 893 of the *Advance DCA*. To help you find it, it’s in the right column, in the middle, line five and the last line of that petition.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. You bring that as an amendment. Is there a second? Alright, I hear a second. Do you wish to speak further to it, Ed?

TOMLINSON: The committee, again, did not have legal counsel’s advice at this time and it was felt that the mental condition may of detriment to us.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, again, first we are considering the amendment to remove in the two places the words “or mental.” Yes, a card here, please, mic 1.

DARREN R. CUSHMAN-WOOD (South Indiana): Darren Cushman-Wood from South Indiana. I rise to speak against this amendment on behalf of my son who has a psychiatric disorder. He has Asperger. He is bipolar and AD/HD. And yet, he is baptized, baptized by The United Methodist Church. Two years ago when he was eight years old he had to

be hospitalized in a psychiatric unit over Christmas. What got me through that was recognizing and remembering that what defines my son is not his diagnosis, but it is his baptism. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about psychiatric disorders in our society and a great deal of prejudice. I would suggest that we leave this language in here, that we submit it for legal counsel to see if it is permissible. I certainly understand the legal ramifications, and I would agree with you on that. But I think you are over reacting to things that you do not understand, and God’s grace can work through people who are mentally ill. I would suggest that if you would read Athanasias’ life of Anthony that you would probably see is great Saint of the church was probably also mentally ill. So I rise to speak against, against, this change. And let’s let the legal counsel guide us.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. Just to state that the chair considers that the opening statement of Dr. Tomlinson properly put before us this calendar item and then he moved this amendment. And then his speech on this amendment was the first speech for. We’ve now had this speech against. Yes, a card here in the middle, please. Mic 7.

*Amendment Regarding
Mental Conditions*

IVEY-SOTO: Daniel Ivey-Soto, New Mexico. I hope the conference would indulge me on a substitute amendment that will satisfy legal counsel.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, proceed.

IVEY-SOTO: The substitute amendment is to leave the first column on 893 intact. That deals with membership. In the second column that deals with leadership in the church, that we delete the word “mental” in the second place and that prior to the word “disability” we add “physical.” So the first column would stay the same, the second non-discrimination clause would read “national origin, status, physical disability, or economic condition.” If there is a second, I will very briefly speak to it.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a second? Alright, please.

IVEY-SOTO: The problem with waiting for legal counsel to weigh in is that this goes into the Constitution. So...

BISHOP PAUP: A point of order has been called for, Daniel. Yes, on three. What is the rule you are referring to and the page number, please?

KATHI AUSTIN MAHLE (Minnesota): Bishop, if you will look at—Kathi Austin Mahle, Minnesota—the petition that we’re working on is 40353. It is in the second column, not the first petition that goes from column 1 to column 2.

BISHOP PAUP: Let me return to mic 7. Which petition were you referring to?

IVEY-SOTO: Bishop, apparently this is the second time today I have done that. I was actually—the locations are the same. It’s just I had the wrong paragraph location on the page. So in the first set of bold words that would stay the same, at the bottom of that paragraph it would read “ethnicity, gender, physical disability, or economic condition?”

BISHOP PAUP: We’re going to treat this as an amendment to the amendment rather than as a substitute. Does someone wish to speak against? Yes, please, here. Mic 3. Did you finish your statement, Daniel?

IVEY-SOTO: I had not.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Pause just a moment to left me invite him to finish his statement.

IVEY-SOTO: The brother who spoke about his son is absolutely correct, and our church needs to be open in its membership and baptism, to all persons, regardless of their situation, including mental situations. However, in the second part, where it talks about the structure in terms of constituent bodies of the church, there we need to have certain protections. I can tell you as the chair of my District Committee on Ordained Ministry, that having mental evaluations is extremely important

in terms of the candidates that we receive. This should be in there; the “physical” will clarify that that’s the kind of disability we’re talking about there. In the first place, this is completely appropriate to have “mental.” Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Now before you leave the microphone, I’m going to consider that to be the first speech for, please read this text for us so that we can all follow with you what this will now say.

IVEY-SOTO: Yes, Sir.

BISHOP PAUP: ...mic, I’m going to consider that to be the first speech for, but would you please read this text for us so that we can all follow with you what this will now say.

DANIEL A. IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Yes, sir. The first part of the paragraph stays the same. At the bottom of the paragraph, it would say, “For any constituent body of the church, because of race, color, ethnicity, gender, national origin, status, physical disability, or economic condition.”

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, this is before us. Is there a speech against? Yes, back here please. Mic 6.

RON BRETSCHE (North Central New York): Thank you, Bishop. Ron Bretsch, North Central New York. Is it in order to refer, Bishop?

BISHOP PAUP: Let me have you hold that just a moment since I had earlier recognized another speaker. Let me return to that person, and then I’ll return to you, please.

BRETSCHE: Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Yes, mic 4.

MARY ELIZABETH MOORE (California-Pacific): Bishop Paup, I may be trying to do the same thing that my brother is. Mary Elizabeth Moore, California-Pacific. I’m prepared to make a speech against the amendment, but I appreciated what our brother from the UK did the other night when he referred this back to a committee for 30 minutes of consultation. I believe that both of these amendments are inadequate

for what is being raised. And I would like some opportunity for the committee to ponder this and bring something back that has some more thought to it. Is that possible to do?

TOMLINSON: Bishop, we have the advice of general counsel, and we stand by that.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, we’ll receive your motion if you choose to make it. He is indicating that they have had advice of legal counsel and that’s why it was brought with the amendment at the beginning. But if you wish to make a motion to refer, we can try that.

MOORE: Let me, instead, please... I can’t make another amendment, can I?

BISHOP PAUP: Not at this point. We have two amendments before us. You have spoken on this matter now. I could receive this as a speech against, and we could go to another speaker.

MOORE: May I make my one minute speech against, then?

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, please.

MOORE: Thank you. I think the inadequacy of the present amendment is represented by the fact... Let me represent my daughter, who has a serious learning disability, and who is capable of leadership in many dimensions of the church. The last sentence needs a great deal of work if we’re going to make it adequate. I agree with the spirit of this statement, but the last sentence sets us up for many complications.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Yes, now, mic no. 6.

Refer to Connectional Table

BRETSCHE: Thank you, Bishop. I move to refer this to the Connectional Table. And if I may, I will speak to it.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Please, the motion to refer. Is there a second? I hear a second, please? This motion to refer to the Connectional Table. Yes, do you wish to speak? Mic 6.

BRETSCHE: Thank you. This item is embedded in our Constitution for good reason. It is frequently cited as reason

for defining the inclusivity of our church, including persons with mental conditions as worded here. With all due respect to legal counsel that was consulted today, I would prefer that the legal counsel of the Connectional Table, which would enable the present General Board of Church and Society and the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry to meet and, in a more timely fashion, resolve this very profound definition that is in the Constitution. This is not just another petition.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. We have a speech, therefore, in favor of referring this to the Connectional Table—that is the entire calendar item. Yes, please, in the far back, a speech against? Mic 8.

BENTON R. HEISLER (West Michigan): Benton Heisler from West Michigan. Ed, also the material that people are reading in their *DCA* is the way it is printed in the present *Discipline*. This was an article, a constitutional article, that was amended at the last General Conference. So that’s another piece of information that the body should have, which our committee dealt with at that time. So the language that you have in your *Discipline* is different than that actual language of the Constitution that was passed in Cleveland. That doesn’t help things, it just confuses it more.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. I will... do you wish that to be considered information or a speech for referral?

HEISLER: Speech in favor of referral.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, we’ve had two speeches in favor of referral. We are prepared to receive speeches against. Yes, please. Here, mic 1.

JOE M. WHITTEMORE (North Georgia): Joe Whittemore, North Georgia. I would like to speak against referral because it seems to me that this... the Connectional Table, is a table of working together between the agencies. And it seems to me that we don’t want to start out referring things

like this to the Connectional Table, which really do not fit into the ideas that we had in the legislative committee with regard to the Connectional Table. So I would speak against referral.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. We have room for one more speech against. Yes, please. Back here, mic 5.

TERRELL SESSUMS (Florida Conference): Mr. Chairman, I understand and share brother Whittemore's feelings about referring to this Connectional Table, but it needs to be referred some place or laid on the table. As a lawyer who has worked with people with a variety of mental illnesses, the term here is completely unqualified. It covers people with paranoid schizophrenia, with severe delusional difficulties or mentally incompetent, all the way down to somebody with transitory depression. By not having this in the *Discipline*, does not require us to discriminate against cases where you have a very benign, transitory mental illness or one that is not a problem, but it does permit some discretion in those extreme cases. And I would agree with the church's general counsel: This is a very hazardous proposal that needs to be thought through. The American Association of Psychiatry has a listing of dozens and dozens of mental disabilities; some are no problem, some are major problems that would plague our church. So I would... I'd like to offer a substitute motion that this calendar item be laid upon the table.

BISHOP PAUP: Sorry, at this point, we cannot have a motion now after your speech. However, for the record, would you please state your name and conference?

SESSUMS: Yes, sir. I'm sorry. I'm Terrell Sessums, a lay delegate from the Florida Conference.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. We've had total number of speeches. Is this an inquiry or point of order? Mic 7.

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Bishop, Jay Brim, Southwest Texas. I'll move to table this motion.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, that motion is in order. Is there a second? Alright,

this is not debatable. Majority vote. Prepare to vote, please. Please vote now. [*Yes, 681; No, 187; Abstain, 4*]

Alright, you have moved to table this calendar item.

TOMLINSON: Bishop, this concludes the work of General Administration. I want to express gratitude to Carolyn Johnson, our vice chairperson; to Mary Brooke Casad, our secretary; the officers of each of the four subcommittees committee; and to the wonderful ninety-seven members of General Administration.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Let's turn now to Independent Commissions.

DENNIS L. BLACKWELL (Greater New Jersey): Thank you, Bishop. Dennis Blackwell from the Greater New Jersey Conference, clergy delegate. We're pleased tonight to present our last petition, and Gil Hanke, the subcommittee chairperson will give the presentation.

*Annual Conference Archives
and History*

GIL C. HANKE (Texas): Gil Hanke, lay delegate from the Texas Conference. If you would turn in your *DCA*, please, to p. 1756, 1756; Calendar Item 1112. It is Petition No. 40121, and that complete petition is found on p. 1300 in the *DCA*. This is a... the title of this is, "Clarify, Intent, and Language." If you remember, what seems like a month ago, I was up here, and we had an issue that came from Archives and History in which we went from... to less permissive language where we deal with Archives and History on a judicial—excuse me, on a jurisdictional level—this does exactly the same thing except at the level of the annual conference. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. That's before us. Does anyone wish to speak? Yes, please. Here in the back, mic 5.

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Jim Harnish, Florida. Brothers and sisters, I would speak against the deletion of this

language that provides options for annual conferences to...

BISHOP EDWARD PAUP: Alright, thank you, that's before us. Does anyone wish to speak, yes please? There in the back mic 5.

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Jim Harnish, Florida. Brothers and sisters I would speak against the deletion of this language that provides options for annual conferences to meet this important need in a variety of ways. Across the past several General Conferences there have been several ways in which annual conferences have been permitted to organize themselves around their mission and their ministry. It seems that to move back to a very narrow definition of how that work is done is clearly in my mind moving in the wrong direction. I would encourage you to move—to vote against concurrence in this matter, Thank you

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, Thank you. Is there a speech for? Yes, please mic 5.

CAROL A. GASTON (Virginia): Bishop, Carol Gaston, Virginia Conference, lay delegate. I was in this committee and the discussion that went forth on this particular petition. The reason it was sent forth and they asked to take the structure, they said these other structures just were not working, and they felt that need to be a more narrow definition on how they wanted to put the archives together.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you, another speech against? Yes, please, here mic 2.

CARL L. SCHENCK (Missouri): Thank you bishop I'm Carl Schenck, from the Missouri Conference and I would speak against the committees recommendation of concurrence. You know my favorite and most beloved programs and ministries of the church are so important that they should be mandated. But of course yours are of lesser importance and don't need to be mandated. What we have here is an effort to that will inevitable start us down a road of each group putting their particular interest as a mandated structure back in the *Discipline* and undo the

freedom and the liberty to be creative which we've given to annual conferences. I hope you will oppose the committee's recommendation of concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, Gil do you have a final statement?

HANKE: Just that this does come to us from archives in history and has been stated their reason for putting it in is not because it's their favorite but because apparently in their viewpoint it's not working with the current language. We would ask you to vote with the committee for non-concurrence. Excuse me, I'm sorry I got confused, I'm tired. We would you ask that you would vote with the committee on concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: On concurrence, alright. So the committee's recommendation is concurrence. I invite you now to prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 511; No, 345; Abstain, 4*].

Thank you have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

HANKE: Thank you and that completes the work of our task force and of our committee.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. Let us turn now to Discipleship.

Conference Scouting Coordinator

JEFFREY E. GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Paup, delegates to the General Conference, Jeff Greenway, Discipleship Committee, chairperson. We have two items for your consideration this evening. The first will be presented by Arthur Jones and is related to the conference scouting coordinator

ARTHUR JONES (North Texas): Bishop Paup, members of the 2004 General Conference. Please turn in your *DCA* to p.1747, that's 1-7-4-7, Calendar Item. 1027, Petition No.40316, its in your *Advance DCA* p.476. This petition is requesting that the conference scouting coordinator, a position which already exists, be placed on the Conference Board of

Laity. We believe that scouting is a place of real growth in our local church ministries and so we recommend concurrence. I would like to point out this is permissive language, only a recommendation, therefore, bishop, we move concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. You've heard the report. Is there a speech against? Alright, seeing no cards please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 640; No, 215; Abstain, 3*]

Thank you, you have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

Holy Communion Study

GREENWAY: Our second item is going to be presented by Gene Fitch-Justice, a lay person from the Minnesota Conference, and it is related to the study on Holy Communion entitled "This Holy Mystery."

GENE FITCH-JUSTICE (Minnesota): Bishop Paup and delegates. This is item currently in your *DCA* on p. 2102, this is the third time it's been lifted so it has appeared a few other pages as well. It is Calendar Item 702, if you want to see the text you need to turn to p. 1709, in your *DCA*, 1709. Petition No. 40879, and to complicate things even a little bit more, it appeared in the *Advance DCA* on p. 500. The two pages you need are 500 and 1709. "This Holy Mystery, a United Methodist understanding of Holy Communion" is the subject of this petition. It is the recommendation of 97 voting members of the Discipleship Legislative Committee, unanimously, that we concur as amended.

General Conference in 1988 authorized a study committee to formulate a theological and functional understanding of the sacrament of baptism in the United Methodist tradition. We received that substantial study document in 1996 and adopted it for study and reflection. At General Conference 2000, we continued on this sacramental journey, by authorizing a similar study on Holy Communion. Over the course of the past quadrennium groups all

across our connection have been in conversation about the history, theology and practice of communion. The General Board of Discipleship, General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, General Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-religious concerns, and the Council of Bishops have worked together diligently to complete this task. This Resolution, No. 40879, calls for the adoption of the report of the Holy Communion Study Committee which is entitled "This Holy Mystery, a United Methodist understanding of Communion". Our legislative sub-committee on the sacraments and our full legislative committee worked together to perfect this petition and the study report. We bring it to you for approval. Our group included persons from all around the world-wide connection. We agreed that our conferences and local congregations need this study and will benefit greatly from its use as a guide for study and reflection. "This Holy Mystery" is not a policy setting document, but rather is an interruptive document which comprehensively presents historical and practical understandings of Holy Communion in the Wesleyan tradition. On behalf of the Discipleship Legislative Committee, I move concurrence as amended.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, that motion is properly before us. Does someone wish to speak against? Yes, please, here in the middle mic 2.

VICKI M. BRENDLER (Greater New Jersey): Hello Bishop, Vicki Miller-Brendler, Greater New Jersey. I would like to make an amendment by deletion, if that's appropriate at this time.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, let's hear where that will be please.

Delete Section on Table Servants

BRENDLER: I would move to delete the section of the document entitled "Servants of the Table" found on the *DCA* pp. 1717-1719. If I have a second I'll speak to it.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a second. I hear a second, please.

BRENDLER: I really appreciate the time, thought, and care that has gone into this study and I affirm the historic and theological underpinnings of the document. It's really an important step in defining and regularizing our sacramental ministry. But the study raises some questions that I believe that we need to keep open in a process of spiritual discernment. Number one, the document states Wesley insisted that there could be no sacramental ministry without ordination, which was amended by the legislative committee to add "as elder," yet we have licensed local pastors, some with little training, who are eligible for sacramental ministry while we have ordained deacons with master degrees, as in theology and often other professional degrees, that are not permitted to celebrate the sacrament. These clergy have been through the rigors of interviews and paperwork as well as spiritual honing as they've prepared for the hands of a bishop to ordain them. Our deacons, who comprise of about 2 percent of all clergy, mostly women, have a clear call of servant ministry that bridges the church and the world.

BISHOP PAUP: Please prepare to sum up.

BRENDLER: Two, the document says that Holy Communion is a means of grace and deacons are out on the front lines of evangelism and chaplaincy, classroom, outreach ministry and youth and young adult ministries. And third, we have the only Christian denomination that has an ordained order that does not have sacrament and ordination.

BISHOP PAUP: We need to ask you to close now. We ask again to be clear for the body your amending by deleting the section that begins with "servants at the table" on p. 1717? Correct? And continues on until about just short of halfway down the first column on p. 1719? Is that correct?

BRENDLER: That's correct. We, we approved a study of orders...

BISHOP PAUP: I'm, I'm sorry. We, we've heard your speech. We must ask now for someone who would like speak against this amendment. Here in the far back, please, mic 6. I'm sorry. Mic 6. Yes, please.

CLARENCE R. BROWN (Virginia): Bishop, Clarence Brown, Virginia Conference, clergy. In our subcommittee, the understanding was that we were speaking to the historic understanding. In Wesley's time there were no deacons of full connection, and, hence, that reference was put in.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there a speech for this amendment to delete? I see no other cards. Yes? Please, back here in the back. Mic 7.

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): David Banks, North Carolina Conference. I rise simply to correct some information. There are other denominations that have an order of deacons who do not celebrate the sacraments. That includes the Episcopal Church. That includes the Lutheran Church. That includes the Roman Catholic Church. That includes the various communions of the Orthodox churches.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is additional information for us. Let me again invite a speaker here. Yes, please. Mic 6.

SKY LOWE-MCCRACKEN (Memphis): Bishop Paup, this is Sky Lowe-McCracken, clergy delegate, Memphis Conference. I speak against the amendment. I'm not in favor of beginning to amend a document that has undergone a significant study and been perfected through holy conferencing and listening posts throughout the United Methodist connection both in the United States and abroad. We have had—we will have four years to live with this document. I suggest that we live with it for a while and see how it fits. This study will help us reclaim our Wesleyan emphasis on the sacraments as outward and visible signs of the grace of Jesus Christ. I am pleased that this study is taking place, and I would pray that our church reclaim our sacra-

mental and evangelical emphasis; and in doing so, we may find unity at the table where we all come to receive the crucified and risen Christ and commune with all the saints.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there another speech for? Alright. We may turn now for response here at the podium.

JEAN FITCH JUSTICE (Minnesota): I believe that part of what is being deleted speaks specifically to the issue which has been raised on p. 1718, the paragraph that begins right in the middle of the first column. Under the terms of *The Book of Discipline*, several groups of people are authorized to preside at Eucharist in the charges to which they are appointed. These include associate member deacons, deacons ordained under the provisions of the 1992 *Book of Discipline*, licensed local pastors, and commission ministers licensed for pastoral ministry. I would restate that this is an interpretive document, not a policy-setting document. If we wish to make changes to the *Discipline* on who may preside at Communion in whatever setting that needs to be done in a disciplinary section. This is a resolution, which is interpretive. I would oppose the amendment on behalf of the committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. We have this amendment to delete, these sections in pp. 1717-1719 under "Servants at the Table." Please prepare to vote on the amendment. Please vote now. [*Yes, 126; No, 734; Abstain, 10*]

You do not support this amendment to delete. Yes, please? Here in the far back, mic 7.

Questions on Study

LOUISE R. OTT (Detroit): Louise Ott, Detroit. Question for clarification? First column, p. 1710, the second complete paragraph, about the middle, underneath the bold words. In parentheses, it reads, "Sometimes erroneously called corporeal presence or consubstantiation." If someone could answer my question, why is calling it consubstantiation erroneous?

JUSTICE: I can speak to that. In this section, we are—the study is presenting the positions of other denominations; and some of the persons whom we consulted were persons from those other denominations. In this case, the Lutherans—the ELCA—they took exception to how we were defining their tradition's understanding of Holy Communion; and we believe that it was only reasonable that since we are describing their understanding, we would use their words. These are the words that the Lutherans preferred that we use to describe their understanding of Communion. They do not understand their position to be consubstantiation or corporeal presence. They don't.

OTT: Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. That was inquiry. Yes? Speech against the motion? A question? Yes, please. Mic 3.

PHILIP J. CLARK (New England): P. J. Clark, New England Conference. Just a question to the committee. On p. 1718, in the middle of the page, you've added the words, "including the roles of those assisting;" and I just have a question about how the committee is thinking that this would happen. Is this gonna be—include acolytes? Is it gonna include everyone who participates in Communion? Is it gonna be one of those meetings that happens right before worship when we find the people to fill in for the people who aren't there to serve Communion? I just wanted some clarification on that.

JUSTICE: We did not get to the level of detail that you are talking about. We think this statement stands as it is written, that whenever persons are going to participate in a service of Holy Communion, it will be the responsibility of the presiding elders or others to see that those persons are trained. And we did discuss the very question of who would do the training. It may be lay people in some congregations who would do the training. It may be deacons. It may be Sunday school teachers. But, ultimately, there is a

responsibility to see that persons who are assisting in this service know what to do and how to do it properly.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Is this a speech against? Mic 1.

DAVID B. WILSON (Arkansas): David Wilson, Arkansas. I move we suspend the rules and vote on what is before us.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I've heard a second. This is a motion that requires two-thirds vote. Please prepare to vote. If you would choose to stop debate, you will vote yes. Please vote now. [*Yes, 830; No, 28; Abstain, 3*]

Alright. Thank you. You have chosen to stop debate. Do you have a final statement, however?

JUSTICE: This study is a very important tool to help us understand better Holy Communion, one of our sacraments; and so, on behalf of the committee, I would ask that you support concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Again, this is concurrence as amended. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 822; No, 39; Abstain, 4*]

Alright. Thank you. You have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

(applause)

JEFFREY GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Paup, that completes the legislative work of the Discipleship Committee, but we have one matter that has come unanimously from the committee, requesting a moment of privilege that we might recognize Dr. Ed. Phillips, who was the chair of the Holy Communion Study Committee, so that he might be able to speak a word to us of the significant moment in the life of the church is not lost and is a part of the record.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes. Is the body accepting of this moment of personal privilege to receive him. Thank you. Yes, please.

(applause)

Reflection by Study Committee

L. EDWARD PHILLIPS: Dear Brothers and Sisters. The 19 members of the Holy Communion Study Committee have included two active bishops, three general secretaries; the committee is ethnically diverse and two are from the Central Conferences. Five members of the committee are lay persons, one is a licensed local pastor, one member comes from the Youth Council of the church. It has been my privilege to serve as chair of this dedicated committee. While the document has truly been the work of the entire committee, Dr. Gayle Felton has been the primary writer and editor of our work, and I would ask her now to speak very briefly about the content of the document. Gayle.

GAYLE C. FELTON: There are, of course, many things that we could say about the document and much of the content that we would like to share with you. Those of you have been at my—in my classes know that I could go on, on these subjects, forever. But in view of the circumstances of the evening let me just raise what to me is the most powerful point in the entire document. And that is the emphasis upon the reality, that when we come to the table of the Lord and receive Holy Communion, we are not simply remembering something that Jesus did for us 2000 years ago. Oh, there is that element, yes. But it is by no means limited to that.

When we come to the table and commune with other Christians and with Jesus Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit, we are encountering and experiencing something that is happening then and there. It is not an exercise in recall. It is a—an experience of spiritual revitalization and spiritual nourishment as we continue on our journey of faith. And I believe that when United Methodist Christians come to the experience of that reality, there won't be any problem with our encouraging pastors to offer communion every Sunday morning. People will be demanding it. Thank you.

(*applause*)

PHILLIPS: Bishop, I've worn a coat and tie every day of this conference waiting for this report to come up. The shirt I wear this evening is a gift from United Methodists in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Katanga Region, a gift I received while I was in Lubumbashi on behalf of the Holy Communion Study.

To me, this is a sign of the diversity but essential unity of our church. In our ritual we pray: "Pour out your holy spirit on us gathered here, and on these gifts of bread and wine. Make them be for us the body and blood of Christ that we may be for the world the body of Christ, redeemed by his blood. By your spirit make us one with Christ, one with each other, and one in ministry to all the world."

Every time United Methodists pray our ritual of Holy Communion, we boldly ask God to do these things, to make us the body of Christ. While not always in these precise words, and certainly in many different languages, we ask God to let us receive into our bodies the resurrected body of our Lord, Jesus Christ. We ask that we may be Jesus' body for a world that does not know its Maker, its true Lord, its reason for being. In union with Jesus we offer our bodies, ours, as a living sacrifice. We relinquish our ideologies, our enthrallment to the world, our fear, and our loyalty to any ultimate claim except to be the body of Jesus Christ.

It is my prayer that United Methodists would witness with our lives what we pray in our services of Holy Communion until Christ comes in final victory, and Brothers and Sisters, we all feast together, at the Heavenly Banquet. Thank you very much.

(*applause*)

GREENWAY: Friends, on behalf of the Discipleship Legislative Committee, it has been a joy to be servants among you and this completes our work. Thank you very much.

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, please, mic. 4.

EBEN NHIWATIWA (East Zimbabwe): Thank you, Bishop. Eben Nhiwatima from Zimbabwe East Annual Conference. When we saw Dr. Phillips come to Africa University, Zimbabwe, to conduct this study, we said, "Hallelujah" because our church is beginning to show signs of global integrity. However, in the process, I asked him whether there was any person from Central Africa within the committee making this study. I remember his answer was there was none because it was not within his rights to—because I put him at a corner. I said, "Why?" He said, well, he didn't know the authorities who made up the committee. Actually, we made very good friends; and we are still very good friends with Dr. Phillips there. This is nothing critical on him.

I want to say just, bishop, that if we are going to have a global church, it means opening up; it means opening the windows and the doors and all the things and everything. It means integrating. It doesn't mean that when we are at the General Conference then we begin to say we had Central Africa in this committee when the study's been done. Holy Communion has a lot of significance among the African people because it is symbolic. We have a lot to contribute into it. But if you come to get data instead of involving us in the process of shaping this study—I think we are now capable. You are reaping the fruits of the missionaries. We are the product of the missionaries. I think we should be happy that we are now capable, we have capable leaders in Africa and beyond who can effectively participate in this study. In the future committees, trust us to make studies for our church. Don't forget the Central African countries. Thank you very much.

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much. Thank you for that challenge. Alright. Let us now turn to the Church and Society Legislative Committee.

JESSICA MOFFAT (Oklahoma):

Greetings to you. This evening, presenting our petition, include subcommittee chairs and participants Lynette Fields, Vicki Woods, Thomas White Wolf Fassett, Beverly Wilkes, James Swanson, Mark Webb, and JoAnn Fukumoto.

LYNETTE FIELDS (Florida): Good evening, bishop, delegates. My name is Lynette Fields from the Florida Conference, and I have two petitions to present to you. If you would turn to *DCA*, p. 1930, 1930, Calendar Item 1438, Advance *DCA* p. 179, Petition 40575. Advance *DCA* p. 179, Petition 40575. You may also look want to look at the Social Creed in it entirety—this is just an excerpt—and it's on p. 122 of your *Book of Discipline*, Paragraph 166. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. The amendment would be to put a period after "all persons" and delete the remaining words.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is before us. The recommendation, concurrence as amended. Is there a speech against this recommendation? (*pause*) Seeing no hands, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 733; No, 96; Abstain, 10*]

Thank you. You have sustained the committee's recommendation.

Coordinating Legislative Advocacy

FIELDS: The second petition is in your *DCA*, p. 1846, that's 1846; Calendar Item 1434; Advance *DCA*, p. 181, Petition No. 40469. Petition No. 40469. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. The amendment adds the words "that receive general church funds" at the end of this paragraph. The rationale for the paragraph is this language allows for coordination of the advocacy work of the United Methodist Church.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. That is before us. Concurrence as amended is the recommendation. Yes, please, mic. 8.

MARY BALDRIDGE (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, Mary Baldrige from the Baltimore-Washington Conference. I rise to propose a motion

to amend by deleting the words “and coordinate” from the petition.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I hear a second. Yes, please proceed.

BALDRIDGE: There are many general agencies which need to engage in public-policy advocacy in Washington, D.C. There is value in the diversity of interests and expertise which exist within the various agencies. It would vastly enhance the work of The United Methodist Church to have the General Board of Church and Society facilitate the advocacy work in Washington, D.C. Having the General Board of Church Society take on also the coordinating function would add a potentially heavy demand on this staff which is already been reduced in the last several years.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. You’ve heard this amendment. Is there a speech against the amendment by deletion? Yes, please here, mic 1.

JOHN EDGAR (West Ohio): John Edgar, West Ohio. The hour’s late; I think we’re all tired, but it seems to me, it’s kind of hard to facilitate something if you are not also empowered to coordinate it. And the real reason I stand is I think this is a good motion without being amended by deletion. It’s simply an invitation for one of our major boards to do a fundamental work on our behalf. We need to believe we can work together. We’ve got to stop being afraid that one agency is going to somehow harm or have to be controlled by another. If we want the General Board of Church and Society to facilitate what we’re up to, it might be nice if they’re allowed to coordinate it at the same time. So I’m against the amendment.

BISHOP PAUP: I know that we have only had one speech for, one against. But are you prepared to move ahead? I see a hand. Yes, mic 5.

BILL COONS (Texas): Bishop, I think the objectionable part—I’m Bill Coons from Texas Conference—the objectionable part is, it says the board “shall” facilitate and coordinate legislative advocacy activities, which

means if an agency doesn’t want the board to do that, they would have to go through the board and let them do it. There’s a difference between “may” and “shall,” so I would offer another amendment to amend the amendment that would say the board “may.”

BISHOP PAUP: Let’s, let me ask you to come back to that moment after we handle this matter to delete. Any other one, any other speeches on this matter? Let me ask you if you wish to make a statement about this amendment to delete the words “and coordinate”.

FIELDS: I think the main purpose as was as stated already is that this will help for efficiency and effectiveness to be able to have the board that’s on Capitol Hill be able to do the advocacy work of the social principles in our church.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, the amendment again is to delete the words “and coordinate”. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. Alright. The amendment is not supported. [*Yes, 267; No, 588; Abstain, 9*]

Does anyone wish to speak? Yes. Mic 5.

Changing “Shall” to “May”

COONS: I would like to—Bill Coons, Texas Conference—I’d like to propose an amendment that would change the word “shall” to “may.” And for the reasons I’ve already stated that this way any agency that wants to go and facilitate their own activities can do so, but they can still use the good offices of the Board and Church and Society if they desire.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there? I heard a second. Is there a speech against? Yes, please, right here in the middle. Mic 3.

WILLIAM M. CAMPBELL (New England): Bishop, I’m not sure I can speak over the fireworks, but I’ll do my best. Scott Campbell from New England. I believe that the gentleman has misunderstood the context in which the word “shall” is used. This is to describe the function, the work of the

agency, to give it its assignment as it were. There’s nothing in it that says it shall exclusively coordinate or exclude other persons who are interested in having a word in Washington. It’s, it’s simply to assign a duty to the Board of Church and Society.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there someone who wishes to speak for this amendment? Yes, please in the far back. Mic 7

ANNA WORKMAN (North Carolina): Anna Workman of the North Carolina Conference. Bishop, I just rise to say, to me “shall” means “shall.” “May” means that they can do it if they are invited to or if there’s a collaborative effort. But it really concerns me in our tradition to vote something like this and say “shall.”

BISHOP PAUP: Let me be clear on your points.

WORKMAN: My point is, it’s responding to the last gentleman when he said we were misunderstanding the “shall.” I think it’s dangerous to leave something open-ended if we vote shall, then that says to me that the Board of Church and Society will be doing the advocacy work for all of the agencies. If we vote nay, then that opens the door for collaboration between Church and Society in using the influence they have on Capitol Hill, but it doesn’t preclude any other general agency from doing their own advocacy work where appropriate.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I’m declaring that a speech in favor of this amendment.

WORKMAN: It is. I’m sorry.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. We have room for one speech against. The far back, yes, please, mic 8. I’m sorry; I was recognizing Carolyn. Yes, mic 8.

CAROLYN JOHNSON (North Indiana): Thank you, Bishop. Carolyn Johnson, lay, North Indiana. I think it’s interesting for us to use “may” in some settings but not with our general agencies. When we talk about accountability, when you say “shall,” that lists the expectations for which we will hold the

agencies accountable. "May" says "yes, you may do it," but it also says "you may decide not to do it." And I do not believe you can lead your program right with that kind of permissiveness. The "shall" also means that it is the beginning to invite others to do it. It does not preclude any other agency from participating in the legislative process.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. We've had our speeches now. Do you wish to speak on this amendment?

FIELDS: I think the fireworks speak for this subcommittee.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. I'm sure that the historians will love this portion of the record. The amendment is to change the word "shall" to "may." If you choose to do that, you will of course vote "yes"; if you do not, you will vote "no." This is an amendment to change "shall" to "may." Prepare to vote. Please vote now. Alright. The amendment is not supported. We are back to the main motion. [*Yes, 247; No, 586; Abstain, 7*]

I see a hand. Yes, mic 4; mic 4, please.

Concern About Opposing Agencies

KARL BAUMGARDNER (Northwest Texas): Karl Baumgardner, Northwest Texas Annual Conference. I have a problem with the petition with the word "shall" still in it because, if you recall a couple of years ago, when the U.S. Supreme Court was considering the Boy Scouts' policy towards homosexuals, the General Commission on United Methodist Men...

BISHOP PAUP: May I ask, may I ask you, just, just a moment? You're speaking now against the entire calendar item? Is that correct?

BUMGARDNER: Yes, I thought that's what we were...

BISHOP PAUP: Since we've already handled the matter of the "may" or the "shall." Correct? Alright.

BUMGARDNER: United Methodist Men presented an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of the

Boy Scouts. The General Board of Church and Society presented a brief against the Boy Scouts. And so in that particular instance, there was a conflict within, between two of our general boards and agencies. With the word "shall" in there, I believe that that leaves the door wide open for the General Board of Church and Society to take it upon themselves to facilitate and coordinate all our agencies even though there might be a conflict, and so I would speak against the entire petition.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. We've had a speech for by the presenter, this speech against. Yes, please, over here in the far side. Mic 8.

TOM WOGAMAN (Oregon-Idaho): Tom Wogaman of the Oregon-Idaho Conference. I'm speaking for the motion.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, please.

WOGAMAN: The word "coordinate" covers a lot of territory. It does not, it is not a control verb. It can be as little as actually scheduling meetings, or determining, trying to avoid the kind of situation just described by the last speaker. That is two United Methodist agencies going at the same office, from opposite sides. At least, let them know that they are each in the picture. I think it helps the efficiency of, and the strength of our own message if we know what each other are doing. It does not, this motion would not as I understand it, give the Board of Church and Society the power to control or to limit lobbying by anybody but simply try to control the approach from the church as a whole.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. We have room for a speech against. Yes, card here please. Yes, right here. (*pause*) Yes, yes, thank you, mic 6.

ELLEN PEETE (Memphis): Ellen Peete, Memphis Conference. Bishop, is a motion to suspend the rules and vote on all before us appropriate at this time?

BISHOP PAUP: May I ask you to stand just a little closer to the mic? Thank you.

PEETE: Ellen Peete, Memphis Conference. And I want to know if it's appropriate for us to suspend the rules and vote on all that is before us.

BISHOP PAUP: We are at the point of the last statement against. We may not need this. If anyone does not choose to speak, we'll proceed. Yes, we are entitled to two speeches against. Let me ask you if you have a speech against and then we'll move to conclusion. Yes, mic 6.

JAMES A. SIZEMORE (Virginia): Bishop, Jim Sizemore, from the Virginia Conference, lay delegate. I rise to ask a question. Is it too late to offer an amendment?

(*laughter*)

BISHOP PAUP: No, it's never too late. It is getting late.

Remove Facilitation

SIZEMORE: I would simply offer the amendment that, in the first sentence, strike the words, "facilitate and." If I get a second, I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a second? Alright, you're—again, for the body's sake, you are amending to remove the words, "facilitate and," so that it would read, "The board shall coordinate...."?

SIZEMORE: Yes, that's correct.

BISHOP PAUP: And you're having a point of order, you need to state the rule and the page that you're referring to, or is this a question?

SIZEMORE: I rose to make an amendment,

BISHOP PAUP: You (*unintelligible*)

SIZEMORE: but by (*unintelligible*) order...

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: The body needs to understand that the host committee did try to coordinate the end of the General Conference with these fireworks, and I'm sorry that it has already been proceeded with. So, we'll pause, just for a moment, to make sure there are no ending aftershocks.

Alright, now, if you will stay at mic 6, we have an inquiry or point of order at mic 3.

JEANNIE TREVINO-TEDDLIE (Central Texas): Jeannie Trevino-Teddle, Central Texas Conference. The speaker, right before this one, asked to suspend the rules and we did not proceed with that.

BISHOP PAUP: That's correct, because at this point we had the rules in effect and the chair made the decision we were close to the end, which the chair may not have wanted to make, now that he's been looking back on it. And so, what I'm going to do is suggest we proceed with what this gentleman wishes to do and he'll be ready to turn to the woman, again, very soon. Alright, now we've had your motion. Did you wish to speak any further to it?

SIZEMORE: Yes, I did, bishop.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, please.

SIZEMORE: Very simply, I was a member of that committee and it seemed to me in our discussions, the most concern we had was about the coordination of the emphasis of the different boards and agencies.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you very much. Now I'm going to return to the woman who had been at the mic before him, do you still wish to speak to us? (*laughter*) Mic No. 6.

PEETE: Ellen Peete, Memphis Conference. I would move that we would suspend the rules and vote on all that is before us. (*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: That is in order. Now this requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules and then move ahead to consider what is before us. So you're first voting on whether or not you wish to suspend the rules. If you will suspend the rules to stop debate and prepare to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 790; No, 40; Abstain, 1*] Alright, the result is surprising. Let's proceed. (*laughter*) You have suspended the rules. Let's proceed now to the amendment, to the amendment. No, I knew that. OK, the amendment is to delete "facilitate and."

If you support that amendment, you will vote "yes," if you do not, vote "no." Please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 264; No, 553; Abstain, 12*] The amendment is not supported. No final statement, we're moving ahead now to vote. Prepare to vote on this recommendation, concurrence as amended. Please vote now. [*Yes, 651; No, 188; Abstain, 5*] Thank you, you have sustained the committee.

FIELDS: Thank you, very much.

VICKI L. WOODS (New England): Bishop and delegates, I long for the day we run in to hear Church and Society, instead of run out. I invite you to turn to your *DCA* on p. 1846. I'm sorry; it's p. 1847, Calendar Item 1451, p. 279 of your *ADCA*, 279 and Petition No. 40853. The subject is "Critical Issues on Alcohol." The committee votes concurrence, with amendment.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, that is now properly before us. Does anyone wish to speak on this matter? I see no cards. I will call, therefore, for the vote. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 766; No, 64; Abstain, 7*] Alright, thank you. You have sustained the committee.

Rights of All Persons

THOM WHITE WOLF FASSETT (North Central New York): Good evening, I'm Tom Fassett from North Central New York, annual conference clergy. Bishop Paup, sister and brother delegates, if you will join me in examining *DCA* p. 1930, Calendar Item 1439, Petition No. 40589. And if you'd like to keep track of the worksheets, on the *ADCA* page, it is p. No. 200. This is in entitled, "The Rights of All Persons." The recommendation comes to you for concurrence with amendments, and let me, if I may, trace the journey of the recommendations for amendment.

In the first place, we delete the entire first paragraph, beginning with "A portion of the world's population..." And we replace it with the following: "Around the world, political and religious institutions have targeted different persons for reasons of race, gender,

ethnicity, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability, for discrimination in housing, employment, health care, and access to redress for such discrimination."

And we've also made the following changes, and I'll read them in their context. "It is particularly disturbing when religious values are used to justify, as a foundation for persecution or select groups of people. Christians proclaim that all people are created by God, deserving the protection of their human and civil rights." And then we are recommending certain changes, in point No. 5 as follows: "5. To advocate for initiatives which provide that crimes which are expressly committed for the purpose of harming someone, based solely on their race, ethnicity, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender, or disability, be classified as 'hate crimes'."

And we continue with the "therefore be it resolved..." with a change in the term "sexuality," converting it to "diversity." The rationale I would suggest is for clarity of language and a broadening of issues of inclusiveness.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. You will note this is a recommendation for concurrence as amended. Yes, card here, please. In the middle, mic 3.

BISHOP EDWARD P. PAUP: This is a recommendation for concurrence as amended. Yes, card here, please, in the middle. Mic no. 3.

DIXIE K. BREWSTER (Kansas West): Dixie Brewster, Kansas West. And I would like to make a motion to amend the last paragraph.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Please.

BREWSTER: In the last paragraph, the second line from the bottom, after the words "civil rights of," I would like to replace the remaining of the sentence with "all persons."

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there second? Alright. There is. Yes, please. So you—

BREWSTER: The rational is to include the rights of all persons so that it would be in line with the other language throughout the resolution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This amendment then replaces the words “gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender persons” with the words “all persons.” Is there a speech against this amendment? (*pause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I see no card. Yeah, yes, I do, now, please, in the back, mic no. 7.

CAROL K. LOEB (Southwest Texas): Carol Loeb, Southwest Texas Conference. And I merely have a question so I can understand on the last column, starting with “around the world.”

BISHOP PAUP: Excuse me, does this relate to this amendment that is before us now?

LOEB: No, sorry.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. We’ll come back to you. Yes, please, here, mic 8.

FRANK E. TROTTER JR. (Baltimore-Washington): I’d like to suggest maybe a friendly amendment and suggest that the last language would read “protecting the human and civil rights of all those who are targets of hate crimes.” That’s a little bit different than “all persons” because the nature of this No. 5 is to address the issue of hate crimes— those are targets of hate crimes. And, so “all persons” is a lot broader than just those who are targets of hate crimes.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Do you wish to move that as an amendment to the amendment?

TROTTER: I would.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. To that—is before us, is there a second? Do you wish to speak any further to that?

TROTTER: No sir, I would not.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, is there a speech against this amendment? Yes, please here, mic 2.

CARL L. SCHENCK (Missouri): I believe all the various issues are before us, I would move to suspend the rules

and to vote on all that’s before us.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Do I hear a second? This is before us. If you suspend the rules by two-thirds vote, debate is now stopped on all that is before us. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 782; No, 74; Abstain, 2*] Alright. You wish to stop debate. I’m going to ask that the maker of the amendment to the amendment would return to the microphone. I’m not sure we have the text here on the platform yet, so if you would just state that one more time for us.

TROTTER: Starting the third line from the bottom of the second paragraph, it would read, “of protecting the human and civil rights of all persons who are targets of hate crimes.”

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Dr. Fassett, you wish to speak?

FASSETT: I believe that that certainly captures the spirit of the intent and demonstrates that there is no part of all that we do not understand.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This amendment is before us. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 675; No, 186; Abstain, 7*]

Alright, you have supported this amendment, now if you will keep in mind that the other amendment was “all persons,” this has now been added to “all persons”; and so if you support this amendment now, it will replace the language that came from the committee. This amendment is before us, prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 696; No, 168; Abstain, 5*]

Alright. You have amended the work of the committee, but their Calendar Item is now before us as they amended it; and now the body has amended it. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 759; No, 105; Abstain, 4*]

Alright, thank you. You have adopted this as amended.

Before we move on, what about five minutes? Would you like five minutes? Let’s try a five-minute break, please. Thank you very much.

(*break*)

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you for your cooperation in making this break such a short one, but let’s take our places now. Alright, please let’s take our seats.

Yes? I see your hand. If you would move to mic 4, and let me take just a moment to make sure that we can have the house in order. I’ve called someone else, please. Let’s take your seats, please. I see your card, but I have called on someone else for the moment. Please take your seats; and if you could quietly return to your seats, we will let the person at mic 4 proceed. Mic no. 4.

Procedural Questions

MARVIN D. ARNPRIESTER (Iowa): Marvin Arnpriester, clergy, Iowa Annual Conference. Bishop, in the interest of time, and because of the way we’ve been moving this evening, I would like to try a motion to move that the legislative items that are still to come before us be approved en masse because we trust our committee work.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is going to be a suspension of our rules and will require two-thirds vote, but I’m also going to give you just a moment to be seated, prepare for this action. Alright. This is a suspension of rules. Would you state again your motion, please.

ARNPRIESTER: To suspend the rules so that we can act en masse on the legislative items still before us and prove them en masse together.

BISHOP PAUP: Now you need to understand this is not a debatable motion. Alright. Question. Mic no. 1.

SHANE L. BISHOP: Bishop, Shane Bishop, Illinois Great Rivers Annual Conference. I was just inquiring as to how many petitions we might still have in front of us before we vote on this.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Let’s receive an answer to that question please. (*pause*) We know, according to this word, that we have approximately ten action items that are concurred with by committee. The number of non-concurrence, we know we have a lot of those. [*laughter*] Alright. Now the motion—is this a point of order ques-

tion? It's not—we're not debating this, so unless this is a question, it will not be in order. Alright. This is a motion to suspend the rules. Two-thirds vote is required, and you are accepting the work of the committee. Is this a question? Yes, please, mic 4.

TODD BRISTOW (North Texas): Bishop, my name is Todd Bristow from the North Texas Conference. And there was an item that I requested pulled off the calendar because of the constitutional amendment, and the work that was done by the committee was based off the information in the *Discipline*. And it's not correct; so if we approve all the items, we—it'll be in error.

BISHOP PAUP: We will pull that one as it relates to the constitution.

BRISTOW: Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Other questions? Yes? Here in the front row. Mic 4.

BETH CAPEN (New York): Beth Capen, New York Conference. I, likewise, have a question. In the event that the conference has already voted against a committee petition and, thus, retained the disciplinary language as it now exists here at this session of General Conference, and if subsequently someone has lifted from the Consent Calendar a petition which would change the language, what—where would that leave us? This General Conference has already voted to retain language in one of the paragraphs and voted against the committee's concurrence as amended.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. It is our interpretation that if it is lifted and has not been voted upon, it would die under this action. In the far back, yes? Mic no. 7. Now these need to be questions because we are on a non-debatable motion to suspend the rules.

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): David Banks, North Carolina Conference. There is one problem with this, Bishop. There is a petition to join a boycott, but the material with regard to the boycott has serious gaps with regard to what's required

in *The Book of Resolutions*. It doesn't name who will supervise the process. It doesn't name how it can be terminated.

BISHOP PAUP: I'm sorry, but you're beginning to debate this matter rather than—

BANKS: I'm trying to give information to indicate that if we join a boycott without having followed our own standards—can we lift this? Maybe I ought to say can we lift 1432—

BISHOP PAUP: No. No, I'm sorry. That will not be possible. Yes? Far back over here. Back further, please. No, behind you, sir. Thank you. Mic 5.

EUNICE I. MUSA (Nigeria): Thank you, Bishop. Eunice Musa, clergy delegate from Nigeria. I am not going to give a motion or anything, but I just want to use this opportunity because I know you're being giving a good commendation about different kinds of persons, and I want to use this opportunity to appreciate the dynamic leadership of our bishops. They presided very well during the 2004 General Conference with patience and love, accommodating all kinds of opinions and our behaviors. It is because of your leadership that united the church this morning to the glory of God, and I want to—

BISHOP PAUP: May I—

MUSA: —and I want to tell you, sir—

BISHOP PAUP: Excuse me. Excuse me. I really thank you for that sentiment, but I would ask you to hold that if you will; and we'll come back to that, because I really want to honor the fact that we need to proceed to vote on this motion to suspend the rules. So I will come back to you. Please? Thank you. Yes, here please.

WILLIAM C. SMALLWOOD (Mississippi): Bill Smallwood, from Mississippi.

Is it in order to offer a substitute motion?

BISHOP PAUP: No, I'm sorry. Thank you. In the far back are these all questions? I'm about to call for the vote and you can determine as a house whether or not you want to continue

the series of questions, mic 6.

KENNETH H. CARTER JR. (Western North Carolina): Thank you bishop. Ken Carter, Western North Carolina Conference. As we proceed toward resolution of and perhaps at some point to be able to vote on this. I wonder if those who have spoken at least five times during the General Conference will restrain themselves and allow others to speak.

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, I'm going to proceed. We need to vote. You have moved to suspend the rules. This is the last question, right here, mic 1. Please let's proceed, be prepared to vote after this.

CHRIS E. STEINER (West Ohio): Chris Steiner, West Ohio, lay delegate. Parliamentary question.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes.

STEINER: If we vote on the motion to suspend the rules, will we then have an opportunity to debate the motion to handle all the petitions in mass.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes. Alright you're voting now to suspend the rules for this purpose. Two-third's majority is required. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 566; No, 26; Abstain, 2*]

Alright you have supported this motion. Now this motion before us is debatable and amendable. Yes, here mic 1.

JOE KILPATRICK (North Georgia): Bishop I would like to amend the motion so that we—a substitution so that we vote in mass on all those which the committee has recommended non-concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright this amendment is for those where the committee has recommended non-concurrence, non-concurrency only. Is there one who wished to speak against this motion to amend? Alright, I see no one. This motion is to, in mass, vote on all those matters where the committee has voted non-concurrence. If you agree with this amendment you will vote "yes" if you do not agree with this amendment vote

“no”. Prepare to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 707; No, 123; Abstain, 6*].

Alright, now you have approved the amendment and that means that this matter is now before us where you are creating an omnibus action to vote in agreement with the committee when they have voted non-concurrence, on all matters that would have yet been before us this night. That’s were we are, if you agree now with this main motion prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 745; No, 77; Abstain, 9*].

Alright you have accepted this action now we return to presentations from committees where concurrence is the recommendation. Does this relate to this matter before us, mic 1.

Reduce Number of Speeches

HANNS-ULRICH MEISEL (Germany East): Ulrich Meisel, Germany East. Is it allowed to make a motion to limit the discussion for one in favor and one against, only.

BISHOP PAUP: It is something you can move. It does suspend our rules so it will require 2/3 majority vote. Do you wish to move it?

MEISEL: So I first make a motion to suspend the rules and then the second motion you have already—

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, That’s correct. So stay there with us for a moment. Is there a second? Alright, motion is to suspend the rules and then we will return to the change he wishes to make. If you support the suspension of rules you will vote “yes” if you do not, vote “no”. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 728; No, 105; Abstain, 1*] Alright, you have agreed to suspend the rules now the motion is—

MEISEL: My motion is to limit this discussion for one speech in favor and one speech against.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright that is what’s before us. Alright, yes, is there a speech against this, here in the middle please, mic 2.

VICKI M. BRENDLER (Greater New Jersey): Bishop Vicki Miller-Brendler, Greater New Jersey, I’d like

to amend the amendment to have those speeches be one minute in length.

BISHOP PAUP: I’ll come back to you in just a moment. This is amend this action by making the speeches of one each one minute, is there a second. Does anyone wish to speak on the one minute speech? Yes, please over here mic 5. Let me ask as your coming do you want to speak any further in favor of this than what you have just done to place it before us? Thank you that was a good response. Alright, mic 5.

EWING WERLEIN JR. (Texas): Ewing Werlein, Texas Conference. I know it’s late and we’re tired and most of you are younger than I am, now, but I think that we have been elected to come here to do a job and I believe that we should at least consider these ten petitions that were made and two speeches for a couple of minutes each is not too many. We should be deliberative and thoughtful in our procedure, and I would ask us not to rush so because we’re so anxious to leave that we do not give proper attention to the important business of the conference that we have come to attend to.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you is there a speech in favor of the one minute. Alright, I’m going to put that to the body. This amendment to the amendment would limit the speech to 1 minute in length. If you support the amendment you will vote “yes,” if you do not, vote “no”. Please prepare to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 476; No, 354 ; Abstain, 3*] Alright, you have supported the speeches to be one minute. Now the maker of the amendment; I had not, in fact, given you opportunity to speak any further to it. Do you wish to on the one speech for and one speech against? Mic 1, did you wish to speak any further on that.

MEISEL: I need no minute. Our committees have prepared their reports with a lot of work and I think we can go forward.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, is there a speech against? Yes back here mic 7.

CAROL W. GOEHRING (North Carolina): Bishops and members of the

conference, I’m Carol Goehring, North Carolina Conference, to limit this to one speech each side is unjust it disenfranchises many and we don’t know for sure which petitions yet are before us. I appose this motion.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, is there anyone who wishes to speak in favor of this amendment. Alright are you ready to vote? Understand that we are now with the amendment, which has been amended to one minute. You will change your number of speeches from two unto one with this action. Prepare to vote, please vote now [*Yes, 467; No, 372; Abstain, 4*]

Alright, you have accepted this action and we will proceed now with one speech for one against one minute each, thank you.

Mt. Olive Pickle Boycott

JOANN Y. FUKUMOTO (California-Pacific): Aloha Bishop, Aloha. I am Joann Fukomoto, from California-Pacific Annual Conference from the Hawaii district. I call your attention to *DCA* p.1844, 1844, Petition No.41073, 41073, “Boycott Mt. Olive Pickle,” found in your *ADCA* p.288, 288. Our committee recommends concurrence. Rational: this boycott is on solid ground with our social principals. It is supported by workers right to collective bargaining, support migrant workers and cooperation responsibility for workers suppliers and vendors. This is found in the *Discipline* under our Social Principals No.163, p.113, 115, and 116. Bishop, our committee recommends concurrence with amendments.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright the recommendation is concurrence as amended. We are now under your rule of one speech for and one against. I will take one speech for.

BISHOP PAUP: Now the recommendation is concurrence as amended. We are now under your rule of one speech for, one speech against. I will take one speech for. In the far back. Yes, please. Mic 7.

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): Bishop, David Banks, North

Carolina Conference. I move to postpone this indefinitely, and I will be glad to explain why.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there a second? Alright, yes, please.

BANKS: One minute is not enough time to explain the ways in which we have abridged the process that is given in the *Book of Resolutions* which Paragraph 702.5 says we ought to follow. But let me read one: "The gathered information and data are to be written and distributed to the decision-making body." I have not had the data written nor distributed to me. That's one way in which the process is abridged.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a speech against postponing indefinitely? Yes, please here in the middle. Mic 7. Yes, please.

CHARLOTTE A. ABRAM (Nebraska): Charlotte Abram, Nebraska Annual Conference. We have been working on this petition since I was on the Board of Church and Society in 1999. The General Board of Church and Society has satisfied all the guidelines for initiating a boycott. It is printed in a guideline we received here, and I would move that we would vote against postponing.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, we've had our speeches. Closing word?

FUKUMOTO: I was just going to say that the General Board of Church and Society has been working on it for five years, and they've made, I believe, two visitations to North Carolina of which one of them I personally went to. And so we have had much debate on it. And now the General Board of Church and Society is supporting the boycott.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, it is before us now. This is majority vote. Prepare to vote. Postpone indefinitely is the action you're voting on. Please vote now. [*Yes, 382; No, 460; Abstain, 7*] Alright, you have not supported that request. Now back to a speech for. Yes, here, right here, please. Yes. Mic 3.

JULIUS C. TRIMBLE (East Ohio): Julius Trimble, East Ohio Conference.

I rise to speak in favor of the action of the committee. If we might join the boycott against Mt. Olive. Martin Luther King Jr. said that progress does not role in on the wheels of inevitability. My grandfather said that thinking people can always find a reason not to do what is right.

TRIMBLE: It didn't take the action of a General Conference or even a one-minute speech to end segregated buses in Montgomery, Alabama, My grandparents and parents lived through that. It took the action of Christians who were willing to join a boycott. This was a request from the working poor for good news from this General Conference. If we join this boycott because all requirements have been met, this will be good news to the poor.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you very much. Yes, back here, please. Mic 8. Is this is a speech? Against? Is this a speech against? Alright, let's hear your point of order. I need to know the rule and the page number.

WILLIAM T. MCCLENDON (South Carolina): Bishop Paup, Tim McClendon, South Carolina. I think it is not a page number, rule number are given rules that we just adopted one speech for and one speech against. And I think that I've heard three speeches for the boycott and only one speech barely from the friend from North Carolina.

BISHOP PAUP: We were dealing, Tim, on the motion to postpone indefinitely. We've now come back to the main motion. That's why we have the one, now just for. We're ready for one against. Yes, please. Back here, mic 5. Yes, please back here. Statement against? No, I'm sorry, Sir. The other gentleman. Yes. Mic 5.

THOMAS R. WUSSOW (North Texas): Thank you, thank you, Bishop. Tom Wussow, North Texas Conference. This is not a social justice issue. It's a union organization issue, and I am not speaking to the worthiness of that or vice versa. But the union, the federal, the farm laborers' organization needs to go work this farm by farm and

not hold Mt. Olive hostage. Mt. Olive is a reputable company. They've acted responsibly in this matter, and it is my understanding that the North Carolina Conference has not endorsed this boycott and it's in their home territory. Mt. Olive is located in a small northeastern North Carolina community. Several United Methodist churches. They employ 500 people, many of which are minority and many of which are United Methodists, including the president of the company. Can you imagine what they think about the value of the connection?

BISHOP PAUP: Please sum up.

WUSSOW: I have lived personally in a community that suffered a boycott. I was exposed to it, and many innocent people are—there's discord and injury and people losing their jobs.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you. Thank you.

WUSSOW: I would recommend against.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you, yes. For the committee?

FUKUMOTO: May I remind you that our social principles support collective bargaining which means they worker can choose whoever they want to represent them. And corporation responsibility for workers, suppliers, and vendors. May I also remind you that the General Conference here this week passed the Taco Bell boycott with no debate. There is no difference between these two boycotts. Some would have you believe this is a secondary boycott when they know this type of boycott does not apply to farm workers. This three-way agreement boycott is the same as the Campbell's boycott of the 80s that The United Methodist Church supported.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

FUKUMOTO: Farm workers have come to the Board of Church and Society because they know that our Social Principles support all workers. Farm workers feed America. Farm workers bring the food

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, alright.

FUKUMOTO: to our table.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you, thank you. Now, we are ready to vote. Pardon? Alright, please, mic 7.

JOHN HARRELL (Baltimore-Washington): My name is John Harrell. I'm a youth lay delegate from the Baltimore-Washington Conference. Question for clarification. My question is this, Committee: Where is the Messiah in this resolution?

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I'm going to have to ask you to return to your seat. We're going to take a vote on this now. Alright is this a point of clarification? Yes, please.

CHARLES D. WHITE, JR. (Western North Carolina). I thank the Chair—my name is Denny White from Western North Carolina—My question, Sir, is to the committee in the hopes that they will know the answer to this: By what majority in the Board of Church and Society was this petition sent to this body? In other words, what was the vote in the Board of Church and Society that proposed this?

BISHOP PAUP: We're—this is not part of our consideration now. We're prepared to vote. The recommendation of the committee is concurrence as amended. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [Yes, 446; No, 391; Abstain, 16]

Alright, you have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Beverly Wilkes, Illinois Great Rivers Conference. I would call our attention to *DCA* p. 1926. *DCA* p. 1926. Calendar Item 1512. Petition No. 40994. Petition No. 40994. In your *ADCA* p. 284, p. 284. The recommendation of our committee on subject support for Religious Coalition for Reproduction Choice is concurrence. Rationale: The United Methodist Church has been (was indeed a founder) of this organization. It has continued to be in ministry to provide families with choices as it relates to

their reproductive rights as well as to work with HIV/AIDS ministry in specifically South Africa.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. The recommendation is concurrence. We have room for a speech for, one against. Yes, here, please. For? Mic No. 1.

LYN A. POWELL (North Georgia): Thank you, Bishop. Lyn Powell, North Georgia. This is a speech against.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

POWELL: The Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, according to its literature, is an advocacy group for the pro-choice side of the abortion debate. Their position is in conflict with a more balanced position of *The Book of Discipline*. The RCRC supports abortion at any time, including abortion as a means of birth control and/or gender selection. The RCRC supported partial-birth abortion in a recent press release, even though The United Methodist Church opposes partial-birth abortion.

BISHOP PAUP: Please sum up.

POWELL: Understand that the RCRC allows each denomination the right to determine their own position, but I do believe by inference that membership in this organization casts a shadow on the clarity of our statement—

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

POWELL: —in *The Book of Discipline*. I urge the body to vote no—

BISHOP PAUP: Thank—alright. Thank you.

POWELL: —on this concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes, here please. Mic no. 4. Is this a speech for?

CAPEN: It's in regard to Rule 9; and in that regard, it would also be a speech for, Bishop. Unless there has been a change, it is my understanding that the coalition does not do or advocate for anything which is inconsistent with that which we as United Methodists—since we are a significant contributor—have in our Social Principles. It is also my understanding that because of that, after our last General Conference, the

coalition conformed to their advocacy to that which we had passed. And I do want to clear up this misinformation. It is true that, consistent with our Social Principles, it does—the coalition does advocate for free choice—for choice; and there are many of us who—

BISHOP PAUP: Please sum up.

CAPEN: Thank you, Bishop. There are many of us who hope that that continues so that we don't return to the desperate situations that existed prior to *Roe v. Wade*.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Yes, please?

WILKES: Yes. While there are those who would think that Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice is a one-agenda coalition, indeed it is not. It is a coalition that supports the rights of all persons to have access to a wide range of reproductive health services, including sexuality education, family planning services. It also assists with HIV education and prevention, specifically in South Africa. It trains pastors how to be good listeners and counselors to those persons who may be struggling with life issues as it relates to reproductive choice. I would urge you to support the decision of the committee of concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. That is now before us. The committee is recommending concurrence. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [Yes, 480; No, 350; Abstain, 17] Alright., You have sustained the recommendation of the committee. Next item, please?

Tobacco Regulation

WILKES: I would call the house's attention to *DCA* p. 1622, *DCA* p. 1622; Calendar Item 260, Calendar Item, 260; Petition 41029. And I believe that would be on your *ADCA* p. 291. It is entitled, "Tobacco Resolution." Our committee—there were 88 persons voting. The committee voted concurrence, 88 for, 0 against. We would ask the house to support the committee's recommendation of concurrence on this tobacco resolution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Yes? Up here, please, mic no. 5.

JIM M. WELCH (Texas): Bishop, Jim Welch from Texas. I want to ask the chair a favor. If we could reverse the order—since we've shortened the number of speeches, we follow the pattern where there are two speeches against at the end of things. I wonder if we could begin with the speech against, then for, and then go back to the presenter. I think it would be more equitable, Bishop.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I'll accept that. The chair was believing that it might help you to have a speech for, then one against, and then the committee statement for. And that's the way I've been interpreting the way we would go back and forth, but we'll do the best we can to follow a process of some kind. Alright. Here, mic no. 1. We'll try to make certain that we give you a chance across the body, as many as we can perhaps, get into these debates with this rule; but I know it's difficult. Yes, please, mic 1.

DONALD R. AVERY (Louisiana): Donald Avery, clergy, Louisiana. This petition was removed on advice of general council from GCEA that our doing this would have an effect upon our tax exempt status; and for that reason, I speak against it.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Yes. Now we're ready for a speech for. Right here in the middle. Just a moment, just a moment, Tom. Let me take this speech here. Yes, sir? Mic no. 2. Speech for.

VINCENT WALKUP (Tennessee): Vin Walkup, Tennessee. I'd like to make an amendment.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

WALKUP: If you'll turn in your Advance *DCA* to p. 287, where you will find the resolution. I move that the paragraph "be it further resolved," etcetera be deleted from the resolution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I hear a second. Now let me be clear. From the "therefore be it resolved" the rest of the—

WALKUP: No, no. "Be it further

resolved."

BISHOP PAUP: Oh. "Be it further resolved."

WALKUP: The very last paragraph—

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

WALKUP: —in the resolution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Do you wish to speak to this?

WALKUP: Just simply to say that's the portion that raises the question about our status. Remove it. I think the resolution—

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

WALKUP: —would be OK.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a speech against this amendment? Alright. Committee?

WILKES: We would urge that the house would consider supporting the committee in that this paragraph was a part of that, and our committee did indeed vote that, 88-0. And so we would not favor the amendment and ask that the house would vote that amendment down.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. The amendment is to remove that final paragraph. That is before us. If you will support the amendment, you will vote yes. If you do not, vote no. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 555; No, 268; Abstain, 12*] Alright. You do support the amendment, removing that final paragraph.

We're back to the motion as amended. Yes, please. Mic 6. Is this a speech for?

FASSETT: Bishop, Thom Fasset, North Central New York. This is a—of reference to Rule No. 9, *DCA* p. 1538, a matter of information. I tried to get your attention to clarify this before the last vote. I just voted for the resolution; and I—or rather *against* the amendment, therefore, I can't call for reconsideration. But this is the information. The Board of Church and Society and people working in Washington must have this information, and this is what it is.

It has (*unintelligible*) statement

regarding the United States Internal Revenue Service, regarding liability of churches to lobby, as they sometimes call it, and still maintain their tax exempt status. According to attorneys in Washington, the firm of Kaplan and Drysdale—specialists, non-profit law of churches—are free to "lobby" as long as no substantial part of their activities are directed toward propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. What is "substantial"? IRS rulings have found that a group that spent up to five percent of its financial and other resources lobbying—that is advocacy of executive offices of government is not counted—have not crossed the line; but that a group that spent between 16 and 20 percent of its resources—

BISHOP PAUP: OK. Please—

FASSETT: (*unintelligible*)

BISHOP PAUP: —please sum up. Thank you. Now is there a speech for this item as amended? Alright. Seeing no cards, any further statement?

WILKES: Again, the committee would urge that you would adopt this. This simply allows the church to inform its constituency about the importance of our politicians participating in helping us be a healthier people. Furthermore, I would encourage the house to not be intimidated about state versus church. The issue is that the state is not to be in the church's business. The church has a mandate, I believe, from God to be busy in the state's business; and I would encourage you to please, on behalf of all of those who find themselves addicted as early as age 14 to tobacco products, support this on their behalf. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there a question? Mic 6.

SHARON L. BASSETT (North Central New York): Sharon Bassett, North Central New York Conference. I'd like to ask for reconsideration of the vote on the amendment. I had vote for it without the information previously stated.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. There's a second to that motion to reconsider. Yes? Is this a speech against reconsidering? Alright. Mic 7.

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Jay Brim, Southwest Texas, lay delegate. I would point out that from Rev. Fassett's information, he pointed out for us that if it would seek to influence legislation, it would be illegal. Our difficulty here is this is revealing the names of congressmen, and it's very easy to interpret this particular portion of this resolution as being an attempt to influence their votes. That's the why the GCFA legal council is recommending against this.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Now we're on the motion to reconsider, and that is to reconsider the amendment. If you support the reconsidering, you will vote yes. If you do not, you will vote no. Prepare to vote.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, now, we're on the motion to reconsider, and that is, to reconsider the amendment. If support the reconsidering, you will vote yes; if you do not, you will vote no. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 305; No, 520; Abstain, 8*]

Alright, you are not reconsidering. The calendar item is now before us as amended with the deletion and revised paragraph. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 663; No, 153; Abstain, 110*]

Alright, this item is approved as amended. Next matter.

UN Treaties

JAMES E. SWANSON (South Georgia): Bishop, James Swanson, a member of South Georgia Annual Conference. I would call your attention to *DCA* p. 1847, 1847, Calendar Item, 1449, Calendar Item 1449. You can find this in your *ADCA* at p. 1109, 1109; Petition No. 40530. The name of the petition is "UN Treaties." The legislative committee on Church and Society voted by a margin of 62 for and 16 against to concur to with this particular amendment—this particular petition, rather, resolution. And I would urge the body to support us by voting in

favor of concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Yes, speech here, mic 4.

KARL BAUMGARDNER (Northwest Texas): Karl Baumgardner, Northwest Texas Conference. Even though I'm from Texas, I'll try to speak fast. I speak against. This has twenty-four UN treaties contained in it; and I asked in the committee meeting if anybody could tell me what any of those things said and nobody could answer my question. One of them that I know about is SEDAW. Its implementation is through judicial imperialism. A committee of twenty-three, UN-appointed women determines whether a nation is in compliance with the treaty, including whether the laws of the country align with the treaty. In that particular treaty, they have criticized the country of Slovenia because less than 30 percent of children under 3 years of age were in formal daycare.

BISHOP PAUP: Please sum up.

BAUMGARDNER: They also criticized several countries because they don't legalize prostitution. The international criminal court does not provide due process.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you.

BAUMGARDNER: Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. We have room for a speech for. Yes, all the way over here. Mic 5. Speech for?

LELAND A. MCKEOWN (Florida): Bishop, I'm sorry I was so slow, but I'm the last one in the house over there. Thank you for finding me.

BISHOP PAUP: Well, we're glad you're still here.

MCKEOWN: Leland McKeown from Florida. I'll do my braggin' rights.

BISHOP PAUP: But you're using your time...

MCKEOWN: I know it. I want to make a motion to postpone indefinitely. We do not have time. This is too complex an issue; we just don't have time tonight to deal with this issue. And I would err on the side of inaction rather than to err on the side of action. I've

been baptized 75 years, and a member of the same church for 66 years. Everybody's been bragging about that.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, we have a motion to postpone indefinitely. This is debatable. And we've had the one speech in favor; we need now to offer one speech against. Yes, please. Right here in the middle. Mic 1.

HANNS-ULRICH MEISEL (Germany East): Ulrich Meisel, Germany East. Bishop, I speak against...to the motion to postpone it. Because we are a global church, United Nations treaties and cooperation on the international field are very involved for all the social issues. They also help all of the smaller churches in our countries in the fields—in many fields—also in the field of religious freedom. It is important to bring this matter forward.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, committee.

SWANSON: Bishop, I would just call your attention to p. 1110 in your *ADCA*, the second paragraph that begins with the sentence, "sovereign nations need to have a place and a forum for agreements and disagreements can be commonly discussed and addressed." I would also call your attention to the fact that many of these treaties have been around as long as 51 years. They have been signed by our presidents—all the way from Dwight Eisenhower to Bill Clinton—and yet, our Senate has not ratified them. And I would not doubt the wisdom of our presidents.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, we have a motion to postpone indefinitely. That is what is before us. Prepare to vote. If you will postpone indefinitely, you will want to vote yes; if you do not want to postpone indefinitely, vote no. Please vote now. [*Yes, 423; No, 400; Abstain 12*]

You have postponed indefinitely this calendar item. Next matter, please.... Yes, mic 8.

BRIAN J. WITWER (North Indiana): Bishop, Brian Witwer, North Indiana. Point of information, please. Could you tell how many more we have to go?

BISHOP PAUP: We're told approximately six.

MOFFATT: We have no more items for concurrence; however, we do have two more items for referral. But we would prefer that the other committees have a chance to go on their concurrence items. And then we'll bring our last three or four items to you later.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you very much. Next committee, please.

(pause)

Thanking the Presiders

Alright, before we do this committee statement, I'm going to return to our delegate who was speaking earlier about... I believe it was about presiding officers, and I interrupted her speech. I would invite you to come back and to make that statement if you would wish. Mic 5, please.

EUNICE MUSA (NIGERIA): Thank you, Bishop. As I have said earlier, I said you have commended the effort of different kinds of chairpersons of different committees, and different leaders within this General Conference. And it is now time for us to look unto you, and on behalf of the delegates of the 2004 General Conference, we want to appreciate the effort of all our Bishops for the dynamic leadership you have shown during this General Conference. Because you are able to accommodate our behaviors and our insults, and that have taught some of us that this is our first General Conference to know how to love and to accommodate each other. And to be of open heart, open mind, and open doors to one another. And if this body would support what I'm saying at this moment, I would very much appreciate that all of us should stand up and give applause to our bishops for their dynamic leadership. Thank you.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much.

MARY WHITE (Eastern Pennsylvania): Bishop, delegates, and guests of General Conference. I'm Mary White, lay, from Eastern Pennsylvania Conference, and vice chair of Conference Committee. I'm privileged and honored to present to you tonight, our first presenter, Rev. Norman Coleman.

Amendments to Paragraph 31

NORMAN H. COLEMAN III (West Ohio): If you would turn in your *DCA* to p. 1745, Calendar Item 1011, Petition No. 40411; found in your *ADCA* p. 309. The committee voted concurrence as amended. And Bishop, if I may, I'd like to invite Bill Barney to come to offer an amendment.

BILL BARNEY (Troy): Bishop, if I could explain, this is a Constitutional amendment, and on Paragraph 31 of the *Discipline*. Our committee voted two different resolutions regarding this constitutional amendment, and so, therefore, we would like to combine them into one to help the ratification process. So if you'd keep your finger where Norman sent you in that part of the *DCA*, and turn to p. 1637, 1637; Item 464, 464; Resolution 4136, 4136. I would like to move that we amend the item on the floor with these words from this action item. Amend by the following—and this would be a second paragraph after the one that was just introduced: "Central conferences may decide, by two-third majority vote, upon adjustments deviating from the previous paragraph regarding voting rights or matters of ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy." And I'm not sure if you need a second coming from the committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, let me ask on that—is it an individual motion or coming from committee?

BARNEY: This is from the committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, then we will not need a second.

BARNEY: OK. And I'm not sure if you need a second coming from a committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Let me ask on that. Is this an individual motion or coming from committees?

BARNEY: This is from committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Then we will not need a second.

BARNEY: OK. It's our request that we combine these two items for purposes of passing this constitutional amendment as one item.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. If you can understand then, the work that committee is doing, we are considering this last amendment first. Whether or not you wish to include it in calendar item, therefore 1011. Yes, please, mic 7.

Refer to GBHEM

DENNY WHITE (Western North Carolina): I thank the chair. I'm Denny White from West North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the conference, I believe if my records are correct we referred Calendar 1429 which has substantively to do with this same issue to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry as a part of the study they will be doing. In light of that, sir, I move that this entire matter now presented be similarly referred.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is before us. I've heard the second. Did you wish to speak any further to that?

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Speech against. Mic 6.

HANS-WILHELM HERMANN (Germany North): I would prefer to speak in German.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

HERMANN: The brother who made a motion for deferral, I refer to Page 1843 in *DCA*. That's Item 1429. And that concerns another article and that's Article 33. This WAS referred to the Board of Higher Education and Ministry. But here we are talking about Article 31. And I would like to talk about Paragraph 2 which (*intelligible*) mention the amendment that he mentioned. And if this is not in order then I would like to wait for a moment.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. In fact we granted the extra time for translation.

But the time is up. And so I will declare that we've had the speech for the amendment and... Were you speaking against referral?

HERMANN: I was against referral because this was not matching the actual article because it's a different article.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Now we've had the speech for, speech against. Let me turn to the committee.

NORMAN COLEMAN (West Ohio): This particular matter is a different issue than granting voting rights to probationary members, local pastors, associate members, and so on for delegates to General and Jurisdictional conferences. This issue here has to do with the Board of Ordained Ministry and I would like to strongly urge you to vote in favor of this constitutional amendment.

There were 69 for, two against, and three abstentions here. So we're not trying to offer voting rights at this time. And with regards to our brother from Germany, they are looking to have a way in the central conferences and in his conference where they do not have local pastors. They may need to deviate from our *Discipline* to make things work well. I would encourage you to vote yes.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is a motion for referral. Yes, is this a question? Mic 7.

WHITE: I thank the chair. I'm Denny White still, from Western North Carolina still. I would, the question is, granted the that paragraphs are different but could the chair of the committee please enlighten me, sir, as to how it can be construed that this paragraph has nothing to do with voting rights when in point of fact that is exactly what it has to do with.

COLEMAN: I believe we said it had, didn't have to do with voting rights for Jurisdictional and General Conference delegates. It does have to do with voting rights for part of that paragraph with regards to the Conference Board of Ordained Ministry and that's why we would encourage voting no against referral.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Your motion before you is to refer this. Are you prepared to vote? Please vote now. Alright, you have voted to refer these items. [*Yes, 447; No, 362; Abstain, 10*]

Let's move to the next calendar item please.

COLEMAN: Next Calendar Item on your *DCA* Page 1635 Item Calendar 464, Petition 41306. Found in your *DCA*, *DCA* page 309. The committee voted and recommends concurrence. In this particular one, we are just adding the second paragraph with regards to our brother from Germany without dealing with the voting rights.

BISHOP PAUP: The chair needs to ask you, it seems to me that that was wrapped into the last action that the body was considering and therefore the body has referred this as well. Does the body agree with that?

COLEMAN: OK, We were unaware or misunderstood. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Let me be clear but it was my understanding that this it was presented as an amendment to 1011 and on that basis we were acting on the amendment; it was before us with the body of 1011 and that entire section was therefore referred.

COLEMAN: I didn't. Was the amendment, did we concur the amendment, did we ever concur with the amendment?

BISHOP PAUP: We had at the point...

BARNEY: The objection was not to the amendment, it was to the previous paragraph.

BISHOP PAUP: It was my understanding that the entire matter was being referred. Thank you. Next item.

MARY WHITE: Our next presenter will be J. T. Seymour, who will be presenting on (*unintelligible*) powers and duties of the annual conference.

Annual Conference Acts Against Discrimination

JAMES SEYMOUR: Bishops and delegates and visitors to the General

Conference. I invite your attention to the *DCA* p. 1843, Calendar Item 1430. In the *ADCA*, it is found on p. 332 and the petition number is 40254. The committee voted concurrence as amended.

The petition relates to *Disciplinary* paragraph 604.1 dealing with the powers and duties of the annual conference. The committee's decision on this item of concurrence as amended pertains to two amendments. The first is to strike all the words that follow the word discrimination on the third line up the bottom of the text. And then secondly, to add a reference after the period to paragraph 4 which is Article 4 of Division 1 of the constitution.

The rationale for the deletion, if I may give the rationale, bishop, is that by placing a period after the phrase "elimination of discrimination" the point is made simply and directly without further elaboration by naming various categories of discrimination. At the same time the rationale for adding the reference to Paragraph 4 is that that is the paragraph which deals with the policy of our church regarding categories of discrimination, inclusiveness, etc.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. The committee has recommended concurrence as amended. Yes, here, please. Mic 2.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. The committee has recommended concurrence as amended. Yes, here, please. Mic 2.

Reword Statement

MARK CONRAD (Kansas West): Mark Conrad, Kansas West, clergy. I would move an amendment and that would be to delete the words that would be "elimination of discrimination" at the end of the petition as amended by the committee, and replaced them with the words "inclusiveness and racial justice," so that the entire phrase would read, the relevant section would read: "That in exercise of its powers each annual conference shall act in all respects in harmony with the policy of the United Methodist Church with respect to inclusiveness

and racial justice.” The paragraph reference would remain.

BISHOP PAUP: Is there a second. Do you wish to speak to it.

CONRAD: Yes. The paragraph section in the constitution refers both to inclusiveness and with the action of the 2000 General Conference racial justice it is...

BISHOP PAUP: Excuse me just a moment. Yes, what is your point of order?

DONALD AVERY (Louisiana): Donald Avery, clergy, Louisiana. If the secretary would check Consent Calendar B. One of the special consent calendars, that item is on that consent calendar.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright let's. Excuse me, did, Don, did you identify yourself?

AVERY: Yes, I did.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Hold there just a moment.

CONRAD: That was removed.

AVERY: It was taken off?

BISHOP PAUP: We're checking just a moment.

JAMES SEYMOUR (Peninsula-Delaware): Bishop, It was announced earlier that that item had been removed from the Consent Calendar, earlier this evening.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. The word is that it has been removed.

AVERY: I stand corrected.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Yes, now please, mic 2.

CONRAD: That would make the language a positive statement; it would make it resonate with what is now in the constitution that does have the phrase of inclusiveness and with the action of the 2000 General Conference adds a strong paragraph about racial justice. We believe it's warranted.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. You might stay there so that we can get the reading again in just a moment but is there a speech against? I see no cards. Then would you read it for us once more.

CONRAD: In the statement as amended by the committee, it would delete the last three words; it would delete the words “elimination of discrimination” and in place it would put the words “inclusiveness and racial justice” so that the entire section would read “That in exercise of its powers, each annual conference shall act in all respects in harmony with the policy of the United Methodist Church with respect to inclusiveness and racial justice.”

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Does the committee have a response?

SEYMOUR: Yes, bishop. I've thought a lot about this and I would urge support for the committee's position in that there are times when there is value in using language that specifically discourages and seeks to prevent discriminatory actions. I believe that this is a place where this direct language of elimination of discrimination is stronger than the other language which may have some vagueness to it. And it allows for accountability in preventing discrimination.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. The amendment is before us. Prepare to vote please. If you support the amendment you will vote yes; if you do not, vote no. Please vote now. [Yes, 359; No, 406; Abstain, 16]

Alright. The amendment is not supported. Are there persons who wish to speak? Yes, please, mic 4.

TODD BRISTOW (North Texas): Bishop, Todd Bristow, North Texas Conference. Now I don't know if I can use a personal privilege or the actual talk to this particular issue. He refers to paragraph 4 in the constitution. And the, paragraph 4 in the constitution is not printed in our current *Discipline* because of annual conferences having, needing to approve that language. So the committee's recommendation was based off of the information in paragraph 4 and that's just not correct in their ruling.

BISHOP PAUP: Can, can the committee respond?

SEYMOUR: Bishop, I do not think that's correct. There is paragraph 4; it is Article 4 of Division I of the constitution; it's a paragraph that we've had some discussion about early this evening which supports the idea of not trying to list all the categories of discrimination which supports actually this committee's recommendation to end the sentence at the word: “elimination of discrimination” and then simply offer the reference. Matters of categories of discrimination are appropriately covered in that constitutional paragraph which will be receiving attention from time to time.

BRISTOW: That's correct. But we removed something from; we tabled something earlier because of the discrepancy in paragraph 4.

SEYMOUR: Bishop, if I may respond to that. Thank you. The point is that paragraph 4 continues to be the place where matters of the specific categories are cared for and dealt with appropriately. That supports the committee's recommendation to simply deal with elimination of discrimination, to put a period there, and let paragraph 4 as that's worked on eventually sort out what those various categories are.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Let's proceed. Is yours a speech against?

SEYMOUR: My speech is against the committee's recommendation which I sat on that particular committee. I think that racism is still a problem that we deal with and we are weakening the paragraph by making the changes as referred to by the committee.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there a speech for the committee? Yes, please. Right here. Mic 3.

DAVID BARD (Minnesota): David Bard, clergy delegate from Minnesota. I speak in favor of the resolution. There is something to be said for being succinct, clear, and direct. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Further word. Yes

SEYMOUR: I would urge support for the committee's position to simply

say “elimination of discrimination” to put a period and to cite the reference to paragraph 4 of the constitution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is Calendar Item 1430; committee recommends concurrence as amended. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 660; No, 118; Abstain, 12*]

You have approved the recommendation.

BARNEY: Bishop, we’ve been notified that we’ve just recovered a long lost petition from outer space that will conclude our committee’s report. This needs to be done; it was not done previously. It’s on p. 1746 of your *DCA*, Calendar Item 1017, Calendar Item 1017, Petition 40314, in your Advance *DCA* p. 328, having to do with adding conference scouting coordinator. The committee voted concurrence and what this would do is add the scouting coordinator to those that would have voting rights, membership rights, at the annual conference session. We move concurrence.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. That recommendation is before us. Does anyone wish to speak?

Alright please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 467; No, 315; Abstain, 4*]

Alright you have approved the recommendation. Next calendar item, please.

BARNEY: Bishop, this completes the work of the Conferences Legislative Committee and I would like to, if I could. We had four persons whose subcommittees did such good work you didn’t have to consider their resolutions. Ellis Conley of West Virginia, Luis Reyes of Northern Illinois, Susan Garrett of Virginia, and Todd Bristow of North Texas. For the record I would like them entered into the record and thanking them and the rest of our committee for their hard work. Thank you.

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Yes. Does this relate to the calendar items? Mic 5.

ANNE BURKHOLDER (Florida): Bishop Paup, (*unintelligible*) Burkholder.

BISHOP PAUP: Yes. Does this relate to the calendar items?

BURKHOLDER: No, sir. I need to move for a declaratory decision by the Judicial Council.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. I’m going to ask you to hold that until all the matters that we have calendared are cared for and then we will return to that. We have calendar items and a couple of resolutions and then we’ll come back.

BURKHOLDER: Great. Thank you.

Reconsider Global Ministry Items

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference, chair of the Legislative Committee on Global Ministries. We have two items which were previously approved by this conference but were printed in error and I would like to make two motions to reconsider. I move reconsideration of Consent Calendar A04 in order to lift from the calendar Item No. 576 for correction of text.

BISHOP PAUP: Can you tell us the *DCA* page, please?

BOAYUE: There are two pages. *DCA* p. 1698.

BISHOP PAUP: *DCA* page, please.

BOAYUE: There are two pages, *DCA* p. 1698, 1-6-9-8, as well as well as *DCA* 2100. They were printed twice. The second printing is the correct text, which we’d like to be adopted. (*pause*) Now when you look on p. 1698, Item No. 576, you will see—well, I’ll pause there for a moment and see if we’ll reconsider and then I’ll—is a correction on that page of the bolded letters, home missionaries, within the text at the bottom of the paragraph.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, to you my friends, we have a request to lift this—or to reconsider, I’m sorry, to reconsider, so that we can correct the text. Are there any questions about that request for reconsideration? And you voted in favor of it?

BOAYUE: Yes, we did.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. If you would move to reconsider, you will vote yes; if you do not, vote no. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 654; No, 113; Abstain, 8*] Alright. You have voted to reconsider, so we’ll return then.

BOAYUE: On p. 1698, Calendar Item 576, the committee on Global Ministries voted new language that would add “home missionaries” to the front—the office of Deaconess Program Office. We did not vote in the text. There you see No. 4, the second from bottom line, has the bolded “home missionaries” there in the approval process. That was a printing error. No. 4 should read, “There may be jurisdictional organizations of deaconesses, home missionaries, and home missionaries and their support constituencies, which shall operate according to policies approved by the General Board of Global Ministries.” That is the correction.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, and you’re moving the correction?

BOAYUE: We move those corrections.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, any questions? Alright.

BOAYUE: The correct—recommended print is on *DCA* p. 2100.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. So you see the corrected calendar Item on p. 2100. Anyone wish to speak? Alright. This is before us. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 761; No, 16; Abstain, 5*]

Alright. You have approved this recommendation with the corrected text.

BOAYUE: Bishop, the second and last item, I move reconsideration of Consent Calendar B05, in order to lift from the Calendar Item No. 1228 for correction of text. This can be found on *DCA* p. 1825, p. 1825, as well as p. 2100. Page 2100 will be the correct text. The problem, there, was that all of the text was not printed. So—

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. And, again, the Calendar Item is 1228.

BOAYUE: 1228

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Again, this is a motion to reconsider to correct the text. It is before us. Prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 744; No, 27; Abstain, 5*] Alright. You've agreed to reconsider, and the corrected text begins on p. 2100. Any questions at all.

BOAYUE: For those who may have any doubt, the correction, if you look on p. 2100, Item 1228, all of the text on p. 2100, including the text on p. 2101, up till the middle column were it says, caps, "CALL TO ACTION." All the text prior to "CALL TO ACTION" is what was not printed.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, alright. Seeing no cards, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 744; No, 26; Abstain, 7*]

Thank you. You have approved this corrected text.

Conclusion of Global Ministries Work

BOAYUE: Bishop, as we conclude the work of the committee on Global Ministries, I want to begin by expressing thanks to a great leadership team of several persons who were introduced earlier in this conference. For purposes of brevity, I'll name just the committee officers: Sally Dyck of East Ohio, Ilda Vasquez of Southwest Texas; and we had committee—subcommittee chairpersons Charlene Black of South Georgia, Robert Long of Oklahoma, and Darren Cushman-Wood of South Indiana. They were a great team on behalf of the mission of the church.

(*applause*)

Being an African native and knowing the time is late, I want to just close with a—perhaps a 45-second story. And the story is about a train that is flying and losing altitude. Pilot figures that we need to get rid of some weight—some load. They throw off everything in the baggage compartment, and they still need to get rid of more weight, so the overhead is emptied. And now it's time to empty people. And so they decide to do so alphabetically. They choose someone to implement that who calls first on,

"All Africans stand up." Nobody stands. "OK, all Blacks stand up." Nobody stands. "All Caribbeans, stand up." Nobody stands. And later in that day, the plane landed safely; and after landing, a young boy turned to his father and said, "Daddy, why didn't we stand up when they call our name." And the Daddy said, "Son, listen to me. I'll say this just once. For purposes of today, we are all ZuLus." (*applause*) May we be united in the mission of the church around the whole world?

(*applause*)

JESSICA F. MOFFAT (Oklahoma): Presenting our final two items for referral are Mary Baldrige and Thomas White Wolf Fasset.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you.

MARY A. BALDRIDGE (Baltimore-Washington): The item I bring to you this evening is in the *Daily Christian Advocate*, p. 1926, Item 1513; and in the *Advanced Daily Christian Advocate*, p. 162. This is Petition 40020. Bishop and members of General Conference, this is a petition called "The Social Community and the Unborn." The committee recommends referral to the Board of Church and Society.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, thank you. That recommendation is before us. Anyone wish to speak? Alright, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 706; No, 68; Abstain, 6*] You have referred this calendar item. Thank you.

FASSETT: Thom Fasset, North Central New York. A spirit just disappeared with my notes, so I will try to carefully direct your attention to—thank you—the *DCA* p. 1847, 1847; Calendar Item 1453, entitled, "A Unified Approach to Issues," Petition No. 40466, and the reference to the *ADCA* is p. 257.

Bishop Paup, members—delegates, the committee recommends referral to the Board of—General Board of Global Ministries and the General Board of Church and Society. And unfortunately, the language was not printed to specifically refer to a joint

committee of those two boards for program development and coordination. Nonetheless, we recommend the referral.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. That recommendation is before us. Yes, please, mic no. 1.

BISHOP PAUP: That recommendation is before us. Yes, please, mic no. 1.

LANE C. WINN (Louisiana): Lane Cotton Winn, lay delegate from Louisiana. I believe in our *DCA* it says GBOM instead of GBGM.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you for correcting that. That should be GBGM. Alright. Anyone else? Seeing no cards, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 736; No, 25; Abstain, 10*]

Thank you. You have agreed to refer this calendar item.

MOFFAT: And that concludes our report. Thank you.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you very much

(*applause*)

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Now we have calendared some—a couple of resolutions. I'm—yes, I'm gonna turn to you first, mic no. 1. We have—and I'll—will do the two resolutions and then come back to you, and these matters will then conclude our work. Yes, mic 1.

Closing Resolutions

DAR A. BERKENPAS (Dakotas): I'm Dar Berkenpas, clergy delegate from the Dakotas Conference. I've been meditating on this for three days. Whereas, according to the *Discipline*, Paragraph 402, bishops are to facilitate consensus and integrated in a living tradition and to be open to the prophetic word and to be skilled in team building and to be effective in negotiation. Whereas bishops are to be leaders in spiritual discipline, theological reflection, building the unique inclusive community of the church and of the larger community. Be it resolved that the 2004 General Conference forward

the resolution on church unity to the Council of Bishops, to lead the United Methodist denomination in dialogue, prayer, and discernment during the 2005-2008 quadrennium. And be it further resolved the Council of Bishops develop a document and a study guide to lead the denomination in holy conferencing on the resolution on church unity.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there a second to this resolution? Alright. You have presented it and used your time in presenting it, so I will ask if there is a speech against this resolution. Yes, please, mic 3.

VICKI L. WOODS (New England): Vicki Woods, New England. I'm not speaking so much about the resolution being forwarded to the bishops, and I don't want this to be the final word of General Conference; but I do feel an obligation to lift up some concern about the resolution. There has been a sense of quietness on the house since we have made that, some special moments; but I'm not sure whether we have been silenced or we have been given peace. And so I just speak caution up against—I would, I do not support forwarding for study; but I would support forwarding it for reflection to the bishops. I think there is much concern by many people about the resolution that does not have the confidence of this body.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. This is now before us. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now [*Yes, 467; No, 290; Abstain, 22*]

Alright. You have approved the resolution. There is a second resolution that had been calendared. Perhaps the person will know who it is—this relates to a prisoner in Iraq. OK, yes, please, mic no. 7.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, I move that this 2004 General Conference of The United Methodist Church expresses support of those persons calling for a full investigation of the alleged abuse of prisoners of war in Iraq. We call further for careful adherence to the Geneva Convention Rules,

for humane treatment of prisoners of war. This expression of concern should be sent to appropriate officials in the administration and the public media.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Do you wish to speak any further. You don't have much time left.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have entered into a lot of self-examination while the world outside, in our society particularly, has had to address some real issues; and I think it behooves us to speak to this issue.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. Is there a speech against? Alright. Seeing no card, please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 637; No, 127; Abstain, 8*]

Alright. You have approved this resolution. Sorry, I had called on the person at mic 5 as the next item.

Request for Declaratory Decision

ANNE L. BURKHOLDER (Florida): Bishop, I'm Anne Burkholder, clergy from Florida. I move that the General Conference request a declaratory decision from the Judicial Council under the provisions of Paragraph 2610, Point 2A on the following question: Are the provisions of Calendar Item 1167, passed by the General Conference on the Consent Calendar, in violation of Paragraph 31 in the constitution by allowing lay professing members to serve with voice and vote as members of the committee on investigation for a bishop, clergy member of an annual conference, or a local pastor, considering that Paragraph 31 restricts matters of character and conference relationships to ministerial members in full connection and lay members of the Board of Ordained Ministry, and that bishops retain their membership in the order of elders in the annual conference and which they held their membership at the date of their election?

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you. That is before us. This needs 20 percent support for it to be referred to the Judicial Council for a decision. Does someone wish to speak against this?

Alright. Let's prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 631; No, 132; Abstain, 21*]

Alright. It is referred. Yes, mic 7.

CHARLES D. WHITE JR. (Western North Carolina): I thank the chair and apologize to the house. My name is Denny White from Charlotte, Western North Carolina. However, my question to the chair is this: Is there currently in Paragraph 30 of the constitution, either as it currently stands or as this body has proposed it to the annual conferences for amendment, any provision for the conference scouting coordinator to be a lay member of the annual conference?

BISHOP PAUP: Let me ask you to state that once more, please.

WHITE: Bishop, the issue is that the lay membership of an annual conference is actually defined in *The Book of Discipline* in two places. One is in Paragraph 30 of the constitution. The other is in the legislative enactments, one of which we just amended a moment ago to add the conference scouting coordinator to the lay membership. I'm simply concerned that it appears to me, sir, that we may have taken an action that is in violation of our own constitution. And I know it's a very simple thing very, very late at night; but if that is indeed the case, I would suggest we reconsider that.

BISHOP PAUP: We are thinking here it might be helpful to ask for a declaratory decision of the Judicial Council.

WHITE: In which case, sir, I would be happy to move that the General Conference request a declaratory decision from the General—Judicial Council as to whether this body's action on—I believe its Calendar Item 1017—is in congruence with the constitution.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Is there a second? Alright. Does anyone wish to speak? Alright. This is a matter to request that the declaratory decision of the Judicial Council. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, does anyone wish to speak? Alright, this is a matter to request the declaratory decision of the Judicial Council. Please prepare to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 699; No, 56; Abstain, 11*]

Alright, that is so ordered. Yes, please, mic 5.

Adjournment

MARY ALICE MASSEY: I move that the 2004 General Conference of the United Methodist Church be adjourned (*unintelligible*) of the conclusion of the worship service.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, I trust by your motion that's supported or by your applause that's supported, but let's be clear; go ahead and vote on it; let's just do that once more. Those who would support this action, please vote "yes"; please vote now. [*Yes, 706 ; No, 64 ; Abstain, 9*] Alright.

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, I must tell you, I must tell you, that I think that is the only item in the General Conference that the bishops had a chance to vote on. They were the ones who still wanted to remain for a little bit longer. Alright now we have, we had promised a word from John Braun. I want to thank my assistants and then we will move to worship.

JOHN BRAUN: John Braun. Let's say, coordinator. I need to thank Mike Cunningham, Tom Baker, Richard Street, and Gerald L. Davis II, from The United Methodist Publishing House, because they are the people who put together the CALMS system that tracked the legislation this last two weeks. We've spent about a quarter of a million dollars on programming effort this last four years, and let me tell you what we've received for that money. Right this instant we have the complete results of everything that's happened to every petition at this conference. That is the first time in the history of the Methodist conferences that that has occurred before the delegates have left their chairs.

(applause)

Will those people named please stand?

(applause)

BISHOP PAUP: Now I'll turn to the conference secretary for some announcements.

MARSHALL: Just one for our information. Many of you had asked for printed verbatim transcripts of the actions that were taken around and the speeches that were made this morning during the unity time. Those are available. Some of them, some of you got them this afternoon. We have printed some more, and they will be available by the pages as you leave. So feel free

to take them; also be aware that it is now on the Web site. And then just—the continuing motion or mention for us that the worship service will begin immediately, and it will be brief. Thank you all for your attention.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright, I want to thank you so very much for the way in which you cared for all of this agenda that we had before us this night. You were very gracious in the way we moved through thi, and a special thanks to those who have assisted me, Bishop William Grove, Bishop Melvin Talbert. And we'll now turn to those who are leading in the closing worship.