

# Proceedings of the 2004 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

## The Committee on Journal

The Committee on Journal hereby certifies as accurate the proceedings as printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* for Monday, May 3, 2004 with the following corrections:

P.1870, column 1, fourth full paragraph

Mark Conrad is actually Mark Conard.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

## Monday Morning, May 3, 2004

(continued from page 1883)

ARTHUR JONES (North Texas): Thank you. I believe that much of the reasons for doing this is to urge annual conferences and districts to put in place committees on scouting. I believe that our annual conferences are represented here, and I believe that the argument has been made and that we do not need to put it in front of the *Discipline*, put it in the *Discipline* to populate it. I would like to repeat what Ben said from Carolina that we do have, that there is in the—there is in the *Discipline* a conference scouting coordinator under the section of the United Methodist Men, and that that person can do a great job at facilitating ministry with youth all across our connections. So, thank you very much, and I recommend you vote non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEO A. SORIANO (Davao Area): Alright, we are ready to vote. If you are ready to vote, the committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. If you are ready, please vote now. [*Yes, 709; No, 215; Abstain, 3*]

(pause)

BISHOP SORIANO: The recommendation passes. Non-concurrence, alright.

JEFFERY E. GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Soriano, this completes the work of the Discipleship Legislative Committee this morning. Thank you.

BISHOP SORIANO: Thank you very much. Now we call to the next item in the agenda; it is the committee on Conferences; Bill Barney.

BILL BARNEY (Troy): Thank you Bishop.

BISHOP SORIANO: Yes? Yes, please? Just go to mic no. 4.

MARVIN D. ARNPRIESTER (Iowa): Bishop, members of the conference, Marvin Arnpriester from Iowa. For clarity of understanding regarding our mutual responsibilities, I move the General Conference ask the Judicial Council for a declaratory decision in answer to the following question: Does unwillingness by a pastor to lead a local church toward full payment of apportionments including proportionality Paragraph 823, Episcopal Fund, constitute a chargeable offense under Paragraph 2702(d), the "failure to perform the work of ministry," and (e) "disobedience to the Order and Discipline of The United Methodist Church"?

BISHOP SORIANO: Alright, is there a second to that? It's a motion that's properly before you. Do you want to discuss it? If none, then if you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 612; No, 262; Abstain 28*]

The motion passes. Thank you very much. You may now proceed with the report.

BARNEY: Bishop, for the committee on Conferences, I'd like to introduce...

BISHOP SORIANO: Yes? Mic 3, please.

MARTHA ORPHE (Western Pennsylvania): Martha Orphe, Western Pennsylvania Conference. Bishop, I'm gonna ask that we be given the opportunity to have prayer before we vote, a moment of prayer.

BISHOP SORIANO: Thank you. You may proceed.

BARNEY: Bishop, the committee on Conferences was pleased to have, and I'd like to introduce Mary White from Eastern Pennsylvania as our vice chair, and Eloida Lindo from Philippines East as our secretary. They are with me here on the platform this morning. And this morning I am also joined by pastor Andrew Wolfe from North Alabama Conference, one of our sub-committee chairs. Our first item on the agenda is on *DCA* p.1635, 1635; Calendar No. 438, 438; Petition No. 41184. It's on p. 316 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: Alright, the committee recommends non-concurrence. Are there any discussions?

BARNEY: The recommendation is non-concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: Alright, the committee recommends non-concurrence. Are there any discussions? If there are none, as we have heard the suggestion, before we take a vote, let's pause for a few moments of prayer.

(prayer)

If you're ready to vote, the recommendation is non-concurrence. Please vote now. [*Yes, 759; No, 134; Abstain, 17*]

The recommendation passes. You may proceed.

BARNEY: Next item *DCA* page 1635, 1635, item number 443, 443, petition 41333, p. 335 in the *Advance DCA*. The Conferences committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: The committee recommends non-concurrence. Let us

pause for some thirty seconds of silence as you pray in your seats.

*(prayer)*

Amen. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 802; No, 106; Abstain, 7*]

BISHOP SORIANO: The recommendation passes—non-concurrence.

BARNEY: *DCA* p. 1636, Calendar Item 447, Petition No. 40942, 40942, p. 307 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence. Calendar Item 447.

BISHOP SORIANO: Is there no further debate or discussion about the petition? The recommendation is concurrence. This is, this is a constitutional amendment. It needs two-thirds vote. Let us pause for 20 seconds of prayer.

*(prayer)*

Amen. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. The committee's recommendation is concurrence and we need two-thirds vote. [*Yes, 873; No, 31; Abstain, 8*]

Yes, it passes. It passes, it passes two-thirds vote. You may proceed.

BARNEY: Next item, turn to p. 1636, p. 1636, Calendar Item 448, 448, petition number 41243, 41243, 308 is the page in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: Is there no further debate? It is before us. Let's take 20 seconds for prayer.

*(prayer)*

Amen. The committee's recommendation is concurrence. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 851; No, 60; Abstain, 10*]

This is a constitutional amendment, so it needs two-thirds and it passes. You may proceed.

BARNEY: Bishop, the six items were to have been presented by our subcommittee chair, Ellis Conley from West Virginia. He's ill this morning and cannot be represented here, so I will present these, but I ask that the body

keep him in your prayers. On p. 1636, Calendar Item 453, 453, Petition 41409, *Advance DCA* 308. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: If you have no further debate, 20 second pause in silence.

*(prayer)*

Amen. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 805; No, 109; Abstain, 6*]

Alright, the recommendation passes—non-concurrence. You may proceed.

BARNEY: On p. 1636, Calendar Item 454, 454, Petition No. 40538, *Advance DCA* 307. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: If you have no further debate, let us pause in prayer. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. The committee recommends concurrence. [*Yes, 864; No, 34; Abstain, 4*]

The recommendation passes. You need two-thirds because this is a constitutional amendment, and it passes. You may proceed.

BARNEY: Continuing with amendments, p. 1636, Item 455, 455, Petition 40537 on p. 307 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: If you have no further discussion, let us pause, again, in prayer. If you're ready to vote, the committee's recommendation is concurrence. Please vote now. [*Yes, 876; No, 20; Abstain, 5*]

Alright, the recommendation passes. It needs two-thirds and it is more than two-thirds.

BARNEY: P. 1636, Calendar Item No. 456, Petition 40755, *Advance DCA* 307. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: Let us pause in silence, again. If you are ready to vote, the committee recommends concurrence. Please vote now. [*Yes, 832; No, 66; Abstain, 5*]

The recommendation passes and this is a constitutional amendment, and so it needs 2/3 and it passes.

BARNEY: *DCA* p. 1637, 1637, Item 458, 458, Petition 41416, and 308 in the *Advance DCA*. Bishop, the committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP SORIANO: Let's be silent again for a few moments. The committee recommends concurrence. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 791; No, 107; Abstain, 10*]

This is a constitutional amendment and it needs two-thirds and the recommendation passes. You may proceed.

FARNEY: P. 1637 in the *DCA*, Item 459, Petition No. 41256; 305 in the *Advanced DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP SORIANO: Just pause in silence.

*(pause)*

The committee recommends concurrence as amended. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 812; No 72; Abstain, 20*]

This is a constitutional amendment and it needs two-thirds and the recommendation passes.

BARNEY: Bishop, we have five items that are not constitutional amendments, and I am asking Andrew Wolfe if he will present those.

*Recognition of Gary Bowen*

BISHOP SORIANO: Alright, we are following a schedule and we will interrupt you at this time. Our schedule says that at this very hour we will call on the committee on Conferences to make a report at this time. And I call now on Brother James Perry to present the report. Committee on Conferences.

*(pause)*

JAMES PERRY: Bishop Soriano, members of the Council of Bishops, delegates and friends. Robert Frost, in his poem *Stopping By the Woods on a Snowy Eve*, wrote "and I took the road less traveled by and that has made all the difference." It is not just poets and theologians and United Methodist

clergy that find themselves living out Frost's words. Such also happens to accountants.

Back in 1974, Gary Bowen came to the staff of the General Council on Finance and Administration, expecting to stay for about five years. Eight years ago, as we reached the mid-point of the General Conference in Denver, Gary, still a member of the GCFA staff, had no idea that within a week, he would head down a path that for him looked very much to be the one less traveled by.

For the last eight years and two General Conferences, Gary Bowen has been the business manager. Sometime within the next year, he will retire from the GCFA staff. I am sure that he will be properly roasted at that time. However, at this time, on behalf of the Commission on the General Conference and all of you as members of the General Conference and visitors and friends, I wish to acknowledge the way in which Gary has gone about his duties as the business manager for this quadrennial gathering. It is a responsibility that requires his attention throughout the four years leading up to the session. In fact, the work on the General Conference begins about six to seven years before the session with the selection of a site. Once that is accomplished, the business of that general conference is gently laid aside until the one preceding it is history.

There are a myriad of details that must be attended to and many, many, many decisions made. There are deadlines to meet and contracts to sign as well as many, many many disputes to mediate. As business manager, you have to deal with a commission that keeps trying to work outside the box. In so doing, you keep sprinkling with a liberal dose of reality.

Throughout all of this, Gary Bowen has worked with gentleness and an attention to detail that makes him both fun to be with and confident to follow. His optimism and sense of humor complement his deep and abiding faith.

Gary, your leadership behind the

scenes of this general conference will be missed. The commission joins with the 2004 General Conference in saying to you, thank you and may God continue to bless you as you explore more of those roads less traveled by in your new motor home.

*(applause)*

GARY BOWEN: I will be brief. After all, I am an accountant. Very few people are fortunate enough to hear their eulogy while they are still alive. Thank you, Jim.

*(applause)*

PERRY: And now I would like to call on Bishop Woodie White to make a presentation.

*Recognition of Carolyn Marshall*

BISHOP WOODIE WHITE: Mrs. Carolyn Anderson has been the secretary of the General Conference. Carolyn—I said Anderson, didn't I?—Marshall has been the secretary and consequently, the primary staff person for the General Conference. She has led us well. As her bishop, we express appreciation for the leadership she has given in the annual conference, as leader of United Methodist Women, conference lay leader, conference secretary; she's been the president of the Women's Division, and now serving us as General, as Secretary of the General Conference. Sometimes "thank you" can become perfunctory. However, Carolyn, when it comes from a collective heart, expressing gratitude, it is immeasurable and so we would like for you to receive from us a thank you, a profound thank you, for the service you have rendered to this General Conference and thus, to The United Methodist Church. I know the conference would join me in expressing appreciation for such outstanding leadership.

*(applause)*

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: And to each one of you, thank you. It has been a wonderful journey. I am grateful for the opportunity and also grateful to

God for each one of you as you have provided insight and help along the way. May your journey with God continue always and I shall be continually interested and concerned and watching. It has been wonderful and thank you so much.

*(applause)*

MILLIE KOWAN: We have been dealing with some chapters with Carolyn's life and last night she said, "What is chapter three?" And I said, "Well, that's a part of the mystery."

Today we are here to offer another chapter. Carolyn, you, you gathered us, carefully gathered your staff from the desert and the hills and the ocean, the shores, and you have nurtured us and we have bonded into a very effective team.

A couple of years ago, you came to visit me in Long Beach, California, and your eyes lit up as you observed an artistic framing on the wall. You said, "I could just take that and put that into my house." So we commissioned an artist to copy that for you and we, your staff is presenting that to you today. We, Carolyn, we love you. You are a whole enchilada.

*(applause)*

And on the back is stitched the various years and locations of the General Conferences in which she has served as your general secretary.

*(applause)*

MARSHALL: It will be here and I hope many of you can stop by to see it. Those of you who know me, know that I am a butterfly person. Last night when the staff went out to dinner, one of our staff gave me a package of Kleenex. I had never seen butterfly Kleenex. Well, she had found those, even told me what store I could buy some more in if I really wanted to weep over it. So, this is an example of the butterflies, but it is also an example of the love and affection that this staff has formed. Last night they were trying to tell me that we had the best staff we've

ever had. Well, you know, it is always the best whatever.

I had a father-in-law—the best meal you cooked was the best meal everybody could ever do and you knew full well they weren't all the best. Well, we do have the best staff. And they're what makes anything that happens here look good. They do all the work. Thank you all.

*(applause)*

KOWAN: Now Deila has Chapter 1 for you now. The book and the glassine pages.

DELIA CRUZ: And this is the book.

MARSHALL: Again, there's nothing more genuine to say than "thank you" and my love to each of you, South Indiana particularly, but all of you around the world. You're all a part of my family. Thank you.

*(applause)*

JANET FORBES (Rocky Mountain): I'm Janet Forbes, chairperson of the Committee on Courtesies, and I would like to invite Bishop Roy Clark to bring his guest and our guest to the podium for a special introduction.

BISHOP ROY C. CLARK : It's my pleasure to present to you one of the remarkable ladies of Methodism, Mrs. Louise Short, the widow of Bishop Roy Short. Mrs. Short is 98 years old. She attended her first General Conference in 1938 which was the last conference with the Methodist Episcopal Church South. She has attended every General Conference of the Methodist Church and The United Methodist Church since—19 General Conferences in all. And we are glad to present her to you. Will you greet her.

*(applause)*

FORBES: I would like to recognize Lane Cotton Winn, vice-chair of the Committee on Courtesies, for a moment of celebration.

*Birthday Wishes*

*(song)*

LANE COTTON WINN (Louisiana):

As a child I always wanted to celebrate my birthday at the latest and greatest spot in town. One year we had a pizza party; one year we went to the children's museum; and one year we even had a clown. But I don't think I ever wished to have my birthday during General Conference. And while it is not my birthday while we're here, there are several among us who are celebrating their birthday during the two weeks of General Conference. Now we couldn't hire clowns for you. But I imagine if you look around where you're seating, you're probably seated next to a couple of them. And I've got a few standing back here behind me and I don't mean the bishops.

At this time I would like to ask everyone who is celebrating a birthday to please rise and remain standing. If you're here and it is your birthday during General Conference please stand. The pages are going to come around,

*(applause)*

The pages will come around and bring you a birthday sticker. Please place this sticker on your name badge so we can all recognize you and celebrate with you that it is your birthday. And now we're going to invite Barbara to come and we're going to sing "Happy Birthday." Please remain standing as we sing for you and wish you the wonderful year as we go ahead with this General Conference.

BARBARA DAY MILLER: We love to do this and I want to join you because I'm having my birthday in these two weeks, too, so let's just sing to ourselves "Happy Birthday, Dear Friend."

*(song)*

BISHOP SORIANO: Now I would turn to the committee of Presiding Officers, Dr. Paul Fernandez.

PAUL V. EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ (California-Nevada): Thank you bishop and members of the General Conference. This afternoon's presiding officer comes from the Michigan Area, Bishop Linda Lee; and this evening for

the evening plenary session, from the Louisiana Area, Bishop William Hutchinson.

*(applause)*

EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ: We will be announcing the presiding officer for tomorrow morning's session this evening. Thank you.

*(applause)*

BISHOP SORIANO: Thank you very much. And now the Committee on the Agenda, Sister Mary Massey.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Good morning, Bishop and Council and delegates. We have a slight change in the afternoon agenda which I would like to announce. There are several committees who will need to meet according to their committee chairpersons and the—as I understand it, the times and the rooms will be up on the screen. Is that correct, Jake? At least they are going to be announced.

Conferences will have to meet briefly: Church and Society, General Administration, Global Ministries, Higher Education, Independent Commissions, and Judicial Administration. Those of you on those committees will be meeting according to your chairperson's assignment of time, but it will be lunch or after lunch. We will reconvene here for our conference business at 3:45 and then we will have the celebration of the United Methodist Women. I am not sure what business we will take up in that time frame. We are behind with Judicial Council nominees and the University Senate, but we will work on this. I don't think we can do it in 15 minutes. I am advised that we probably will be voting for one at a time, so we will work this in and the schedule a little bit later on this evening. I think we will have to. And here is Gere Reist with the calendar.

L. FITZGERALD REIST: Mary Alice, we just received word that Global Ministries is not meeting.

MASSEY: Yeah.

REIST: I am Fitzgerald Reist, Coordinator of the Calendar. I want to

introduce to you again John Brawn to give us an update on where we are in process.

JOHN BRAWN: I am John Brawn. I am the legislative coordinator for the Secretary of the General Conference. And as you all know, you have accomplished heroic effort this weekend, and I want to congratulate all of you on behalf of the secretary and the secretary's staff. As you can see from the chart, we are well ahead of where we were four years ago and we are definitely on track to make our goal to have all of the petitions calendared and published in time for Wednesday morning. So thank you very much. I would like to go to the next slide and we can also see that we are well into our plenary activity as of the time this slide was made at 8:00 this morning. So we have 8 percent at 8:00 this morning of all of the petitions that have been dealt with on the floor already. We need to be at 100 percent before we can go home Friday night. So we are doing well and let's keep up the good work. Thank you.

BISHOP SORIANO: Thank you very much.

MASSEY: Thank you. We would ask for those chairpersons who were on the agenda for this morning and didn't get to their calendar items to be ready to present at 3:45, please.

REIST: I am Fitzgerald Reist, coordinator of the Calendar. I have a few things to share with you about process that I hope will be helpful to you. The first is that a number of you have noticed that there are things on the regular calendar that do not belong there. There were some software flags that were set that we have to reset. We are manually moving those things to the appropriate consent calendars.

Those would be items with financial implications—constitutional amendments, and GCFA reports that appeared—the GCFA reports that appeared on consent calendars must be pulled from those calendars. And the other items, financial implications and constitutional implications that had non-concurrent votes can go on

Consent Calendar C and we will be in the process of doing that. I would ask you also to look in your DCAs on p. 1761, p. 1761. There you will find a chart compiled by GCFA that may assist you in your decision-making process as you consider petitions with budgetary implications. I draw that to your attention to help facilitate the work of the conference. It is my understanding that GCFA intends to update that chart as needed.

Now if you will turn in your DCA to p. 1615, p. 1615, Consent Calendar A03, Consent Calendar A03. Calendar Item 161, Calendar Item 161 has been removed and appears on p. 1759 in the "Corrections to the Consent Calendar." Apart from that change, all other items on the Consent Calendar A03 are properly before you.

MASSEY: Bishop, I move the approval of the Calendar A03, with the exception of one item.

BISHOP SORIANO: All right. If you are ready to vote the recommendation, please vote now. The recommendation passes. [*Yes, 889; No, 5; Abstain, 6*]

REIST: Consent Calendar B03, is on p. 1621. P. 1621 begins Consent Calendar B03. Calendar Item 260 has been removed. Calendar Item 260 has been removed, and appears on p. 1759 with other items removed from the consent calendar. In addition, Calendar Items 277 through 281, that would be Calendar Items 277, 278, 279, 280, and 281 are improperly on the consent calendar because they are reports of GCFA, and those items will be part of the regular calendar. They are not on the consent calendar, should be removed from Consent Calendar B03 for your consideration today.

BISHOP SORIANO: If you are ready to vote on those recommendations, please vote now.

MASSEY: Bishop, I move the approval of Consent Calendar B03, with the exception of those mentioned.

BISHOP SORIANO: All right. You may proceed now. If you are ready to

vote on these recommendations, please vote now. It is approved. [*Yes, 892; No 7; Abstain, 5*] You may proceed.

REIST: Page 1628 in your DCA. Page 1628 marks the beginning of consent calendar C03. Consent Calendar C03. The following items have been removed from Consent Calendar C03: Items 326, that's 326; Item 332, Item 332; Item 336, Item 336; Item 370, Item 370; Item 372, Item 372; Item 382, Item 382; Item 395, Item 395; all appear on p. 1759 as items removed from Consent Calendar C03.

MASSEY: Bishop, I move the approval of Calendar C03, with the exceptions mentioned.

BISHOP SORIANO: If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 897; No, 10; Abstain, 2*]

It is approved. Now we'll call on our secretary, Carolyn Marshall, to make some announcements.

#### *Closing Announcements*

CAROLYN MARSHALL: You heard the announcements as far as several legislative committees meeting. Let me be specific because there have been some updates on that. Higher Education will meet in rooms 411 and 12 at 12:40; Independent Commissions in room 408 and 409 at 12:40; and Church and Society in 320 and 321 at 12:40; General Administration in rooms 401 and 402 at 2:15.

Another note that anyone from the Conferences Committee who has a pending minority report needs to see Bill Barney after this morning's session, immediately, as soon as we adjourn, at his seat in Section I, and it's either Row 6 or 7, but you'll certainly be able to locate him there.

In today's DCA on p. 1681, there is a notice in the upper right hand quadrant about book signings this afternoon, however, there is not a time given for that of *Leading Women* at which our women bishops will signing. That is from 6 to 7 this evening.

The Advance for Christ and His Church invites you to visit the Advance

hospitality boat to receive your complimentary Advance tote bag and other Advance resources. The boat is docked next to the convention center. To find it, just follow the winding walkway between the waterfalls. While you are on the boat, you can enjoy a complimentary hotdog, coffee or tea, and other snacks while supplies last. The Advance is an official program of The United Methodist Church that belongs to you, the General Conference. Created by the 1948 Methodist General Conference, the Advance has made it possible for local churches to support missionaries and ministries around the world for the past 56 years. Welcome aboard.

And a note from the Judicial Council that any person wishing to file briefs on declaratory decisions, on the declaratory decision requested this morning, is requested to do so by 9:00 A.M. Tuesday, May 4<sup>th</sup>. Any member of the General Conference or Council of Bishops who wishes to request an oral hearing in writing must do so by 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday. Please slip your requests under the door of Room 323. That ends the announcements for this morning, with the exception to remind everybody that we will reconvene here in the plenary hall, Hall A, at 3:45.

BISHOP SORIANO: I want to thank all of you for the work that you have done this morning. I will now call on Bishop Mendez of Puerto Rico to dismiss us with blessings. Information? Yes, we will recognize that.

JON R. GRAY (Missouri): Jon R. Gray, Missouri Conference. I have sent a note to the secretary regarding updated information concerning the Judicial Administration Committee.

BISHOP SORIANO: Yes, you may make your announcement now.

GRAY: The Judicial Administration Committee will not meet during the noon hour. All of our petitions have been turned in. It will not meet during the noon hour.

BISHOP SORIANO: Alright. Thank you very much. Bishop Mendez.

BISHOP JUAN VERA MENDEZ (Puerto Rico): Please stand up. Let us pray.

*(Prayer and music)*

### Monday Afternoon May 3, 2004

BISHOP LINDA LEE (Michigan Area): Good afternoon! Good afternoon and welcome back. I'd ask you to take your seats so that we might call our session to order.

Thank you for taking your seats. I'd like to give you a brief overview. We will begin with the United Methodist Women and their 135th anniversary, then we'll move to an update on the voting that we began this morning. We'll complete the business that was left from this morning. And then we'll move into other agenda items. Yes, mic 8.

CAROLYN BRISCOE (South Carolina): Thank you, Bishop. Carolyn Briscoe, South Carolina Conference. I have a motion to offer at this time and I hope it's in order. I very much appreciate our sister in Christ, Martha Orphe, offering up a suggestion that we have prayer prior to balloting. I hope that you all know that she's the host district superintendent of this conference. I move that, prior to voting on Judicial Council elections, or University Senate elections, and on legislative committee recommendations, that we have a prayer offered for our discernment of God's will as we vote on those matters that will be before us, rather than voting—rather than having a prayer prior to each individual vote.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. That was a motion. Is there support? Is there any discussion? Alright. If you would support this motion, does everyone understand it? Please. Yes, mic 2.

BRIAN SUTTON (Kansas West): Brian Sutton, Kansas West. Bishop, I like the idea of having a prayer before each one, because it gave an opportunity for those not speaking the English

language to catch up and maybe figure out what was going on with the petition.

BISHOP LEE: So you're speaking against the motion?

SUTTON: Correct.

BISHOP: Alright, is there anyone else who would speak? One for the motion at this time. Alright, it appears that you're ready to vote. The motion was for prayer before Judicial Council and University Senate, for discernment before those specific votes. That is the motion before you. Are we ready to vote? Alright, please vote now. [*Yes, 538; No, 181; Abstain 6*]

BISHOP LEE: The motion carries. Thank you. Over here, mic 1.

LONNIE D. BROOKS (Alaska Missionary): Lonnie Brooks, lay, Alaska Missionary Conference. Bishop, under the authority of Paragraph 2609.2 for the General Conference to petition the Judicial Council for a declaratory decision on legislation pending before the General Conference, I move that the General Conference ask for a decision on the following questions, prompted by a constitutional amendment approved by the General Administration's Legislative Committee, but not yet calendared for action by this 2004 General Conference. The proposed amendment is on p. 893 of the *ADCA*. It is Petition 40123. And it will read as follows, as amended by the committee. And Bishop, there is a problem here in that what is printed in the *ADCA* will not be very much help to our delegates because the petitioner did not use the text that was in the errata—not in the errata, but following the certification of this amendment by the Council of Bishops after it had gone through the process with the—through the members of the annual conferences. So I'm afraid I'm going to have to read the article as it will be amended.

It says: "Article 4. Inclusiveness of the Church. The United Methodist Church is a part of the Church universal, which is one body in Christ, therefore, all persons without regard to race"

and then the committee is proposing to add “gender” at that point, “color, national origin, status,” adding here “disability,” then “or economic,” and then adding “or mental condition shall be eligible to attend its worship services, to participate in its programs, and when they take the appropriate vows, to be admitted into the—into its membership in any local church in the connection in The United Methodist Church. No conference or other organizational unit of the church shall be structured so as to exclude any member or any constituent body of the church because of race...” and in the rest of that, we add the same new language to that list of characteristics against which we cannot discriminate—that we cannot use to discriminate against persons, I should say.

BISHOP LEE: OK. You need to finish up.

BROOKS: Yes, Ma’am. Paragraph 338.3a of *The Book of Discipline* in establishing the provisions for the recognition of the orders of elders or ordained clergy from other denominations authorizes psychological or aptitude tests of the applicant as the board may require.

Question: Since the purpose of the psychological test is to determine the mental condition of the applicant, and since the pending amendment to Paragraph 4....

BISHOP LEE: Your time is finished, Sir. We need to ask you to finish in order that we can go ahead and take the vote. Your time is up.

BROOKS: The questions haven’t been asked.

BISHOP LEE: Pardon?

BROOKS: The questions have not been asked.

BISHOP LEE: OK. Let me ask you if you would be willing to come back to your request after the United Methodist Women’s ...

BROOKS: Yes, Ma’am.

BISHOP LEE: Would you bring it back after our video presentation Would you do that?

BROOKS: I will. Yes, Bishop.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. OK, let us move ahead to the celebration of the 131st anniversary of United Methodist Women and those who are ... We welcome you and invite you to the podium.

*UMW Anniversary*

GENIE BANK: Thank you, Bishop. My name is Genie Bank. I am president of the Women’s Division, and with me are the officers of the Women’s Division and the past presidents of the Women’s Division. We ...

*(applause)*

At this time, we’d like to view a brief video clip.

*(video presentation)*

“On November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1869, Bedford Street Church in New York was crowded to the doors with a sympathetic audience waiting to see this strange sight. Two single ladies about to sail the ocean to a new and untried task with no pledge of support, save that handful of women.”

That was a paragraph from one article in an 1869 publication. The idea of two women, a doctor and a teacher, sailing the ocean by themselves to work as missionaries for women and children in India was, indeed, quite the sight. But the fact that they were only being supported by a handful of women—now *that* took faith!

Faith and discernment is how the work of United Methodist Women started. Clementina Butler and other missionary wives in India saw that the women of that country were not being reached through the evangelistic efforts of their husbands. So, they opened their homes as day schools for women and girls, teaching them the Bible and basic skills. Then they returned to the United States and pled for the women of India, until the Tremont Church Ladies Benevolent Society in Boston finally heard.

The women agreed to invite the missionary wives to a special meeting and

at least hear their stories, even though they already thought they had too much to do. The church was locked when the earliest arrived on the rainy night. But once inside, the women prayed, and listened to the stories told by Clementina and another missionary wife, Mrs. Parker.

Within minutes, the Tremont women organized a woman’s missionary society with dues at two cents a week and a prayer so that membership might be within the means of every woman in the church. One hundred thirty-five years ago this handful of women began an organization that is now close to 1,000,000 members. Their two cents a week and a prayer has evolved into close to \$25 million in giving each year through United Methodist Women, and millions of prayers.

*(applause)*

The history of this work is still evident today. They began home missionary societies to meet the needs of newly freed slaves and the poor and oppressed women and children within their own communities. They built schools, hospitals, skills training programs, orphanages, community centers and more for women and children. More than 100 of these mission institutions exist in United States communities today. They started anti-lynching leagues and boldly stood against lynchings in their own communities. They were instrumental in the Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education* with their research on the states’ laws about race and color.

They built the Church Center for the United Nations 50 years ago understanding that this world is God’s world and we need to work together for peace and justice. They worked in coalitions and funded programs and projects in more than 100 countries around the world that empower women and children. They began schools of mission and national seminars to educate themselves about the world, justice issues, the Bible, and leadership skills. Now will all the United Methodist Women,

and all those who have been touched by United Methodist Women, please stand and remain standing.

(applause)

United Methodist Women for the past 135 years have listened to God's call to liberate and love in the name Christ. For these women, their work, and their continued response to God's call, we celebrate. Happy 135<sup>th</sup> birthday, United Methodist Women.

(applause)

BISHOP LEE: Thank you, Genie, and the officers and past presidents. I have a word of information for the delegate who presented the agenda item who so graciously agreed to wait until after the United Methodist Women's report. And it is my understanding that the request that you brought is out of order at this time. You must take the item, the agenda item, to the calendar committee to receive a calendar number and then you can bring it back to us on the floor. So if the delegate would do that, I'd appreciate it. And we'll move on to our next item which is to complete the work of the Conferences which was begun this morning. Bill Barney. Yes, while he is coming, mic 3.

PHILIP AMERSON (California-Pacific): Yes, Bishop, I'm Phil Amerson from the California-Pacific Annual Conference. I move to suspend the rules to have the document, *A Wesleyan Vision for Theological Education and Leadership Formation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, distributed either on Tuesday or on Wednesday. This was a document, a working document, prepared by a task force of The Council of Bishops, The General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, and The Association of The United Methodist Schools.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, there is a motion to suspend the rules with the purpose. Is there support? Alright, are all ready to vote? Alright, if you would approve the suspension of the rules for this purpose, please vote now. [*Yes, 739; No, 113; Abstain, 12*]

(pause)

The motion is passed. We do have two announcements I'd like to take before I recognize anyone else on the floor. Carolyn Marshall and then Jay Vorhees.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: (*unintelligible*) to all of us as we look toward programming and budgetary matters. Concerns were expressed in this morning's plenary session around approval of calendar items with financial implications that did not have an associated budget estimate. The General Council on Finance and Administration, as always, is prepared to work with the leadership of legislative committees that will be presenting such calendar items to help them prepare a budget estimate. Legislative committee leaders should contact the staff in the GCFA office, Room 327, for assistance.

BISHOP LEE: Thank you. Jay.

#### *Voting Issues*

JAY VORHEES: It's not good for me to be standing here because every time I stand here I feel like I have bad news. But I'm due, am forced, to come before you and tell you the status of the voting procedure and system from our tabling this morning. As we understand our rules as they have been established, the first vote that was taken and the first election where we were voting for two people did not conform to the rules of the conference. Because the voting system was set up, through a variety of circumstances, to count invalid votes but not invalid ballots. We are in the process of getting a patch, which is being emailed to us, which we believe will fix this.

And our recommendation to you today is that we keep this item on the table to allow us time to get that patch in, install it, and to run complete tests on every keypad tonight to allow voting to go forth. The other option that I presented to you earlier today was, as somebody has called it, the option of doing ballot voting. The problem with that, as we have learned, is that in order

for us to use that process for voting for nominees, we would have to suspend Rule 15.2 because that rule specifically relates to the earlier process we thought we were using.

Our, again, our recommendation, and what we ask your indulgence for, is to allow us to make the system conform to the rules that we passed early on in the conference. And we believe that we can do that and we will be working on that through the night to make sure that happens.

One last comment. It's been brought to our attention that some materials have been distributed to your desks claiming to be paper ballots for election. Those materials were not authorized and were not distributed according to the rules of the conference and should be disregarded. At this point, they have nothing to do with our election process, at this point.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. The recommendation is to leave the voting items on the table. That is not debatable; it's already on the table. Yes, mic 8.

LONNIE CHAFIN (Northern Illinois): Bishop, Lonnie Chafin, Northern Illinois Conference, I rise to request to change Rule 15.2 to allow ballots that do not include the same number as open positions to be considered valid, so if one voted for four and we need six, it would still be a permissible ballot and is the way the software works presently. If I receive a second, I would like to speak to it if I may.

BISHOP LEE: It sounds like you spoke to it, but we'll ask for a second. Is there support? (*unintelligible*) Alright.

LONNIE CHAFIN: Thank you, Bishop. We can remember that when the rules were first passed this was an issue that we considered. Some felt that it was appropriate to not require the same number of votes as open positions. Others felt differently. But now that we are in this situation where our software is set up to allow all valid votes and not valid ballots, I think it's expeditious and prudent and useful for

a good steward of the time of the General Conference to allow balloting to proceed with a change in this rule—to allow balloting to proceed on the General Conference and to allow the current elections to stand.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. We will also receive as a speech for. Is there a speech against the motion? Alright, mic 1.

MAXIE D. DUNNAM (Kentucky): Maxie Dunnam, clergy, Kentucky delegation. I oppose this amendment, or the change of the rule. We're so confused in our process now. For us to make a decision before our technology is fixed would be a grave mistake.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. We have a speech for, a speech against, mic 2.

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard, South Indiana. I have a question first. Did I understand our technical person to say the elections of Jon Gray and Beth Capen to the Judicial Council are now invalid? Was that the intention of the statement?

BISHOP LEE: That was my understanding. I'll double check.

MILLARD: Is that correct?

BISHOP LEE: Is that right?

VORHEES: In actuality, numerically, Beth Capen's election was valid because we were only voting for one position. And so, numerically, the way the math works, the computer was programmed according to the wrong rules. But the way the math works, it could possibly be considered valid. The computer system was not set up on the rules as the conference has adopted them. And so from that standpoint, from my interpretation, that would make those two elections invalid.

BISHOP LEE: We are right now dealing with the motion. Alright.

MILLARD: Given the fact, I am wondering, do we need—we have a situation where a bishop declared elections completed and persons elected. Now with due respect to our technical person, he is telling us that those ballots were invalid even though one of them

was only one person on the ballot and it was technically elected. So I wonder if we could appeal the decision of our technical person that that ballot is invalid when in fact, by his own admission, it was valid. So I would just like to ask the chair for a decision on that.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. We'll take that as a speech for the motion to amend. Is there a speech against? I am not going to do a ruling right now. Yes? Mic 5.

STEPHEN P. WENDE (Texas): Bishop, I am Steve Wendé from Texas Conference and I am speaking against the motion.

BISHOP LEE: Alright.

WENDE: I am speaking for us starting again tomorrow morning. This has nothing to do with my respect for the people wherever they have been in the rank ordering of the votes. However, I came into this thinking that the way to vote, one at a time or cluster, didn't matter and then on Monday afternoon—or Tuesday afternoon—when we all got together and adopted the rules, I was converted. We voted these rules in.

They were, for a lot of reasons, safer and more honest and you get a more valid result. I was converted and I don't reconvert easily. And the one thing we don't want is people to leave this General Conference saying, "You know what? I can't trust the way the Judicial Council was elected." I recommend we vote against this motion and we start over tomorrow.

BISHOP LEE: Thank you. That's a speech against the motion on the floor. Is there someone speaking for it? Yes. Mic 2.

H. EDDIE FOX (Holston): Eddie Fox from the Holston Conference. In light of the earlier conversation that was given to us by the technical people and the fact that we do not want to disenfranchise any voter, I move that we table this motion that is in front of us.

BISHOP LEE: It is in order. The motion is seconded. A motion to table, I don't believe, is open to debate so if you

will table the current motion to amend Item—Rule 15, are you ready to vote? To table the current motion to amend Item—Rule 15. Alright, please vote now. [*Yes, 570; No, 325; Abstain 6*]

(pause)

BISHOP LEE: The motion to table passes. We are ready to move ahead now to conclude the business of conferences which was tabled this morning. Welcome back.

#### *Conference Calendar Items*

BILL BARNEY (Troy): Thank you. Bishop, I am Bill Barney, the Chair of Conferences. I am pleased once again to invite Pastor Andrew Wolfe, North Alabama, to come forth with the completion of our report for today.

ANDREW WOLFE (North Alabama): Thank you, Bill and committee. If you will turn in your *Daily Christian Advocate* to 1537—1637, I'm sorry, 1637, Item No. 460, p. 318 in the *Advanced Daily Christian Advocate*, Petition 141218—41218. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation is non-concurrence. Are you read to vote? If you are in agreement with the recommendation of the committee, you vote yes; if not, you vote no. Please vote now. [*Yes, 758; No, 110; Abstain, 30*].

(pause)

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation of the committee is affirmed.

WOLFE: Also, on p. 1637 of the *Daily Christian Advocate*, 1637; Item No. 461; Petition 40988; p. 319 in the *ADCA*; Item 461; p. 1637. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? If you are in agreement with the recommendation of the committee, your vote is yes; if not, your vote is no. Please vote now.

(pause)

BISHOP LEE: And the motion passes. [*Yes, 787; No, 113; Abstain, 11*].

WOLFE: Also on p. 1637; Item 463; Petition 40159, found on p. 319—319 of the *ADCA*. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, once again, the recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? I see a hand here. Mic 8.

CAROLYN BRISCOE (South Carolina): Carolyn Briscoe, South Carolina. This is not a question related to the proposal. But the motion which was passed earlier included a request for prayer prior to voting on legislative matters for discernment for all of those matters that would be before us as well as Judicial Council elections and University Senate elections. Thank you.

BISHOP LEE: My understanding is that we took a vote when we returned this afternoon. I understood it to be that we would not vote for every vote but for specific votes. Was that the intent? Mic. OK. We are going to ask the Secretary to read the motion that we voted on earlier, if you'd hold on.

MARSHALL: I move that prior to voting on Judicial Council elections or University Senate elections and/or legislative committee recommendations that we have a—I presume that it means prayer—it says prior, offered for our discernment of God's will as we vote on these matters that will be before us rather than a prayer prior to each individual vote being cast.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, the understanding was correct, but we didn't do what the motion said before we began to hear from our committees. So let me stop now and take a moment to pray for the rest of the work that we will be doing related to our legislative committees' recommendations this afternoon. Let us pray.

*(prayer)*

Amen. Did you finish?

WOLFE: Did we vote?

BISHOP LEE: I'm sorry. Did you have a recommendation already?

*Regarding General Conference Delegates*

WOLFE: We were on p. 1637; Item 463. Did we vote on that one, Bishop?

BISHOP LEE: Alright, it is now before you. Item 463. The recommendation of the committee is before you—non-concurrence. Is there any other discussion? Yes. Mic, I can't tell which mic. Come to mic 4.

KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): The elections of Jon Gray and Beth Capen to the Judicial Council are now invalid. Was that the intention of the statement?

BISHOP LEE: That was my understanding. I'll double check.

KENT MILLARD, South Indiana: Is that correct?

BISHOP LEE: Is that right?

JAY VORHEES: In actuality, numerically, Beth Capen's election was valid because we were only voting for one position. And so, numerically, the way the math works, the computer was programmed according to the wrong rules. But the way the math works, it could possibly be considered valid. The computer system was not set up on the rules as the conference has adopted them. And so from that stand point, from my interpretation, that would make those two elections invalid.

BISHOP LEE: We are right now dealing with the motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: *(unintelligible)*

BISHOP LEE: Alright.

KENT MILLARD: Given the fact, I am wondering, do we need—we have a situation where a bishop declared elections completed and persons elected. Now with due respect to our technical person, he is telling us that those ballots were invalid even though one of them was only one person on the ballot and it was technically elected. So I wonder if we could appeal the decision of our technical person that that ballot is invalid when in fact, by his own admission, it was valid. So I would just like to ask the chair for a decision on that.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. We'll take that as a speech for the motion to amend. Is there a speech against? I am not going to do a ruling right now. Yes? Mic 5.

STEPHEN WENDE (Texas): Bishop, I am Steve Wende from Texas Conference and I am speaking against the motion.

BISHOP LEE: Alright.

STEPHEN WENDE: I am speaking for us starting again tomorrow morning. This has nothing to do with my respect for the people wherever they have been in the rank ordering of the votes. However, I came into this thinking that the way to vote, one at a time or cluster, didn't matter and then on Monday afternoon—or Tuesday afternoon—when we all got together and adopted the rules, I was converted. We voted these rules in. They were, for a lot of reasons, safer and more honest and you get a more valid result. I was converted and I don't reconvert easily. And the one thing we don't want is people to leave this General Conference saying, "You know what? I can't trust the way the Judicial Council was elected." I recommend we vote against this motion and we start over tomorrow.

BISHOP LEE: Thank you. That's a speech against the motion on the floor. Is there someone speaking for it? Yes. Mic 2.

EDDIE FOX (Holston): Eddie Fox from the Holston Conference. In light of the earlier conversation that was given to us by the technical people and the fact that we do not want to disenfranchise any voter, I move that we table this motion that is in front of us.

BISHOP LEE: It is in order. The motion is seconded. A motion to table, I don't believe, is open to debate so if you will table the current motion to amend Item—Rule 15, are you ready to vote? To table the current motion to amend Item—Rule 15. Alright, please vote now.

*(pause)*

BISHOP LEE: The motion to table

passes. We are ready to move ahead now to conclude the business of conferences which was tabled this morning. Welcome back.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The vote to table was [*Yes, 570; No, 325; Abstain 6*].

BILL BARNEY (Troy): Thank you. Bishop, I am Bill Barney, the chair of Conferences. I am pleased once again to invite Pastor Andrew Wolfe, North Alabama, come forth with the completion of our report for today.

ANDREW WOLFE (North Alabama): Thank you, Bill and committee. If you will turn in your Daily Christian Advocate to 1537—1637, I'm sorry, 1637, Item No. 460, p. 318 in the Advanced Daily Christian Advocate, Petition 141218—41218. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation is non-concurrence. Are you read to vote? If you are in agreement with the recommendation of the committee, you vote yes; if not, you vote no. Please vote now.

(*pause*)

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation of the committee is affirmed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The vote is [*Yes, 758; No, 110; Abstain, 30*].

ANDREW WOLFE: Also, on p. 1637 of the Daily Christian Advocate, 1637; Item No. 461; Petition 40988; p. 319 in the ADCA; Item 461; p. 1637. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: The recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? If you are in agreement with the recommendation of the committee, your vote is yes; if not, your vote is no. Please vote now.

(*pause*)

BISHOP LEE: And the motion passes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The vote is [*Yes, 787; No, 113; Abstain, 11*].

ANDREW WOLFE: Also on p. 1637; Item 463; Petition 40159, found on p. 319—319 of the ADCA. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, once again, the recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? I see a hand here. Mic 8.

CAROLYN BRISCOE (South Carolina): Carolyn Briscoe, South Carolina. This is not a question related to the proposal. But the motion which was passed earlier included a request for prayer prior to voting on legislative matters for discernment for all of those matters that would be before us as well as Judicial Council elections and University Senate elections. Thank you.

BISHOP LEE: My understanding is that we took a vote when we returned this afternoon. I understood it to be that we would not vote for every vote but for specific votes. Was that the intent? Mic. OK. We are going to ask the Secretary to read the motion that we voted on earlier, if you'd hold on.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: I move that prior to voting on Judicial Council elections or University Senate elections and/or legislative committee recommendations that we have a—I presume that it means prayer—it says prior, offered for our discernment of God's will as we vote on these matters that will be before us rather than a prayer prior to each individual vote being cast.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, the understanding was correct but we didn't do what the motion said before we began to hear from our committees. So let me stop now and take a moment to pray for the rest of the work that we will be doing related to our legislative committees' recommendations this afternoon. Let us pray. "God, we do thank you for the opportunity to serve you here today and for the decisions that are being made. We pray that for each vote that is taken, related to a recommendation or a motion, in the rest of this time together this afternoon, that you will guide us with your Holy Spirit to discern what is

your will, that your will might be accomplished and your purposes fulfilled. In Jesus name we pray. Amen."

BISHOP LEE: Amen. Did you finish?

ANDREW WOLFE: Did we vote?

BISHOP LEE: I'm sorry. Did you have a recommendation already?

ANDREW WOLFE: We were on p. 1637; Item 463. Did we vote on that one, Bishop?

BISHOP LEE: Alright, it is now before you. Item 463. The recommendation of the committee is before you—non-concurrence. Is there any other discussion? Yes. Mic, I can't tell which mic. Come to mic 4.

THOMAS D. WOGAMAN, (Oregon-Idaho Conference): Thank you Bishop. My name is Tom Wogaman. I'm lay representative from the Oregon-Idaho Annual Conference, and I am rising to oppose my own legislative committee recommendation of non-concurrence with this motion. I'm speaking to the point of whether or not I want to make the case that it isn't either in our society at large or in our church an absolute practice that we make all proportionate delegations exactly proportionate to the raw numbers involved in the area being represented. In the society at large, of course, we have the United States Senate; we have the Electoral College that all tweak the proportionate number by some factor recognizing each locality has a separate and additional interest in representation.

In our churches we have the principle that even the smallest church has a lay member of conference and the largest churches have one also, plus one to match every minister that they have, but not proportionately more. I think that we would all agree that the larger the membership in the area being represented the larger the delegation should be. But that doesn't mean that it should be solely on that criterion, either as I say as a principle in our society or in the church; and I think the proposal here which would put a 5 percent floor under each jurisdictional delegation's strength is a reasonable

recognition of the disparate, the wide-spread areas, and one of our jurisdictions that even though it is small in population or in church membership is large in variety of interests being represented, and I think this kind of tweeking of it's representation is reasonable and fair. Thank you.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. Thank you. That's a speech against the recommendation of the committee. Is there anyone else that would speak for the recommendation? Mic 1.

JOE M. WHITIMORE, (North Georgia): Bishop, I would like to speak against it. I would like to speak for the, for the motion.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. For the recommendation of the committee?

WHITIMORE: Yes.

BISHOP LEE: Alright.

WHITIMORE: I believe that in our current disciplinary provisions we already have a minimum provision that adequately takes care of every annual conference being represented in The United Methodist Church at General Conference.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you.

Alright. Is there a speech against the recommendation? Mic 8.

(pause)

FRANK DORSEY (Kansas East): Frank Dorsey from Kansas East. I want to speak against the committee's recommendation. Even though there is some provision in the *Discipline*, I do not believe that it is adequate, and I believe that we really ought to err on inclusion, and so I have to oppose non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. The recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? Do you have a speech in favor of the committee? Mic 1.

CHARLES B. LANIER (North Georgia): Bishop, Chuck Lanier, lay delegate from Georgia. I was in the sub-committee and committee that addressed this. The reasoning that we had was that the 5 percent is an arti-

cial floor. You have to keep in mind that there's sort of a zero sum game here. If you give a conference more voting power than they would otherwise be entitled to, you have to take that representation from somebody else who is entitled to representation. So we saw this as a fairness issue, and I would recommend that we sustain the position of the committee.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. There is opportunity for one more speech against the recommendation. Alright. Mic 1.

(pause)

DEBORAH CRONIN (South Indiana): Having lived for 3½ years in the Western Jurisdiction then returned to the Northeast Jurisdiction and currently serving in the North Central Jurisdiction, I am still impressed with the West and the vast amount of land that folks are responsible for out there, and their presence as a standing up in the midst of an area that is highly impacted by the Mormon Church, Church of the Later Day Saints, which is in my opinion is not a church at all, and I would recommend that we do not concur with the committee and that we go along with this idea that Phil Wogaman has presented. Thank you.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. Thank you. We need to take the vote now. We have had three speeches for and three speeches against. If you agree with the recommendation of the committee for non-concurrence for Item 463, vote yes. If you do not agree with the recommendation of the committee, vote no. Please vote now. [Yes, 613; No, 285; Abstain, 15]

The motion and recommendation of the committee passes. Thank you.

WOLFE: Bishop, if we'll turn now to p. 1615, 1615 of the *DCA*, Item No. 161, 161; Petition No. 41248; found on p. 321 through 322 in the *Advanced DCA*.

BISHOP LEE: The item is before you. Are you ready to vote?

WOLFE: I might explain. There is an amendment. The committee recom-

mends concurrence as amended. Retain the original language of Paragraph 507 of the *Discipline* except that 150 should be changed to 180, referring to the number of days petitions have to be submitted for consideration.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. Are you now ready to vote on Item 161? The committee recommends concurrence. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [Yes, 838; No, 79; Abstain 9]

The motion passes. Thank you.

WOLFE: And my final one, Bishop, on p. 1628, 1628 of the *DCA*; Item No. 332 in the *Advanced DCA* p. 320 and following. I have some point of clarification here. The committee had recommended non-concurrence on all of these items, except for 40798, and these were on the consent agenda and asked to be removed. We are not certain that the person, or persons, who asked to do that intended to include 40798 which has to do with an entirely different matter than the others. All of these again have to do with the way the General Conference can be petitioned and our committee had recommended non-concurrence for every petition except 40798, which had to do with a change of name to the Global Youth Organization in concurrence with legislation passed in another committee. So we are not certain if they included to also lift that off the consent agenda. Was that clear?

BISHOP LEE: Somewhat.

WOLFE: There is a whole list of petitions here that were all voted non-concurrence having to do with the same issue, except for 40798, which is in the third column there. I'm not sure asked to have these removed from the consent agenda, but we recommended non-concurrence on every item except 40798.

BISHOP LEE: So you are asking that the vote be for every item except 40798?

WOLFE: I assume. I'm asking for you to help me here, or someone else.

BISHOP LEE: Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is an error, I guess (*unintelligible*).

WOLFE: Can we ask that Item 40798 be lifted out of this list so that we can vote concurrence on that and non-concurrence on the others?

BISHOP LEE: Yes, we can do that.

WOLFE: OK. We would move that. That we lift 40798.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. We actually have 2 items before you. One is 40798, with which the committee voted concurrence, and the other is the one on page—Item 332, which was voted non-concurrence and all the petitions lifted there. So we would need to take 2 votes, and I see a question here or a comment. Mic 4.

BECKY HAASE, (California-Pacific): Becky Haase, California-Pacific. I was also a member of the Conference Legislative Committee. I hope this is helpful clarification. My notes indicate that 40798 was voted non-concurrence because we did add that language to petition 41248; so I think it is handled in another place.

WOLFE: Thank you for that clarification.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, microphone 2.

J. PAT STROMAN (Central Texas): Pat Stroman, Central Texas. A question on the 160 and 221. One says delete. One says retain. They're talking about Paragraph 507.

WOLFE: In our previous vote, we retained all the language already is the reason for that.

BISHOP LEE: And the recommendation is non-concurrence. OK.

WOLFE: We'd already dealt with that paragraph in the previous.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, so what we have before us is item...What did you want to do with 40798?

WOLFE: We're going to leave 40798 there because it is handled in another way. We need one vote on non-concurrence; affirmation of the committee.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, now it is

before you. Are you ready to vote? We're voting on Item 332. The recommendation of the committee is non-concurrence. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 888; No, 21; Abstain, 9*]

The recommendation passes. Thank you.

WOLFE: Thank you, Bishop. That concludes the work for our committee today.

BISHOP LEE: Thank you. Ready to move to Financial Administration? Is that Tracy Merrick?

#### *Financial Administration Calendar Items*

TRACY R. MERRICK (Western Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bishop. We have six items to present at this particular point. And Ewing Wierlein and William Scott are here to assist. We'd like to start out with three items. If you will turn to p. 1641 in the *DCA*. It is Calendar Item 501. It's on p. 1641; Calendar Item 501. In the *ADCA*, the information is found on p. 618, that's p. 618; and it is Petition 41506, 41506. The action of the committee is to recommend non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, the recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? If you are in agreement with the recommendation of the committee, you are voting yes to non-concurrence. If you are not in agreement, vote no. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 817; No, 89; Abstain, 5*]

The motion passes.

MERRICK: Our second item is in the *DCA* also found on 1641 and this calendar number 508; p. 1648, Calendar No. 508. In the *ADCA*, this information is on p. 626 and it is Petition 41059. That's p. 626, Petition No. 41059. I need to make sure that we're clear on an amendment. If you'll in the second column of p. 626, at the top of the page, half-way down; you'll notice that there's a figure \$25,000. The committee amended by deleting \$25,000 or so that that sentence then reads, "remodeling of such a building, if the cost will exceed 25 percent of the value of the building." And with that

amendment, the committee voted concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, this item and recommendation are before you. Are you ready to vote? If you would agree with the recommendation of concurrence, please vote now. Or if you don't agree, you still vote. [*Yes, 841; No, 58; Abstain, 6*]

The recommendation is passed.

MERRICK: Our next item is also found on p. 1641 *DCA*, Calendar No. 509, right below the previous one; Calendar Item 509. The information in the *DCA* is also on 626. That's p. 626 in the *ADCA* and it is Petition No. 41060, 41060. And on this particular petition, the committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, this recommendation is before you. Are you ready to vote? The recommendation is non-concurrence. If you agree with non-concurrence, vote yes. If you do not, vote no. Please vote now. [*Yes, 872; No, 41; Abstain, 0*]

The recommendation of the committee is affirmed.

MERRICK: Bishop, Ewing Werlein is the committee chair who dealt with the next couple of items and he will present those.

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): p. 1642, 1642; Calendar Item 510. A petition in the *ADCA* may be found on p. 605, 605. It is Petition No. 40258. The committee has amended the petition to substitute where 180 appears; 180 days instead 150 days, 150. With that amendment, the committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. This item is before you. Are you ready to vote? Alright, the recommendation is concurrence. Vote yes if you agree; no, if you do not. Please vote now. [*Yes, 889; No, 20; Abstain, 3*]

The recommendation is passed.

WERLEIN: P. 1642, Calendar Item 512, 512. This petition may be found in the *ADCA* at p. 604; Petition No. 41214. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP LEE: This item is before you. Are you ready to vote? The recommendation is non-concurrence. If you agree, vote yes; if not, vote no. Please vote now. [Yes, 732; No, 183; Abstain, 5]

The recommendation passes.

*Special Sundays*

WERLEIN: P. 1640, Calendar Item 499. This item may be found in the *ADCA* at p. 611, 611. It is Petition No. 40287. As you know, at Paragraph 263 of the *Discipline*, "it is required that six special Sundays with offerings shall be celebrated in The United Methodist Church." This petition which came from United Methodist Communications basically specifies and reorders the program boards and agencies under whose general supervision these special Sundays are to be observed. It also provides that in all instances for each of the six Sundays, the General Board on Communications is charged to conduct a church-wide appeal.

The sum clarification is added as to how the funds are collected or to be administered after payment of promotional expense; and at the outset of each of the numbered paragraphs, a short historical reference is made to the date that these six special Sunday offerings have been observed followed by an encouragement to congregations to observe the special day on that historic date, or another date appropriate to the local church. The committee recommends concurrence. There is a minority report that will be presented by William Scott of our committee.

WILLIAM D. SCOTT (Mississippi): William Scott, Mississippi Conference, lay delegate. If you would remain on those same pages of your *DCA* and of your Advance *DCA*, and if you would take a few moments to look at those two petitions, the minority report, and the original petition as it appeared in the *ADCA*, they parallel each other almost exactly. So then let me say, in presenting this minority report that those

members of the Finance and Administration Committee who voted against the proposal as it was written were in no way opposed to the special Sunday offerings.

The motivation for filing this report is to the contrary. We feel strongly that the special Sunday offerings should not only be celebrated, but should be required participation as indicated in Paragraph 262 of our *Book of Discipline*, which gives it the rationale for having these Sundays, and Paragraph 263 which make them required ministries of the church. It is our belief that cleaning up the language in *The Book of Discipline* and stating as to what agencies would promote these particular special offerings should not have changed the intent of Paragraph 262 and 263, and therefore the minority report simply changes, in every instance where you see the word "be encouraged to," strike that and replace it with the word "shall." And, with that, we are in total agreement with the rest of the committee.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. This item is before you. We need first, to deal with the original petition, in terms of any perfecting that it may require. Alright, I see no hands. We want to move then to the minority report. Any additional input related to the minority report? Alright, if you are ready to vote, we would vote first on the minority report. Yes, you may have a word.

WERLEIN: On behalf of the committee, I would recommend that you vote no on the minority report. As has been pointed out, the special Sundays are required to be held according to Paragraph 263 of the *Discipline*. There has been a lot of "shall" language with respect to these. At the same time, as you will see by the report on p. 531 of the *Advance DCA*, the church participation in six special Sundays for all jurisdictions combined averaged only 26 percent of our churches. It was the belief of the committee that, since mandatory language of saying "shall, shall, shall" does not seem to draw

more interest than that in our churches, that to encourage the churches to observe these historic days or use a date that they would prefer, is a nice grace note when asking for these special offerings. And for that reason, the committee would ask that you vote "no" on the minority report.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, thank you. Yes? No, you have the last word.

SCOTT: For that same reason, I think that often we become lower if we did do that.

BISHOP LEE: We think we made a little mistake, but we are going to go ahead and vote. And we still begin with the minority report. So, we want to ask you, if you are in agreement with the minority report as it is presented vote "yes", if not, vote "no". Please vote now. [Yes, 407; No 498; Abstain, 10]

The minority report does not pass.

We are back to the original item, the original recommendation for 99. If you are in favor of the original recommendation, please vote "yes," if not vote "no." Please vote now. [Yes, 698; No, 13; Abstain, 11]

The recommendation does pass.

TRACY MERRICK (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop, I do have one more item to bring up, and this is a piece of information in response to questions that were asked yesterday. It's not an item of legislation that's before us at this time. There were folks in the body that wanted some information regarding the actions of Financial Administration regarding the budget. If I could just point them to the pages in the book, that would be helpful at this point, and perhaps answering those questions. Is that acceptable?

BISHOP LEE: That's fine. Thank you.

MERRICK: Members of the body yesterday were curious as to what the Financial Administration had done in their consideration of the budget, and the various funds that are part of our work. I will point you, by way of information only, to p. 1751 in the *DCA*. In the left hand column of that page you

will see Calendar Item 1053. That's p. 1751, Calendar Item 1053. This item will be before us on Friday when the GCFA reports are considered but wanted to point out to you the recommendations coming from Financial Administration for your review in case that helps you with any decision making. The other piece of information that you should know about, in contrast, is what's on p. 1761. That is a GCFA report which covers petitions with financial implications coming to all of the committees, not ones that just came through the Financial Administration Committee. I just wanted to place that before you for your information. Thank you.

BISHOP LEE: Thank you. Alright, we're ready to move ahead to Local Church. Deborah Kiesey. I think someone over here wants to speak. OK, mic 4.

JANET E. STEPHENSON (Iowa): Bishop, Janet Stephenson from Iowa. In light of the petitions we just passed which extended the time that petitions have to be received to General Conference from 150 to 180 days, we passed two petitions that made that action. We need to bring the rules of order into agreement with that. So my motion, is to, on p. 1488 or 1537, one of your many rules, reports, in the second paragraph of XIV, second paragraph XIV, either 1488 or 1537, change "150 days" to "180 days," to be consistent with the action we've just taken.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. For the purpose of consistency; is there support? There is support. Are you ready to vote to change this item, No. XIV, to make it consistent with what has just been done? Yes, mic 3.

JEANNIE TREVINO-TEDDLIE (Central Texas): Jeannie Trevino-Teddle from the Central Texas Conference, clergy. I have a question. The petitions that we passed, does that not take into effect for next General Conference? So then, do we need to change the rules since those rules apply to this conference, and we'll have new

rules for next General Conference?

BISHOP LEE: My understanding is that it would refer to the future, but in fact, I've been informed that the item could be referred to the rules committee for them to make those adjustments. So the body does not have to vote, although we have a motion on the floor.

TREVINO-TEDDLIE: Then I would make an amendment referring to the rules.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. We have an amendment to refer. Is there support? Alright, I don't believe we discuss. Maybe we do. Are you ready to vote on the amendment to refer? Alright, if you would agree to refer, vote "yes," if not vote "no." Please vote now. [*Yes, 820; No, 71; Abstain, 10*]

Alright, the motion to refer passes. Alright, we are ready for Local Church.

DEBORAH L. KIESEY (Iowa): OK, thank you. Bishop, delegates to the General Conference, I am Deb Kiesey from the Iowa delegation, and it was my privilege to be able to chair the Local Church Legislative Committee. Before we begin to present our items this afternoon, I would like to introduce the leadership team that so ably led our legislative section as well as our sub-committees. Our vice chair was Virgilio Vazquez-Garza from the Southwest Texas Conference. Our secretary was Mary Council-Austin from the Wisconsin Conference.

We had four sub-committees and their chairs were Ana Kelsey-Powell from the Northern Illinois Conference, Valerie Stolz from East Ohio Conference, Jim Dorff from the North Texas Conference, and Dawson Taylor from Texas Conference. We have four items to present to you this afternoon. You will find all of them on pages 1644 and 1645 of the *DCA*, and I turn it over now to Jim Dorff.

BISHOP LEE: (*unintelligible*) ...after the dinner hour. Thank you for introducing everyone so we know who's coming back. We'd like to ask the secretary for any announcements.

MARSHALL: No announcements.

We've asked Bishop John Innis to come and close our time together with prayer. Point of order. Yes, mic 4.

RAUL GARCIA: Se Raul Garcia de Mexico. Quiero hablar en Español.

BISHOP LEE: You need a translator?

GARCIA: Si, Senorita.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. Is there a translator available? We have a point of order. OK, you can go ahead and it will be translated.

GARCIA: [*simultaneous interpretation*] I would like to suspend the rules to deliver a document from the bishops from Mexico.

BISHOP LEE: Alright, is that a motion to suspend the rules to deliver a document—is there support? There is support. Alright. Thank you. If you would suspend the rules please prepare to vote. If you're in agreement vote "yes," if not, vote "no." Please vote now. [*Yes, 808; No, 92; Abstain, 4*]

OK, the motion passes and we're ready for Bishop Innis to lead us in. Yes, mic 3.

CHERYL BELL (Kansas West): Cheryl Bell, clergy from Kansas West. I would like to make a motion, that mail that is sent to the delegates on the floor must be identified who the sender is; if it does not, when it is discovered who the sender is, that they be banned from sending mail to the delegates for the remaining of the General Conference.

BISHOP LEE: Alright there's a motion. Is there support? Alright, is there any discussion? Did you want to speak to it?

BELL: Yes. This is very confusing. We receive a multitude of mail and when we receive information from sources that do not identify who they are—it was identified earlier by I believe individual on the staff with the secretary's office that there was confusion as to whether this was a written ballot or not.

BISHOP LEE: Alright. Thank you. Is there any discussion about this motion? Alright, if you are in favor,

vote “yes”; if not, vote “no.” Please vote now. [*Yes, 663; No, 222; Abstain, 10*]

(pause)

The motion passes. Thank you. Bishop Innis, I think we’re going to try it one more time.

## Monday Evening, May 3, 2004

(song)

BISHOP WILLIAM W. HUTCHINSON (Louisiana Area): We give thanks to our music leadership team for their wonderful leadership, both tonight and throughout all the conference this time.

(applause)

If you will find your places and be seated, I think we can begin the evening’s agenda. I hope all of you had a good time of rest at dinner time and are not so full but what you can really zero in on what we are going to do tonight. One of the requests that we have had repeatedly as we have begun each of our sessions is that we remember that we are a people of prayer and that we want to be prayerful about the business that we do—that it not just be business, but it be prayerful conferencing of a faith-filled people.

And so tonight, I’m going to ask us if we will enter into a short time of prayer before we begin with the actual presentation of the petitions, and that we have that suffice as our time of prayer. We will move slowly enough that the interpreters can interpret, and during that time, I think we can also be in prayer as we get ready to vote on each issue. If there is a particularly difficult issue that might come before us, which I am certainly not anticipating; but if there is, and we feel a special need of prayer at that moment, we will stop and pray specifically at that moment. But let’s enter into a time of holy silence as we each ask for God’s

blessing upon that which we are about to do tonight. Let us enter into a few moments of prayer.

(prayer)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: We begin this evening where we stopped at the break after the afternoon session with Local Church, and I’ll turn to Deborah Kiesey to lead us in to that particular section.

DEBORAH L. KIESEY (Iowa Conference): Thank you, Bishop. We have four petitions, four items to present to you this evening, and you will find all of them on *DCA* pages 1644 and 1645. If you will turn to those at this time, I will turn this over to Jim Dorff.

JAMES E. DORFF (North Texas Conference): Jim Dorff from the North Texas Annual Conference. *DCA*, p. 1644. Call your attention to Calendar Item No. 541. It is Petition No. 41348. And in the Advance *DCA* the page no. is 1376. This petition is entitled, “Apportionment Plan,” and the committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. We have before us Petition No. 541 on p. 1644, and the committee’s recommendation is non-concurrence. I see a person to my right. Mic 4.

DALE R. SHUNK (Western Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bishop. Dale Shunk from Western Pennsylvania Conference. Whenever there is a motion for non-concurrence from the committee, could we at least have at least a one sentence rationale—reason—why there’s non-concurrence? Particularly for those of us who haven’t been in their committee?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Do you choose to make a quick statement?

DORFF: Sure.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you.

DORFF: This is an apportionment plan—an alternative plan—that was brought to our committee. In this petition, it is intended to provide an alternative way of doing apportionments in which local churches would be given

the option of designating certain line items that they would then pay instead of paying the equal amounts to which they would normally apportioned. In addition to that, in this particular petition, though, it was clearly indicated that that provision—that opportunity to designate those apportionments—would only be workable and acceptable if the church paid an amount equivalent to 100 percent of the apportionments to which they would normally be given.

The committee felt that although this was a very well-intentioned and well-spirited petition in order to try and include more, indeed, more money—or at least as much as would be apportioned for every church—we felt that it took us a little bit too far in the wrong direction in terms of our connectional responsibilities and paying all the apportionments equally as they would come to us.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. There is the rationale for the recommendation. Are there those who wish to speak to the petition? I see to my far right—over here, mic 4.

J. ROBERT LADD (Eastern Pennsylvania): I was one of the dissenting votes on the committee and felt—I feel—I’ve done a lot of fundraising, and that’s what I actually do for a living. And I felt that this would actually be a tremendous help to the local churches. My experience in doing consecration Sunday’s programs, and that sort of thing, is that oft times there are churches that are not paying their full apportionment and are not collecting what they need for their local churches because they do not favor where the money is going. I really believe that giving them the choice—if they are willing to pay a 100% apportionment—will help everybody involved, and I would like to urge your considering overriding the committee’s decision.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. There is a speech against the committee’s report. Is there a speech for? Right here in front of me. Mic. 3, please.

PAULA J. WHITBECK (Central

Texas): Paula Whitbeck, Central Texas Conference. I'm also on the sub-committee that looked at this proposal. I think while I appreciated the stewardship emphasis of the proposal, I believe our committee felt that there would be too negative impacts. One would be a feeling of the brokenness of the connection. And secondly there was a feeling—a strong feeling—that this would be little more than designated giving, which is not what our apportionment system is set up for. We already have designated giving beyond our apportionments.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Thank you. Way back over here. Yes, mic 5, please.

MORRIS MATTHIS (Texas): Morris Matthis, Texas Annual Conference. I would move that we refer this petition to GCF for further study and conversation over the next quadrennium.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. There is a motion to refer to GCF and A for further study over the quadrennium. Is there a second to that? Alright. The motion is made and seconded to refer it to GCF and A for further study over the quadrennium. Do you wish to speak to it?

MATTHIS: My sense of the conversation in the committee was that while (*unintelligible*) there was a lot of discussion and interest in these concepts and (*unintelligible*) GCF were to talk about it and they may find some of these concepts helpful and bring us a report in 2008.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. Yes, here in the middle, mic 3.

CHERYL J. BELL (Kansas West): Cheryl Bell, clergy, Kansas West. I served on the Local Church Committee and there was not that much discussion. Amen.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. That is a speech against referral. Does anybody else want to speak for referral? I think we are ready to vote. If you would sustain the motion to refer to GCF and A for further study over the

quadrennium, you will vote in favor of that or against that. You will vote now. [*Yes, 260; No, 604; Abstain 10*]

And it is not referred. Alright. We have one for and one against, and we can take another for or against. Right here in the middle, mic 2.

MORENIKE IVING (Mississippi): Morenike Iving, Mississippi Conference. What we discussed in our committee was pretty much what the sister over there said—that we did not want to get into the business of designated giving. And one of the comments that was made in our committee meeting was, well, this will make these entities, which we will be able to give if we were paying 100 percent of our apportionments, an awareness. Because if they did something that they knew that the local church would not necessarily approve of, that they would not be receiving—that they knew there would be a chance that they would not be receiving money from that church and maybe other churches who disagree with their position. And I don't really think that's a positive thing for the church to get into the business of "you did something I don't like so we're not going to give you money," and we just did not think that there was a positive way that the church needs to start—a positive direction—that the church needs to start moving in. So, I would vote that you do concur with the committee in a decision of non-concurrence with this petition. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. There is two for. Is there—we have one against. Is there one to—I don't see any cards any place. I assume you are ready to vote. If you will vote to sustain the committee you will vote yes, which will mean that you do not concur with the petition.

DORFF: The committee recommended non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Please vote now. [*Yes, 748; No, 135; Abstain, 7*]

And you have sustained the committee. Yes, sir.

#### *Additional Local Church Items*

DAWSON B. TAYLOR (Texas): Bishop, I'm Dawson Taylor, lay delegate from the Texas Annual Conference. And it was my privilege to chair the sub-committee for program ministries in the local church and wider community. I bring Petition No. 40081; Calendar Item 542, on p. 1644 of the *DCA* and p. 1353 of the *ADCA*. This petition is entitled, "Connecting College and University Students with United Methodist Related Campus Ministries." Our committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence. Is there any discussion? I see none. I assume you are ready to vote. If you are, please vote now. [*Yes, 794; No, 74; Abstain, 12*]

You have voted to sustain the committee, which is to concur. Yes.

ANA KELSEY-POWELL (Northern Illinois): Good evening. My name is Ana Kelsey-Powell, and I'm a delegate from the Northern Illinois Conference. The first petition we will be looking at is be found on p. 1645, 1645. It is Calendar Item No. 546. It is Petition No. 40494, and it is found in your *ADCA* on p. 1370.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, proceed.

KELSEY-POWELL: The committee moves non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, non-concurrence. Do you wish to make one quick statement as rationale?

KELSEY-POWELL: I believe it had to do with policing this issue, whether or not it was feasible for us to...to make sure that all of this was going on at the same time. So feasibility, I guess, would be the issue.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. Is there any discussion around this particular petition? I see none; I think you're ready to vote. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 767; No, 116; Abstain, 9*]

You have sustained the committee to non-concur. Yes.

KELSEY-POWELL: The next petition is found on the same page, 1645, 1645. It is Calendar Item 547. It is Petition No. 40311, and may be found in your *ADCA* on p. 1384, 1384.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright.

KELSEY-POWELL: The committee moved concurrence as amended.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The committee is recommending concurrence as amended. Any discussion? I think not. I think you're ready to vote. If you are to vote on this calendar item, please vote now. [*Yes, 842; No, 48; Abstain, 10*]

And you have voted to sustain the committee to concur as amended.

KIESEY: That concludes the items from Local Church for this evening.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. Let's give them a hand for their leadership.

(*applause*)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: We will move now to General Administration.

#### *General Administration Items*

EDWARD K. TOMLINSON (North Georgia): Bishop Hutchinson, Ed Tomlinson, North Georgia Conference. First, I want to commend and thank the officers of the General Administration Committee: Carolyn Johnson of North Indiana was the vice-chair of the group; Mary Brooke Casad of North Texas was the secretary of the group. And now, the petitions to be presented will be offered by the sub-committee chairpersons, beginning with Marcus Matthews of the Baltimore-Washington Conference; Carl Frazier of North Carolina; Debbie McLeod of Florida; and Elaine Stanovsky of Pacific Northwest.

MARCUS MATTHEWS (Baltimore- Washington): Bishop, Marcus Matthews, the chair of the sub-committee dealing with missional priorities. We have three petitions to bring to you this evening. The first petition is found in your *DCA*, p. 1643, Calendar Item No. 529, Petition No. 40312; in

the *ADCA*, p.900. The committee recommends non-concurrence. The rationale is that we would want to keep this subject in *The Book of Discipline* as a way of keeping important concerns before the whole church. We see this as another opportunity to teach and to educate the members of our congregations. And so the committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. The recommendation is non-concurrence. Alright, the petition, I'm being told, recommends concurrence. Are you saying that...

MATTHEWS: I'm sorry, Bishop. Yes, it recommends concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, as amended. Concurrence as amended.

MATTHEWS: Yes, as amended. Yes.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, fine. Thank you. So the recommendation is not non-concurrence. It is concurrence as amended. I see no one with a card. I think we're ready to vote. Concur—the recommendation is concurrence as amended. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 809; No, 99; Abstain, 5*].

Alright, we are sustained. Please proceed.

MATTHEWS: The second petition is found on the same page, p. 1643, Calendar Item No. 528, Petition No. 40091; in the *ADCA* p. 901. The subject title is "Organ and Tissue Donor Sunday." The committee recommends non-concurrence. The rationale is that we want to keep this in the *Discipline* because of the importance of the educational issues and to keep it before the whole church.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, the recommendation is non-concurrence. Does anybody wish to speak to this? I believe you are ready to vote. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 810; No, 100; Abstain, 6*].

And you have voted to sustain the committee in non-concurrence.

MATTHEWS: The third petition is found on *DCA* p. 1643, Calendar Item

527, Petition No. 41379; and in the *ADCA*, p. 1068. The title, "Study on Latin America and the Caribbean." The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, p. 1643, Calendar Item 527. Everyone found that? We are ready to discuss if you wish to discuss this particular petition. Mic 3.

ARTHUR JONES (North Texas): Bishop, Arthur Jones, North Texas Conference. It is my understanding that we were to be giving out monetary numbers, and there is an exclamation point, which means this is off-budget. I would like an answer from the chair, I believe. Thank you.

MATTHEWS: Bishop, the amount for this is \$425, 000. You can find that amount in your *DCA* on p. 1761. At the bottom of that page, you'll see the amount of \$425,000.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, on 1761 in the *DCA* is an explanation of, or a listing, of that amount.

MATTHEWS: At the bottom of the column, you'll see the Petition No. 41379. You'll see the page, "Study on Latin America and the Caribbean." \$425,000 is the amount.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes. Alright, \$425,000. Of course, this will go back to GCFA for recommendation before it comes to the floor again. Back, over here to mic 4, please.

KRISTINA GONZALEZ (Pacific Northwest): I'm just curious as to where the \$425,000 figure came from. As I look on my *ADCA* at 1069, I do not see a budgetary figure with this. What I do see, is \$425,000 connected with Petition...

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: With the "Town and Country Ministry."

GONZALEZ: With "Town and Country," correct. Petition No. 4127—no, sorry, 41349.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

GONZALEZ: So just clarity on that, please.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Can you give us an answer to that question?

MATTHEWS: We're sorry, we don't have an answer. This was the amount that was given to us.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: That was the amount that was given to you?

MATTHEWS: Yes.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Back here to mic 8, please.

WADE PASCHAL (Oklahoma): Bishop, Wade Paschal, Oklahoma delegation. I'm—I'm not willing to vote on something where I'm not really confident about the dollarary [*sic*] amount. I move to table.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, the motion is to table. Is there a second to the motion to table? It is seconded. It is a non-debatable motion to put this on the table. So we are voting to table this motion until later in the conference.

We put this on the table. So we are voting to table this motion until later in the conference. If you would vote to table, you will vote now. [*Yes, 579; No, 328; Abstain, 7*]

And it has been sustained, so it is put on the table. Let's move to the next one.

MATTHEWS: OK, that completes the mission of priorities subsection.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Thank you.

R. CARL FRAZIER JR. (North Carolina): I'm Carl Frazier from the North Carolina Conference. I chaired the subcommittee on membership on boards and agencies.

I invite your attention to p. 1643 in the *DCA*, Calendar Item no. 526, Petition no. 41245. You will find the Petition on p. 915 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends non-concurrence. While membership on boards and agencies are nominated initially by annual conferences, they come through a jurisdictional pool, and we could find nowhere else that the cabinet is specifically charged with the responsibility of serving as a nominating committee, the committee felt that this task was still best left to the College of Bishops of the jurisdictions.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. You have heard the rationale. The committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. Yes? Here at the mic. 1.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Kevin Goodwin, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. I am the gentleman who submitted this petition, so I would like to try to explain my rationale for why it was sent in.

I understand your reasoning and can accept that. We are also in the position of potentially reducing our bishop count, and I looked at this was from two reasons. One, it reduces the workload on our bishops who are extremely overloaded. And I also believe even though the cabinet is not technically in charge of nominations they could pass that responsibility on to the nominations committee that was at jurisdiction if they felt that. And I also believe the cabinet would know the people within the conference better.

My other concern was it is potential that if the College of Bishops does not re-appoint somebody from the conference losing a person, a small conference such as Peninsula-Delaware could technically by the end of a quadrennium have absolutely no representation on any of the boards and that issue really concerned me, which is why I submitted this. So I would vote non-concurrence with the committee on this issue.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. That is a speech against the committee's recommendation. Is there a speech for? Alright. Would you like to speak to that again?

FRAZIER: No, sir. Our rationale is pretty . . .

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, I think you're ready to vote. If you are ready, please vote now. [*Yes, 734; No, 167; Abstain, 12*]

Alright, you have voted to sustain the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. Yes, please continue.

DEBORAH A. MCLEOD (Florida): Debby McLeod, clergy, Florida. Our next petition is found in the *DCA*, p.

1632. It is Calendar Item 395, Petition 40420. In the *Advance DCA*, you find it on p. 930.

This is the Burtner petition that seeks to adjust the membership to the General Council on Ministries, because both the General Council on Ministries legislation on Living into the Future and the Connectional Table that was approved by the General Administration Committee eliminate General Council on Ministry, the committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The committee's recommendation is before you of non-concurrence. I see no cards. I assume you're ready to vote on this issue. If you're ready vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 840; No, 54; Abstain, 13*]

And you have sustained the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. I'm sorry, yes, back here?

SCOTT SELMAN (North Alabama): Scott Selman, Bishop, North Alabama Conference, layperson. I just would like to remind the General Conference that we have previously passed a motion that any matter coming before this body that involves money that hasn't gone through the budget process with GCFA should offer us an explanation as to why the amount did not go through the GCFA. So I'm specifically referring to the petition that we just tabled. We need to know why it bypassed GCFA.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is our understanding that it has been sent to GCFA as a petition that had financial implications related to it. So we do not feel that has bypassed GCFA in any manner.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Please continue.

#### *Science and Theology Study*

ELAINE J. W. STANOVSKY (Pacific Northwest): OK. I'm Elaine Stanovsky from the Pacific Northwest, and I'll be reporting on behalf of the subcommittee on governance.

If you would turn in your *DCA* to p. 1643, Calendar Item 522, referring to

Petition 40880, found in your *ADCA* on p. 954.

This is a recommendation for a study on exploring the relationship of science and theology. It follows up a group that worked during the last quadrennium and commends that group's work to another study group in the next quadrennium. It's a joint effort between the General Board of Discipleship, The United Methodist Publishing House, and the General Board of Church and Society, and does not anticipate new funds.

The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The committee's recommending concurrence. I see no cards. I assume you're ready to vote. If you are—I'm sorry. Alright, straight ahead in front of me here, mic. 6.

RON HARDMAN (Virginia): Ron Hardman, lay delegate, Virginia. What is it going to cost, and where will the money come from?

STANOVSKY: My understanding is that this is funded from within the agency budgets of the cooperative agencies and that there are no new funds.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Yes? Back here, mic. 5.

DENISE J. HONEYCUTT (Virginia): Denise Honeycutt, Virginia Conference. Just a question then. What we have printed in front of us, that is incorrect because it indicates that that is new funding?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Are you referring to the exclamation point?

HONEYCUTT: Yes.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes, OK.

STANOVSKY: I'm not finding where you're referring to. Can you show us exactly?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: To the exclamation point on 522 at the end of the reference letters.

STANOVSKY: I can't speak to the exclamation point. I don't know where

it came from, but there's no reference in the petition to any new funds.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: What is being said is that the exclamation point is an error in the printing. Yes? Back over here to mic. 5.

STANOVSKY: Bishop, I'm in error on this.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright.

STANOVSKY: There's another petition that comes later that addresses the funding issue, and it's not before us. It's the next petition in your *ADCA*, if you are on the bottom of p. 955. Sorry for the error, and the funds are outlined there and that has been referred to GCFA. Is that correct? So right now, we're authorizing this study. You would act on the funding for this study is a separate item later.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Yes?

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Jim Harnish, Florida. That's what I wanted to pointed out that there is immediately following a petition regarding funding. And it seems to me just really odd that we would approve something and then talk about money later. And would—I guess I wanted to point out it's there and wonder where we think the \$33,800 is going to come from. I'd sorta like to know that before I vote on the proposal that's presented there.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. I consider that as speech against the committee's recommendation. Mic. 2 please.

NORMAN H. COLEMAN III (West Ohio): Norm Coleman, West Ohio, clergy. Just a point of information on p. 1761, where we have the actual figures. It says there that it's \$37,800 instead of \$33,800. On 1761, Relationship of Science and Theology Task Force.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes. Back in the very back. Mic 6.

KENNETH H. CARTER JR. (Western North Carolina): Ken Carter, Western North Carolina Conference, clergy. I think this is a vital importance. I have a simple amendment. Since much of the proposal reflects on gaps

in congregational life and the relation of theology and science, I would propose an amendment that a pastor of a local congregation be added to the study group.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: That a pastor be added to the study group? Is there a second? Alright, we have an amendment that a pastor be added to the study group. Is there discussion? Alright, would you like to speak to that amendment?

STANOVSKY: My chair says we can accept that.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. I assume then you're ready to vote. If you are ready to vote on the amendment, please vote now that we would add a pastor to the study committee—that's the amendment. If you're ready to vote, you're doing so already. [*Yes, 667; No, 200; Abstain, 5*]

Alright, the amendment passes. Now we're back to the main motion. Any further discussion on the main motion? Yes, back here. Back here to mic 6.

#### *Study's Financial Implications*

HARDMAN: Ron Hardman, lay, Virginia. I'd like to move to amend the petition before us with the chart and language that's included in the petition immediately following, so that we will be considering both the substance of the proposal and the cost of the proposal as one item.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, it is seconded.

STANOVSKY: Bishop, may I ask if it's in order to adopt—to consider such an amendment without its being considered by GCFA?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: The consensus is it can be considered and will be automatically referred to GCFA.

STANOVSKY: Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: So the amendment is before you. Yes, back here at mic 5.

ANDREW WOLFE (North Alabama): Andy Wolfe, North Alabama. Again, a clarification. We passed a motion that, for these extra

budget items, that we'd be given an explanation why they were not included in the original GCFA budget and submitted to us before the conference, why they're being presented now instead of having been a part of the original budget. And if GCFA acted on it at that time or are these after, what's the reason this was this not acted upon in the original budget? That's the motion that we referred to a while ago, Bishop.

STANOVSKY: Well, since that budget, or that motion, was passed after the committee had finished its work, we haven't had the opportunity to ask that question; and I don't have an answer to it.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Does anyone on the floor have an answer to this question that's been raised? Yes, Jeannie.

JEANNIE TREVINO-TEDDLIE (Central Texas): Jeannie Trevino-Teddle, Central Texas Conference, clergy. Now, I've not been a part of GCFA, but my understanding of the process is that GCFA cannot include in their budgeting process anything that has not been voted on by this General Conference. And if we need to have this explained, I would request that we have somebody like Sandra Lackore from GCFA to explain the process. We're—you're really—it seems like we're in a catch 22. You're saying, "Well not even go before GCFA"; and GCFA is saying, "Well, it hasn't been voted on by our General Conference, so we can't consider it."

(pause)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes, I see you and I'll come to you in just a second. The process is that it comes to General Conference. If it's voted, then it goes to GCFA for its study and then is brought back to the General Conference floor.

Yes, let me come over here to my far right, mic 4.

BARRIE M. TRITLE (Iowa): Barrie Tritle from the Iowa Conference, clergy. A piece of information that might be

helpful. The item that we're talking about is on the Consent Calendar, No. 284, which we've already adopted, the budget item.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: I'll turn to the committee. Is that correct?

STANOVSKY: I would take his word for it.

(laughter)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Here in the middle. Mic 4, please.

*Motion to Refer*

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Scott Jones from the North Texas Conference. Bishop, I move referral of this study to the General Board of Discipleship for it to be included in their deliberations and their budget during the next quadrennium. If I have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, is it seconded? Alright—

JONES: Bishop—

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Go ahead.

JONES: I served on the Financial Administration Committee where the pressing need for so many of our missional priorities over the next quadrennium were considered carefully. I think we have very talented staff and members of our general agencies; and whenever these studies come up, I am going to be moving referral to the necessary general agencies for them to take care of with the resources that they have. And therefore, I hope we'll refer it and save the money.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The motion to refer is before you. It is seconded.

STANOVSKY: Bishop, may I ask a question for clarification?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

STANOVSKY: If it is indeed true that we already adopted the budget item on the consent calendar, what does that do to Scott Jones's recommendation?

(pause)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: The con-

sensus is that this would become the last action and it would prevail over the previous action of the General Conference. So if you vote to sustain this Jones amendment, then it will prevail over any previous motions and actions that you have taken. This motion to refer, I'm talking about.

Did you wish to clarify this further? Mic 4.

JONES: Bishop, Scott Jones, again. It's my understanding that matters with financial implications cannot be on the consent calendar. So if it was, in fact, considered there, it was done so improperly and is before us properly for the first time.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Now is there any, any other—here, mic 1. We're still discussing the motion to refer at this point.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Yes, Beverly Wilkes, Illinois Great Rivers Conference. Bishop Hutchinson, I think the proper thing for us to do at this point—as a point of order—is to lift it from the consent calendar and then take action on it properly before the floor before it can be referred. But it needs to be lifted from this consent calendar. It appears that there's a typo in that it left off the dollar sign. It would be Item 284 on p. 1623 in our *DCA*, p. 1623 in our *DCA*, and it is Item No. 284. *DCA* 1623, Item No. 284, and I would move that we lift that from the consent calendar so that it might be properly before the floor.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. I believe that that is a proper motion. We can put that before you, to remove this from the consent calendar. Yes? We do have a motion to refer, yes. Yes, yes, all right. We will deal with the motion to refer, and then we will lift this from the Consent Calendar in order to move forward.

Alright, we will deal with the motion to refer and then we will lift this from the consent calendar in order to move forward. Alright, any further comments on the motion to refer? Yes, back here to mic 8.

FRANK E. TROTTER JR.

(Baltimore-Washington): Frank Trotter for Baltimore-Washington Conference. I would speak against the motion to refer. We've had a lot of confusion about the budget process tonight. I hope we don't take out our confusion on this motion that is before us. This is a legitimate issue that the church needs to address and I hope that we can fund it and let it move forward without referring it backwards.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, that's a speech against referral. Is there a speech, another speech, for? Yes, back here to my left, mic 5.

EWING WERLEIN JR. (Texas): Ewing Werlein, Texas Conference. I do support the motion to refer that Dr. Jones has made. I believe that he's right in analyzing this matter, that we've got these number of off-budget items that are now being presented to us. This is something that the Board of Discipleship could look into and examine. You know, I suppose there are probably a hundred books or more already written on the relationship of science and theology. We have a number of theological seminaries. There's probably several of the theologians in these seminaries that research and investigate and write things about this. The Board of Discipleship would be well suited to explore this, to bring together the resources that we need to have in order to have this presented to us without adding further to this budget that is going to be a staggeringly large budget. I would hope the conference would refer.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, there's a speech for referral. We can take one more against. I see no cards. I assume you're ready to vote on the motion to refer...

STANOVSKY: Bishop, may I have the last word?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

STANOVSKY: If you notice, both of these items were overwhelmingly supported by the committee. It was the feeling that in this day and age of stem-cell research and cloning emerging, even though the legal and the ethical

fields are out on that, that the church needs to have a strong statement about these matters, to be able to lead the society rather than to follow, and that this is exactly the kind of study that brings together the variety of perspectives within the church—the public policy side, the seminary, theological side, the ethical side, and the teaching, curriculum side of our work in the church. So, I would encourage you not to refer this.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, I think we're ready to vote. If you are ready to vote, please vote now on the motion of referral. [*Yes, 530; No, 372; Abstain, 9*]

You have voted to refer and so that is what we will do.

STANOVSKY: We have one more.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright.

#### *Ethnic Minority or Ethnic Persons*

STANOVSKY: Please turn to p. 1631, Calendar Item 382, referring to Petition No. 41445 found on *ADCA* 958. Again, that's *DCA* p. 1631. This is a petition asking that we change the language that we use in the church from "ethnic minority" to "ethnic persons." It was the—it was the belief of the person who submitted the petition that this made our language more hospitable. The committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The motion is for non-concurrence. Is there any discussion around this motion? Yes, mic 1.

WILKES: Bishop Hutchinson, Beverly Wilkes, Illinois Great Rivers Conference and the author of that particular petition. Is it in order to ask the question first?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

WILKES: I would like to know if there were ethnic persons who actually addressed this petition, that made the recommendation?

STANOVSKY: Are you asking in the debate in the committee?

WILKES: Correct.

STANOVSKY: I don't, I can't answer that. There certainly were ethnic persons, both in the subcommittee and the committee as it was considered and there was conversation about it.

WILKES: Thank you very much. In that case, I want to urge this body to vote no on the committee's recommendation. As a racial ethnic person, I believe since 1988, The United Methodist Church has been asking us to remove the word "minority." We've got, done that almost, but there are still places in the *Discipline* and *The Book of Resolutions* where that word shows up.

"Minority" is for people of color, considered to be the, a racist classification of the majority of the people in the world. And so, when we say "minority" as it relates to racial ethnics, what we're actually saying is less than, rather than equal to. And this is a global church and we would call this body to recognize that The United Methodist Church is global and that it is more hospitable to use the term "ethnic persons" when it is not feasible to use particular ethnic groups. But I urge you to try to view this from the position of those of us who are ethnic and do not consider the term "minority" to be helpful in this day and time when we are progressive, we are global.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, there is a speech against the committee's recommendation. Come to my far right, front table, come to mic 4, please.

JON RISS (New York): Jon Riss, New York Annual Conference. Could I please hear a rationale from the chair as to why the committee voted for non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: They will do that in their final statement. Is there another... Yes, again, back to my far right, oh, come to mic 4, please.

DARLINE D. BALM-DEMME (Iowa): Darline Balm-Demmel, clergy from Iowa. It's my understanding that we are all ethnic and if we take away "minority," it would be all-inclusive.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, yes.

ROBERT L. LOCKABY JR. (Holston): Bishop, Bob Lockaby, lay, Holston Conference. In response to your question a minute ago about the rationale, you said it would be given to us in the final statement. I would suggest it might be more appropriate that we be given an opportunity to debate the rationale. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Is there any other? Way back here to mic 7.

CLARK A. JENKINS (South Carolina): Clark Jenkins, South Carolina. I certainly rise to support the use of “persons” because I think God sees the worth of persons, all persons, rather than minorities. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. We have two against the committee, one for the committee’s recommendation. Back here to my far right, if you’d come to mic 8. Are you going to make a statement for the committee’s position?

KRISTINA J. GONZALEZ (Pacific Northwest): Bishop, I’m going to make a statement against the committee’s position.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, we need a statement for. OK, here at no. 4, mic 4.

ANDREAS ELFVING (Finland-Swedish Provisional): Thank you, Bishop. Andreas Elfving, Finland-Swedish. I’m a part of an ethnic minority in my country, which consists of about 6 percent of the population. We have our own language, we have our own culture, but our skin color is the same as the majority’s. I think we need to look at these things in a perspective wider than the American context. I don’t see how the word *minorities* in any way negative to the person. It just defines them in relationship to the majority. Certainly, we have many minorities in countries in this world who are White, for instance. So I would speak in favor of the committee’s recommendation and against this petition.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright,

thank you. I’ll come back to mic 8 for a speech against. Yes.

GONZALEZ: (*unintelligible*) not on.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

*Use “Racial/Ethnic Persons”*

KRISTINA C. GONZALEZ (Pacific Northwest): Kristina Gonzalez, Pacific Northwest. Bishop, I would move to amend the petition to replace the word, to add to the term *ethnic, racial ethnic*, so it would read *racial-slash-ethnic persons* and if I have a second, I’ll speak to it.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, it is seconded.

GONZALEZ: Bishop, I agree with many of the arguments that have been made here in terms of the use of the term *minority*. I think it is U.S.-centric in the, in *The Book of Resolutions* and the *Discipline* where it’s located. However, when we use the term *minority*, we’re actually using a term that is outdated given the demographics in the United States. Many persons who were seen as ethnic minorities are now becoming—we’re becoming a plurality, and the term *minority* simply doesn’t apply any more. If we’re talking about issues of race and racism, then what we’re talking about is dealing with issues that are racial/ethnic in nature, and so I would ask that we amend this to refer to racial/ethnic persons.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, that’s a speech for the amendment. Is there a speech against the amendment? I see none wishing to speak. If you are ready to vote . . .

STANOVSKY: May I speak, Bishop?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: OK.

STANOVSKY: The committee did not debate this petition in detail, but the subcommittee did; and the persuasive voices in the subcommittee argued that to drop the word *minority* drew attention away from the prejudice and injustice that many persons experience when living as minorities in a majority

culture, whether in the U.S. or around the world. So the argument was that the word *minority* encourages us to remember the needs for intentional inclusion.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, are you ready to vote? Alright, we are ready to vote. Will you please—I’m sorry? Back at mic 8.

GONZALEZ: I just want to make sure that we are voting first on the amendment, the motion to amend that I just made.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: That’s correct. That’s what we’re voting on: the motion to amend to use the term racial/ethnic. The motion to amend. If you’re ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 569; No, 350; Abstain, 7*]

Alright, you have sustained the amendment to change the language to read “racial/ethnic.”

Now we’re back to the main motion, which is non-concurrence. Alright, if you’re ready to vote on the main motion—yes? Mic 4.

DALE SHUNK (Western Pennsylvania): Dale Shunk, Western Pennsylvania, clergy. Did the lady who just spoke earlier want to include the word *persons; racial/ethnic persons*? And if we—we have to clarify how we’re going to vote now. Are we still using the word *minority*, or do we have to vote down this and then come back with the word *persons*?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: What—if we could read back the amendment. Will the maker of the motion please clarify the exact wording you used?

GONZALEZ: Bishop, the wording I used was “racial/ethnic persons.”

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you for that clarification. Alright, in the back. Mic 8, please.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. If we vote right now no on the committee’s recommendation of non-concurrence, and if the no vote wins, does that mean that the amended motion becomes the decision

and the committee's recommendation fails?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: I believe that is correct.

BOAYUE: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, one last statement from the committee chair before we vote.

STANOVSKY: Bishop, I really have nothing further; but I'm not clear. Where is the motion of substitute or where the language "racial/ethnic person"—"ethnic," yeah, "racial/ethnic persons" is being added or substituted. In the—is it in the last sentence?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Would you please insert for us where this new language would appear?

GONZALES: It is in the last line of the petition: "Be it further resolved that the term 'ethnic persons' replace the term 'ethnic minority';" and that would read, "Be it resolved that the term 'racial/ethnic persons' replace the term 'ethnic minority.'"

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright.

STANOVSKY: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. I think all I want to say is that in all of the conversation, I don't sense any disagreement about what we're trying to do. The question is, "What language does it best?"

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: So you—the committee is recommending non-concurrence with the current language—I mean, with this motion to change the language.

STANOVSKY: That's correct.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Then we're ready to vote, and, and (*pause*) the motion is for non-concurrence. Please vote now. [*Yes, 380; No, 534; Abstain, 7*]

Alright, you have voted not to sustain the committee, and the amended version will be the decision of the body. We are ready to take a—yes sir?

EDWARD K. TOMLINSON (North Georgia): That concludes the work of General Administration for tonight.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank

you very much. We need to have an announcement from the secretary, and then we're going to take a break. And then we will come back; and when we do, we'll come back to you in the back.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Two announcements. One is that a meeting of the rules—The Plan of Organization and Rules of Order Committee immediately during this break at the piano, left front. It will be very brief; but please, the new committee that was just organized at noon, please meet there. Members of the Committee on Agenda, the chairs of legislative committees, and the chair of Presiding Officers are invited to gather behind the stage during the break for a short meeting.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, we're going to take a break. It is now 15 until 9. We will take a break until 9 o'clock. We will reconvene at 9 o'clock.

(*break*)

Alright, if we could reconvene, if you would find your places so that we might reconvene. Let's move as quickly as you can to your places so that we can consider the remainder of the agenda for the evening. I'm going to call for us to enter into a time of silence once again as we begin this part of our business time, and then I'm going to move to the people in the back that I said that I would recognize when we came back from the break. So if you would be seated and be silent if you're not seated. If you would be silent as you walk to your places that would be very helpful. So let us enter into a moment of prayer as we begin this second half of our evening session. Let us be in prayer.

(*prayer*)

Alright, I'm coming to the back. There was a group that had asked for recognition before the break I said I would come back to them. It would be at mic 7.

WON S. NAMKOONG (North Carolina): Won Namkoong, North Carolina. I make a motion General

Board of Global Ministry, and the General Commission on Religion and Race, and the General Commission on Status and Role of Women train the General Conference delegates and the legislative committee officers on working interculturally at the General Conference. If I get a second, I will explain the rationale.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, it is seconded. You may speak to it.

NAMKOONG: I was a Presbyterian when I was in Korea and I have become a United Methodist Church since I came to this country and I'm very proud to be a United Methodist. We believe freedom of speech should be honored at all times at the General Conference; and we believe The United Methodist Church seeks to be a global church; and we believe each delegate should feel safe when they are expressing their own opinions; and we believe that United Methodist Church believes it is important to hear individual voices; and we believe we seek to be more sensitive to diverse persons in particular to race and gender; and we believe the General Conference should set the model for conduct in all activities, but unfortunately, there have been several instances where individual rights have been infringed upon.

So therefore, I make a motion a code of conduct for working in multiracial and multicultural settings be prepared by the General Commission on Religion and Race and General Commission on Status and Role of Women with the General Board of Global Ministry to be placed in the *Advanced DCA*; and also the Commission on the General Conference ask that the General Commission on Religion and Race and General Commission Status and Right of Women train delegates at the General Conference on working interculturally at the General Conference; and finally, the General Conference secretary's office requests that General Conference on Religion and Race and the General Commission on Status and Role of Women together with the

General Board of Global Ministry lead a training with legislative committee officers on getting diverse groups.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Thank you. Back here to mic 6 please. 6.

YOUNGSOOK KANG (Rocky Mountain): Youngsook Kang, Rocky Mountain Conference, clergy. I support this recommendation that calls for seeking to be sensitive to all diverse persons. Inclusiveness means openness, acceptance, and respect that enables all persons to participate in the life of the church as is stated in *The Book of Discipline*. This inclusiveness, in my mind, denies every resemblance of discrimination. Therefore, I support this recommendation that calls for inclusiveness and recognizes the importance of every person's right and voice. I believe that this recommendation will be very helpful and will be helping future general conferences in enhancing the sensitivity in multicultural and multiracial relationships. Thank you very much.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. According to our rules for our conduct, any—if you wish to turn to p. 1529 in your *DCA*, 1529. In the right hand column, item "C," 1529 item "C" in the right hand column under agenda and calendar, "Proposals, questions, communications, resolutions, and other matters not included in the regular business of the General Conference shall be referred to the Committee on Agenda and Calendar without motion or debate. This committee shall determine whether or not the matter presented shall be considered by the General Conference. Appeal from the decision of this committee may be presented to the conference upon the written signature of twenty delegates and the item shall be presented to the conference if the appeal is supported by one-third vote."

My recommendation here is that you would write this, this motion and give it to the Committee on Agenda and Calendar and let them consider it and bring it to us at a later time. You could

bring that to the Secretary here at the table and that will be given to the Committee on Agenda and Calendar. Thank you. I believe we are ready to continue with the Faith and Order. Patricia Farris.

#### *Faith and Order Items*

PATRICIA FARRIS (California-Pacific): Thank you, Bishop Hutchinson and members of the General Conference. Your Faith and Order Legislative Committee is pleased to have finally arrived at this moment of bringing you six items this evening. I want to take a moment first to lift up the leadership of this legislative committee and thank them publicly. Our vice-chair Lonnie Chafin, lay person for the Northern Illinois Conference, our secretary Carol Smith, a lay person from the Missouri Conference. Thank you. And then the chairs of our subcommittees: the first chaired by Joy Barrett of the Detroit Conference; the second by—co-chaired by Susan Hunn, a lay person from the Cal-Nevada Conference, and Greg Stover, clergy from the West Ohio Conference; and the third subcommittee has been chaired by Sharon Bassett, Conference Lay Leader of the North Central New York Conference. We have been grateful for their leadership and we thank you all. Some of them will be bringing the items that are before us tonight and I would like to first introduce to you Sharon Bassett.

SHARON BASSETT (North Central New York): Thank you, Patricia. Bishop and delegates to General Conference, I invite you to turn to p. 1631 in your *DCA*, p. 1631, Calendar Item No. 372, Calendar Item No. 372, Petition No. 41221, Petition No. 41221. You can find this in the *ADCA* on p. 800, p. 800 of the *ADCA*. The committee recommends non-concurrence. The rationale from the committee is that, in review of Petition 41221, the committee believed the language to be of a negative nature but, at the same time, also believed this to be an important message. Therefore, we amended Petition 41283, found on p. 1616 of your *DCA*,

trying to capture the intent of this language that we felt was important.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, the recommendation is non-concurrence with this particular petition. I assume you are ready to vote on that. If you are ready to vote for the recommendation of the committee, please do so now. And you have sustained their recommendation of non-concurrence. [*Yes, 851; No 42; Abstain, 5*]

BASSETT: Thank you. The next item can be found on—in your *DCA* on p. 1642, 1642, Calendar Item No. 517, Calendar Item No. 517, Petition 40757, Petition 40757 and you can locate that in the *ADCA* p. 801, *ADCA*, p. 801. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

Rationale: We continue to grow—as we continue to grow into “by water and the spirit” and our shared understanding of Baptism across the denomination, the committee brings forward the added language in this paragraph to help us remain clear and, at the same time, be more inclusive of perspectives in the Central Conferences.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. The petition is before you. I see no one asking for the floor. I assume you are ready to vote. Please vote now. You have voted to sustain the committee in concurrence as amended. [*Yes, 860; No, 49; Abstain, 4*]

BASSETT: Again on p. 1642, 1642, Calendar Item 519, Calendar Item 519, Petition No. 41304, Petition 41304, found in your *ADCA* on p. 800, the *ADCA*, p. 800. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. Again, by adding “by water and the spirit,” the committee includes the Holy Spirit in acknowledging the Trinity's present—presence in carrying out our mission.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, yes, here to mic 2.

VINCENT WALKUP (Tennessee): Vin Walkup, Tennessee Conference, clergy. Sharon, I believe that the Spirit is supposed to be a capital “S.” If we could make that editorial correction. I was a member of that committee.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. An editorial correction. I see no one else. I assume you are ready to vote. The recommendation is concurrence as amended. Please vote now. [*Yes, 893; No, 15; Abstain, 4*]

And you have sustained the recommendation of the committee.

BASSETT: Thank you bishop and delegates of General Conference.

FARRIS: Our next items will be brought by subcommittee co-chairs, Susan Hunn and Greg Stover.

GREG STOVER (West Ohio): I am Greg Stover. I'll be bringing the first two of three items. Bishop and members of the General Conference, please turn to *DCA* p. 1631, 1631, Calendar Item No. 370, Petition No. 40958, Support for Dialogue and Openness about the Authority of Scriptures, which is found on *ADCA* p. 817 through 820. The legislative committee recommends non-concurrence. The rationale is that the petition is lengthy and involved, quotes a variety of sources without complete footnotes. It's titled as a petition focused on dialogue but appears to us, in reality, to be a theological statement and so we—that is very complex and we recommend non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, it is before you. The recommendation is non-concurrence. I see no one moving to a microphone. If you are ready to vote, please vote now. You have sustained the committee in non-concurrence. [*Yes, 885; No, 41; Abstain, 1*]

STOVER: I would now invite you to turn to p. 1642 in the *DCA*, 1642, Calendar Item 518, Petition No. 40716 which is also found on *ADCA*, p. 718. It is entitled Open Table and the legislative section has recommended non-concurrence. Once again, we believe that, as we had this conversation about this, we believe that there were some recommendations in this particular paragraph that were not in keeping with practices particularly found in our Central Conferences and therefore, and we also believe that it

did not fully recognize our sacramental tradition and Protestant tradition that is side by side in our history. And so we recommend non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. The recommendation is before you of non-concurrence. I see no cards. I think you are ready to vote.

STOVER: We recommend non-concurrence.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, the recommendation is before you—non-concurrence. I see no cards; I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 806; No, 112; Abstain, 1*]

And you have sustained the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

SUSAN HUNN (California-Nevada): I'm Susan Hunn from California-Nevada, a lay delegate, and I invite you to turn to p. 1643 of the *DCA*, that's p. 1643. The Calendar Item is 521, 521. In the *Advance DCA* it is p. 814, 814. The Petition No. is 40071, that's 40071. It's entitled "Expansive Biblical Language"; the committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. The prevailing vote expressed the view that the current Resolution No. 321 adequately addressed the opportunity for inclusive biblical language.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, the committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. It is before you. I see no cards; I assume that means you're ready to vote. If you would vote on this, at this time, please vote now. And you have sustained the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. [*Yes, 755; No, 166; Abstain, 4*]

FARRIS: Thank you, Bishop; that concludes our items for this evening.

(*applause*)

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. We're ready for Judicial Administration. Following Judicial Administration will be Independent Commissions. If they would be ready. Following Judicial Administration, Independent Commissions.

### *Judicial Administration Presents*

JON P. GRAY (Missouri): Good evening, Bishop Hutchinson; good evening, delegates. I'm Jon R. Gray, lay delegate from the Missouri Conference; it has been my distinct honor and privilege to serve as the chair of the legislative committee on Judicial Administration. The delegates of that committee are a dedicated and committed group of United Methodist Christians who worked long and well for our church. I want to thank each of them for their efforts. Ours was truly an experience in holy conferencing and I am proud to present on behalf of the committee.

I was joined in leadership on the committee by the Rev. Danita Anderson Wilkins of the Northern Illinois Conference who served as vice-chair and Ben Bowden, Esq., the hardest working secretary in General Conference, of the Alabama-West Florida Conference. We have five, five calendar items, this evening. As we return to you later in the week, I will have the opportunity to introduce some of the sub-committee chairs.

### *Just Peace*

I would first direct your attention to p. 1581, 1581, of the *DCA*. On p. 1581 you will find Calendar Item 158. Calendar Item 158 relates to Petition No. 41105. Petition No. 41105 can also be found on p. 1336 of the *Advance DCA*. The petition, if adopted, would add a new Paragraph 2406 of Section 18 relating to ecumenical organizations. The petition would recognize Just Peace Center for Mediation and Conflict Transformation as a mission of The United Methodist Church, that will engage in constructive conflict resolution, resource preservation, and reconciliation.

Your committee heard testimonials from several members concerning their knowledge of the effectiveness of Just Peace in those situations where all parties seek resolution.

The petition also carries an exclamation point with it. I am sensitive to the

will of body. The petition appears to have financial implications. The text of the legislation proposal does not make specific requests for new money. I can tell you that it's contained in the GCFA report of the 2001-2004 quadrennium as a line item. The legislation currently pending provides that Just Peace will seek and obtain financial support through fee income, special funds, or endowments, gifts, and bequests.

I have attempted most of today to gain some clarification as to why the exclamation point appears. I'm giving you the best and all information that I have. The committee recommends concurrence. I presume since it does have the exclamation point that it would be necessarily referred to GCFA. Bishop.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you, Judge Gray. Back in the back, mic 7 please.

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Thank you, Bishop, Jay Brim, lay delegate from Southwest Texas. We appreciate you recognizing us way back here in the back. Bishop, we're so far back that these delegations have put together a project to send a space probe to see if there's life behind you on the stage.

*(laughter)*

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: In some, there is.

BRIM: Yeah. Not to worry, the payout on the project's only 88 percent so we weren't able to buy fuel. Bishop, I had the honor to be one of the founding board members for Just Peace and for the past four years the dubious pleasure of serving as the treasurer of this organization.

And I rise to explain the quote financial implications of the petition. I tell you fellow delegates that this is a gift to the general church from GCFA and the financial implications are that we will have no apportioned funds for this project. We will seek funding from outside sources and from services rendered, training persons to transform conflict within our organizations, and our connectional structures. You heard Judge Gray say that there were a number of

testimonials given to what the organization's already done in the first four years. We have had literally hundreds of persons within this hall who have been touched by the work of Just Peace already in assisting to reach conflict transformation through processes that you'll find in Matthew 18 and in Acts 15.

It is possible, brothers and sisters, for us to change the way we deal with conflict within this church. And Just Peace is committed to doing that. We ask your support for this legislation and we promise you that we're going to do what we can to change the way people view conflict within the church. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. That is a speech for the recommendation of concurrence. Is there a speech against? Far left, alright, over here in the very back.

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Jim Harnish, Florida; this is not a speech against. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this ministry and very grateful to see it find its place in the church. I have a question and then, perhaps, an amendment. The question has to do with "it shall be accountable to the General Conference." And I'm curious about that structural relationship, particularly in terms of ongoing accountability between the General Conference sessions, and wondered if there's a reason that it isn't related in some way to the Board of Church and Society or to one of the existing structures. Again, this is not in any way questioning the ministry but a question about the, the structure and its relationship to the church.

GRAY: I must confess that committee did not specifically discuss that. The focus of the committee's discussion was on the effectiveness of Just Peace through the testimonials that we heard and the discussion that was had. There was such enthusiasm that, that specific item was not specifically discussed.

*Whether to Relate GBCS*

HARNISH: Well, then, if it's open

Bishop, I would move to amend the line in item no. 2 that says "it shall be accountable to the Board of Church and Society" to replace the words "General Conference." If there's a second, I'll speak to that.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, there is a second.

HARNISH: We only have a very few bodies that are directly accountable to the General Conference: GCFA, GCOM. And it would simply seem to me that in terms of the way our ongoing life works together that being related directly to the Board of Church and Society would provide a way for ongoing connection and relationship between the sessions of the General Conference and would be more effective in the overall ministry.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. The amendment is to make Just Peace accountable to the Board of Church and Society.

Come here to the far left, in the front rows. Yes, you with the yellow card there, *(laughter)* which is everyone in the room. J. Harris is my roommate at the General Board of Church and Society, so I know who he is.

JERRY H. MOORE (Arkansas): Jerry Moore, Arkansas Annual Conference. There is a member from the General Board of Church and Society that sits on the board of directors of Just Peace.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Say that again, J. Harris.

MOORE: A member of the General Board of Church and Society sits on the board of directors, to my understanding, of Just Peace Center.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Yes, back here, mic 7.

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Bishop, Jay Brim from Southwest Texas. And speaking again on behalf of the board of Just Peace, it does have a number of different general boards represented; and, in fact, the reason we have left GCFA is in order to find a neutral position among the general

agencies so we may assist improving dialogue between the various agencies. We would ask that the body refuse this amendment. It goes against what we're trying to do in maintaining a position of neutrality within the general church organization so that we can assist all the boards and agencies in working through conflict.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. I would consider these two speeches against the amendment. For the amendment? Yes.

CHARLES E. LIPPSE (Holston): Charles Lippse, Holston Conference. I would support Mr. Harnish's motion. I noticed that we often have had problems with accountability of how we would handle monies that are held in trust; and, ultimately, it is my understanding that GCFA has the final oversee of that responsibility to properly use funds. Now, assuming that there will be funds collected, it would seem that we must tie this committee to one of the agencies in order to hold this line of accountability. Therefore, I think the motion is good.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. We got two speeches for, two against. I see no other cards. I—yes, I'm sorry. Mic 1.

JOHN W. EDGAR (West Ohio): John Edgar, West Ohio. I speak against the amendment. I think part of the whole spirit of Just Peace is to invite us to try things in some different ways, that we get out of our accustomed boxes; and one of the boxes we fall into too frequently in General Conference and across this connection is sort of taking sides with one general agency or another, thinking one's better than the next. And I think it makes sense that this organization that's gonna try to teach us better ways of interacting is saying that they want to be able to begin from a neutral position when folks don't judge them before they've begun by who they've been tied to. I think it's time for a fresh start, and we could use some help with Just Peace, so let's give them the space to do what they want. Let's defeat this amendment.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. We have had three against the amendment. We can take one for, if there's someone who desires to do that. Back here, mic 3, please.

HANK DUNN (New England): Hank Dunn, New England Annual Conference. This is a question. I wondered if someone could speak to how the nominating process would work for Just Peace in this accountability. We've talked about finances, but we haven't talked about who is going to be guiding this process that will help us all come together. Thank you.

GRAY: I'm unable to speak to the nominations process, Bishop. Perhaps one of the board of directors, Mr. Brim, who spoke earlier would be able to provide some information in that regard.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Is there someone from Just Peace? Yes, sir? Mic 7.

BRIM: Bishop, Jay Brim, Southwest Texas, lay delegate. We have a proposed set of bylaws. We'd call on five different boards, including GCFA and the four program general boards, to provide directors, as well as a group of practitioners mediation so we could have a broad base of experience on the board to assist in coming up with the best practices to work with conflict.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: OK, thank you. Thank you. I think we're ready to vote.

GRAY: May I, Bishop?

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Yes.

GRAY: I would urge the body to reject the amendment. Just Peace exists as a new answer only because persons were willing to ask new questions. It is conceivable that Just Peace could provide services even within the general agency to which it is attached. If the amendment were to pass, the independence—I believe and I would submit to you—is necessary in order for the organization to genuinely do the ministry that it's called to do. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. We're ready to vote. We're voting on the amendment to make the Just Peace

accountable to the Board of Church and Society. You're ready to vote on that, please vote now. [*Yes, 190; No, 713; Abstain, 10*]

Alright. The amendment fails. We're back to the main motion. Do you wish to say any more on the main motion?

GRAY: I believe all the salient points have been made, Bishop. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. We're ready to vote on the main motion. Those—I'm sorry. I'm about to make you vote by hand. If you're ready to vote, you will do so by voting now. [*Yes, 875; No, 50; Abstain, 5*]

And the motion carries concurrence with the committee.

Now we are at a time of order of the day, and I think that will complete our ability to take further petitions.

GRAY: May I have one moment? I need to see my subcommittee chairs at the conclusion of this session. If we can meet back behind Section F, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Alright. I call on—I want to say a word of thanks to all those who have made presentations tonight. It's been a good evening.

*(applause)*

Let's give them a round of thanks for what they have done.

Now, I'm going to call on the Committee on Presiding Officers. *(pause)* Following that, I will call on the Committee on Calendar and Agenda.

PAUL J. EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ (California-Nevada): Thank you, Bishop and members of the General Conference. Tomorrow morning, we will be receiving Bishop Bruce Blake as our presiding officer. We'll make an announcement on tomorrow afternoon's—tomorrow morning's schedule about the presiding officer for the afternoon and evening schedule.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright. Thank you. Mary Alice?

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida):

Thank you, Bishop. I had to run to get here tonight!

Tomorrow morning, we will follow our order of worship, as we have been; and then I know you're all anxious to know that we're going to vote on the Judicial Council nominees first thing. Following that, we'll take up the conference business; and we'll be hearing from Faith and Order and Church and Society. Thank you, Bishop.

*Concordat with Puerto Rico*

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Thank you. Now we have a very special opportunity tonight to be a part of a historic time in the life of our church. We passed earlier in the conference a concordat agreement between The United Methodist Church of Puerto Rico and The United Methodist Church; and tonight they are going to sign this agreement, the concordat, in our presence. So I would like to call on the four following people to join at the podium in order to do this: Bishop Peter Weaver, who is the president of the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church; and Bishop Juan A. Vera Mendez, who is the presiding bishop of The Methodist Church of Puerto Rico; Carolyn Marshall, secretary of the General Conference of The United Methodist Church; and Victor Ortiz, the lay representative of The Methodist Church of Puerto Rico.

BISHOP PETER D. WEAVER (Philadelphia Area): Thank you, Bishop Hutchinson. Isn't it wonderful to know that something you did at the beginning of today is now reality tonight? For we *(applause)*

We are about to recognize that by the movement of the Holy Spirit, you approve this morning a new concordat relationship between The Methodist Church of Puerto Rico and The United Methodist Church; and we have that concordat here tonight. I want to read simply the last lines of that concordat that are instructive, not only for our rest tonight, but our preparation for a new day tomorrow, "We enter this concordat believing that the God revealed in Jesus Christ has far more in store for our

churches in matters of mutual faithfulness to the gospel than we can see our imagine at this important juncture. Thus we enter this concordat with mutual trust, gratitude, and hopeful expectation in the name of Jesus Christ."

On behalf of The United Methodist Church, I will begin by signing this concordat and then turn to Bishop Juan Vera Mendez to sign on behalf of The Methodist Church of Puerto Rico, and then Carolyn Marshall to sign as Secretary to the General Conference, and Victor Ortiz to sign as a lay representative of The Methodist Church in Puerto Rico. To God be the glory.

*(applause)*

BISHOP JUAN VERA MENDEZ: Good evening to the Council of Bishops, the General Conference Officers, and delegates, sisters and brothers in The United Methodist Church. This journey started 100 years ago for the sake of Jesus Christ and God missions in the world. Today we reaffirm our commitment to same Jesus Christ and the same mission. The world is our parish together, and all churches will pray and work together for peace and justice, for salvation and liberation. To our mother church we say, "You have raised good children; faithful and loving." Tonight as sister churches, now let's pledge together to always keep our hearts and arms open and caring for each other and for the world. Muchas gracias! We love you.

*(applause)*

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, I'm going to—I'm going to call now on Carolyn Marshall for any final announcements and concerns.

MARSHALL: Bishop, just one this evening, and that is the Church and Society Legislative Committee will consider one petition immediately following the adjournment of this session. You will meet in Room 320. Church and Society Legislative Committee, Room 320.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: Alright, thank you. There was one request for

personal privilege. Is that young man here? Yes, at mic 7.

BRYAN C. BAKER (West Virginia): Hello General Conference. My name is Bryan Baker. I'm a lay person from the West Virginia Annual Conference. I just wanted to take a moment to ask us to pray on behalf of our brothers and sisters throughout the world, not just the United States, who are in conflict at this time; whether it be war or within their countries. A United States soldier sent me these beads from Iraq telling me that he was praying for me during the Lenten Season, during Easter, and praying for our General Conference now. I'd like us to do the same for them.

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: I've asked if Bishop Ben Chamness of the Central Texas Conference will lead us in our closing prayer, and he is going to prepare—or to include that in his prayer—that request for people in conflict throughout the world. Bishop Chamness.

*(prayer)*

BISHOP HUTCHINSON: We are adjourned.

**Tuesday Morning,  
May 4, 2004**

*(worship service)*

BISHOP BRUCE A. BLAKE (Oklahoma Area): And let us be in order for the business of the day. Please be seated. I am aware that some are coming, but we want to invite our colleague bishops and presidents of autonomous and autonomous-affiliated churches to join the bishops of our communion on the platform. You are invited to sit with us and come now or at your convenience. We welcome you in the spirit of this service this morning.

Friends, as we begin our day together, I would like to—we will call first on the Committee on Calendar and Agenda to share their report with us, Hee-Soo. Let us give attention to the Committee on Calendar and Agenda.

HEE-SOO JUNG (Wisconsin):