

Proceedings of the 2004 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

The Committee on Journal

The Committee on Journal hereby certifies as accurate the proceedings as printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* for Thursday, May 6.

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

Wednesday Morning, May 5, 2004

(continued from page 2059)

BISHOP JOE E. PENNEL JR. (Richmond Area): Alright, that motion is before you. And there is a second. It does require two thirds. I feel that you're ready to vote. If so, please vote now. [*Yes, 788; No, 89; Abstain, 10*]

You have adopted the motion.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): This concludes our report.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you very much for facilitating our work. Yes? I see a card over here, please. Mic. 1.

MELVIN R. BOWDAN JR. (Kentucky): Bishop Pennel, Mel Bowdan, Kentucky Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

BOWDAN: If you will follow the legislation that is still remains before us, I move to suspend the rules and allow only two speeches on each side of a motion and to limit these speeches to two minutes each.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the motion to suspend the rules is before you. It is not debatable. It does require two-thirds and you understand the motion. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 663; No, 211; Abstain, 6*]

(pause)

You have adopted the motion to limit debate to two speeches.

And did you specify how many minutes to each speech? Two minutes to each speech. Thank you, very much. That's an enabling motion that will facilitate our work, and we have a lot of work before us. Thank you, very much.

We need now to—yes, I see cards. May I say that, when we raise groups of cards, I don't know which card to recognize. So if we could please just lift one card, then I would know who wants to speak. Yes, please, you may come to the microphone. Thank you for helping the conference.

SUSAN HUNN (California-Nevada): Susan Hunn, Western Jurisdiction, California-Nevada Conference. I move consideration of the legislation concerning "Living Into the Future" be placed on the afternoon agenda so as to allow time for careful reading of the text which has been distributed. The translations for non-English-speaking delegates can't be effectively done in the time that's allowed and the rest of us need time to read the new text, as well. The GCOM material has been available to us for several months, but there is new material in here for us to consider, and it is lengthy.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes, I really appreciate the intent of your motion. This may help you. The Agenda Committee tells us that it's scheduled for this evening, which would give plenty of time for people to read. Would that satisfy your need? Yes, I think it must. No, we'll try again.

HUNN: Sure, yes.

BISHOP PENNEL: OK, thank you very much, and thank you for helping the conference with its work. That has been scheduled for this evening. Now, we're moving toward elections and in order to facilitate elections for University Senate, Commission on

General Conference, secretary of General Conference, trustees of John Street Church, and also Inter-Jurisdictional Committee on the Episcopacy, I turn to our secretary to help us facilitate this work.

University Senate Elections

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: The nominations for the University Senate are found in p. 1519, as well as the additional one of the bios are found on pp. 1652 through 1654. The first election will be for the Chief Executive Officer, and you will see those six names there. We will elect two by plurality.

BISHOP PENNEL: You see the names, and you've read the bios. You'll be electing two persons by plurality—meaning the two persons who receive the highest votes will be elected. We will elect from the Chief Executive Officer list first. Are you ready to vote? If so, please vote now.

(pause)

Let me cancel that vote, please, before it's tallied. We, we need a discussion up here about whether you should take two votes or one vote for a fair plurality. So let us settle that, if you will, and we'll come back to you. Thank you.

(pause)

Now I think we're ready. We need to take two ballots for Chief Executive Officer. This would be the first ballot for Chief Executive Officer. The one receiving the highest number of votes on this ballot will be the first elected. I think you're ready. Please vote now.

(pause)

Well, we had some mechanical problems, but they've sent a messenger to the table to tell me that they are ready now, so you'll be casting your vote for Chief Executive Officer. We'll take two

ballots. This is the first ballot. The person receiving the highest vote, highest number of votes will be elected on the first ballot.

(pause)

Are you bringing me a paper ballot for certification? No? There is no paper ballot for certification. My bifocals are not working well this morning. You have elected David Maldonado Jr. with 294 votes.

(applause)

And now you'll take a second ballot, please, for Chief Executive Officer...

...when this ballot leaves the screen—it has. Are we ready for this next ballot? Not quite ready. Alright, they'll signal me when they're ready. We are now ready to vote. You would please vote now. You have elected Socorro Brito de Anda with 257 votes.

(applause)

And now we need to elect persons from other staff and let's ask our secretary to give us some direction please.

MARSHALL: Now we look to elect two in the category of other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs or church relationship. You will turn to pp. 1653 and 54; there are the bios of the seven persons nominated in that category. 1653, 54.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes, thank you. I see a card over here. Come to mic 1, please.

SUNSHINE BIRD (South Georgia): Morning, Bishop. This is Sunshine Bird from South Georgia, lay. Would there be a possibility, sir, if we could have the reading of the votes audibly for those who are listening by way of Internet?

BISHOP PENNEL: I'm sorry. I could not understand your question.

BIRD: Would it be possible, sir, for those who are listening to the reports by way of Internet, to be given audibly so that they can hear the votes as they are cast.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes, we could have our secretary to do that.

BIRD: Alright, thank you, sir.

BISHOP PENNEL: You're welcome. Alright, we are now voting for two persons for, in the other staff category. You have those names before you. You will vote for one on this first ballot, please. I think you are ready. Would you please vote now for one person? You have elected Rebekah Miles.

(applause)

And we will have our secretary to read the remainder of the names and the number elected for Internet purposes.

MARSHALL: Rebekah Miles was elected with a vote of 244; L. Gregory Jones, 197; Maxine Clarke Beach, 149; Maggie Jackson, 129; Pamela Couture, 87; Kathleen Greider, 43; David P. Pascua, 41.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, thank you. Now you will vote for one more person out of this category. You have the names before you. There is a card over here. Yes, way over to my left, to mic no. 1, please.

LUEBURDA J. MYERS (Louisiana): Lueburda Jameson Myers, lay delegate, Louisiana. My machine is not working. I've lost the last two votes.

BISHOP PENNEL: Could I ask you please to come up and use one of the machines on the stage until that can be corrected?

MYERS: Yes, that would be fine.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Just come up here please and you can use that machine. Thank you for calling that to our attention. Now I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. I'll wait for her, yes. Thank you. Thank you. She's coming. Slow the voting down until she's ...

(pause)

She is ready. Please vote now. That's not the "S" for spirit, is it? You have elected L. Gregory Jones and our secretary will read the remainder of the ballot, please.

MARSHALL: Balloted: L. Gregory

Jones, 343; Maxine Clarke Beach, 208; Maggie Jackson, 159; Pamela Couture, 80; David P. Pascua, 39; and Kathleen Greider, 32.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, you have elected persons in the Chief Executive Officer category and other staff. And now we need to turn to Commission on General Conference and our secretary will give us direction.

*Elections for Commission
on General Conference*

MARSHALL: We would refer you to p. 1520, 1520 in the *DCA*, the lower left hand column, and two names at the top of the right-hand column. There are not corrections in names, but corrections in class because we will be electing the class of 2012. This is an 8-year term and three names are printed here in the class of 2008 which are instead of the class of 2012. They are the names are Alma Edwards, Inday Day, and Pat Stroman which means that the names of those who will be, that we will be electing for the class of 2012 are: Neriah Edwards, Alma Edwards, Inday Day, Pat Stroman, Vincent Walkup, Bill Barney, and Joel Huffman.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, if you would elect these people, you will vote yes; if not, you will vote no. I think you're ready to vote. Yes? Do I see a card? This is, over here, yes. We've moved the table which is, has made the lights right in our eyes and we cannot see the house very well from here. So, we'll do our best. Thank you. Mic 1, please.

LANE C. WINN (Louisiana): Lane Cotton Winn, lay delegate from Louisiana. I was just wondering if any of these persons listed are youth or young adults?

BISHOP PENNEL: Can someone answer that question for us? Are any of these persons youth or young adults? The rules on p. 1527 say that these nominations come from the Council of Bishops. It reads "they shall be nominated by the Council of Bishops at its fall meeting next preceding General

Conference and elected by the General Conference for a term of 8 years. Half of the members shall be elected by the General Conference each quadrennium.” So these do come from the Council of Bishops. I—that does not answer her question, however. I realize that and can someone—the answer is no, I am told.

Alright, if you would elect these persons you will vote yes, if not, you will vote no. [Yes, 713; No, 159; Abstain, 17]

You have elected these persons by a vote of 81.8 percent.

Thank you very much. Now we turn to the election of the secretary of General Conference. I see a card, over here, please, yes, mic no. 5.

BISHOP PENNEL: I see a card over here please, yes, mic. 5.

ANTHONY C. ALEXANDER (Central Pennsylvania): Anthony Alexander, Central Pennsylvania Annual Conference. Bishop, half of Central Pennsylvania delegates’ key pads were not functioning during that last election.

BISHOP PENNEL: You say that one half were not functioning?

ALEXANDER: At least.

BISHOP PENNEL: At least half. Was that true in other parts of the house? Or did it happen over here? We want everyone to be able to vote. So let me consult with our technicians and see what is the appropriate thing to do.

(pause)

Alright, I think we’re clear now. We understand the problem. We’re going to retake that vote and everything is in order. So I think you are ready. Please vote now. [Yes, 724; No, 136; Abstain, 22]

Alright, you have voted yes. Thank you. Now we turn to the election of the secretary of the General Conference.

MARSHALL: The nomination of L. Fitzgerald Reist is listed on the second column on p. 1520 in your *DCA*.

BISHOP PENNEL: L. Fitzgerald Reist has been nominated. Are there

other nominations? I do not see a card. I think you’re ready to vote. Please vote now. [Yes, 824; No, 43; Abstain, 17]

You have elected L. Fitzgerald Reist as the secretary for General Conference.

(applause)

Even as you’ve elected him, you would have me to say to him, “We’re grateful to you for being willing to serve”

L. FITZGERALD REIST: Thank you, so very much.

(applause)

BISHOP PENNEL: Now we need to elect the Trustees of St. Johns, of John Street Church. Trustees of John Street Church and our secretary will give us direction.

MARSHALL: According to the *Discipline*, one of the responsibilities of the General Conference is to elect the trustees for old John Street United Methodist Church. The persons so nominated are: Ernest Lyght, Ray Rodgers, Jay Cardwell, Allen Stapler, James Holenstein, Connie Takamine, and Robert Holmes.

BISHOP PENNEL: These are they that have been nominated. Are there other nominations? If not, I think you’re ready to vote. Would you please vote now. [Yes, 842; No, 23; Abstain, 34]

You’ve elected these trustees to John Street Church.

*Interjurisdictional Committee
on the Episcopacy*

Now, you need to elect the Interjurisdictional Committee on the Episcopacy and our secretary will help facilitate this election.

MARSHALL: In your delegate handbook on pp. 101 and 102 are the nominations which have come from the various annual conferences in the jurisdictions. There are two corrections to that which were submitted after the handbook was compiled and printed. Those are listed on pp. 1522 and 1523 in the *DCA*.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, these are before you. These nominations have moved through— yes, there’s a card over here. Yes please, mic. 4.

JANE ALLEN MIDDLETON (New York): Bishop, Jane Middleton, the New York Conference. Because of the election yesterday of Beth Capen we need to put Ernest Swiggett as the nominee from the New York Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright.

MIDDLETON: I place that name in nomination.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, thank you. Did our secretary record that?

MARSHALL: Yes.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Alright, these are before you. Yes, I see a card in the back. Mic 6, please.

SHARON L. BASSETT (North Central New York): Bishop, Sharon Bassett, North Central New York Conference. We need to add—remove my name from the North Central New York Conference and add Ron Bretsch.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, could you spell that please?

MARSHALL: It’s already listed in the—it’s already been done on 1523.

BISHOP PENNEL: I think she did that on p. 1523.

BASSETT: OK.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Thank you for helping

BASSETT: Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Alright, I do not see another card. Yes, there is a card back here. Mic. no. 5, please.

PAUL H. WILEY (Troy): Paul Wiley, Troy Conference. We would like to replace Paul Wiley and Michele Ruller with Bill Barney and Shirley Readdean.

MARSHALL: What conference?

BISHOP PENNEL: New York Conference. I’m sorry; we didn’t get the conference up here.

WILEY: T-R-O-Y.

BISHOP PENNEL: Troy Conference. Thank you. We know the New York

Conference is over here, that's why we were confused. Yes, please, back here. As you're making these corrections, we need you to send those names to the secretary, please. So if you would forward those as quickly as possible, that would be a great help. Yes, I'm looking at mic no. 2.

LEWIS A. PARKS (Central Pennsylvania): Lew Parks, Central Pennsylvania Conference. On p. 101, for North-eastern Jurisdiction, Central Pennsylvania Conference, laity, replace Phyllis Bowers with Zedna Haverstock.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, if you'll forward the name. And I saw another card back here. Yes, mic no. 6, please.

BEN F. BOONE (Memphis): Ben Boone, Memphis Conference. Harry Durbin and Anita K. Archer are incorrectly listed under the South Central. They should be under Southeastern Jurisdiction.

BISHOP PENNEL: OK. Make that correction, thank you. I do not see any other cards. I think we made all the corrections. If you would forward those corrections to the table it would be most helpful. Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 844; No, 19; Abstain, 28*]

You have elected these persons. Thank you very much.

And that completes our elections for this morning. You have chosen persons to be servants of Christ's holy church, and thank you for your attention to those important matters. And now we move to Judicial Administration and then Independent Commissions and then Global Ministries; if those persons would come to the platform and be prepared.

JON R. GRAY (Missouri): Good morning, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Judge Gray, thank you.

GRAY: John R. Gray, Missouri Conference. Bishop and members of the General Conference; we continue with the calendar items that we left off on Monday evening at the hour of adjournment. I want to express my

thanks to the Agenda Committee for permitting us this opportunity. We have eight remaining items that will be presented by various members of the committee. I would first like to introduce Lynn Catterson of the Greater New Jersey Conference to present two items.

Petitions Regarding Judicial Council

LYNN S. CATERSON (Greater New Jersey): Bishop, brothers and sisters. The Judicial Administration Legislative Committee had four petitions before it dealing with membership on the Judicial Council. Two were mandatory requirements. Two were suggested requirements. The house has dealt with two of those conditions on the consent calendar, indicating non-concurrence. There are two petitions that we will address this morning.

First, if you will turn to *DCA* 1577. It's Calendar Item 120, and that has been pulled from the consent calendar. In your *Advance DCA*, go to p. 1336. It is Petition No. 40416. You will find that on the right-hand column, the middle of the page. The committee recommends non-concurrence. There were many reasons given in the committee. The two prominent ones were the process of nomination is quite inclusive, that is, the Council of Bishops must name possible nominees from the various jurisdictions. Secondly, there is open nomination from the floor where other nominees can be lifted up from any of the jurisdictions and, of course, the central conferences as well.

The second reason was, if you will look in your *Discipline* at Paragraph 2602, there is a footnote indicating a Judicial Council decision, No. 540. That indicates that by lifting up and requiring a certain conference in the case of the decision, the issue was that there must be someone from the central conferences. The Judicial Council ruled that that was unconstitutional; that the body, by selecting and limiting one, actually allows others then not to have a fair opportunity. Those were the two reasons the committee recommended non-concurrence. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Alright. The report is before you. Is there conversation? I do not see a card. I think you're ready to vote. Would you please vote now? [*Yes, 774; No, 87; Abstain, 6*]

You have supported the recommendation of your committee for non-concurrence. Thank you.

CATERSON: Now will the house please turn to *DCA*, p. 1644. It is Petition No. 539. If you have kept your blue *Advance DCA* open to p. 1336, you will find the petition and its language on the right-hand column, at the top. However, the committee voted concurrence with the amendment that, instead of the words "offered by the petition of geographic regions," the specific words of "Jurisdiction and Central Conferences" be substituted. The committee voted concurrence, believing that simply to lift before these delegates the concept that we must be inclusive in all these areas is appropriate. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Is there conversation? I do not see a card. I think you're ready to vote. If you would support your committee's recommendation for concurrence, would you please vote now. [*Yes, 821; No, 54; Abstain, 8*]

You have supported your committee's recommendation. Thank you.

GRAY: Bishop and members of the house, I would next like to introduce to you the Reverend Danita Anderson-Wilkins of the Northern Illinois Conference, who will present two items.

DANITA ANDERSON-WILKINS (Northern Illinois): If you will turn in your *DCA* to p. 1581, 1581. We are looking at Calendar Item No. 156, 156. The document appears in your *Advance DCA* on p. 1338, 1338. It's Petition No. 41052, 41052. Bishop, we move non-concurrence with the document.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. Is there conversation? I do not see a card. The committee is recommending non-

concurrence. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. You have supported the recommendation of your committee. Thank you. [*Yes, 816; No, 64; Abstain, 6*]

ANDERSON-WILKINS: We continue on the *DCA* p. 1581, Calendar Item No. 157. Page 1581, Item No. 157. It's in the Advance *DCA* on the same page, 1338. It's Petition No. 40348, 40348. Bishop, this, the committee recommends non-concurrence on this document as well.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Your committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. Is there conversation? I—yes, there is a card over here, please. Mic no. 4, if you will.

DALE R. SHUNK (Western Pennsylvania): Dale Shunk, Western Pennsylvania. Like I said the other day, I would like to (*unintelligible*) one sentence of rationale or something why you're recommending non-concurrence from each of the people. I know we have a lot of things we have to do, but that really would help facilitate my vote and others.

ANDERSON-WILKINS: OK. For this petition, we felt like it was already being done.

BISHOP PENNEL: Other conversation? I do not see a card. The committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 774; No, 125; Abstain, 2*]

You have supported the recommendation of your committee. Thank you.

GRAY: Bishop and members of the conference, I next wish to introduce Ben Bowden Esq. of the Alabama-West Florida Conference to present two items.

Petition On Bribery

BENJAMIN M. BOWDEN (Alabama-West Florida): Conference, if you would turn to p. 1756 of your *DCA*, 1756; and we'll be dealing with Calendar Item 1116, Calendar Item 1116. This can be found in the Advance *DCA* on p. 1351, Advance

DCA 1351, Petition No. 41111, Petition 41111. And the committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. This petition calls for a process of arbitration. It adds a new paragraph to the *Discipline*. The committee had two issues that led to non-concurrence. The first was the petition was cast in mandatory terms "You shall use arbitration," and we wanted this type of process to remain optional for whoever might want to use arbitration. And then the other thing that we thought of is that we felt like JustPeace would perhaps use arbitration at some time—does that mean slow down?

OK—that JustPeace would use arbitration from time to time and that the *Discipline* also has a process called just resolution that deals with dispute resolution, so your committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. You've heard the recommendation of the committee. Do you have conversation? I do not see a card. The recommendation of the committee is non-concurrence. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 849; No, 25; Abstain, 4*]

You have supported the recommendation of your committee. Thank you.

BOWDEN: On the same page of your *DCA*, that'll be p. 1756, p. 1756, Calendar Item 1117, Calendar Item 1117. In the Advance *DCA*, it can be found on p. 1341. It's Petition No. 41291; Petition No. 41291. This petition seeks to make bribery of the various conferences—conference delegates a chargeable offense. The committee recommends non-concurrence. The—I'll tell you that this petition hurt our feelings a little bit, and that if there was bribery going on we were getting cut out of it somehow.

BISHOP PENNEL: How much would it take?

BOWDEN: It was a committee of lawyers, so I'll just say a lot.

(*applause*)

If I could, if you could indulge me just a moment further. We did have a chuckle about this, and I think levity

and humor is good for the conference. But we did have a brother on our committee who had a real life story about a conference delegate being given some sort of substantial gift by an entity that, that had an agenda before the conference. So, it is a serious issue, but nonetheless your committee recommends non-concurrence because of the vagueness of what would constitute bribery.

BISHOP PENNEL: Is there a conversation? I do see a card here please. I think you go to mic no. 7. Here please, mic no. 7.

VICKI L. WOODS (New England): Vicki Woods, New England. I, I appreciate you saying that it's not all laughter. I think there's different kinds of bribery. And I think that even that this came in makes us aware that there are ways that many, someone feels that other people are being used in order to get their agenda across. And, therefore I support this so that in some way I do not support non-concurrence. I think we have to hold one another accountable, and really consider that.

BISHOP PENNEL: So that's a speech against, is that correct? Yes, one speech against. Now is there a speech for? I do not see a card. The committee has a right to a closing statement.

BOWDEN: We, I agree with our sister that it can be a serious offense. We were just concerned that there a lot of things that are given to us as gratuities and, and small gifts as we approach General Conference and some more work would have to be done on a petition like this for us to determine what would be considered to be bribery and what would not and because of that vagueness and ambiguity your committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right, I do not see a card. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. The committee is recommending non-concurrence. [*Yes, 719; No, 176; Abstain, 3*]

You have supported the recommendation of the committee. Thank you.

GRAY: Bishop and members of the

conference, I next would like to introduce Phillip Connolly of the West Ohio Conference to present one calendar item.

Appeal of Trial Court

PHILLIP CONNOLLY (West Ohio): Please turn with me to p. 1756, 1756, for Calendar Item 1119. This is found in your Advance *DCA* on p. 1349, 1349, and is Petition 40991. The petition allows for the right of a church appeal to a trial. Our committee voted concurrence 48 to 7.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right, I see a card over here please at mic no. 8.

LONNIE CHAFIN (Northern Illinois): Thank you Bishop (*unintelligible*), I rise for a point of order. This petition requires an expenditure of funds because it has a provision asking the Judicial Council to have special meetings or procedure for special meetings that may involve international travel, visas, a lot of additional costs for meeting costs. And according to Rule 9B, I think it should be referred to the GCFA for a recommendation.

BISHOP PENNEL: Would you please come back to the microphone. Would you be kind enough to identify the rule for us, please. You have interrupted the speaker, but I'm going to permit it. It's all right.

CHAFIN: It's a point of order; I hope that is permissible Bishop. It's Rule 9B.

BISHOP PENNEL: 9B or D?

CHAFIN: B as in boy.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you.

(pause)

I think our sense is that if it is adopted it would then go to GCFA, if it has financial implications.

CHAFIN: Bishop, if I may pursue this one moment. The petition did not have financial implications when it first was submitted. The committee then amended it, and I'm referring specifically to Part B of the, of the change which calls for media consultation by the Judicial Council in the

midst of investigative trials. That would absolutely mean additional meetings for the Judicial Council, and absolutely would require additional costs, and I believe it's been our practice that GCFA has had a chance to look at all these before plenary action.

BISHOP PENNEL: The way, the way we understand, the way we understand the work that is before us is that the General Conference is the gatekeeper for GCFA. If you adopt a report that has financial implications, there's no guarantee that GCFA will include that amount of money in its budget. If for example, you adopt a report that has a million dollars in it, there's no guarantee that GCFA would include a million dollars in the final report that comes back to General Conference. GCFA might include \$500,000 or \$100,000 and they may have to take away from this entity in order to satisfy that entity.

CHAFIN: Yes, Bishop, I...

BISHOP PENNEL: So, finally, after GCFA makes those decisions, the body will decide what its final budget will be. Now, I think we're clear about that, are we not?

CHAFIN: I guess, Bishop. I'm trying to understand p. 1535 of the *DCA*. There's this Roman numeral 9, and there is a letter B, and it says "any action proposed to the General Conference plenary which involves the expenditure of funds not included in the established budget shall be referred to the General Council on Finance and Administration for advice and recommendation before final action is taken."

BISHOP PENNEL: This is not the final action. I think that's where you're a little confused. The final action is when the final GCFA report comes back to General Conference. So, if you should adopt this report, those financial implications would go to GCFA for their consideration. This is not the final action, this is the process. Is that OK?

CHAFIN: I'm not the one to decide, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Let's proceed with the report.

CONNOLLY: This action came after seven hours of work and debate, a task of the original subcommittee brought an amendment back to our group that was a very convoluted, confusing process and after another hour of debate, we tabled that. That night I thought I had an idea of how to break that and worked with an attorney and a judge to, to bring another amendment in. After the presentation of that amendment, several people joined me in the hall and wanted to know if we could work together to find a consensus around this issue. And so a group of us that evening, independently, met who were geographically and theologically diverse and spent 3 1/2 hours with an attorney from GCFA and said let's not just react to the petition, let's not talk about theological or political ideals, let's talk about a problem and how we might work together to fix it. So seven of us worked that night until after 11 o'clock to form this proposal, brought it back to the body and it was adopted the next morning ...

PHILLIP CONNOLLY (West Ohio): The seven of us worked that night until after 11:00 to form this proposal brought it back to the body and it was adopted the next morning. After the attorneys that were just referred to spent an hour changing semi-colons and commas and dotting i's.

BISHOP JOSEPH E. PENNEL JR.: Alright the entire report is now—and what is your recommendation. Is your recommendation concurrence?

CONNOLLY: Yes, the recommendation is concurrence 48 to 7.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, recommendation is concurrence. Now I see, I see cards way over here please, mic 5. Is this a speech for or against?

LONNIE D. BROOKS (Alaska Missionary): Against the report of the committee, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright.

BROOKS: Lonnie Brooks, lay, Alaska of the Western Jurisdiction.

This process that we're dealing with is the ecclesial parallel of a criminal process, and if we approve this petition, it would establish an unprecedented right of the church to appeal a verdict of not guilty, through the means of appealing matters of law that were potentially an issue during the decision. This would essentially amount to a double jeopardy for the respondent and I vigorously oppose our adopting this measure.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright that is a speech against, is there a speech for? Yes, mic no. 4 please.

PATRICIA E. FARRIS (California-Pacific): Patricia Farris of Western Jurisdiction, California-Pacific Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Are you speaking for?

FARRIS: I have a question of the presenter, if I may?

BISHOP PENNEL: You may. Yes.

FARRIS: In your remarks, sir, you mentioned that this was written to address a problem. Could you please tell us what is the nature of that problem that this is intended to address? Thank you.

CONNOLLY: There was a consensus in the, and I'd say consensus—general consensus—in the committee as a whole that there needed to be some way to address the right of appeal to trials. I would note that this is only appeal of law not fact, and that's a substantial difference. And we spent a long time talking about how we could protect—how we could be in fair process and not create a situation of double jeopardy, but have an appeal of law.

BISHOP PENNEL: We've had one question and we've had one speech against. Is there a speech for? Over here please the speech for, no. 4, mic 4 please.

Motion to Refer

ELAINE J. W. STANOVSKY (Pacific Northwest): Elaine Stanovsky, Pacific Northwest Conference. I have a motion to refer.

BISHOP PENNEL: A motion to refer is in order.

STANOVSKY: I move to refer Petition 40991, found on p. on *ADCA* p. 1349, reported as Calendar Item 119, on *DCA* p. 1756 to the Judicial Council. To bring out with a request that they bring us an opinion on the following question. If adopted would Petition 40991 be constitutional under Article 31?

BISHOP PENNEL: That is a motion to refer and a motion to refer is debatable. Is there a second? There is a second. Yes, would you like to speak? This would be a speech.

STANOVSKY: I don't have the. OK. Elaine Stanovsky, again, Pacific Northwest. If you go to Article 31, this is the article in our Constitution that reserves matters of ordination to the annual conference and, (boy, do I have the right article here?) now I'm lost, we're acting quickly. Well, I'm going to let that stand, sorry.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, I see this card here, please. We've had a motion and one speech for, is this a speech for or against? This is on the matter of referral.

LYNN S. CATERSON (Greater New Jersey): Lynn Catterson, lay, Greater New Jersey. It's against the motion for referral at this time. There is provision in the *Discipline* to refer this matter if it is passed. I think in the interest of our resources and our time to make a referral of a matter that may not pass is not a good use of that. Should we pass this there is then ample opportunity to make that referral.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Other conversation? I do not . . . I do not see a card. I do see a card over here, please. Yes, mic 4, please.

DARLENE D. BALM-DEMME (Iowa): Darlene Balm-Demmel, Iowa, clergy. I was on this committee, and I would just like to correct one statement that the speaker made. There was not a general consensus as far as I was concerned in that committee on this issue of a problem.

BISHOP PENNEL: We will receive that as a correction. Alright, I do see a card way back over here near mic 5, please. Is this a speech for or against, please?

JOHN W. EDGAR (West Ohio): John Edgar, West Ohio. I'd like to amend the motion to refer by additional agency to refer it to. My amendment is that I would like this to also be referred to GCFA to be brought back to the next General Conference after their lawyers have had a chance to look at this.

I am struck by the fact that the presenter keeps talking about judges and attorneys who looked at this and then he says that there's this complete consensus, somebody else says there isn't consensus. If it's all about letting the lawyers be the experts on this let's give them time to do that and I would suggest let's refer it not only to Judicial Council for the items stated, but lets GCFA take a look at this and come back to next General Conference with a recommendation. This is a profound change in our practice it ought not be done in a late night mood meeting with a few attorneys who are going to tell us what we have to do.

BISHOP PENNEL: There is a second. You have a— this is an amendment to a motion to refer. Is there conversation? We're on the amendment. I do not see a card. Yes, I do see a card. Over here please, mic No. 4.

ROBERT T. HOSHIBATA (Pacific Northwest): Bishop and General Conference, Bob Hoshibata, Pacific Northwest Annual Conference. I want to just input the information that my colleague Elaine Stanovsky was not able to get her finger on at the moment. The information she wanted to place before us was in the Constitution Section 6, Annual Conferences, Paragraph 31, Article 2. Information can be found on p. 31 of your *Book of Discipline*.

It reads "The annual conference is the basic body in the Church and is such shall have reserved to it the right to vote on all constitutional amend-

ments on the election of clergy and lay delegates to the general and the jurisdictional or central conferences, on all matters related to the character and conference relations of its clergy members and on the ordination of clergy and such other rights as have not been delegated to the General Conference under the constitution, with the exception that the lay members may not vote on matters of ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy except that lay members of the conference board of ordained ministry may vote on matters of ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy, with the further exception that lay members of the district committee of ordained ministry be full participating members of the district committee on ordained ministry with vote. It shall discharge such duties and exercise such powers as the General Conference under the Constitution . . . ”

BISHOP PENNEL: You need to sum it up, please.

HOSHIBATA: This is the information that needed to be placed in our consideration of this matter.

BISHOP PENNEL: Chair will take that as a speech against the amendment. Let's have our secretary read the amendment please.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: I don't have it.

BISHOP PENNEL: She does not have the amendment. Will the maker of the amendment, well let me take care of a couple of cards then. I want you to be clear about the amendment. Will the maker of the amendment come back to the mic and restate the amendment and also will you send a copy of it to the chair so we can use it please.

EDGAR: My amendment is that we would, is amendment by addition, that we would also refer this matter to the General Commission on Finance and Administration for its review and a report back at the next General Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright it's an amendment by addition and it specifies

the time. We've had one speech against is there a speech for. I'm seeing a card over here please. Yes, mic 5.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is really a question, Bishop. The issue has been raised about constitutionality and my question is since I didn't serve on the Judicial Administration Legislative Committee, was this discussed and will we have an opportunity to hear from the committee on their discussions on this constitutional issue. That would be helpful to me and since the committee voted so overwhelming 38 to 7, or whatever it was, in favor of this I'd like to hear them on that issue if that was discussed before we refer the matter.

BISHOP PENNEL (Richmond Area): Alright, would you answer that question, please?

PHILLIP CONNOLLY (West Ohio): It was not discussed in the full committee. In the writing of the legislation it was discussed. I want to be clear—some of the confusion that we've heard—that this was a late-night session with some attorneys trying to figure this out. There's seven hours of work that have gone into this with a broad consensus in a small group and a vote of 48 to 7 in favor in the whole committee. This was worked out in consultation with an attorney from GCFA, so to move it to GCFA is confusing to me, when they were a part of helping us write this legislation.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the amendment is before you. Is there conversation about the amendment? Yes, over here, please. I'm seeing two cards. I'm talking to this other gentleman, first, the man in the bow tie. Mic 3 is your shortest walk, I think.

Concern About Reacting

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): Thank you, Bishop, James Ehrman, East Ohio, and I'm waiting for my picture to show up, here.

Some people have asked—it's real.

I'm speaking in favor of the amend-

ment to refer even if the GCFA attorneys were involved in some of this negotiation. This is a profound change in the way we do church trials. I believe the chair was somewhat disingenuous in his answer to the question of what's the problem that we're trying to fix. It's obvious that what we're trying to fix is the Karen Dammann trial. We never had this problem before that trial.

It is never a good idea to rewrite fundamental legislation in response to one specific issue. There may be a need to make this change, but it shouldn't be done just thinking about that one case. And you can see how it has opened a can of worms if you look down at the bottom of the right-hand column of 1756, where we talk about all the additional people who are going to have the right to force an appeal. Is this something we really want in a situation where the trial is upset. . .

BISHOP PENNEL: Sum up your remarks, please.

EHRMAN: when the accusation is the pastor with the affair with the choir director.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. Alright, we've had a speech against the amendment and for the amendment. The amendment is before you. I see a card way over here, now, mic no. 1, please.

JOE W. KILPATRICK (North Georgia): Bishop, Joe Kilpatrick, North Georgia. I'd like to move the previous question on that which is before the house.

BISHOP PENNEL: By rules this morning, we're allowing two speeches for and against. We've had one speech for and one against, so the chair will proceed. Is there another speech? Over here, please, mic 4. Is this a speech for or against the amendment, please?

JANET E. STEPHENSON (Iowa): It's a request for a ruling from the chair. Janet Stephenson, Iowa, conference Rules of Order Committee. I would like to have a ruling from the chair

regarding the rule on p. 121 in the Advance *DCA*, F(2). The rule reads, "The legislative committees may not originate business, but shall consider and report only upon that which is referred to them by the Committee on Reference, or which has been referred to them directly by the Conference and processed by the Committee on Reference." Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Would you please state the reference, again, for us? Our colleagues are looking that up.

STEPHENSON: The Advance *DCA*, it would be p. 121, rule F(2).

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Thank you. This—it is in order, because this was opened by a petition that was referred to this committee. Alright, we're on the amendment. I see a card back here, please, mic no. 6.

RONALD BRETSCHE (North Central New York): Thank you, Bishop. Ron Bretsch, North Central New York.

BISHOP PENNEL: Is this a speech for or against the amendment?

BRETSCHE: It's a speech in favor of referring.

BISHOP PENNEL: So you're speaking in favor of the amendment that was made?

BRETSCHE: The amendment to refer, yes.

BISHOP PENNEL: To GCFA?

BRETSCHE: Yes.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, you may proceed.

BRETSCHE: I'm not a lawyer, but when the phrase, double jeopardy, is used, I'm very concerned. The chair of the committee said or implied that "double jeopardy" is not involved, here, because it's not a matter of "fact," but instead a matter of "law."

I hesitate to make analogies between the church and civil society, but in our courts in the Western tradition, the prosecution must get it right the first time. It doesn't have the opportunity to further prosecution on a "matter of law."

BISHOP PENNEL: We've had two speeches for the amendment and one against. I do not see a card. Yes, there is a card over here, mic no. 1, please. This will be the—yes, please.

RODNEY G. STEELE (Arkansas): Against the amendment.

BISHOP PENNEL: Against the amendment. This will be the final speech, yes.

STEELE: Rodney Steele, Arkansas. I speak against the amendment to refer all amendments to refer. This was an issue before the Dammann trial. Because it was an issue of the church's right to appeal, before that trial, people from all around that issue sat down to work out the proposed legislation. There was deep concern in the committee of broaching anything that would appear to be "double jeopardy." That's not the intent and we believe this is good legislation that needs to come before the body. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the committee has the opportunity to speak to this motion to refer—this amendment to refer to GCF&A. Would you like to comment?

CONNOLLY: I'd just say that in a group, trying to look at it bigger than the Dammann trial. We tried to include anyone who was participating in that or had been a part of any part of that, to try to look at it as a matter of church rule and legislation and to remove the political and theological questions from it. So we'd speak against referral.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the amendment to the motion to refer is now before you—to refer to GCFA, that is the amendment, to refer by addition. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 417; No, 492; Abstain, 4*]

You have voted "no" on the amendment. So we're now back to the original motion to refer, and we've had one speech for and one speech against. And this is a Judicial Council referral. Is there another speech for or against? I do see a card, way back here. Yes, please, mic no. 8. We've had one

speech for and one against to refer to the Judicial Council. Is this a speech for or against, please?

FRANK DORSEY (Kansas East): Yes, it is for referral to the Judicial Council.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright.

DORSEY: Frank Dorsey, Kansas East. Because this marks such a fundamental change in the way we do business, and the way we do make decisions, I believe that it is necessary to refer this to the Judicial Council and hope that the body will support that action.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, we've had two speeches for and one against. Is there a speech against referral? Right in front, here, mic no. 2, please.

ROBERT L. LOCKABY JR. (Holston): Bob Lockaby, Holston. First I have a question. If this is referred to the Judicial Council on this constitutionality question, do we know whether that decision could be made and brought back to us before the end of General Conference?

BISHOP PENNEL: I think that's in the request. I believe that's what her motion to refer says. Is that correct, maker of the motion?

STANOVSKY: Elaine Stanovsky, Pacific Northwest. I didn't specify the report back time. I don't know what's possible. That would be a question for the Judicial Council.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. So you just referred, you didn't specify, so would like—you ask your question. Now would you like to make a speech?

LOCKABY: Well, if we don't have the answer to that question, and the possibility is that it could be referred to the Judicial Council before we act and then not have an answer on the constitutionality question before we leave here, then I strongly urge us to act on this proposal before we consider referring it to the Judicial Council for the question of constitutionality.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. It's properly before you now. Yes? See a card here please, on the front row. Yes?

Mic no. 2. There's no debate now, you've had your speeches for and against. This would only have to be for questions and the presenter has the opportunity to make a statement. Yes.

Technical Questions

CARL L. SCHENK (Missouri): Thank you, Bishop Pennel. It is indeed a question and a question of our procedure. If the motion to refer fails at this time, and should the motion from the committee before the house prevail, is it in order after that action to again consider appeal to the Judicial Council; or would our action on this appeal prohibit a request later?

BISHOP PENNEL: I think we'd have to work on what is before the house at this point. Now you're asking will other legislation be coming that would address the same thing, is that what you're asking?

SCHENK: No, sir, that is not my question. We have a motion to appeal, and one of the first—

BISHOP PENNEL: We have a motion to refer.

SCHENK: Excuse me.

BISHOP PENNEL: It's all right.

SCHENK: Thank you. Thank you for the correction.

BISHOP PENNEL: It's all right. It's all right.

SCHENK: If the—one of the early speeches on the matter before the house requested the delay until after the house had decided the main question, and made a rather good speech supporting that viewpoint. If we act now, not to refer, are we then tying our hands about referral later after the committee's report is acted upon?

BISHOP PENNEL: We have to act on what is before us and then the house would have the right to make other motions.

SCHENK: It would?

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

SCHENK: Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. The presenters can make a final—we've

had speeches, the debate is closed. We're ready now for our friends to make a final statement.

CONNOLLY: We're opposed to referring it and would like to pass it and then be open to a referral at that point.

BISHOP PENNEL: May I read the motion to you? Yes, you're anxious, so let me let you have the microphone out of fairness, please.

CRAIG A. PARRISH (Pacific Northwest): Craig Parrish, Pacific Northwest, clergy. I'm just a little confused in our delegation. The speaker on the platform mentioned that persons connected with the Dammann trial were consulted, and we'd just like to know who that might be.

BISHOP PENNEL: So you're asking a question now. We can direct that question—let me read the motion to you again, the motion to refer: "I move to refer Petition 40991, found on *ADCA* p. 1349, reprinted as Calendar Item 119 on *DCA* p. 1756, to the Judicial Council to bring us an opinion"—I think "us" means this body, that's the way I would interpret that—"on the following question: If adopted, would Petition 40991 be constitutional under Article 31?" So the chair would interpret "us" to mean the Judicial Council would bring us the ruling. Now our presenter can make final comments, please.

CONNOLLY: Just that we'd be opposed.

BISHOP PENNEL: Is that all you want to say? Alright. Now the motion to refer is before you, and you are ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 450; No, 466; Abstain, 7*]

BISHOP PENNEL: You have voted not to refer.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes? I hear a point of order.

BRADLEY LAURVICK (Rocky Mountain): Looking—Brad Laurvick, Rocky Mountain Conference—looking in the Constitution, Paragraph 54, Article 2, p. 38: "The Judicial Council shall have the authority to determine the constitutionality of any act of the

General Conference upon an appeal of the majority of the Council of Bishops or one-fifth of the members of the General Conference," which I believe we have.

BISHOP PENNEL: That's not what was before the house. The house was voting on referral only. Alright, we're back now to the motion, the main motion, to the original petition, and there's been one argument against. I see a hand here, please.

PAUL E. BLACK (Illinois Great Rivers): Paul Black, Illinois Great Rivers Conference, lay delegate. I just have a question for the committee. Since several were attorneys and judges, I would like to know how this process compares to the process that we grant our secular courts. I, too, am very concerned about the issue of double jeopardy. And are we granting to our church courts authority that the secular courts do not have in a criminal proceeding?

CONNOLLY: I am—admit now that I'm one of the few on there that's not an attorney or a judge. I was in the minority. I'm a contractor; but I deal with lots of attorneys. The effort was made to be sure that the appeal in this was only the law and not the fact, where there wouldn't be a retrying of the case. And the appeal is not to the case, but is to certification of the facts. And so in Paragraph B of the legislation you see, allows an opportunity to appeal the law in the case and the application of it. That's parallel to what happens in our legal system.

BISHOP PENNEL: No—you're coming back to the microphone for a follow-up. Is that right?

BLACK: It's to clarify.

BISHOP PENNEL: Clarification.

BLACK: So what you're telling me is the secular courts can appeal in the regard to correcting law, but they don't get a second bite of the apple when it comes to the other issues of the trial.

CONNOLLY: (*unintelligible*) You can't retry the trial. That's not what this is about. This is application of law.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right, you've had a speech against. Is there speech for? Is there a speech for? Back here please. Mic no. 7, person on the aisle right here.

Delete Clause on Venue Change

CHARLOTTE A. ABRAM (Nebraska): Bishop, would it be in order for me to make an amendment?

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

ABRAM: I move that we amend this document under Paragraph 2715.2. I would delete the words "if the appellate body finds that good cause exists upon remand of the matter, it may change the venue for a new trial." I move to delete those words.

BISHOP PENNEL: So your amendment is to delete?

ABRAM: Yes.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes. Is there a second? There is a second. Yes?

ABRAM: I would suggest that the trials that take place need to stay in the area and under the jurisdiction of that particular annual conference. I would suggest that moving trials—whatever the trial might be—takes it out of the context of the area in which it happened. I would hate to think that a trial that needed to take place in Nebraska might be moved to another jurisdiction. That's not allowing folks who are closest to the trial access to being there.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right. This amendment is before you. There's been a speech for it. Is there a speech against the amendment? I recognize the person here, please. Mic no. 3. Is this on the amendment? We're on the amendment now.

PHILIP A. AMERSON (California-Pacific): On the amendment to remove—

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes, to delete. Yes.

AMERSON: And this is a speech in support of that.

BISHOP PENNEL: All right.

AMERSON: It seems to me that one of the—Philip Amerson from the

California-Pacific Annual Conference. I would ask the body to please consider the path we're going down just now. And I would encourage you to consider the cost, the financial cost, before us. Not only are we going to face a number of trials if this passes; we're also going to face the possibility of having to move them various distances.

I was a good boy yesterday. I did not stand and support a piece of legislation from my wife that was—that came to this body. I'll have to deal with that when I get home. But the legislation had to do with providing scholarship assistance to pastors to go into our inner cities to work there. And I didn't speak, even though I wish now I had. We're spending time, friends, on issues that do not touch the real needs of the poor and the oppressed in our world. We're spending time as a church...

(applause)

BISHOP PENNEL: Ah, friends, ah...

AMERSON: ...to redirect sources toward trials rather than toward feeding the hungry and being with the homeless and doing the work that John Wesley founded our church to do.

(applause)

BISHOP PENNEL: Now, believers, I know you want to express yourself; but we express ourselves with our votes and not with our applause. May I with great humility ask you not to applaud; rather listen prayerfully to what is being said which will provide more guidance for the spirit to work among us. Thank you.

We have had two speeches for the amendment. Is there a speech against the amendment to delete? Yes. Way in the back, back here please. He said no. Alright. I do not see, I do not see a card. The amendment to, the amendment to delete is before you and the presenter can make a statement if you'd like.

PHILLIP CONNOLLY (West Ohio): We'd be opposed to the amendment. If you'd refer back to that, it says, "that if

good cause exists." It's permissive language that may allow anybody to, to be requesting that they would move it for, for various reasons. It could be the conference their self that would want it moved.

BISHOP PENNEL: OK. The amendment is now before you. You are ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 411; No, 474; Abstain, 16*]

The amendment fails. We are back now to the main motion. We have had one speech for and one against. Way back over here, please. No. Way back over here. The lights are on—mic no. 5, please. The lady in the—yes, that's right. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Mic 5. Identify yourself, please.

Postponement

DARLENE DAWES (Central Pennsylvania): Darlene Dawes, Central Pennsylvania Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Is this a speech for or against?

DAWES: Neither. I move to postpone indefinitely.

BISHOP PENNEL: Is there a second? There is a second. That is in order. It is not debatable. It is debatable, excuse me, I'm sorry. It is debatable. The motion to postpone indefinitely is debatable. That motion is now before you. Now, I'll recognize you.

DAVID N. MOSSER (Central Texas): David Mosser, Central Texas Conference. I was one of the seven dissenting votes on the legislative committee. I think that the committee says that it is not double jeopardy. People come to the microphone to say they are lawyers, or deny that they are lawyers, say that it is double jeopardy. And my question would be: We have made the distinction between the matters of fact and matters of law; if the law was misapplied—and that's what this all has to do with—then what happens to the accused and/or acquitted person in dissent trial in terms of double jeopardy?

BISHOP PENNEL: The motion before us is to postpone. So are you

speaking for postponement or not to postpone?

MOSSER: Not postpone.

BISHOP PENNEL: That is a speech against postponing. Is there someone who would like to speak for postponing? Over here, please. No, the lady, please. Mic. no. 3 might be your shortest walk.

HOLLY GRANT (East Ohio): Bishop, I think it is obvious that this is a really sensitive issue for the church. I would just ask if we can take a moment in prayer, please.

BISHOP PENNEL: We certainly can, and we will. Could we take that moment of prayer after we've had these procedural issues? We have a motion to postpone. There has been one speech against postponing. Right here, please, mic no. 2. Is there a speech for postponing?

VINCENT WALKUP (Tennessee): Yes, this is a speech for.

BISHOP PENNEL: Identify yourself, please.

WALKUP: I'm Vin Walkup from Tennessee Conference. We have yesterday refused to acknowledge that we are a divided body. Our votes today have already, on this issue, have already indicated that we are a divided body on this matter. It is such an important, important decision because it changes so much of what we have held to be the right of individuals within our connection. I cannot support our quick change of this portion of our *Discipline*, and I would support our move to postpone our action; because I think we need much more than just a brief prayer. We need deliberate prayer before we make such a monumental change in our *Discipline*. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. There is a speech against postponement and for postponement. Over here, please. I think I see mic no. 1, mic no. 1.

MAXIE DUNHAM (Kentucky): Maxie Dunham, clergy, Kentucky Conference. Because I am interested in the poor and the homeless and all the

matters that this General Conference is going to have to consider before we leave here, I move that we suspend the rules and vote not only for the amendment but for the primary motion that is before us.

BISHOP PENNEL: I think the chair would rule that we have to handle the motion to postpone indefinitely. That's what is before us right now. We must stay with that motion. Alright. I do not see a card for additional conversation on the motion to postpone. Yes. Right back here, please. Yes. Whichever is the shortest distance for you, mic 3. Are you speaking for or against the motion to postpone?

WILLIAM M. CAMPBELL (New England): I am speaking for—Scott Campbell from New England—for the motion to postpone. There is no rush to judgment on this particular matter. This is, this is something that we have lived with in the *Discipline* without problems for generations. There is no need for us to all of a sudden, on the basis of a matter that we have not had time to duly consider, undue fundamental principles and... We talked a lot yesterday about the need to send clear signals about who we are as a church. We will be entering into such a realm of confusion if we do this. Let's take the time. Get it right.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. We can allow one more speech against postponement. Is there someone who would like to make a speech against postponement? If not, we'll move to the question. I do not see a card. May I ask the lady over here, the sister who came to the microphone to request prayer, who was that, please? Would you come to mic no. 3 and pray for us? Thank you, so very much. I heard the sincerity in your voice, and we would appreciate you lifting us in prayer.

(prayer)

Alright. You are ready to vote. Please vote now, on the motion to postpone indefinitely. [*Yes, 492; No, 423; Abstain, 3*]

You have voted to postpone.

GRAY: Bishop, we have one more item that's a request...

BISHOP PENNEL: We are way beyond our break time. Let's take our break for 20 minutes, and look at—my watch says 11:20. Let's be back at 20 minutes 'til 12:00, and we will take this final item. Thank you, very much.

(break)

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you, Barbara, for calling us back together in such a prayerful way. Now, let's be in order, friends. The Lord be with you. Let's be in order, let's find our places. Thank you for coming back so promptly and finding your places. We have one more agenda item from this legislative committee, Judicial Administration.

GRAY: Thank you, Bishop, members of the conference. The last calendar item from the batch that we began on Monday evening, will be presented by Daniel Ivey-Soto Esq. of the New Mexico Conference.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes? We're ready?

Laity on Bishop's Jury

DANIEL A. IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Bishop, members of the Annual Conference. The item that I am to present at this time is found in your DCA on p. 1757, that is p. 1757. It is on the left-hand column, Calendar Item 1121, Calendar Item 1121. It is in the Advance DCA on p. 1348, Advance DCA p. 1348, regards Petition No. 40351, Petition No. 40351.

Bishop, this matter comes with a recommendation of non-concurrence from the committee. Pursuant to the request of the General Conference for an explanation, and on this one, one is in order. This petition has to do with the addition of laypeople on a jurisdictional jury pool. A jurisdiction jury pool is utilized during the trial of a bishop. The legislative committee initially voted concurrence on this matter. There were two companion pieces which would have provided for the addition of laypeople in an annual conference jury

pool for the trial of a clergy member. Those were dealt with subsequent to the initial consideration of this matter in the committee.

At the time that the additional petitions were dealt with, there was a constitutionality question that was raised in the committee. It was the judgment of the chair of our committee that it would be unconstitutional pursuant to Paragraph 31 of the, in the Constitution in the *Book of Discipline*, for laypeople to serve on a, on the trial of a clergy member of an annual conference.

It was the subsequent ruling of the chair of the committee, however, that a bishop relates to a jurisdiction, and not to an annual conference. And lacking a clear paragraph in the *Book of Discipline*, it could not be determined whether or not it would be constitutional to add lay members onto the jury for a bishop. Nonetheless, the committee determined to reconsider its previous recommendation to this body. The feeling in the committee at that time was, that it would not be fair to add laypeople onto the, the jury for a bishop if we were not being consistent and do that for all clergy members as a bishop has their ecclesiastical authority from the same ordination as other ordained elders. As a result, this comes with a recommendation of non-concurrence to the body.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the recommendation is before you and the recommendation is for non-concurrence. Is there conversation? I do see a card back here, next to the aisle, please. Yes, to mic 2, I believe we'll get you a place to speak.

A. MARK CONRAD (Kansas West): Mark Conrad, Kansas West, clergy. The petition that was referred to seems to denote the information about where the nominations would come from for the jury pool rather than whether laypeople could be part of it or not, so I'd appreciate clarification at that point.

BISHOP PENNEL: Daniel.

IVEY-SOTO: The petition provides

for a jury pool that would include laypeople. It was the determination—is that not?

BISHOP PENNEL: Let's give our committee an opportunity to frame an answer that's appropriate.

IVEY-SOTO: Bishop, I apologize for the confusion.

BISHOP PENNEL: That's alright.

IVEY-SOTO: I was trying to take advantage of the fact that we're at the end of a break to allow all the members to return to their seats.

BISHOP PENNEL: He's a quick thinker. That's alright. Now you can help us.

IVEY-SOTO: Bishop, this particular petition specifically deals with who would be naming the, the members of the jury pool, and whether or not it would be done from the jurisdictional Episcopacy Committee or the College of Bishops, as opposed to the other matter which was dealt with separately in the, in the committee.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Is there conversation? I do not see a card. I think you're ready to vote. The committee is recommending non-concurrence. When you're ready, please vote now. [*Yes, 607; No, 139; Abstain, 6*]

Alright, you have supported the recommendation of the committee.

GRAY: Bishop Pennel, members of the house, thank you very much for your attention.

BISHOP PENNEL: And thank you for your good work. We appreciate it. And we appreciate the spirit with which you brought all that work to us. Thank you so very, very much. [*Yes, 607; No, 139; Abstain, 6*]

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, you have supported the recommendation of the committee.

GRAY: Bishop Pennel, members of the house, thank you very much for your attention.

BISHOP PENNEL: And thank you for your good work. We appreciate it.

(*applause*)

And we appreciate the spirit with which you brought all that work to us. Thank you so very, very much.

Now, I think we're ready for Independent Commissions. And before we go to Independent Commissions, let us pray.

(*prayer*)

Alright.

Independent Commissions Reports

EVA C. THAI (California-Pacific): Bishop, and members of the General Conference, I am Eva Thai, lay, young adult delegate from the California-Pacific Conference. I bring greetings on behalf of the Independent Commissions legislative committee. I also bring greetings on behalf of our chair, Rev. Dennis Blackwell, who could not be with us this afternoon. David A. Banks serves as our, our committee secretary.

Dennis, David, and I would like to thank our legislative committee for their hard work. We would also like to thank the following people for their leadership as sub-committee chairs: Anthony Alexander from the Central Pennsylvania Conference, Gil Hanke from the Texas Conference, Sung-Ja Lee Moon from the Northern Illinois Conference, Marilyn Murphy from the South Carolina Conference, and Judith Pierre-Okerson from the Florida Conference.

This afternoon we will be presenting nine pieces of legislation. Three of those pieces are in regards to the Igniting Ministry campaigns. We will hold those three pieces off until after lunch to ensure proper time. First I would like to introduce sub-committee chair Judith Pierre-Okerson who will bring our first piece of legislation. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Judith.

JUDITH PIERRE-OKERSON

(Florida): Thank you, Eva. Judith Pierre-Okerson, lay, Florida Conference. Bishop, we are on page—*DCA* p. 1644, 1644, Calendar Item 534, Petition No.

41169, 41169, Advance *DCA* p. 1311, p. 1311.

The committee recommends non-concurrence and the rationale for our vote: this project is too diffuse, is not focused clearly on specific ecumenical or interfaith issues, is not global in its focus, it's left out our brothers and sisters from the central conference, and is an off-budget project.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, you're recommending non-concurrence. Do we need conversation about the recommendation about the legislative committee? I do not see a card. I think you're ready to vote. They are recommending non-concurrence. Please vote now. [*Yes, 784; No, 31; Abstain, 4*]

You have supported the recommendation of your committee.

THAI: Thank you. And now I'd like to introduce Anthony Alexander, chair of our religion and race subcommittee.

Multicultural Ministry Referral

ANTHONY C. ALEXANDER (Central Pennsylvania): Thank you, Eva. Anthony Alexander, clergy, Central Pennsylvania Annual Conference. Bishop, we direct your attention, in your *DCA*, to p. 1644, Calendar Item 535, Petition No. 41491, located in your Advanced *DCA*, on p. 1235, 1235. It is entitled "Implication of Multicultural Ministry." For those of you who are watching for dollar signs and exclamation marks, the committee rules that this goes, as referred to, the General Commission on Religion and Race. The rationale for that, is that the study has already been done by the staff at General Commission on Religion and Race. If it is to be continued, it would be in the portfolio calling for Hispanic and Latino ministries, and therefore we recommend referral to General Commission on Religion and Race.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the recommendation is for referral. Would you like conversation? I do not see a card. The recommendation is for referral. When you're ready to vote,

please vote now. [*Yes, 823; No, 20, Abstain, 1*]

You have voted to refer. Thank you very much.

ALEXANDER: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you.

THAI: Thank you. And now I'd like to introduce Gil Hanke, chair of our United Methodist Men, History and Archives, and other commissions subcommittee.

GIL C. HANKE (Texas): Good afternoon. Our first item is found on *DCA* 1756, p. 1756, and it is Petition No. 1111. Bishop and members of the General Conference, this petition has an, a exclamation point after its, its final code of letters. After talking with GCFA, they have found no reason for that exclamation point to be there, and I would ask the chair if he would like me to proceed with this, because it is not a financial matter or go to the next resolution. We, I'll do whatever the body would like.

BISHOP PENNEL: Let's give—if you don't mind Gil, would you cite the page numbers again, please?

HANKE: Certainly.

BISHOP PENNEL: We did not cite all of those...

HANKE: Alright.

BISHOP PENNEL: ...and I still see delegates turning their pages.

HANKE: OK

BISHOP PENNEL: Let's give them time to get to their pages, please.

HANKE: If you'll turn to the Advanced *DCA*, p. 1756, you'll see the Petition 1111, it refers to Petition 40119, found on the Advanced *DCA* on p. 1299.

PENNEL: I think you can—you've given the conference information, I think you can proceed.

HANKE: OK. This is a, a proposal that came to us through archives and history that mandates, at a jurisdictional level, that there be a Commission on Archives and History. This committee recommends concurrence. This

becomes less permissive, but the reason we recommended concurrence was because it is very important that our history be remembered and the information that we'd gotten from archives and history was that there was a need for this to be mandated on a jurisdictional level.

PENNEL: Alright. Is there conversation? Seeing none, when you're ready to vote, please vote now. The recommendation is for concurrence. [*Yes, 750; No, 106; Abstain, 10*]

You have supported the recommendation for the committee.

Deaf Ministries

HANKE: Thank you. Our second petition is found on that same page in the Advanced *DCA*, 1756, it is Petition No. 1113, that is the Calendar Item, 1113, it is Petition 40727, it is found on p. 1310 in the Advanced *DCA*. The title of this petition is for "Funding of the National Committee on Ministries with the Deaf, Late-Deafened, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-blind People." There are financial implications. If you will turn, also, in your *DCA* that you received this morning, on p. 1936, you will see that this petition is part of a petition, a part of a program that goes through the General Board of Global Ministries.

The total cost of this program, was asked, was \$350,000. \$50,000 was not approved through that budget process. This committee has come to us for additional funding. The purpose of this 50,000—additional \$50,000 is to do an international project to support the committee's work through persons who are deaf, late-deaf and in hard of hearing. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, I see a card right here, please. Mic no. 2, if you will.

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard, South Indiana Annual Conference. I call your attention to p. 1936.

HANKE: Recommends concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. I see a card right here, please. Mic 2, if you will.

KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard, South Indiana Annual Conference.

I call your attention to p. 1936, the *DCA*, the same page that was just referred to. You'll see on that page about 22 different items with requests for additional funding. I was on the Financial Administration subcommittee and our concern was this: that there was a process that GCFA went through with GCOM and all the agencies. They had hearings and had all of these requests come before them and decided on a number that they would recommend to us, and now a number of agencies has said because we didn't get what we wanted through that negotiation, we'll come directly to the floor of General Conference.

While I think deaf ministries are exceedingly important—we have a deaf ministry in our church, we have a deaf minister in our congregation, we have a regular deaf service—I think these are very important ministries, but I would speak against this additional funding because it goes outside the parameters of what's already been negotiated. The Financial Administration committee is trying, will eventually be recommending a budget where we hope not to have more than about a 6 1/2 percent increase, excuse me—3 1/2 percent, 3 1/2 percent—increase annually in the World Service budget. In order to keep within that we will have to say “no” to a number of these items that are very good items but have already been negotiated with the appropriate agencies coming to a figure we'd like to support the figure of \$300,000 which has been negotiated and not add the additional \$50,000. This is a speech against.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright that is a speech against. Is there a speech for? I do not see a card. Would you like to make a final comment, Gil?

HANKE: The reason that the committee voted concurrence on this was

because of the great need that the members of this group presented to us to complete their work in this international forum. And that was why, the committee voted concurrence on this matter.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Yes. I can. Yes. Mic 2, please. Is this a speech for or against?

WILLIAM D. SCOTT (Mississippi): William Scott, Mississippi Conference. I was on Finance and Administration also. And my question is, if we defeat your motion for concurrence will we defeat the whole notion of funding the administration at even \$300,000? That's what my question is.

HANKE: It is our understanding that what is on the table in this proposal is \$50,000 additional funds.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. I do not see a card. Are you ready to vote? If so, would you please vote now. [*Yes, 389; No, 475; Abstain, 11*]

The committee is recommending concurrence. You have voted to support the committee.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Excuse me, excuse me. You voted not to support the committee. You surely did answer me quickly. Thank you so much.

HANKE: Pretty sharp group.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes. Thank you.

Study of Men

HANKE: The next petition is found on the same page in our *DCA*. No. 1756—that page in our *DCA*. It is petition, excuse me, it is Calendar Item 1114. It is Petition 40324. And it is found in your Advance *DCA* on p. 1328. The title of this is “Study of Men in the United Methodist Church.”

It has been recommended by this committee concurrence, there is a budget impact. And let me explain that budget impact. This body had asked that we try to seek ways of understanding why this comes to us out of that process that was just discussed in our last debate, and so I would like to try to explain that. This is a research proposal; the design of the research has

already been done. The budget is \$35,961. \$35,961. That process, to design that study, was done in a cooperative effort between the joint, the General Commission on United Methodist Men and the General Council on Ministries research group. And so the committee, the design of the study has already been completed. This \$35,961 would be to implement that study. It comes to you outside the budget because the work of that committee to come up with that was not completed at the time the general commissions and other budgets were due to be provided to this body. I'd like to also, the reason that it cannot be absorbed by the General Commission on United Methodist Men is because, if you will turn to page in your—here's a book we haven't used yet—this *DCA*, the Ed Christian the *GCA*, the *GCFA* report, Vol. 3. And if you will turn to p. 1579 in that volume.

BISHOP PENNEL: Let's give the house time to find that, Gil.

HANKE: OK.

BISHOP PENNEL: It might take a minute.

(*pause*)

HANKE: On p. 1579 in the *DCA*, which is the *GCFA* report Vol. 3, you will see how funds are apportioned through World Service to the various agencies of our church. You'll notice in the bottom of that line that in 2000, in the year 2000 the smallest number in that grouping goes to the General Commission on United Methodist Men. I talked to the staff of the General Commission and other board members; we raise 75 percent of our own money to run the general commission. And what seems like a very small amount to some general agencies that you can see on that would dramatically affect our program resources for the General Commission on United Methodist Men. So we would ask the body to approve this, and the committee has recommended concurrence on completion of this study.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. It is

now with the house. Is there conversation? Yes, I see a card way over here near mic 1 or 5; you can take the shortest or the longest walk. Mic 1, please.

CAMILO N. TOLEDO JR. (Mindanao Philippines): Camilo Toledo from the Mindanao, Philippines, in our conference. I have just a question, Bishop.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

TOLEDO: Would this study include the central conferences?

HANKE: Is the question, would the study involve central conference?

TOLDEO: Yes, sir.

HANKE: At this price, it is currently involving targeted churches I believe in the—it would not involve central conferences. But I would stand for correction if there is someone in the body that can correct that.

TOLEDO: I, if I am allowed—I be allowed, Bishop, to support this petition. I would support this petition because of the current situation of the United Methodist Men in the Davao Episcopal Area. The UMMO in our area is named “The Sleeping Giant.” And the result of this study if we could include the central conferences would be a great help for us in order to activate this organization. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Thank you. I would interpret that as a speech against. Is that correct? No. For. In favor. Thank you very much. Yes, we want to make certain. I see a card over here. Mic. 4, please.

Financial Concerns

DAN J. GARA (California-Pacific): Bishop, Dan Gara, California-Pacific. I also arise here to be opposed to this. I also was a member of the Financial Administration Committee and we have through a long, long process gone through and carefully crafted what we think is an appropriate budget including these off-budget sheet items. In doing that, we realize there are many, many very good projects that were shown there. However, our kind of in-number that we ended with was very

carefully considered and compromised between some who wanted a lot more and some who wanted a lot less. This was not included, even though it’s a very small amount; this was not included in that budget. And it’s like one brick in a building. Even though it’s a small brick, if it’s a key brick, it starts a process where others will come and say, “Well, you included that little brick but my brick is also just as important as that.” And we do not want to get into that situation. So we as a committee did not choose to support this particular dollar off-budget request and I would ask that you not vote in favor of this proposal. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright. Is there other conversation? Yes, on the front row here please. If you would go, is this a speech for or against?

Go to the nearest mic no. 2, please. We have had one speech for and one against.

JUDITH A. SANDS (Central Texas): Bishop, Judy Sands from Central Texas Conference. I have a request.

BISHOP PENNEL: Request.

SANDS: Would it be possible for the presenters of these petitions to tell us if this is money that is in addition to what has been granted them by GCFA? In the future.

BISHOP PENNEL: I think he stated that for us but we’ll try to make that even more clear for the house.

SANDS: Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you very much. Is there other—way in the back, back here, please. Yes, that’s fine. Mic no. 7, please.

ANNA GAIL WORKMAN (North Carolina): Bishop Pennel, Anna Workman from the North Carolina Conference. I rise with much trepidation because I don’t want to make enemies of United Methodist Men.

BISHOP PENNEL: Speaking for or against?

WORKMAN: Against. As my brother Scott Jones shared with us yesterday,

and we also heard it again today, there is a process through which general agencies can request funding for those programs which they deem necessary. Over and over again, we are hearing additional requests. It’s not the judgment of whether it is a good or bad program. To me, the judgment is what we can take back home to our local congregations to pay for. As I remember, and I am over 50 so I might be able to claim a 50s moment or a senior moment, when we established the Commission on United Methodist Men in 1996, it was my understanding that the plan was within 4 years this commission would be self supporting. So I, with that information, with that memory, then I would recommend voting against this consensus.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, is there a speech for? If not, we’ll move to the question. There, way in the back, back here, please. The man who might be near mic 8, yes.

WILLIAM C. SMITH (South Carolina): Bishop, I am Bill Smith, the South Carolina delegation. It’s easy for us, as this issue was raised, to consider it to be rather frivolous. I have heard a lot of snickering and laughter around it, but the truth of the matter is, the men are not nearly as active in our churches as the women. In a great many churches and I have heard figures up to 85 percent of the churches are run by the women. Now I have no problems with churches being run by women, but I do like to see men in church and men active and men on fire for the Lord.

Now one survey that we have seen says that when a youth is the first person to come into the church, the rest of the family follows 17 percent of the time. When the lady of the house, or the woman or the wife is the first one to come into the church, the rest of the family follows 35 percent of the time. When the men or the father is the first person to come into the church, the rest of the family follows 93 percent of the time. That’s an astounding number, but we are not attracting the men and we need to find out why.

We need to find out what the role of the men should be, what the role of the men is, why we aren't attracting people and I think this is a very small amount to consider for working with men and trying to find out how we can reach them more spiritually. We have got a lot of men here. That's not the problem here but in most of our churches and especially in smaller churches, it's very difficult to draw the men into the church and we need to do this study to find out why. Thank you very much.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, you have heard, you have had speeches for and against Calendar Item No. 1114, and I think that you are ready to vote.

HANKE: I have the last word.

BISHOP PENNEL: You do have the last, you do. Excuse me, our committee does have the last word.

HANKE: I appreciate the dialogue. I would just like to point out that this, the reason this did not go through the regular budget process is because that process began and was initiated before the outline and the work on this study was completed and that's why it is not in the general budget process. This is not an end around. This is something that has come to us more recently than the budget process that began a year and a half ago. I would urge, with the committee, concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: Recommendation of the committee is concurrence. We're ready to vote now on Calendar Item No. 1114. Please vote now. [*Yes, 469; No, 443; Abstain, 6*]

You have supported the recommendation of the committee.

Commission on Alcohol and Drugs

HANKE: Bishop, we have one final item from this, from this committee which does include a minority report. Would you like me to continue with this process, sir?

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

HANKE: If you'll turn in your *DCA* to p. 1850, 1580.

BISHOP PENNEL: 185, 1850.

HANKE: 18, is that what I said?

BISHOP PENNEL: It's OK. 1850.

HANKE: Dyslexia is your friend. 1850, and if you'll look at Calendar Item 1486.

HANKE: ...50. And if you will look at Calendar Item 1486, this is Petition 40740. It is also found in your Advance *DCA* on p. 1331. The subject of this resolution, of this petition, is to create the General Commission on Alcohol and Drugs. The committee votes non-concurrence. We do have a minority report, and Bishop, how would you like us to proceed?

BISHOP PENNEL: Well, we need to work to perfect the majority report first.

HANKE: Alright, the majority would like you to vote non-concurrence. The reason for our non-concurrence; this is a petition that would take, let me start again. When the Board of Church and Society was formed, it was formed from three agencies, three different general agencies. One of those was the Board of Temperance. And what this committee or this petition would do would be to set up a General Commission on Alcohol and Drugs using money from... that is currently allocated to the General Board of Church and Society. The premise of, of that, of this petition is that alcohol and drugs are not being... is not a focus of the work within the General Board of Church and Society.

And in conversations with the committee and in conversations from staff and other individuals, the committee feels that it is within the purview of the General Board of Church and Society and in fact, they do have areas of work in this area. And, therefore, a new General Commission on Alcohol and Drugs would not be needed. And so that is why we have voted non-concurrence.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, let's have a, let's have a statement from the maker of the minority report please, so that we can have both reports before us. And then we'll go back and perfect.

HANKE: It's my pleasure to introduce Jared Thomas.

JARED THOMAS (East Ohio): Bishop and delegates, in order to make this legislation more amicable to our worldwide church, we have added several central conference board members, in addition we've expanded the commission's scope back to its 1960 level by adding additions to the proposed alcohol and drugs language. And the reason we have done this, is that hundreds of millions across our connection and globe feel the negative effects of alcohol, drugs, and other addictions.

I myself have a vivid memory of my first college visitation to a United Methodist university. As we toured the halls of the freshman dorms at Ohio Northern University, I noticed the recycle bins located on every floor marked plastics and beer cans. If our United Methodist universities overlook or condone underage drinking in their own freshman dorms, how much more does our world need to hear and be ministered to in light of the terrible evils of addiction?

This is not, however, only a problem at American universities. As a brother from Africa shared in our legislative committee, alcoholism is a massive societal problem in Africa today. We as a global church have needed commissions on race and the status of women, but we fail to give the same needed attention to alcoholism and addiction. Alcoholism, drugs, and addictions are problems that cross gender, class, race, and nation. We as a denomination, and even we as a church whole, are not doing enough to combat this very serious ill in our society.

In 1960 it was reported that 70 denominations were using the 30 pamphlets, 3 films, 3 filmstrips, 60 elementary education sessions, 60 college, and 60 college programs produced by our Board of Temperance. The problem of alcohol and addiction is no less than it was in the '60s. However, today we do not even have a line item in our Church and Society budget for alcoholism and intemperance. The monies are taken from various other locations. Church and Society has many great ministries,

but due to the magnitude of this problem, we need to do all that we can to combat addiction and alcoholism in this world. And we are not doing that.

Some might or might have already argued that yes, this is a terrible problem, but also respond that we cannot spend any more money at this time of downsizing. But, for you today, and today only, I have a special deal. We can perform this indispensable ministry with no new money from the General Conference, thus lightening the load for GCFA in these last days of the General Conference. The price is right and the ministry is vital. There is a restricted trust within the stocks, monies, and properties held by Church and Society. Monies from this trust can be used to maintain the trust and also maintaining the trust “used and applied to work in the area of temperance and alcohol problems on a national and international basis.”

There’ll be no loss of funding from other programs in Church and Society because the assets being moved, being restricted in trust, are assets that operated the old Board of Temperance and will operate our new commission. In fact, since Church and Society will have more staff and less projects, this move of making a new commission will strengthen Church and Society’s ministries and ability to operate. If it is argued out that they will be losing money for other projects, it will only because they were not following their moral obligation to follow the trust in the first place. Thousands of Methodists in the twentieth, early twentieth century, had the foresight to build a trust to be used to help our church combat alcoholism, drugs, and addictions.

BISHOP PENNEL: Bring your remarks to a conclusion, please.

THOMAS: We today are not doing enough to fight this great evil in our community. Only by making a strong, focused, concerted effort to reach out to these people can we fulfill our mission as Wesleyans to reach out to those who are suffering. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, since the, the majority report is non-concurrence, I don’t think we need to perfect the majority report since the recommendation is non-concurrence. So, let’s move to the minority report to see if you would like to now perfect the minority report. I see a hand way in the back, back here, near mic 6 please.

On the Minority Report

THOM WHITE WOLF FASSETT (North Central New York): Yes, Thom White Wolf Fasset of the North Central New York Conference. Bishop, sister and brother delegates, I rise to speak in support of the committee’s recommendation and to oppose the minority report. Our church has no need of yet another general agency, especially when the ministry called for by this petition...

BISHOP PENNEL: If you don’t mind, if you’ll hold that, I’ll come back to you. We are not speaking for and against now; we’re just seeing if we need to perfect. And I promise I’ll come back to you. And I’ll have my colleagues to remind me if I should forget. Now, we’re perfecting the minority report, so back in the corner over here please. Way in the back, I see cards. And I see cards; I’m trying to see the house. Way back over here. And I’m sorry—the lights will not let me see. No, no one? Here? Yes, way back over here in the back. Yes, mic 8 please. We’re working on amendments and et cetera for the minority report. And we’ll soon have an order of the day. So, mic 8 please.

VASILI V. BANK (Central Russia): My name is Vasili Bank, Central Russia.

INTERPRETER: Russian, we are ready.

BISHOP PENNEL: We’re ready.

BANK: [*simultaneous interpretation*] As I far as I understand, this petition has two goals: to restrict the circle of social issues that we are discussing; and involves some more funds to the issue of drugs and alcohol that United Methodist Church promotes. As far as I

understand this, this issue is going to restrict our ability as United Methodist Church to reach more people. I’m from Russia, and I may not understand all nuances, but this is my impression. As far as I remember, this issue was discussed at other General Conferences, and we did not concur with this.

I think we have far more problems than alcohol and drugs. We have issue of hunger; we have problems related to our health; we have issues related to AIDS. I think we should be very wise and responsible in dividing our funds to other important ministries. I work in the committee, on Church and Society Committee. And talking to my colleagues... and talking to my colleagues, I discovered there are two people who working toward making decision on this issue in the committee of Church and Society. As far as I understand, here we have an issue of disagreement between different committees. And maybe I’m not clear on that, but as far I know this committee is working for 4 years already to try to decline taxes on the beer—

BISHOP PENNEL: We need now to sum up the speech, please.

BANK: Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. I want the house to know that I allowed that speech—I would interpret it as a speech for—because we were into translation and I did not feel it was fair to our brother to interrupt. And so now friends, we’re approaching an order of the day. We have a very distinguished guest to introduce to the conference, to have our closing prayer. We’re perfecting the minority report which means we’re only taking amendments to the minority report. If you do not have any amendments, we can, we can, move quickly to a vote. Yes, over here, please, mic 1. Is it an amendment? It is an amendment. Alright. To the minority report.

Add “Gambling”

DEBORAH K. CRONIN (South Indiana): Deborah Cronin, South Indiana Conference, clergy. Bishop, I

would like to amend that, in the minority report, every place where we see the word, words “alcohol and drugs”—and I believe it occurs 6 times—be followed by the word “gambling” and then “addiction in The United Methodist Church.” If I could receive a second, I’ll speak to that.

BISHOP PENNEL: This is an amendment by an addition. You are going to add the word “gambling.” You may speak. Do we have a second, please? There is a second? Yes.

CRONIN: Bishop, I, I have been astounded in the past decade of the proliferation of gambling casinos across our country and my hunch is probably in other places of the world as well, although I have no proof of that. In the mid-1980s, I did a lot of study on our post, post manufacturing economy and what kind of jobs would be emerging. The whole gambling industry in a growth unit was nowhere on the horizon. This has come as a real shock I think to us... and in many cases has caught us unaware.

In many areas, the local state referendums that have allowed the growth of casinos would have been defeated if United Methodists, in mass, had voted against them. We as a denomination have been ignoring this problem, this situation. I believe by naming it specifically in this minority report, that we would then get that in front of The United Methodist Church, including the education that needs to be done about the addictions related to gambling, the lives that are lost, the suicides that are committed, the family foundations—the financial foundations—that are lost in the casinos. This is something we need before the entire United Methodist Church. Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, the amendment is now before you and we’ve had a speech for the amendment. It is amendment by addition. I see a card over here, please. We’re perfecting the minority report. Are you speaking to the amendment, for or against, please?

STANLEY R. COPELAND (North Texas): I’m raising a question.

BISHOP PENNEL: Mic number...

COPELAND: Stan Copeland from the North Texas Conference. Before we get too far into the amendment, I’d like to raise an issue of clarity. I believe the brother from Russia was speaking against the minority report, not for.

BISHOP PENNEL: I’d be delighted to correct my interpretation. Could someone back there, ask our brother from Russia, if he was speaking for or against and—mic no. 8, please.

BANK: [*simultaneous translation*] Vasili Bank. I was against.

BISHOP PENNEL: Against. Thank you very much.

BANK: [*simultaneous interpretation*] Thank you.

BISHOP PENNEL: Now we are on the amendment and let’s, let’s stay focused on the amendment until we can take care of it, please. Back here, mic no. 7, please. This is an amendment to add. Is this a speech for or against?

ABRAM: This is a speech against the amendment.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright.

ABRAM: Charlotte Abram, Nebraska Annual Conference. The Board of Church and Society does much work on behalf of our denomination in terms of gambling. We’re passionately opposed to expanded gambling, the gambling we already have present in our society. The Board of Church and Society was thanked on the floor of the House of Representatives of the US Congress for its work in securing passage of legislation that cracks down on Internet gambling. The board has also been involved in, and led the Coalition of Christians, Southern Baptist Convention, and Family Research Council in fighting bills that come to our Senate that would expand gambling. We’ve worked with Tom Gray and the National Association Against Legalized Gambling. I believe that our Board of Church and Society is leading our nation and other groups in fighting this and so I speak against the amendment.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, friends,

let me tell you where we are. We’re going to finish dealing with the amendment and then we’re going to the order of the day to take our break. We do have a very distinguished guest to introduce to the conference and a closing prayer. So, do we have another speech for or against the amendment? Yes, over here please. We’ve had one and one. Mic 4, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, I am not, this isn’t a speech for or against. I think this is a point of clarification.

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Within the General Board of Church and Society, there is a work area that is designated the “Alcohol and Other Addictions,” so that already includes alcohol, drugs, other drugs and gambling. It’s “Alcohol and Other Addictions” is the title of the work area at Church and Society so I don’t know how that helps with this, with this amendment. But that’s the official title.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, I think you’re ready to vote on this amendment. You’ve had good discussion and you know it’s an amendment by addition to add the word “gambling.”

JARED THOMAS (East Ohio): May I speak to it, sir?

BISHOP PENNEL: Yes, you may speak. Excuse me, thank you.

THOMAS: In answer to the question that was just raised, when we asked Church and Society in sub-committee, how much money was being spent on alcohol and other addictions, they told us there was no line item. That was their exact words, that they pulled money from different areas. In 1984, the floor of the General Conference requested that the committee do things for alcohol and addiction...

BISHOP PENNEL: You need to address the amendment which is...

THOMAS: OK, then can I address the amendment itself now? OK. I was just trying to answer his question.

BISHOP PENNEL: That’s OK. If

you would move to address the amendment by addition for gambling.

THOMAS: OK, on the gambling issue. That issue is, was, in the 1960 Temperance Board; but as we see in the Temperance Board, it was alcohol and temperance. It was a minor issue of the board. I leave that to the floor of the body, if they would like to make that specific as in addictions that we do see that to possibly include gambling.

BISHOP PENNEL: Alright, we're ready now to, to vote, the amendment and after we vote the amendment, we're going to the order of the day. I feel like you're ready to vote the amendment. If you are now ready, please vote now. You have defeated the amendment. [*Yes, 357; No, 543; Abstain, 8*]

Closing Announcements

Alright, we're ready for the order of the day, and we'll come back and pick up the rest of this report after lunch. Let's have a report from announcements, please, and while the announcements are being made, guest—point of order?

JOE M. WHITEMORE (North Georgia): Joe Whitemore, North Georgia Conference, and member of the rules committee. Bishop, I am trying to be helpful here.

BISHOP PENNEL: I'm sure.

WHITEMORE: I would like to ask that the presiding officers of the next session review new Rule 20.5 on p. 1540 and new Rule 8.2 on p. 1538. The issue is whether the call of the previous question is in order under our new rules at any time.

BISHOP PENNEL: You are asking for a review, and I am sure they'll do that and can pick it up. Now let's have our announcements, please.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: A request from persons in the bleachers: that other persons sitting there not engage in extended conversation as it is difficult to keep track of what is going on the floor when there is extraneous conversation around them.

The Commission on Central Conference Affairs will meet at 1 P.M. today. Commission on Central Conference Affairs, 1 P.M. today, in Rooms 320 and 321.

And then, three matters for our prayer concerns: Ressie May Bass, a delegate from Florida, has health concerns and will be having surgery today and so is not among us at this time; Bishop Dabale has brought us word that he has received word that his wife's father, in other words, his father-in-law, passed away last week. And for Bishop Dabale and his family, we request a time of prayer.

And a note from Bishop Justo that Rev. Benjamin Gutierrez from the Philippines has been hospitalized since last Monday with various tests being run; and so the Philippines are concerned, naturally, about him and would ask for all of us to be in prayer about his health. That concludes the announcements.

BISHOP PENNEL: Thank you. We're going to ask Bishop Martinez to come to present a guest to us who will have our closing prayer. And while they are coming, may I thank you for the wonderful way you've worked this morning and for the way you have cooperated with the chair. I like it that you come to the microphone and you refer to each other as "the brother said," "the sister said." That feels right to me. Thank you so much for your courtesy, and for your kindness, and for all of the help that you've given to your church this morning. You have been a vessel through whom God has worked, and we are grateful.

BISHOP JOEL N. MARTINEZ (San Antonio Area): Thank you, Bishop Pennel, for the opportunity of introducing or presenting to the General Conference, one of our colleague bishops from the affiliated autonomous church of Cuba. Bishop Ricardo Pereira was not able to join with other colleagues when they were recognized and presented a few days ago. We are grateful for the mission and ministry of the church in Cuba and for Bishop

Pereira's leadership. Señor Obispo Pereira, bienvenido entre nosotros. Es un placer tenerle entre nosotros y pedimos que nos dirige en la oración final.

BISHOP PENNEL: If you would greet Bishop Pereira.

(applause)

BISHOP RICARDO PEREIRA: Gracias. Oremos [Let us pray].

(prayer)

Wednesday Afternoon, May 5, 2004

BISHOP S. CLIFTON IVES (West Virginia Area): Those who are coming in, will you come in quickly so we can begin our afternoon session. We've reached the appointed hour for coming together. This afternoon we're going to, after a brief moment of prayer. I'm going to ask those who're coming in, in just a moment, to be quiet, but our process this afternoon is, after a moment of prayerful centering, I'm going to ask the secretary to read a communication to us from the Judicial Council. I'm going to ask Mary Alice to do a procedural motion that she would like to make, and then we're going to move right into the business where we were this morning. If those of you who are in your seats or coming to your seats, would just do that in silence now, and may we as a house be in silence as we center ourselves for the work of the afternoon. Let us pause.

(prayer)

We call upon our secretary to read a decision of the Judicial Council.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Decision No. 986.

BISHOP IVES: Give your attention to the secretary of the General Conference.

Judicial Council Decision

MARSHALL: Decision 986.

Decision 986: Request from the General Conference for a Declaratory Decision Concerning Pastoral Leader-

ship in Paying Apportionments as a Chargeable Offense under ¶ 2702.

Digest: Unwillingness by a pastor to lead a local church toward full payment of apportionment, including proportionally in the Episcopal fund, ¶ 823, does not constitute a chargeable offense under ¶ 2702.

Statement of Facts: On a motion from a delegate, the 2004 General Conference requested a declaratory decision of the Judicial Council as follows:

For clarity of understanding regarding our mutual responsibility, 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 proportionally, ¶ 823 Episcopal Fund, constitute a chargeable offense under ¶ 2702(d), failure to perform the work of ministry and (e) disobedience to the order and discipline of The United Methodist Church?

Jurisdiction: The Judicial Council has jurisdiction under ¶ 2610 of the 2000 *Discipline*.

Analysis and Rationale: A basic provision for leadership requires that for leaders to be held accountable, they must have commensurate authority and responsibility. The duties of a pastor of a charge, including administering the temporal affairs of the congregation, (¶ 331), leading the congregation in the fulfillment of his mission through full and faithful payment of all apportioned ministerial support, administrative and benevolent funds (¶ 331.2f), and being the administrative officer of the local church (¶ 331.3a). In addition, once the annual conference has determined the amount of apportioned funds to each charge, “it is the responsibility of the district superintendent, the pastor, and the lay members of the annual conference and/or the church lay leaders to interpret to each charge conference the importance of apportioned funds” (¶ 246.13). “The pastor shall be the administrative offi-

cer (of the charge conference), and as such shall be an ex-officio member of all conferences, boards, councils, commissions, committees, and task forces, unless restricted by the *Discipline*” (“The Charge Conference” at p. 145, 2000 *Discipline*). The church council has responsibility for “establishing the budget on recommendation of the committee on finance...” (¶ 251.4c). The pastor is only one of a number of individuals who hold membership on the church council (¶ 251.5k). The Episcopal Fund is apportioned proportionally within an annual conference to the salary paid to each local church pastor (¶ 823). Once the apportionments for bishops, district superintendents, conference claimants, and the Equitable Compensation Fund are determined by the annual conference, “payments made to the same in each pastoral charge shall be exactly proportional to the amount paid on the clergy-based compensation. The treasurer or treasurers of each pastoral charge shall accordingly make proportional distribution of funds raised in that charge for the support of ordained ministry...” (¶ 620).

The pastor of a church has an important role in leading a local church to accomplish its plan for mission and ministry and to pay its apportionments in full, including the apportionments for the Episcopal Fund. But the pastor does not carry this responsibility alone. The pastor of the church is just one of many individuals, lay and clergy, who has responsibility for providing leadership to a local congregation, and thereby leading a local church toward full payment of apportionments. To hold the pastor of a local church personally accountable for a chargeable offense when a church under his or her pastoral leadership does not pay its apportionments in full, including the requirement for proportionality, in the case of the Episcopal Fund is unjust.

The clear legislative intent of the list of chargeable offenses in ¶ 2702 is to hold pastors accountable for their own personal actions, not the actions of

other ordained or lay persons. Thus the unwillingness of a pastor to lead a local church toward full payments of apportionments, including ¶ 823, is not a chargeable offense under the current provisions of ¶ 2702.

If a pastor deliberately encourages the church not to pay its apportionments in full when the church has the ability to do so, this action by the pastor may rise to the level of a chargeable offense under ¶ 2702.

Decision: Unwillingness by a pastor to lead a local church toward full payment of apportionments, including proportionality in the Episcopal Fund (¶ 823), does not constitute a chargeable offense under ¶ 2702.

May 5, 2004

Signed: John G. Corry, President;
Sally Curtis AsKew, Secretary.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you very much. You’ve heard the report. Is my microphone not on? Is it on? OK, just can’t hear myself, that’s all. We have a lot of work to do this afternoon. I’ve asked... OK, I didn’t think you could hear me. I didn’t think this was up. Is it up now? Is it up yet? It isn’t the way it was just a minute ago. Is it getting better? OK, is that getting better? OK, everybody OK in the back now? Can you hear all right? Thank you.

Rules and Procedures

I’m saying that we have a lot of work to do this afternoon. We have set ourselves to the task of trying to deal with all the matters that have finances related to them so that they can be referred to the General Council on Finance and Administration. Already I’m hearing myself talk too fast for translation, so I’ll try to slow down. But we do have a need to move with some dispatch today. And in order to assist me, I’ve asked Bishop Yeakel and Bishop Huie, who are with me. So they will be working as a team to try to facilitate our work today. As we begin, I want to call on Mary Alice back as calendar chair. She has a procedural motion that she wants to bring to us. Mic 5.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Mary Alice Massey, lay from Florida. I move to set aside the rules so that petitions with ten or fewer dissenting votes be placed on the consent calendar.

BISHOP IVES: It's been moved and seconded. Is everybody hearing alright? It didn't sound to me like the system was up the way it needs to be. The motion is to place on the consent calendar anything that has ten or fewer votes out of the subcommittee. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 670; No, 99; Abstain, 9*]

You've supported the recommendation.

Just before we broke for lunch today, a question was asked in relationship to our rules regarding the motion to call for the previous question. If you would, please turn to p. 1538. I remind you that the rules under which we are operating are in this section. The rules have been printed three times. They were printed originally, changed, and they were printed in error once; but these are the rules under which we are operating. And up in the second column on p. 1538, you see Rule No. 82, which says regarding to non-debatable motions, "no report shall be adopted or question relating to the same decider without opportunity having been given for at least two speeches for and two against the said proposal."

I was asked to interpret the meaning of these. My understanding is that it is not possible for us to adopt a proposal or report in its final form without having at least two speeches for and two speeches against. That says nothing about the numbers of speeches that are—the limitations or the maximum number of speeches that are—in relationship to amendments or other kinds of things that might be in common relationship to those. So we're talking about only in the final adoption of a report. If you turn the page, you'll note on p. 1540 there is, under Rule No. 20, No. 5, there is a description of what it means to call for the previous question. That's under the section of non-debatable motions. It's telling you how to do

that—how that happens with a non-debatable motion.

Over on the next page, if you look at Rule 25, No. 5, you'll see that a motion for the previous question—are we there?—Rule 26.5, a "motion for the previous questions shall not be in order on the adoption of the report or recommendation on making the proposed substitution until the opportunity has been given for at least two members to speak on each side of the question of substitution or adoption."

Let me continue to remind you where we are. Yes, question, mic 1.

MELVIN R. BOWDAN JR. (Kentucky): Bishop Ives, excuse me I'm sorry, Bishop Ives, Mel Bowden, Kentucky Conference. On rule I just added and then dropped it out of my. There's a rule on suspension of the rules, it's in the very last section and that says that when you call for a suspension of the rules all that is before that can be suspended with a two-thirds vote. Now it's right there and I had it in my finger and lost it.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you Mr. Bowdan. The question, that was not the question that was placed this morning but you are absolutely correct. That was not the question that was asked this morning. There was a question as to whether that was asked at another point, but this morning that was not the question as I understand it.

BOWDAN: My colleague, Maxie Dunnam, was overruled by the chair at one point this was prior to this question.

BISHOP IVES: I'm trying to help you understand how we're going to operate today. If you give him a chance to finish perhaps we'll know where we are going. What I'm trying to say is that, it is important for us to live by our rules allowing for at least two speeches before the final adoption of any report. That does not mean that rules cannot be suspended and you can indicate, if you decide to do that, which rule you wish to suspend in order to accomplish what you want to accomplish. So that, I don't think that is a problem. I just

want to reiterate the fact that I think the bishops who have ruled in relationship to the calls for the previous question have in the past been doing so with accordance with our rules.

Remember that our rules have changed; these are somewhat new rules from what we operated out of previously. So we have adopted rules which are more restricted in some ways than those that were here before.

Return to Minority Report

Let me remind you where we are now. Now we have before us a report from a committee which they have voted non-concurrence. That has been set aside so that we can receive a substitute in its place. A minority report by our rules becomes treated like a substitute. We are in the process of perfecting that substitute motion. I think that's where we pick up at this moment. So we are perfecting the material which is on p. 1851. We had there was a motion to amend which was not approved and now that material is before you, not for debate, but for perfection at this point. Yes, point of order. Coming to mic. 4.

TIMOTHY J. RISS (New York): Tim Riss of New York. Bishop, I'm confused about the minority and about whether or not it is properly before us according to Rule 27 and Rule 26. It seems to me that it is merely the negation of the majority report except for the addition of three words.

BISHOP IVES: Do you— Did you. Well tell me what the three words are that changed.

RISS: The three words are to add the words "and other additions."

BISHOP IVES: No, that is not. That was defeated.

RISS: That is the minority report. The minority report takes the original petition which was voted non-concurrence and repeats it verbatim except adding those words in two or three places.

BISHOP IVES: I'd like for the chair of the committee, Mr. Hanke, to verify whether that is accurate or not.

GIL C. HANKE (Texas): Bishop if it would be, I think it would be most advantageous to have the author of the minority report explain how it is different from the petition, if that is in order.

BISHOP IVES: Can you tell us what was in the original petition. In what way was it like or unlike this?

HANKE: The minority report is different from the original petition, in many different ways.

BISHOP IVES: OK. Thank you. I hear the point of order but I sense that the chair is clear in telling us there are many differences in these two pieces. Yes over here. Come to no. 1.

M. CREEDE HINSHAW (South Georgia): Bishop Ives, Creede Hinshaw, clergy member from the South Georgia annual conference. I would like to ask a question is it in order at this point to ask that the original motion be placed on the consent calendar, considering the rule that we just passed, that any motion with ten or fewer votes on it would be automatically placed on the consent calendar. The original report of the majority had only ten descending votes and if in order I would move that we place this immediately on the consent calendar in the same spirit of the motion that we just passed.

BISHOP IVES: I hear the point, I hear the motion but I think I need to move that out of order because we are in midst of dealing with this now. It is on the floor, it is on the floor now. Yes. We are perfecting the minority report.

LINDA CAMPBELL-MARSHALL (New England): Yes, Linda Campbell-Marshall, New England. I'd like the committee in charge of the minority report to help me understand the implications of Paragraph 2403 in your motion as it stands beside Paragraph 1005 on p. 491 of the *Book of Discipline*. It looks to me like transitioning certain things that are now in the hands of the Board of Church and Society to this new organization with a very limited task and purview.

BISHOP IVES: Are you asking for—

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: I'm asking for information please.

BISHOP IVES: For information on—

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: How those paragraphs line up and what the essence would be if we vote the new paragraph; what will that mean with regard to Paragraph 1005 in the 2000 *Book of Discipline*.

BISHOP IVES: Would you speak to that.

JARED THOMAS (East Ohio): Yes I can sir. I'm by my understanding of the original author's intent from that paragraph. The trust that was originally with the Board of Temperance when the three committees were combined, as we were told earlier by the Chair of the committee, that money, those monies that are restricted trust would be the only funds that would come from Church and Society to this new commission as they are restricted for the operation of what this commission would be doing.

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: Does that also include the building? The property—

THOMAS: Anything within the trust. Which does include the building.

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: Does include the building. May I make a motion?

BISHOP IVES: Pardon me.

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: May I make a motion?

BISHOP IVES: Well I guess you may, Yes.

Suggested Amendments

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: I would move to delete Paragraph 2403 from the minority report and replace it with the paragraph that is presently standing in the *Discipline*. May I speak to that?

BISHOP IVES: It's moved and seconded you may speak to it. Remember we are under the limit of two minutes max.

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: It seems

to me that the Board of Church and Society has operated at the direction of this General Conference for a great many years as it has diversified its ministry and its mission. If we choose to tell it to work only with alcohol and drugs we can do that directly. This feels to me like undercover operation. I would urge defeat of the minority report but if that can't happen I'd like to see the change that I have just moved. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Did you send that motion this way. Please. We have, we have a motion to amend on the floor. Anyone want to speak to the motion to amend? Yes over here. Yes. Come to mic.1.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Kevin Goodwin, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. I want to make a friendly amendment to the amendment. I believe in the spirit of the amendment of the previous speaker. We also need to throw into the garbage paragraph 2410, which can be found on p. 1851. Because it contains the statement "it shall receive all property owned and controlled by the former Board of Temperance at the time of its merger." So if our previous maker would consider that a friendly amendment we could discuss it simultaneously.

BISHOP IVES: I think, I think we need to handle that as an amendment to the amendment.

GOODWIN: Well take that as my speech and I've read it.

BISHOP IVES: What we have is to include with the amendment to delete 2403 and to replace that with motion to delete also 2410, so we will talk about whether we will delete 2410. OK, over here.

Refer to GBCS

PHILLIP KERLIN (East Ohio): Phil Kerlin, East Ohio Lay Delegate. Bishop, I move referral on the minority report and all the amendments to the General Board of Church and Society for their consideration, and I further move that the General Board of Church and Society report back to the 2008

General Conference on their findings. And if I have a second I'll speak to it.

BISHOP IVES: OK. It's moved and seconded. You may speak to it.

KERLIN: Bishop, I think that this action of referral will help us to move along in our business, but more than that I think that it will show that within the General Board of Church and Society there is already a mechanism in place to handle the issue of alcohol and other addictions. And so by referring this minority report and the amendments we will be using this mechanism already in place and not creating a completely new mechanism in order to handle that issue.

BISHOP IVES: OK. The motion to refer is in order. Are there other questions—other concerns about the referral? Does the maker of the minority report want to make some comment about that?

JARRED THOMAS (East Ohio): The only problem I have with referral is we've mandated in 1984 to the general, the General Conference mandated to Church and Society that all alcohol and drug concerns are high priority program for funding.

BISHOP IVES: We're on the issue of referral.

THOMAS: Exactly. And I'm speaking against referral for this reason. One of the gentleman that was on the board from 1984 to 1988 when asked how much money Church and Society used in their commission, he responds—the amount of funds the Committee on Alcohol and Drugs in the General Board of Church and Society used during this quadrennium, 84-88, he says that he fought for every cent that was allowed to us, and it was pitifully small. In fact, the figure of \$20,000 seems to stick in my mind, out of \$5 million budget. If this is what Church and Society deems to be a very important issue, important enough to give them enough money for stationery, than we—I do not think it will help to refer to Church and Society. Maybe another commission could do so, but this particular motion I do not support.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Does the maker, the committee chair, have a final statement to make before we operate?

GIL C. HANKE (Texas): The premise of the non-concurrence from the committee is that contained within the portfolio of the General Board of Church and Society is the obligation to work on this in the area of alcohol and drugs, and since it is in their portfolio and reports from their staff and from others that they are in fact working on this, was the reason for our non-concurrence.

BISHOP IVES: OK. I think you're ready to vote. Yes. Come to mic 4.

DALE WEATHERSPOON (California-Nevada): Dale Weatherspoon, California-Nevada Annual Conference. I guess I want to try to do two things; the one is in Rule No. 9 on p. 1538. It speaks to interrupting the speaker when you want to challenge about misinformation in misinterpretation. And also I want to speak against recommendation against non-concurrence, and against the minority report on this issue.

BISHOP IVES: What is before us is referral, and we're ready to vote unless you have a question or a clarification or a point of order.

WEATHERSPOON: Misinformation according to Rule No. 9 which I can interrupt the speaker on. Being the former volunteer treasurer for the General Board of Church and Society from 1992-1996, there is a budget line item and it comes under Witness, Public Witness and Advocacy. And so the work of the alcohol and other drugs comes under that line item. So what the presenter is putting before us is misrepresentation.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you for your information. I think we're ready to vote on the referral—referral of all these matters to the General Board of Church and Society. If you're ready to vote, please vote now. [*Yes, 587; No, 307; Abstain, 4*]

You have voted to refer. The matter is referred. Mr. Hanke, do you have other business?

Igniting Ministry

EVA THAI (California-Pacific): Thank you, bishop. We have three more pieces of legislations; these are pieces regarding the financial implications and Igniting Ministry. First, I would like to invite our secretary, David Banks, for the first piece.

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): I'm David Banks from the North Carolina Conference. I would invite you to turn to Calendar Item 1110 on p. 1755. Again that is p. 1755, Calendar Item No. 1110. It refers to a petition found in the blue Advance DCA on p. 1307, turning the page to 1308. The petition is 40263 and pertains to "Uniting, Igniting Ministry." Again, that is p. 1307, turning the page to 1308, Petition No. 40263. The legislative committee brings to you several, three in number, petitions dealing with the Igniting Ministry proposal. We had originally planned to bring to you the petition that outlines the program. However, over the last several days in listening to the body of this General Conference, the request about the finances has been repeatedly made and we bring that to you first and, secondly, we will bring the program.

So the petition before you, Calendar Item 1110, refers to the financing of Igniting Ministry. You will note that there are two brief amendments, one that strikes the words "in actual receipts," and then at the very end of the resolution, there is a sentence added.

The effect of the additional sentence is to put Igniting Ministry into the regular budgeting process. Often in this General Conference the question has been asked: "Why was this not in the regular process?" The reason is simple. Four years ago, when we presented at the General Conference, Igniting Ministry, we did so as a four-year initiative. Since it was only a four-year initiative, there was not authority for it to enter the budgeting process. What we do with this amendment, if you choose to continue the Igniting Ministry program, it then authorizes it

in 4 years from now to be part of that process. So it would not be additional monies asked for during the General Conference.

As we have explored the work of Igniting Ministry and considered the petitions, one of the things that occurred in our committee was people began to speak of changed lives and effect on the ministry of local churches. One of our members spoke of seeing an Igniting Ministry commercial immediately after the 9/11 tragedy. He said that the powerful commercial said, "Fear is not the only force at work in the world." In its first 3 years, Igniting Ministry has met and surpassed nearly all of its goals; it has touched in its markets—where the commercials have been shown nationwide—over 92 million persons at a cost of seven cents per person. Also, they—the commercials—the program has increased the awareness of The United Methodist Church six-fold. They are broadcast in English, Spanish, and Korean; they are also closed captioned.

In addition to the national flights of advertisements, Igniting Ministry has been used successfully by local churches, clusters of churches, districts, and annual conferences. By the end of this year, \$4 million in matching grants will have been distributed. About 20,000 local churches have in some way or manner used the media resources and welcoming materials, and more than 26,000 local church leaders have participated in one piece or more of the training programs. When it comes to receiving effect from the monies we invest, we would submit to you that Igniting Ministry has been very effective. Interestingly enough, our success has spurred the Southern Baptist Convention to look at doing a similar project and are considering, they are considering, \$100 million over a two-year period.

The committee voted to support a \$33.5 million for the national and local church Igniting Ministry campaign in the next four years. It does expand our sense of presence in order not to lose

those things that we have gained over the previous four years. Igniting Ministry has made us more visible; it has increased the willingness of people in our society to receive the ministry of Jesus Christ as offered through The United Methodist Church. It is an effective evangelistic tool in making disciples for Jesus Christ. And if we would make disciples of all the nations, there must necessarily be first steps. Among those first steps, Igniting Ministry increases receptivity to our message. It pays the way for us intentionally to invite others to participate fully in the Kingdom of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Bishop, we move the adoption of the petition that is before us.

BISHOP IVES: Petition 1110 is before you. It was recommended that it be adopted. Let me ask the question that somebody else is going to ask: This represents how much money outside the budget as being prepared by General Council on Finance and Administration?

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): Bishop, it represents \$33.5 million.

BISHOP IVES: The house has the information it requested, and I will go back to the far back corner, there. Yes, come to mic 5.

JILL HICKS (North Alabama): Jill Hicks, North Alabama. In looking at the *DCA*, 18... p. 1859, that amount represents approximately 57 percent of the total amount that is requested—total. I just bring that to the knowledge of the General Conference floor. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Question? Somebody had a question? Who's got the question? Yes, OK, question come to—go to, go to 7. Oh, come to 3.

VICKI L. WOODS (New England): Vicki Woods, New England. I just have a question for the legislative committee. To support Igniting Ministry, is that also to support the theme, "Open Hearts, Open Doors, Open Minds," or is there any way that those are separated?

BANKS: Bishop, I cannot answer that, but Larry Hollon is on the stage with us, as the general secretary, if I may invite him to speak to that.

WOODS: Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Without objection from the house, you can speak to that Larry.

LARRY HOLLON: It is, of course, possible to change the theme of Igniting Ministry; however, it has been established through the last four years as an effective promise by The United Methodist Church to the world, that we invite people to encounter our church in that spirit. And having established that theme, to change it would risk considerable loss of visibility and consistency in our message.

BISHOP IVES: I remind you that we're under the rule of two speeches for and two against. I haven't had anybody—way in the back of this section. Yes, in the back. Yes, you.

Reduce Dollar Figure

DANIEL O'NEILL (Rocky Mountain): Dan O'Neill, Rocky Mountain Conference. Bishop, I move to propose an amendment to what is before us. I move that the \$33.5 million number be changed to \$30—sorry—\$20.5 million. If there's a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP IVES: It's seconded. You may speak to it.

O'NEILL: I served on the Financial Administration committee last week, and as a body, we collectively looked at all of the numbers being brought before this group. We recognized the final decision is General Council Finance and Administration's later this week, for the recommendation they will bring for our final vote. But we felt that on p. 1936, which is the tally of numbers being presented to us, with each *Daily Christian Advocate*, that the total of the first three numbers for all of the Igniting Ministries, should not exceed \$27 million, and this amendment would bring this proposal in line, giving GCF&A later, in consultation with communications, the ability to rearrange those three line items, should

they so need to. \$20.5 million would get us to that end.

BISHOP IVES: OK, then what is before us is an amendment to the proposal. The amendment is that the figure be \$20.5 million. So, we're talking—we're debating—the amendment. Way back here by mic 8.

Program's Impact

THOMAS J. BICKERTON (West Virginia): Tom Bickerton, West Virginia Conference. Bishop Ives, and members of this General Conference, I like to think that Igniting Ministry is a wonderful form of 21st century evangelism. Immediately after the tragedy of September 11, the fast-food, automobile, and entertainment industries began canceling their advertisements. However, in that same period of time, it was the United Methodist message that was being promoted, across this country, on national advertisements. There was a call from the United Methodists for prayer and everyone was invited to join us.

Stations were contacting UCom for commercials, because our message was relevant to the need our country was facing. No one else was saying, "Let's pray together." It was a message of hope. We were able to do that because we had the mechanism in place, and the money to pay for it. There's no substitute for that. If we lessen the funding for Igniting Ministry, we take away the possibility of being to respond when the need arises.

If we were to buy a commercial on the national media market today, it would cost us 25 percent more than it did four years ago. The asking for \$33.5 million is not extravagant. It's what's required to keep this program running and to combat the escalating media costs. This funding will also help us to take the message beyond three brief periods of time a year, because reality is, people have needs every week of the year. Unless we keep the momentum going, and our message in front of those seeking a message of hope, then what we have worked so

hard for, to accomplish in these last four years will be given back.

For us to turn back and to become, once again, just another denomination, with a, without a distinguishable, recognizable quality, would be regrettable.

BISHOP IVES: Your time is up. Right here, in the front of this. Yes, yes mic 1. Excuse me, sir. Yes, yes, I was looking at you with the white shirt.

THOMAS B. GRIEB (Kentucky): Tom Grieb, Kentucky Annual Conference. I rise in support of the amendment. Certainly, the Igniting Ministry is a valuable presence for our church, but we need to face the financial realities, particularly, given the fact that there are two other components. If you take the Igniting Ministry in total, that brings the total to \$27.5 million. I encourage us, in each of these votes—this one notwithstanding—to encourage the, to realize the financial realities that we have before us as a General Conference and a general church.

BISHOP IVES: OK, way in the back. Come to number 7. Is this is a speech against? Is this a speech against?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is for the amendment.

BISHOP IVES: No, I need a speech against the amendment. Right here, in the front.

JEAN S. HENDERSON (Holston): Jean Henderson, lay delegate, Holston Conference. I do want to speak against the amendment. I had the pleasure of, of supporting Igniting Ministries in the year 2000, and I've been so pleased and thankful for the positive results that we've heard from that and the inspiring stories that have come from that. I believe that Igniting Ministries is the best thing we have to reach people where they are. And I really do believe that Igniting Ministries can indeed assist churches in their efforts to win souls and, and make disciples, which is our purpose.

And I also believe that it may well be that Igniting Ministries could be the catalyst by which we could reverse the

decline that we continue to experience and—and I am talking about numbers here, because numbers represent precious souls of God who may have not yet experienced being water-washed and spirit-born. And so, I am against the amendment, because I would like to think that we cannot afford to do without Igniting Ministries, and I would like this to, to go as it is. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: OK, we've had two speeches for and two against. I'm going to turn to the chair before we vote.

BANKS: The committee would oppose the amendment. Even though the figure \$20 million is comparable to the figure of four years ago, we need to understand that \$20 million will not purchase or work in the local churches as it did four years ago. To vote that amendment in would inhibit the program, in fact, make it—would cause us to retreat in the program. So, please oppose the amendment.

BISHOP IVES: Are we clear, now? The amendment is to reduce the figure from \$33.5 million to \$20.5 million for the Igniting Ministries under Calendar Item 1110. Yes, question? Question, yes, come to 5.

SCOTT SELMAN (North Alabama): Bishop, Scott Selman, North Alabama Conference. I would just like it clarified that supporting this amendment, or even supporting the original petition, is not binding on the General Council on Finance and Administration to include that amount in the World Service Fund. It's important for us to understand that, because, somewhere, we have to draw the line. So we need to know that GCFA...

BISHOP IVES: OK, I think, I think...

SELMAN: ...will still consider this.

BISHOP IVES: I think the house understands that this motion is still a referral to GCFA for them to bring back their best wisdom in relationship to the whole, the whole pie.

I think you're ready to vote. If you can vote on this amendment to Item

No. 1110, please vote now. [*Yes, 414; No, 477; Abstain, 10*]

You have not supported the amendment. So what is before us now is 1110. Yes, over here. Mic 4.

Providing Fluid Funds

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): I'm Scott Jones from the North Texas Conference. Bishop, I move an amendment to the last line of the petition following the words "administered by United Methodist Communications." I would add these words, "The General Commission on Communications shall be given authority to shift funds between its central conference initiative, its Igniting Ministry initiative, and its Igniting Ministry youth initiative, to maximize the effectiveness of its mission." If I have a second, I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP IVES: OK, it's seconded. You may speak to it.

JONES: Earlier this week, we approved Calendar Item 16 on p. 1545. The debate is found in *DCA* p. 1878. We approved the Central Conference Communications Initiative by a vote of 450 to 35. This was a \$2.3 million commitment. It's a commitment that there was no debate about. The presenter—who, by the way, was not the person named in the *DCA* record, but was somebody... I cannot remember who it was—says that did not call our attention to the fact that this was \$2.3 million of additional money. Rather than move reconsideration to this calendar item, I trust that a General Commission on Communications ought to be given authority to balance between these three initiatives and whatever way seems most effective to them, once the budget has been finally settled.

BISHOP IVES: OK, I think you understand the intent of the motion. Are there questions about the motion? Motion to amend by addition. Yes, in the back. See you, yes. Come to mic 7.

DAWN M. HAND (Western North Carolina): Dawn Hand, Western North Carolina Conference. Bishop, sisters, and friends, brothers, I'm going to

speak against this amendment. I actually serve on the general communications commission, and I do believe that the commission will make good decisions on behalf of the church. But I rise to speak against that, because I have a sense, because the core asking of this campaign demands so much money that our sisters and our brothers in the central conference will suffer because of this. Our youth will suffer because of this action.

The mass majority of the money needs to be put in place so that we can continue what we have started four years ago, which I remind everybody that we overwhelmingly passed 4 years ago. I would like to think that we will have enough of the funds that our central conference can have funds for this initiative, that is particular for people in the central conference; and that the youth portion of Igniting Ministries can have the funds that is going to be particular for the youth. And so I just rise to speak against this. I think that we can find a way to make this Igniting Ministries, and all of the components therein, work for our conference, and not only for us, but for the church and for the people that we are striving to bring in.

BISHOP IVES: OK. That's a speech against. Yes? Come to mic 4.

DAN J. GARA (California-Pacific): Dan Gara, California-Pacific Annual Conference and a member of that subcommittee and committee of Financial Administration. Once again we worked very hard across all jurisdictional lines to try to come up with some numbers that we thought made sense, and was those three items together that Dan O'Neil pointed out in the last amendment—which you have to look at in your books—together amounted to some increases well over \$40 million. This would be an increase from \$20 million.

So now, by defeating that last amendment, I now support this amendment because there needs to be flexibility. As we look, Bishop, at those three particular first items, there needs to be

some flexibility on the budget that we do pass for all three of those to somehow be weighted and moved around, as opposed to looking at them each one individually and cumulatively. I would ask that you support this amendment to allow that kind of flexibility.

BISHOP IVES: Is there anybody who would like to speak against the amendment? Yes in the back. Come to mic 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference. There are several issues at stake in this amendment, which makes me to rise in opposition. First, I do not believe it is appropriate to use financial administration as the only criteria for shifting authorization. The central conference initiative is administered separately under our rules currently from the administration of the Igniting Ministries. This amendment would obliterate that and cede the authority, by default, to whoever is responsible for the Igniting Ministries. So this amendment goes beyond shifting of funds. It is also shifting authority. And I do not believe it is wise to shift authority in this way.

Number 2: The ministry needs in the central conferences are both quantitatively and qualitatively different. The contexts are very different than those in the United States; and I am a pastor in Detroit and I understand that, having been born in Liberia. I think this would be lousy legislation even if it is fiscally responsible. So I—since I haven't had a chance to craft an alternative—I encourage the defeat of this, so as not to cede the authority for caring in the central conference to an agency so far that has been solely devoted to ministry within the United States.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Time is up. We've had two speeches for and two against. Turn to the chair for comment.

BANKS: Of course, the committee will accept the will of the body. Two points: First, the amendment does not, on the face of it, reduce the amount that is being requested in the petition of \$33.5 million. Secondly, the amend-

ment does perhaps add some flexibility for the negotiations of when GCFA meets with... in the final preparation of the budget. Those are my comments.

BISHOP IVES: House understands the nature of the motion on which we are going to vote? The motion is to grant authority to the general commission to use flexibility among its three funds in order to maximize their ministry. You've heard the debate in favor of that or against that. I think you are ready to vote. If you are ready, please vote now. [*Yes, 437; No, 462; Abstain, 10*]

You have not supported the amendment.

We are on the motion as it has been prepared. Yes, yes in the pink, in the pink suit in the back. Saw you.

Not to Support Slogan

SUE B. MULLINS (Iowa): Sue Mullins, Iowa Conference. Bishop, I move to amend Calendar Item 1110 as follows: On p. 1308 of the *ADCA*, left column, in the "finally be it resolved" clause, sixth line, insert after the words "campaign initiative" the following: "providing that none of these funds will be used to print, air, or otherwise promote the slogan, 'Open Hearts, Open Minds, Open Doors'." If I could have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP IVES: It is seconded. Yes, you may speak to it.

MULLINS: Brothers and sisters, I worked collaboratively with another church in our area to air the commercials for Igniting Ministries. I think it's a superb initiative, and I think it is beautifully and professionally done. But I spoke with my husband this noon—we've been married for 48 years—and I just kind of needed a long distance hug today after what happened yesterday. I asked Jim how things were going at home, and he said, "Well," he said, "maybe I should ask how things are going there." He said, "I've been reading in the statewide newspapers and hearing on the radio for two days only about one thing and The United Methodist Church.

BSIHOP IVES: You need to sum up.

MULLINS: I don't think that if we are known—because I'm sure your media is carrying the same thing—if we're known only because we have excluded part of human kind from our denomination, that we can't truthfully stand and say that we are for "Open hearts, Open minds, and Open doors."

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Motion to amend is before you. Let me remind you to remain, refrain from applause on these matters.

Yes. No. 8, the gentleman.

MICHAEL D. MCCURRY (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, my name is Mike McCurry. I'm a first-time lay delegate from Baltimore-Washington. I've been learning a fair amount about my church, The United Methodist Church, these past few days. But I already know something about what it takes to communicate effectively in the kind of information revolution age that we live in. Exciting... Igniting Ministries has been an impressive campaign with wonderful results to that respect. Its slogan, "Open Doors, Open Minds, Open Hearts," is one that has proven effectively.

Now, I find myself, yesterday, in the minority on a number of those that would reflect open-mindedness in this church, especially in our ability to disagree agreeably in Christian love. My greatest fear in coming to here—coming here as a first-time delegate to this conference—was that The United Methodist Church would do itself what we have seen too much of in the world of politics: bitterness, polarization, and deep divisions geographically. My fears have not exactly been assuaged. But I do know this, no one single issue defines open-mindedness, and no one single painful controversy can break an open heart.

When I go back home to my local church, I will be invited to feast at the most open Communion table in all of Christianity. The doors in that church will be open to diversity to persons from all walks of life, and I cannot imagine that church telling anyone that they are incompatible with Christian

teaching. I know—believe me—I know that there are people who will disagree with me in that church, but they have an open mind, and precisely because they...

BISHOP IVES: You need to sum up.

MCCURRY: ...of the difficult debate that we had yesterday, we need to remind the world of who we Methodists are and who we can be. I hope will defeat this amendment.

BISHOP IVES: OK. That was a speech against the amendment. Someone... yes, someone over here. Yes. That's alright. Either one of you. You were both up at the same time.

Self-Avowed United Methodist

ANNA K. BLAEDEL (Iowa Conference): Anna Blaedel, Iowa Conference. Sisters and brothers in Christ, I stand before you as a self-avowed, practicing United Methodist. For most of my life I have been able to self-avow this identity with great pride, great joy, and great hope, because it is within The United Methodist Church that I first experienced the unconditional love of God, embodied in faith community. Because it is within The United Methodist Church that I first learned about the radically inclusive ministry of Christ who defied religious authorities by entering in community with the oppressed and marginalized, who rebelled against church law and tradition by calling for justice, peace and love. Because it is within The United Methodist Church that I first felt my heart strangely warmed, experienced mysterious powerful movement of the Spirit calling me into ordained ministry, I stand before you now, still a self-avowed, practicing United Methodist.

But today my pride in this denomination, my joy in its ministry, and my hope in its future are struggling because my heart is hurt. And like the chalice on the front altar, I feel broken because I can't take pride in a church where legalistic, moralistic, exclusionary policy becomes more important and more valued than grace and love.

Because I cannot find joy in a church that advertises, “Open hearts, Open minds and Open doors” when our hearts react with fear and our doors slam shut to lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, trans-gendered persons.

BISHOP IVES: You need to sum up.

BLAEDEL: I stand before you still a self-avowed, practicing United Methodist because I have experience God working within this chaos, because I have experienced community within this division, and because I have experienced hope within this deep pain. And I hope that I will be standing before in four years still a self-avowed, practicing United Methodist.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you, very...

BLAEDEL: But I urge us to open our hearts, open our minds, and open our doors or discontinue the use of this slogan.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you, very much. We have a speech—two speeches for, one against. Do we have another speech against? Standing right in the middle—number 3. Are you speaking against the amendment?

BRADLEY LAURVICK (Rocky Mountain): Yes. My name is Brad Laurvick, and I’m from the Rocky Mountain Conference and would speak against this amendment. Though yesterday I was greatly hurt as I watched our denomination shut its hearts, close its doors and—slam its doors—and close its minds towards a great part of our community, I still would say we need to vote this amendment down. Because, as John Wesley responded when regarding lack of faith, you need to preach faith until you have faith. I would say we need to preach open hearts, open minds, and open doors until we ourselves have open hearts, open minds, and open doors.

BISHOP IVES: OK. We have two votes—two speeches for, two against. We will go to the chair for comment.

BANKS: The committee would oppose the amendment, finding it unhelpful. I think those of you who are directors of the commission have been

advised and take note of that, and would agree with the gentleman who just spoke. There are many things in the gospel that we do not yet embody completely but we hope, by the grace of God, to be sanctified to those ends.

BISHOP IVES: OK. The amendment which is before us would be to provide that none of the funds we use for the slogan, “Open Hearts, Open Minds, Open Doors”... in essence that was the... If you would, I think you are ready to vote. If you would—are ready to do so—would you vote now, on the amendment? [*Yes, 170; No, 726; Abstain, 11*]

You defeated the amendment. I think we’re at a—we’ve taken 10 minutes out of our break time already. I’m going to let you take your break now, but if you do that, let’s come back in 20 minutes. Come back at the top of the hour.

(break)

BISHOP IVES: Thank you for coming in and being in order so that we continue with our business. While you’re coming in, taking your seats, let me just briefly tell you where we are. We are trying to do all of the petitions that have financial implications before this day is over. We’ve already checked with the people who control this building, and they said that we can meet until midnight tonight. The numbers of petitions that we need to work on are 30, including the major piece on “Living Into the Future” tonight. At the rate we’re going, we’re not going to make it by midnight.

But let’s see if we can move with some dispatch to begin to deal with the material which is before us. And I remind you that we have before us Calendar Item No. 1110. I have had one speech in favor of that, of adoption of that calendar item. I would be open to hearing a speech from somebody who might be opposed to that adoption of that calendar item. And I need to make sure I look over here at my friends at the far left because they say I haven’t been seeing them very well. I don’t see

anyone in the back, but I see somebody in the far back. You would like to speak against this calendar item?

MICHAEL WACHT (Florida): Bishop, I’d like to speak for it.

BISHOP IVES: I’d like to have somebody who would speak against it. Yes, right here at no. 2. You can stay there at no. 5

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Kent Millard from South Indiana. Are you... is it possible to make an amendment?

BISHOP IVES: Well...

MILLARD: Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Everything is possible; it may not be...

MILLARD: Let me try this quickly.

BISHOP IVES: OK.

\$22 Million Instead of \$33.5 Million

MILLARD: On p. 1308, I would like to move to amend the figure “\$33.5 million” to “\$22 million.” I would like to speak, and the rationale is this. If we pass this as it is, it’s a 68 percent increase for Igniting Ministries over the previous quadrennium. Last quadrennium it was \$20 million. This is a \$13.5 million increase. In the financial administration subcommittee, we held the line on Africa University. They got zero increase. We held the line on Black colleges—zero increase. We held the line on Ministerial Education Fund—zero increase. Because we recognize there’s a limited amount of funds. Our goal is to keep the increase of our apportionments to about 3.5 percent increase per year. We felt that’s about what local churches would be willing to accept. If we pass this as it is, our increase is going to jump up to 5— or 4, 5, or 6 percent increase—depending on whatever else we put in there.

BISHOP IVES: Can you sum up please?

MILLARD: And I think a \$22 million increase is a 10 percent increase, more than anyone else is getting. If we could give them a 10 percent increase, that would be very generous. \$22 million is nothing to sneeze at, and I think

would go far, so I would move that adjust that to \$22 million.

BISHOP IVES: And the motion is to amend to \$22 million, the figure. Is the... no. 4. Yes, come to no. 4.

C. LANE BOYD (Northwest Texas): Lane Boyd, Northwest Texas Conference, speaking against the amendment. This Igniting Ministry investment that we have made this past quadrennium has been an investment that's paid off. It's already been pointed out about that. We all agree with that. We need to protect our investment, and so that we can move on. Rather than cutting the \$3.5 million [*sic*], we need pour on the coals and make sure that the investment lasts.

Sunday night the, at the theater, a video was shown about Fred Rogers. And he said, you know, why can't something be used to communicate grace? Well, we have television, and we have Igniting Ministry. And we need to preserve the investment of the \$33.5 million so that we can continue to communicating the grace via television and other means. I urge defeat of the amendment.

BISHOP IVES: OK, we've had a speech for and a speech against. Can we turn to the chair and then go immediately to vote? Is the house ready to do that? I think we're ready. Would you turn to the chair?

BANKS: Let me point out to the body that already the dollar buys 25 percent less advertising than it did in 2000. The projection is by 2005, it will be 40 percent less. A 10 percent increase means we will lose ground dramatically. Would urge you to vote against this amendment.

BISHOP IVES: OK, the amendment is to change the figure from \$33.5 to \$22 million. I think the house understands. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 380; No, 367; Abstain, 7*]

You have supported the amendment by 59—by 50 to 49 percent.

The motion is before us. Yes, somebody's waving back here. Yes, come to the mic no. 4.

AIDA I. FERNANDEZ (New England): Aida Fernandez from New England Conference. Bishop Ives, I came here with a lot of enthusiasm to move for Igniting Ministry because I think it's a wonderful tool for the 21st century. However... however, as a born-again Christian with deep evangelical and Wesleyan roots, I cannot support this campaign at this moment because of the legislation that we have passed. It shows definitely that we have closed doors, closed minds, and closed hearts. And I have a question for the lawmakers here. Is, with all this money that we are proposing, are we liable for misrepresentation in this church? I mean, do we need this money sometimes to deal with the lawsuits that may come against us because we are misrepresenting the church?

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. I think that is a speech for it. Back at no. 5, where we were a moment ago. Yes, no. 5. Mic no. 5, please.

WACHT: Thank you, Bishop, Mike Wacht, lay delegate, Florida Annual Conference. With all the debate going about the slogan, I'd like to point out the impact that slogan has had on our culture—here both within the church and without the church. We don't have to go any farther than this body to see how the "Open Hearts, Open Minds, Open Doors" slogan has impacted and framed all of the debate that we've had. In the Gospel of Luke, the 9th chapter, the 2nd verse, Jesus told his disciples "to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal."

You've already heard how after 9/11, this ministry helped do both of those things on behalf of our denomination. We proclaimed the Kingdom of God, and we were a healing force in this world. I would remind you, as others have done, that the cost of advertising is up 25 percent over 14 years, that even the 13 percent increase that has been moved out is a bargain. And we are planning to spend in 4 years, less than the Mormons spend in one, and less than Budweiser spends in one football game. There are ways to fund

Igniting Ministry if we will make mission and evangelism a priority in our denomination.

BISHOP IVES: There we've had two speeches for and two against. I turn to the chair for any final comment before we vote.

BANKS: I am grateful that the body sees the need to continue Igniting Ministry. I'm grieved that we will not be able to do that at the level we have done previously. But this we know: God is very faithful. We anticipate that God can do, with a little, great and wonderful things. I urge you to vote yes.

BISHOP IVES: I think we're ready to vote. The—what is before us is 110 as amended. Yes, point of order. Who has a point of order? Right here?

JOON-SIK PARK (West Ohio): Joon-Sik Park, clergy member from West Ohio Conference. I don't think that there two speeches against.

BISHOP IVES: There were two speeches against, I'm advised. I had two and the ones behind me are telling we had two, as well. Are we ready to vote? Question in the back?

Final Question

ALVIN J. HORTON (Virginia): I'm Al Horton. I'm a member of the Virginia Conference. My question is... we had an amendment before we took a break. The amendment was to reduce the dollar amount of the Igniting Ministries core proposal. A vote was taken. We took a break, and there were eighty-some less people who were here when we had the second amendment that had to do with the same subject. My question is this, is it in order to vote on an amendment that has to do with the same subject? And if so, I question the... if we were prepared for that.

BISHOP IVES: Different, different subject because there is a different number that was being used. If it had been the same number, it would've been the same subject, but it is a different subject.

HORTON: Then would another amendment be in order?

BISHOP IVES: Not at this point. I think we're ready to vote on 1110 as amended. Please vote now. [*Yes, 712; No, 149; Abstain, 12*]

You have supported the calendar item. We'll move to the next calendar item.

BANKS: Bishop Ives, Bishop, I would introduce Sung-Ja Lee Moon, who is a pastor in the Northern Illinois Conference.

SUNG-JA LEE MOON (Northern Illinois): Sung-Ja Lee Moon, Northern Illinois Conference, clergy. Bishops and members of the General Conference, I would like to invite to turn to your *DCA* p. 1644, 1644. Calendar Item 538, 538; Advanced *DCA* p. 1308, 1308. Petition No. 40266, 40266. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

This petition is recasting approval and commitment of General Conference for the mission and ministry of Igniting Ministry. This petition includes two proposals. Proposal 1 is to continue and expand the Igniting Ministry media campaign, which includes eight weeks of additional advertising throughout the year. Proposal 2 is to reach out to young people and to assist local congregations' youth ministry, but offering coordinating local church resources and advertising materials and grants that would extend their ministry to greater number of youth.

BISHOP IVES: We have before us Calendar Item No. 60... No. 538 on p. 1644. Can you say anything about the budget implications of this? Or have we already voted that? Are there other budgetary implications? Are there other budgetary implications of this?

MOON: There will be another petition regarding this proposal, which will be coming after this petition. For the youth expression.

BISHOP IVES: OK, I think the house is ready to vote. Yes, question? Do you have a question? No. Way in the back. Do you have a question or... yes?

DENISE J. HONEYCUTT (Virginia): Denise Honeycutt, Virginia Conference. Just a point of information for the delegates. If I could call your attention to p. 1474 that lists the amount of money, the additional money, that will be given to each conference. What it will cost us in terms of passing additional petitions and resolutions that are outside the budget. So p. 1417, just a point of information.

BISHOP IVES: For information. Are we ready to vote on this petition? I think we are. If you would approve or not approve this petition, please vote now. [*Yes, 739; No, 131; Abstain, 13*]

You have approved the petition. Next, Eva.

Igniting Ministry for Youth

EVA C. THAI (California-Pacific): Eva Thai, California-Pacific, lay, young adult delegate. I am presenting the last piece of legislation with financial implications from the Independent Commissions Legislative Committee. Please turn to your *DCA* p. 1644, Calendar Item 536, *DCA* p. 1644, Calendar Item 536. This is in regards to Petition No. 40264 that can be found on your Advanced *DCA* p. 1308, Petition No. 40264, *ADCA* p. 1308. This is in regards to the youth ministry Igniting Ministry part. The committee recommends concurrence with the following amendment: strike in the last paragraph—where it begins, “finally be it resolved”—strike out “in actual receipts.”

BISHOP IVES: The committee recommends concurrence. Are you ready to adopt? Yes, question. No. 2?

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Bishop, Kent Millard from South Indiana. On p. 1308 in the Advanced *DCA*, the figure is... is it correct that \$5.4 million is the request? Is that correct?

THAI: Yes.

BISHOP IVES: Yes, thank you for helping clarify that for the house.

MILLARD: I would like to move an amendment to reduce that to \$3 mil-

lion. The reason is the same as before: it's reducing about the same percentage as the increase was asked before. We need to use Igniting Ministries for youth but, at the same time, when we get to Friday, we're going to have a larger increase than I think the body will be able to accept. And if we can discipline ourselves now to accept some lower figures than we might like, we'll be happier in the end. So I would hope we would reduce it to... from \$5.4 million to \$3 million.

BISHOP IVES: You hear the amendment is to change the figure from \$5.4 to \$3 million. Haven't been way in the back there for awhile. Go to 7 please.

Sharing Funds Revisited

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Jay Brim, lay member from Southwest Texas. I would offer a friendly amendment to the motion just made on behalf of United Methodist Communications and GCFA. I would move to amend—to add the same amendment we had offered before—to be able to move between the three funds any funds necessary that United Methodist Communications feels it must move between the youth ministry, the central conferences, and the main Igniting Ministries fund.

BISHOP IVES: I think the house has made its decision on that matter and would not be in order.

BRIM: Bishop, this is a separate piece, petition, and I am bringing it at the request of the United Methodist Communications.

BISHOP IVES: OK, it's moved and seconded. Anybody want to speak to the amendment... to the amendment? If you... are you ready to vote on the amendment to the amendment? Way in the back, you're waving a card.

HORTON: Bishop, my name is Al Horton, member of the Virginia Conference. I speak in favor of this amendment to the amendment, mainly to suggest that a lot of the negotiating that seems to be going on the floor of the conference now to cut back figures on a variety of petitions that have

financial implications. I'm concerned that we're looking at it piecemeal rather than the whole picture. I think we have the ability to do more than we realize if we are willing to re-assign our priorities. We talk about the budget as though we cannot touch that, and so anything that is new is always off budget, always in addition to the budget. We need to learn to have a few funerals for programs in order to baptize some new programs and, and I'm concerned that we're cutting back before we've had a chance to look at the whole picture. And so I'm in favor of this amendment to allow some flexibility, so some of that kind of work can be done when the whole picture is in front of the GCFA. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Anybody wish to speak against that amendment, that... Way in the back. I have somebody at mic 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference. It is very important not to delay this process with legislative tricks. We have already clearly determined by this action, by previous action a few moments ago, to separate the central conference funding that has been authorized by this General Conference. I want to request from the presiding bishop a ruling as to whether, when a decision has been made clearly on a line item, the General Conference is free at any moment of debate to bring it back up under another petition to undo its decision?

BISHOP IVES: I ruled the original motion out of order, but since that the house wanted to deal with it one more time, because it does relate to a different calendar item, so I gave the house the privilege of dealing with that; but I think we do need to move to a vote on it.

BOAYUE: Bishop, so will a ruling stand or will, will you allow...

BISHOP IVES: I've allowed it.

BOAYUE: the General Conference to bring up any specific decision on the—any calendar item that may have a remote dealing with it, because the

decision we made was specific and is identical to what has been asked for.

BISHOP IVES: Your action, your, your point of information, or point of concern, is well put. However, it relates only to this specific action now and not to any other actions I might rule differently on another time. But at this point I allowed the house to move, and I think I need to allow the house to move now to come to a decision and then to move on. Question?

PAUL BLACK (Illinois Great Rivers): Paul Black, Illinois Great Rivers Conference, lay delegate. I have a question for Larry Hollon, if I could, concerning this flexibility clause that we're getting ready to vote on.

BISHOP IVES: Larry Hollon's been asked if he could respond. Does the house...without objection?

BLACK: OK.

BISHOP IVES: OK.

BLACK: Larry, is it, is there private funds available that can supplant the money if money is moved for the youth expression and for some of the international initiatives, whereas when we cut the, the heart out of the Igniting Ministry, the \$33 million we have no other source to receive funding for that? Is there other sources that United Methodist Communications may be able to supplant some of these other two and by having the flexibility it'll, it'll help?

Potential Fund Sources

LARRY HOLLON: There is at the present time no reserve fund and no independent source that we have. However, United Methodist Communications does have a foundation which could seek additional funds outside World Service dollars which, if that foundation were to respond to a request from UMCom, could underwrite new ministries globally and with youth.

BISHOP IVES: I'm going to rule that that question was really a—intended to speak in favor of this, so would you, against the motion to, against the motion to amend. So what we have is a

motion to amend to give flexibility to the use of these line items for these funds. I think you're ready to vote. Please vote now. Excuse me, excuse me. These folk over here who've been saying they haven't been seeing me have got, got a sign up, so, yes? Somebody has a question or...come to 1, no. 1.

ANITA H. CRUMP (Louisiana): Thank you, Bishop, for recognizing that area. Anita Crump from Louisiana Conference. I agree wholeheartedly with Bishop Blake who indicated that we do not have a financial problem. We have a gift problem. If our pastoral leadership would preach, stress, and emphasize the biblical mandate of tithing, we would be able to meet every budgetary aspect that our church needs here at this General Conference.

The United States United Methodists are not parishioners who are monetarily poor. We must do more to assist our brothers and sisters in the Third World. United Methodism is growing there more than any other place in the world. Why not accept Bishop Blake's words and work to become United Methodist givers? Then we would not accept these budgetary cuts that we are advocating. We would go along with the legislative committee's. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Now we've really had a speech in favor! We do need to vote. We're voting on the amendment which is the amendment to make the line items on this budget flexible. Question over at no. 1. Is that right?

(pause)

It's a question; not intended to be a part of the debate.

ELOIDA F. LINDO (Philippines East): This is a question, Bishop. Eloida Lindo from the Philippines Central Conference, Philippines Annual Conference East. I would like to be clarified about the intent of the motion. A while ago somebody spoke about the communication, communication allocated for central conferences found on *DCA* p. 1936. If we are going to vote on the amendment, does it mean that

the allocation that has been previously approved as indicated on p. 1936 will be disregarded and that the central conference allocation will be part of the \$22 million being amended of the Igniting Ministry budget?

BISHOP IVES: Does anybody have an answer to that question?

THAI: I believe I do. From what I'm hearing the current amendment of \$3 million with the addition of allowing UCom use this amount as needed for the youth component, the core Igniting Ministry component, and the central conference's component. However, it will not let UCom take from the previously voted central conference's component.

BISHOP IVES: OK. You're ready to vote on the amendment to reduce the figure. Please vote now. [*Yes, 456; No, 439; Abstain, 15*]

OK. You have voted to provide flexibility on this line item. I think we're ready now to vote on the amendment which is to change the figure from \$5.4 million to \$3 million. Chair have a comment?

THAI: Just a few bits of information from my own heart. Our church has 8.3 million United Methodists. Of these, less than 500,000 are youth and young adults. There are youth and young adults sitting amongst you today. A few days ago the church took a step forward in support and recognition of these people and their peers. We supported the new Division on Young Persons. I encourage the body to give support to the presence of these young adults in the church. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: OK. If you want to support the committee's recommendation, it would be \$5.4. If you would support the amendment, which is what is before us—is the amendment. So if you are voting in favor of reducing the figure to \$3 million, you would vote yes. If you are not in favor of doing that and supporting the committee's recommendation, you would vote no. I think you are ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 440; No, 488; Abstain, 6*]

You have not supported the amendment. What is before us is the petition as presented with recommendation for concurrence with one change as shown in the calendar item. I think we're ready to vote. Please vote now. [*Yes, 729; No, 189; Abstain, 10*]

You have supported the calendar item. We thank the Independent Commission for their work.

(*applause*)

Global Ministries is next. Do we have anything that's of a financial nature from Global Ministries? Someone coming? OK. We're going to do Global Ministries and then we go to General Administration. Charles Boyeau, welcome. As they come to bring their report, can we pause for a moment of prayer? We just pause for a moment.

Charles Boayue, welcome. As they come to bring their report can we pause for a moment of prayer? We just pause for a moment. Pardon me, a question? You're still holding up your sign there. No. 3

Questions on Previous Amendments

JOSEPH TOM PRICE (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, Tom Price, Director of Youth Ministry, Baltimore-Washington Conference. Would a motion for re-consideration be in order? I did vote yes.

BISHOP IVES: Re-consideration on?

PRICE: The last motion.

BISHOP IVES: On the last vote?

PRICE: Yes.

BISHOP IVES: You voted for it.

PRICE: I did, sir.

BISHOP IVES: Well, a motion to reconsider is in order.

PRICE: The reason I stand and ask for a motion...

BISHOP IVES: Is it seconded? It is seconded.

PRICE: The reason I ask for re-consideration, Bishop. It is that we are, because of the amendment that was

made, which I believe not everyone truly understood. Because of that amendment, money can be moved from what was just voted for a youth initiative into another initiative. And as someone who goes attends a church that gives 100 percent is part of a conference that gives 100 percent and personally who gives his life to youth ministry, I can't stand here and not speak against the possibility of money that would be voted for going to youth ministry to be moved at the direction of someone into another ministry and when we've clearly voted for it go into youth ministry.

BISHOP IVES: You'd like to re-consider so that that issue could be opened again.

PRICE: Yes, sir. I think it should be opened again.

BISHOP IVES: Somebody else want to speak in relationship?

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas): Bishop, Jay Brim from Southwest Texas. I made that motion to amend and I believe it failed as part of the motion for the \$3.2—or \$3 million reduction. So that was not part of the motion that passed, I believe.

BISHOP IVES: Clarify that we have—we have two conflicting votes. In one instance, the line item was not allowed to blend and in the other it was, as I understand it.

PRICE: Excuse me, Bishop. If it did not, in fact, pass with that amendment, then I will withdraw my motion.

BISHOP IVES: You talking about this last piece. Let's check with the Secretary. I believe it did pass with the amendment. The amendment to the amendment did pass. But the amendment did not pass so the flexibility didn't go with it.

OK, let's pause for a moment of prayer as we prepare to hear from another of our legislative groups. We center ourselves in quietness.

(*prayer*)

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, dear sisters and brothers, I

come to present for the legislative committee on Global Ministries. As we present the legislative report I am reminded of an important pronouncement by Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa in an interview several years prior to the political independence of South Africa, Bishop Tutu was asked about the mission of the western church as it relates to the conditions of the people of Africa, especially southern Africa. To this inquiry the Bishop replied, "The church that is not in mission is not the church. Mission is to the church as burning isto fire."

We bring our report with gratitude with to all those individuals, local churches and conferences that enable and support Christ's mission through The United Methodist Church. Global ministries is where the mission of the church intersects with the ever changing global contextual realities of our times. It requires flexibility, clarity of vision and mission, and determination, as well as resources, to do its work. And so, with that said, I'd like to introduce to you those leaders within this legislative committee who will be assisting me in reporting through all the rest of this General Conference. Our committee vice-chairperson is Sally Dyck of East Ohio Conference.

I'd like her to stand and remain standing. Hold your applause if you intend to give one until we are through.

Sally Dyck of East Ohio, vice-chairperson. Our secretary is Ilda Vasquez of the Southwest Texas Conference. We have three subcommittees. The chairperson of our disciplinary legislation subcommittee is Charlene Black of South Georgia. The vice-chair of the subcommittee is John Lawson of South Indiana. The secretary of the committee is Youngsook Kang of the Rocky Mountain Conference. We have a second subcommittee on non-disciplinary legislation, chaired by Robert Long of Oklahoma, Kristina Gonzalez, vice-chairperson, of Pacific Northwest. Betty Katiyo of the West Zimbabwe Conference. Betty is standing there.

And we have a final third subcommittee chaired by Darren Cushman-Wood of South Indiana. Yolanda Villa of Missouri is the vice-chairperson and Courtney Russ of the Western North Carolina Conference is the secretary. I chair the committee and I'm grateful for what I think is the first Africa native to be elected to chair a legislative committee of the General Conference. And we want to thank you.

(applause)

Bishop, dear sisters and brothers, I have one question of the presiding bishop before we proceed. We have seven financial implication petitions. A previous motion that was passed indicated that all items receiving ten or less votes be put on the consent calendar. Would this affect financial implications?

BISHOP IVES: Not those with financial implications.

BOAYUE: OK. Beyond the financial implications every other legislation and resolution that came to Global Ministries received less than eight votes against the recommendation of the committee, and if it is in order we would like to put them all on the consent calendar tonight.

BISHOP IVES: Think they'll be put there automatically...

BOAYUE: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP IVES: ...by action of the General Conference.

BOAYUE: Thank you, Bishop. At this time I will call on Robert Long to present two petitions.

Asian American Language Ministry

ROBERT LONG (Oklahoma): I invite you to turn to p. 1579 in the *DCA*. Calendar Item 143. It is petition 40731. It can be found on p. 1058 of the Advance *DCA*. The title is Asian American Language Ministry. This is a ministry that works with ten sub-ethnic groups; people of Asian Americans such as Cambodians, Laotians, Vietnamese. It is working to start 50 new Asian American churches, fellowships during this next quadrennium to

train new leadership and to help reach out and share the good news of Jesus Christ with Asian Americans.

The budget that was requested was \$1,820,000 you'll find that in the petition, there. The amount that was recommended by the General Board of Global Ministries and is a part of the suggested budget of GCF&A is \$1,638,000. This is not new money. It is a part of the suggested budget. Our legislative committee recommended unanimously for concurrence.

BISHOP IVES: OK, can you identify for us, lest someone ask, \$1,820,000—you said, a certain amount of that is already in the GCF approved, GCF approved budget.

LONG: No, sir, the 1,820,000 is what you'll find in the petition, and it shows up on p. 1060.

BISHOP IVES: And that is all additional money that you're talking about.

LONG: That was requested and what was approved by the legislative committee was a reduction in that number. So there was an amendment to the petition for the number of 1,638,000.

BISHOP IVES: So what is before us is \$1,638,000?

LONG: That is correct. That is consistent with GCF&A's budget that is presently there now. It is not new off-line money.

BISHOP IVES: House sufficiently understand? Are you ready to act on this petition?

Way in the back, I see a card waving.

JAMES L. BRANSCOME (Virginia): Jim Branscome, Virginia Conference. A question I have. We're talking about \$1,638,000. They said that's approved in the GCFA budget. My thinking is that the GCFA budget is a total of \$585 million. This \$1,638,000 is requested outside of the GCFA budget. Is that correct?

BISHOP IVES: No sir, it is already been a part of the suggested budget from the GCFA.

BRANSCOME: It's a part of the original \$585 million that GCFA is pro-

jecting? And it is not requesting money outside?

BISHOP IVES: That is correct.

BRANSCOME: It's listed in the *DCA* as being on the list of budgets outside.

BOAYUE: GCFA has already included the amount that has been asked for in this budget. GBGM has also approved that, and the whole budget of GCFA will be before you later this week to act on. We are not GCFA. All we can tell you is that they have included it, all of it.

BISHOP IVES: On 1859 you see that in Column 2 amounts included in general fund budget proposal: Asian American Language Ministries, \$1,638,000. Are you ready to act on this petition? If you are prepared, will you please vote now? [*Yes, 848; No, 52; Abstain, 9*]

You have approved the calendar item.

LONG: Next, I invite you to turn on p. 1580 in your *DCA*, Calendar Item 146, the Petition No. is 40728; p. 1049 in the Advance *DCA*. The title is "The Program on Substance Abuse and Related Violence." This is a ministry that was started back in 1992. We are continuing on with this ministry. It provides long term support of locally based programs.

In the next quadrennium, there is an emphasis on central conferences of Africa developing materials and programs; and within six African central conferences by 2008, it should be fully implemented. Again, the budget that was requested in the petition, as you will read through it, was \$3,472,000. The amended petition, the amount approved, was \$3,168,000. That is approved by the General Board of Global Ministries. It is within the GCFA budget. It is not new money. Again, it is accepted and is already in the proposed GCFA budget. It was approved unanimously for concurrence.

BISHOP IVES: I think you may be ready to approve this one as well. If

you would, so order. Please, vote now. You've approved the calendar item. [*Yes, 851; No, 46; Abstain, 5*]

Other Ethnic Plans

SALLY DYCK (East Ohio): I would like to turn your attention to *DCA* p. 1580, 1580, Calendar Item 144, Petition No. 40732; on your *ADCA* p. 1060 entitled, "The Korean-American National Plan for 2005-2008." And this is the mission strategy to upgrade and expand this past quadrennium's national plan, and it provides for new congregational development; leadership development; focus on college age students; 15 new next-generation congregations and campus ministries; and 15 new churches. The committee made an amendment. They recommend concurrence as amended and the amendment was to change the requested amount from \$3,312,000 to \$3,205,000, and this is in agreement between GBGM and GCFA. And you can find it included, already included, in the general fund budget proposal. This was recommended concurrence as amended, unanimously.

BISHOP IVES: Recommendation from the committee is approval, unanimously. You ready to vote on this one? If you're ready, please vote now. [*Yes, 870; No, 42; Abstain, 6*].

You have approved it.

DYCK: The next item is on *DCA* p. 1580, right below it, No. 145, Petition 40730. And you can find it on the *ADCA* p. 1051. And the title is "The National Plan for Hispanic/Latino Ministry for 2005-2008." And the committee recommended concurrence as amended, and the amendment was to add Town and Country to the many other initiatives that this plan works with and has supported as partners along the work of their ministry. The amount that was requested was \$3.8 million, and that's what we have remained to ask for—and this money too is already included in the general fund budget proposal. So we recommend concurrence as amended.

BISHOP IVES: I think you're prob-

ably ready to vote. If you are, please vote now. [*Yes, 873; No, 41; Abstain, 3*]

Yes, proceed.

BOAYUE: Bishop, and sisters and brothers, I would now introduce Darren Cushman-Wood from South Indiana to introduce two of the petitions.

DARREN R. CUSHMAN-WOOD (South Indiana): Bishop, members of the conference, I would turn your attention to the daily *DCA*, p. 1753, that's 1753; Calendar Item 1074, that's Calendar Item 1074; Petition No. 41384, that's 41384; and you will find this in the Advance *DCA* on pp. 1132 and 1133. It is entitled "Encounter with Christ in Latin America," and the committee is recommending concurrence. This petition is simply recognizing the good work of this missional initiative and celebrating it and encouraging its support throughout our churches and annual conferences. It is not asking for new money, and we are urging its adoption.

BISHOP IVES: Are you saying that the symbol is inaccurate on the petition? The dollar sign symbol is inaccurate?

BOAYUE: The funding that this petition comes requesting is in the budget of GCFA and in the budget of GBGM, so it is reconciled throughout the system. In terms of the marks on there, we much rather not speak about the marks because it may confuse the house. It is important for the house to know that the funding that is being requested is already approved in the proposed budget of GCFA and of GBGM. Thank you.

BISHOP IVES: If you're ready to vote on this one, please vote now. [*Yes, 886; No, 33; Abstain, 3*]

You approved the calendar item. Hold tight, we've just got a couple more of these, I think. You have another one to present?

CUSHMAN-WOOD: Yes. We turn your attention now to *DCA* p. 1848, p. 1848, Calendar Item No. 1467, that's Calendar Item 1467, Petition No.

40893; and you'll find it in your Advance *DCA* at the very bottom of p. 1119—that's where the title petition number is; but the text is on the following page, p. 1120. It's entitled "UN Global AIDS Fund." And we are recommending concurrence as amended.

BISHOP IVES: Are there questions about this? If you're ready to approve this or take action on it, would you please vote now? [*Yes, 818; No, 86; Abstain, 1*]

You've approved the calendar item. Do you just have one more?

BOAYUE: Just one more.

BISHOP IVES: Just one more. Let's take care of one more.

Shalom Communities

BOAYUE: If you would turn with me to *DCA* p. 1580, 1580; Calendar Item No. 147, 147; Advanced *DCA*, p. 1048, 1048; Petition No. 40726, 40726, "Funding of Communities of Shalom." The committee is recommending a budget of \$828,000 for the next quadrennium. This amount is included in the recommended GCFA budget as well as in the budget of the General Board of Global Ministries. The program emphasis this quadrennium coming up will be a time of transition where the Shalom program will move from a church-wide initiative to an annual conference-driven leadership model and design. This is a significant growth process for a very popular and effective initiative of our church. We started at a crucial time in this country's history. Since it is provided for in GCFA and GBGM, the committee is recommending concurrence as amended, and the amendment is only in the figure of the money, all of which is in the proposed budget of GCFA. It was 93 votes in favor of and zero against. We recommend concurrence.

BISHOP IVES: Are you ready to take action on Petition number... Yes? Hand waving out here?

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Scott Jones from North Texas. Bishop, I rise to speak in support of what probably doesn't need to be supported, but

to at the same time commend the leadership of the General Board of Global Ministries for their participation in the budgeting process and the leadership of this legislative committee for their fiscal responsibility. Thank you all.

BISHOP IVES: Thank you. Thank you. If you're ready to vote, please vote on the calendar item. Please vote now. [*Yes, 866; No, 39; Abstain, 1*]

(pause)

BOAYUE: We want to thank you for your support of the mission of the church...

BISHOP IVES: You have approved the calendar item.

BOAYUE: Thank you, Bishop. We thank you for the support of the mission of the church, and we will go out and continue missions.

BISHOP IVES: OK, thank you very much, committee.

(applause)

We've a... we're 4 or 5 minutes over time for adjournment. We need to hear announcements, and then if you will just stay put, just for a moment. Yes, announcements. Did I hear someone getting my attention out here? Right here, OK. Yes?

MARY COUNCIL-AUSTIN (Wisconsin): Bishop Ives, I am Mary Council-Austin, clergy delegate, Wisconsin Conference, and I have a motion.

BISHOP IVES: Well, I think we're right at adjournment right now. I think we are past the adjournment hour. That will have to wait for another session.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: It will affect something we work on tomorrow.

BISHOP IVES: Well let's deal with it at another session. OK, thank you. I'm called to call on our conference secretary to bring any announcements that we need to hear.

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Two for our attention. One: those of you who were this morning elected to the Inter-jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy, there will be a meeting of

that group to organize on Friday, May 7th at 12:45 P.M., in Rooms 320 and 321. Friday, May 7, 12:45 P.M., Rooms 320 and 321. And then for our prayer concern, the Iowa delegation asks for prayers for a member of the delegation, Celestyne DeVance, who is leaving tomorrow morning to attend the funeral of her stepfather.

BISHOP IVES: OK, let me just appraise you where we are as we go to dinner, and I'm going to ask Bishop Violet Fisher to dismiss us in prayer. But let me just remind you that I misspoke when I told you that we had about 30 items, because I didn't know how many Global Ministries had on their list. We still have 28 that we need to deal that have financial implications, as well as a major piece of business that we need to do tonight. So, there's still a lot of work to do before we sleep. You've been a wonderful group today. I thank you for your attention and the way you have worked together, and appreciate you and all that we are trying to do together. I call on Bishop Violet Fisher now to dismiss us for the evening break.

Wednesday Evening, May 5, 2004

BISHOP CHARLENE P. KAMMERER (Charlotte Area): Thank you very much. Now, friends, I realize that you know we have some difficult work to do tonight in order to honor our boundary of submitting all petitions and dealing with them that have financial implications. Our deadline for doing that, by a previous action of the conference, is tonight. And so, I commit to you that we will cover the necessary items in order that these matters appropriately can be considered by GCFA before their report back to us on Friday.

Living Into the Future

Now, we will begin this evening with consideration of the "Living Into the Future" document. And I would like to remind the delegates of the distinctive nature of this particular report

coming to the General Conference from the General Council on Ministries. As you recall, General Conference of 2000 mandated that GCOM would bring to this conference a study and recommendation and implementation plan for a new structure for the church. And thus, you have the "Living Into the Future" document on p. 1352 in your *DCA*. I would like to facilitate our presentation time this evening so that you have the information that you need to consider what is before you. We will begin with the president of General Council on Ministries, Bishop Ed Paup. He will report to this conference on the "Living Into the Future" document.

This report has been in the hands and care of the General Administration Legislative Committee to consider. There will be this report from GCOM, and there will be a minority report from the work of the legislative committee. We will perfect the majority report, or you will have the opportunity to do so. And then you will have the opportunity as I prompt you to consider perfection of the General Administration handling of the document. Because considerations of the "Living Into the Future" document have financial implications, we must consider it tonight and meet the deadline of possible referral.

We will now proceed as a body to the "Living Into the Future" document. I recognize Bishop Paup to please come and speak for General Council on Ministries. And he will be given 10 minutes to speak as prior arranged with the Committee on Agenda. Likewise, the chair of the legislative committee will be given an additional 10 minutes to report.

GCOM Report

BISHOP EDWARD W. PAUP (Portland Area): Thank you Bishop Kammerer, colleague bishops, delegates to this General Conference, and friends. The chair of the legislative committee and I have discussed with Bishop Kammerer a way that might help the body proceed this evening. And invite you, therefore, to turn in

your *DCA* to p. 1915, 1915. This is Calendar No. 1498. 1498. This is the work of the legislative committee, and it is in relation to the General Council on Ministries petition that is numbered 40111, 40111, found on p. 927 of your *Advance DCA*, 927. I recognize you will need to have much material in front of you. The fullness of the General Council on Ministries proposal, however, is to be seen in the pages prior to that in petition numbered 40094, beginning at the bottom of p. 923. But we thought for assisting you in your effort tonight that we would want to consider the fullness of the legislative committee's work because, frankly, the decisions we make on this petition will shape other decisions the body will make this night.

While the report of the General Council on Ministries in video form was offered last Wednesday, I want to add these words this evening as this report is considered for action. And as Bishop Kammerer has reminded us, the mandate of the 2000 General Conference was remitted to General Council on Ministries to process the report and recommendations that had come through the connectional process team, remembering the work of the General Conference in 2000. The narrative report was remitted to GCOM, and GCOM was asked to return to this General Conference to offer a report and implementing legislation on the most effective design for the work of the general agencies.

I would share with you that, some of us who were on the General Council on Ministries in the last quadrennium, anticipated in the action of the 2000 General Conference that we would not be in existence in this quadrennium. And, in fact, some of us were therefore a bit surprised when this remit came our way. But we, early on in the quadrennium, chose to send a message to the church stating that we were prepared, if necessary, to go out of existence, because in fact we were with the church seeking a more effective way of ordering the life of our denomination for mission and ministry in the 21st century.

The journey of the General Council on Ministries during this quadrennium has been a fascinating one as we have taken seriously the mandate. And let me just share with you that we did not easily arrive at this basic question that we are putting before the house this night. And that is what has simply been described as seeking to put mission and money at the same table. There were earlier iterations of what the re-ordering of our life might look like, and some even referred to the possibility of the creation of a "super board" that would oversee the various portfolios of program ministry and mission in the life of our church. But finally, through discernment, we found ourselves centering on what we believed to be the first question that The United Methodist Church in this General Conference must answer.

And that is, are we ready to bring mission and money to the same table, and therefore to complete the connection of The United Methodist Church connection?

We have believed through this process that there is a disconnect at the general church level, especially between decisions that are made about our resources, our money, and decisions made about our ministry and mission. And, in fact, I think we have been instructed by feedback received from the connectional process team report and subsequent action of the 2000 General Conference, that in fact, the conference was not ready for the work that the CPT brought to it in that form. And in this way, we have come before you with what we believe is an important step, but a first step.

The church has not received the question before, does it want this form of disconnect at the general church level? The church has not determined before that it wants its money separate from its mission. We believe that it is time for us to bring mission and money together and then to consider other ways that we will reorder our church, in order to be more effective in its response to the needs of the world in the 21st century.

And so it is that this comes before you tonight. There are other values contained in the proposal that we have offered to you. One of those is to create a connection between the table and the program agencies where not only does the president and general secretary of the program agency come to the table, but two members of the table also go to that agency and create an even greater connection between the table and the agencies. We had much discussion about how it would be that we would seek to member the table. But we determined that if the basic unit of The United Methodist Church is the annual conference, that we needed to begin by honoring that value in our system and creating a table that would bring annual conferences to the table as well as presidents of agencies, general secretaries, and bishops of our church. We have also, as you note, added general secretaries as voting members, currently they are a part of the General Council on Ministries as persons with voice but with no vote. And we believe that that has marginalized them from full participation in the life of the General Council on Ministries. That, too, is a very important value that has been added to this table. And let me just say, using words that are included in our report, that we really believe...

BISHOP KAMMERER: Bishop Paup,

BISHOP PAUP: ...that this Connectional Table

BISHOP KAMMERER: Bishop Paup, let me...

BISHOP PAUP: Yes

BISHOP KAMMERER: You have 2 minutes. Please begin your summary.

BISHOP PAUP: Alright. Thank you, Bishop Kammerer. ...that the Connectional Table is motivated by faithfulness to the mission of the church to make disciples of Jesus Christ and would work in the following ways. It would be global in scope and holistic in understanding; inclusive in nature and collaborative in style; and while being efficient in the stewardship of resources, it would be transparent,

accessible, and accountable in all relationships. Thank you very much.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you, Bishop Paup. And now we turn to the chair of the General Administration Legislative Committee, Dr. Ed Tomlinson, who will also have the privilege of speaking up to 10 minutes for the committee.

*General Administration
Committee Report*

K. EDWARD TOMLINSON (North Georgia): Bishop Kammerer, members of the General Conference. In the video presentation last week and on other occasions, we've heard Living Into the Future described as a gift to the church which is to be perfected. Indeed it is. We want to thank Bishop Paup, Dan Church, and the members of the General Council on Ministries who have worked on it. Without their work, what we bring to you would not have been possible. In the General Administration Legislative Committee we saw our role as perfecting that gift and crafting something we could strongly recommend to you. Our opinions and convictions were all over the map as we began our committee work. Yet, with careful negotiations, we saw the structure sub-committee come to a unanimous approval of the document. Then the full committee reviewed it and perfected it slightly, and voted, with only one dissenting vote, to recommend it to you. It was one of the finest examples of holy conferencing I have ever seen. Now, Debbie McLeod, structure committee chairperson, and clergy person from Florida will present it.

DEBORAH A. MCLEOD (Florida): Bishop, delegates, good evening. I want to describe to you the work of our subcommittee, the principles of a Connectional Table and the manner in which the Connectional Table of the General Administration committee approved would function. We do have a deep appreciation for the General Council on Ministries and for their work upon which we see ourselves as building.

Our subcommittee was a very diverse subcommittee. We came from all five jurisdictions of the United States. We represented two central conferences. We had members of the General Council on Finance and Administration and members of the GCOM, including a member of the writing team for Living Into the Future on our subcommittee. We started out with vary divergent views about what the structure of the Connectional Table would look like but we quickly found that we agreed with the principles of Living Into the Future.

I want to talk to you about the energy and the passion surrounding the principles of a Connectional Table that our subcommittee experienced. These are the principles that we want to lift up for you, bringing ministry and money to the same table.

The Connectional Table that we designed would work with the General Council on Finance and Administration to approve budget recommendations, to review agency needs, and to make annual distribution of funds. We also believed in the principles, secondly, of diverse representation and so we retained the 30 percent ethnic minority representation and 10 percent young adult and youth representation. And for the first time, we'll bring the ethnic caucuses to the table to be a part of a collaborative effort.

Thirdly, the principle of being global in scope and representative will have seven, a minimum of seven central conference members of this Connectional Table. Fourth principle is that it is holistic and collaborative. We'll bring the general agencies, representative from the Council of Bishop, and the annual conferences through the Jurisdictional Conference together at the same table. These are the principles upon which we had wide agreement.

We then had to work through how would this table function. So let me describe that to you, the manner in which our redesigned Connectional Table would function. First of all, it would be a common forum for imple-

menting the vision of The United Methodist Church. Secondly, there would be evaluation of general agencies, an accountability of the general agencies to serve the annual conference and the local church. The third part of the function is that our Connectional Table differs in that it is smaller, more focused, for greater efficiency and greater effectiveness.

So let me describe to you some “compare and contrasts” between our Connectional Table and Living Into the Future. Our Connectional Table has 47 voting members; Living Into the Future has 134 members. At our Connectional Table, general secretaries have voice. We believe it is very important for the general secretaries to have voice, to be present, and fully engaged. Living Into the Future gives general secretaries voice and vote, which means that in Living Into the Future, the general secretaries will vote on their own budgets, their own salaries, and their own evaluations. In our Connectional Table, we preserved the GCFA, but we require the GCFA and the Connectional Table to work together on budgets and the distribution of funds. Our Connectional Table begins on January 1, 2005. Living Into the Future would spend 2 years in transition and would begin their work in full in 2007.

In conclusion, let me say this: Our committee has presented a fair and balanced proposal. It is a proposal for a Connectional Table that will cost \$6.8 million less than Living Into the Future. We have fulfilled our charge to receive the gift from the General Council on Ministries of the wonderful document Living Into the Future, and to perfect it and bring a recommendation to you. We believe that this is the best possible compromise. It is a coming together of divergent views and we believe that this Connectional Table from our General Administration committee has widespread support in this body. There is no one person on our subcommittee who got everything they wanted, but we all felt confident that this compromise embraces the essential

principles and effectiveness of the Connectional Table.

We found a wonderful sense of collaboration and coming together for this unanimous proposal out of our structure subcommittee and overwhelming support from the General Administration committee. We met in the middle. There will be staffing appropriate to the needs of the work of the Connectional Table. We also have an enabling resolution to bring a transition period under the purposes of the Connectional Table that will deal with staffing of General Council on Ministries and the programs that are already in place. We are confident about forming a new Connectional Table for a new day and for our great church. We urge you to vote yes to concur on this minority report on this petition as amended. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you, Rev. McLeod. And now I’ll ask Bishop Paup to return to the podium. The Living Into the Future document from the General Council on Ministries belongs to this General Conference.

You now have the opportunity to perfect the document. Is there anyone who would care to speak? Yes, over here, mic. 1.

Extend Debate?

REBECCA KATHLEEN S. VIDAL (Pangasinan Philippines): Rebecca Kathleen Vidal from the Center Philippines. Bishop, I move to suspend our Rules of Order no. 8, paragraph 2, which limits debate of three speeches for and three against. If I get a second, I’ll give the rationale.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Let me check-out with you. It is my understanding that now we are in the mode of having adopted two speeches for and two against with a maximum of 2 minutes.

VIDAL: Right.

BISHOP KAMMERER: And you would like—that is what you would like to address?

VIDAL: Yes, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. It is before us.

VIDAL: The Methodist general church and general agency structure...

BISHOP KAMMERER: Excuse me, excuse me. You may make the motion to suspend the rules. It is not debatable. So make your motion for the purpose and then we will act on it.

VIDAL: I move that the presiding officer allows for up to five speeches for and five speeches against in the debate concerning the Living Into the Future issues.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That is the motion before you. I will have the secretary read it back for you and it will require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules of this conference. May we have the reading of the motion. We need a copy at the secretary table, please. You may... Please, read it where you are and then someone can bring the copy.

VIDAL: I move that the presiding officer allows for up to five speeches for and five speeches against in the debate concerning the Living Into the Future issues.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. This would expand up to five speeches for and five against. Is this the substance of your...

VIDAL: Yes, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That is what is before you. The copy is coming to the secretary table. It will require two-thirds vote. Alright. Let me recognize this card here, please.

PHILLIP KERLIN (East Ohio): Phil Kerlin, East Ohio lay delegate. I just have a question. The time limit on that, would it remain at two minutes as previously set, because she’s only suspended the rules to change the number of speeches, not the time limit of speeches not the (*unintelligible*)?

BISHOP KAMMERER: Yes, the time limit, I’m assuming, would remain the same of two minutes because it was not addressed to be changed.

KERLIN: OK. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Yes, this card back here, please. Questions only. This is not debatable.

JAMES L. BRANSCOME (Virginia): This is a question. Jim Branscome, Virginia Conference. Does these five speeches, if we pass this, apply to amendments, too? I hope not.

BISHOP KAMMERER: I like the way you made your comment in trying to form it in a question.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Yes, sir, mic 2. Do you have a question?

JAMES C. SHAW (South Indiana): Yes, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright.

SHAW: The question is...

BISHOP KAMMERER: Your name, please.

SHAW: My name is Jim Shaw and I'm a lay delegate from the South Indiana Conference. I would like to raise the question, if it's possible, to make an amendment to that, to make that three instead of five.

BISHOP KAMMERER: I would like to take the vote first to see if the house chooses to suspend the rules, and then you make come back and perfect it. I will recognize you later pending the action of the body.

SHAW: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Are you ready to vote? This would be for the purpose of suspending the rules to increase the time. Please vote now. [Yes, 310; No, 579; Abstain, 2]

It does not prevail. We will keep the rules of two speeches for, two against, with a maximum of two minutes each.

Would anyone care to perfect the majority report, Living Into the Future? I see no hands, then we turn to the minority. Dr. Tomlison, if you would return. Would anyone wish to speak to the minority report for perfection? Yes, sir, over here, mic. 1. We are now perfecting the minority report. We are not debating it. We are perfecting it. Do you wish to perfect it?

A General Council Called the Connectional Table

PER ENDRE BJORNEVIK (Norway): I wish to perfect it, Bishop. My name is Per Endre Bjernevik from the Norway Annual Conference. And I have an amendment, and if there is a second I will speak to it. The amendment is to insert the following words after "name" there shall be, on the midst column on p. 1915. In the middle of that column, there is a sentence starting with "name." After there shall be—I have an amendment to insert "General Council hereinafter called Connectional Table."

BISHOP KAMMERER: Sir, I need to ask you to read it again. Now he has identified for the body. We are on p. 1915, the middle column, the section where it addresses name, and he wishes to insert by amendment this phrase. Now would you please state it again? Slowly.

BJORNEVIK: Yeah. Name. "There shall be a General Council hereinafter called Connectional Table in The United Methodist Church." That is my amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. And will you please get the copy for the secretary? You may speak to your amendment.

BJORNEVIK: We are, Bishop, introducing a new name in this proposal, a Connectional Table. I am very much in favor of the idea to bring mission ministries and resources together. But what is the meaning of a table in the *Book of Discipline*? It is not defined. Paragraph 703 in the 2000 *Book of Discipline* clearly defines what is a General Council, what is a General Board, and what is a General Commission. And I would like to read Paragraph 703, if there is time for it.

BISHOP KAMMERER: You have about one minute, ten seconds. Try it.

BJORNEVIK: Yeah. Just a second. "General Council—An organization"—it is on p. 428—"An organization created by the General Conference to perform, defined responsibilities of

review and oversight on behalf of the General Conference in relation to the other general agencies and to perform other assigned functions shall be designated as a general council." I think that what is described here in the *Book of Discipline* fits into the jobs that the Connectional Table is planned to do. Therefore, I move that this sentence is inserted. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That is a speech for the amendment. Are there others who wish to speak. In the back, yes. Mic 7, please.

THOMAS A. LANGFORD III (Western North Carolina): Andy Langford, Western North Carolina Annual Conference. I would speak against the amendment. What the legislative committee has done is created a new thing. It was very important for the legislative committee not to create a new general council of the church, but to create something that is absolutely new to do things in a new way, not to have ourselves put into old forms and old structures and old ways of staffing.

In fact, the legislation proposes that the committee itself, the Connectional Table itself, can begin to define itself and they bring new legislation to the 2008 General Conference to perfect itself. I would urge you to vote against this amendment; and, in fact, to maintain the integrity of what the committee came up with together, to resist most of the amendments coming. We have a very carefully crafted, balanced piece of legislation coming before this body. And I urge us to support it. The minority report is being presented by Devon.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you. That would be a speech against the amendment. In the back, mic 5, please.

Understanding "Majority" and "Minority"

MORRIS MATTHIS (Texas): Morris Matthis, Texas Annual Conference. Bishop, I would just want to clarify, are we talking about an amendment to the minority report, or are we talking about an amendment to the report from the committee on

Petition 40111, which they are recommending concurrence as they have amended it?

BISHOP KAMMERER: We are talking about the minority report, it's an amendment to the minority report.

MATHIS: Then what is the majority report?

MCLEOD: May I answer?

BISHOP KAMMERER: The original report of the Living Into the Future document that Dr. Paup spoke to is the majority report.

MATHIS: But it—here in the *DCA* it says that 56 for, 0 against. So I presume that this was the presentation of the committee.

BISHOP KAMMERER: The minority report is the presentation of the General Administration Legislative Committee. That is what is before us. It is different from the petition on Living Into the Future that you receive in the *DCA*. Alright. Over—yes, right here, please. We are on the minority report, p. 1915.

EWING WERLEIN JR. (Texas): Bishop, Ewing Werlein.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Excuse me, sir. I had recognized someone at mic 2. I'll come back to you. Mic 2.

PATRICIA BRYANT HARRIS (Peninsula-Delaware): Patricia Bryant Harris, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. I have a question. I would like to have an explanation of, operationally, how will the Common Table of the minority report function differently from the current General Council on Ministries?

BISHOP KAMMERER: May we have a brief response to that? I believe Rev. McLeod addressed that, but we'll ask her to do it briefly again.

MCLEOD: The General Council on Ministries is a program agency. A connectional table would bring together all of the general agencies to work together in the common vision and mission of the church. It would also put together the functions of budgeting and spending at the same table with the functions of ministry and vision. That's very

different than the authority that the General Council on Ministries currently has.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, that's a response from the committee. Now I said I would recognize Mr. Werlein, mic 5, please.

WERLEIN: Bishop, Ewing Werlein, Texas Conference. And my point of order was this, with all due respect to the presiding bishop, the report that comes from this committee is shown to have concurrence of—56 for, zero against, not voting 5—if I'm reading the right one at page... at Calendar Item 1498. And, as I understand it, this is something like we would have when the GCFA reports to the General Conference. The Financial Administration committee may report, and they report their majority report; and there may also be a minority report from Financial Administration, so you would have three reports that would come. And we've had that at some General Conferences. And I believe that it's a denigration of the committee majority here, overwhelming majority, to refer to them as a minority because they are not a minority; and I would respectfully ask that the presiding bishop reconsider that nomenclature, which I think would be appropriate.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you for advising the chair. I chose to use the word, *minority report*, in order for us to process this in the same fashion that we have done otherwise in a parliamentary order; and it is an unusual circumstance that the main report coming from GCOM, "Living Into the Future," which we would consider the majority, is not of what the legislative committee brings to you in the vote in which you reflected to us. So I'm choosing procedurally to consider it as the minority report. This is acceptable to the officers involved to both, and we will proceed ahead. Yes, in mic 7, please.

Process by Which Proposal Comes

DANIEL A. IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Bishop, Daniel Ivey-Soto,

New Mexico Annual Conference. With all due respect, I'm left with a question right now. The question is, by what authority does the "Living Into the Future" proposal come before the General Conference?

BISHOP KAMMERER: It comes by the authority of the mandate of the 2000 General Conference to report back to this body.

IVEY-SOTO: But that's a report, not a motion. The motion comes from the legislative committee. It is a substitute for the report that was disregarded by the committee.

BISHOP KAMMERER: The report did come to the committee. The report has to come directly to this body. That has been done. The minority report is now before us from the legislative committee.

IVEY-SOTO: Then I guess my question is whether it will come as a report for information only, is what I understand is... should be happening, and not for action. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Just a moment please. (*pause*) Delegates please hold steady now with me. I'd like to read from p. 1532, which enumerates legislative committee number six, General Administration. You see in the second paragraph this statement: "The report of the General Council on Ministries shall be submitted to this committee for study and review." That was done. "Thereafter, when the General Council on Ministries presents its report to the General Conference for action"—that has been done—"the committee then, the legislative committee, shall present its recommendations and may propose amendments." And that is where we are, the minority report. Alright, yes, right here. No, 2. We're on a motion to amend. Yes.

MORENIKE IVING (Mississippi): I'm Morenike Iving, Mississippi Conference. I have a question. Is it really proper to call this a minority report when it's a substitution? It's not "Living Into the Future" and it in no way really amended "Living Into the Future," but rather drafted a whole new

proposal. So I really don't understand why it is being considered as a minority report when it does not in any way reflect the original "Living Into the Future" proposal.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you for your statement. I believe I've heard that speech before; and, friends, I'm simply trying to help us process it so that you will know how to do it as we have treated others. If you want to think in your mind a substitute report, I think that would fine. The committee presentation from the legislative committee is using a minority report. I would like for us to honor where they are. Now, I'll turn to no. 7, please. We are still on the motion to amend. Yes.

JAY K. BRIM (Southwest Texas) Bishop, Jay Brim, Southwest Texas, lay delegate. And to satisfy the body so that there won't be any further discussion on this, we had this conversation in the committee. And in the *Discipline*, Paragraph 906, sub 12, the General Council on Ministries is given authority to bring to the General Conference its recommendations for changes to the connectional structures. It's properly before the body for that purpose, and our committee is bringing what we believe is a minority report in response to that proper report from the General Council on Ministries. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Thank you, and I believe we are ready to vote on the amendment unless there is a question. Right here, please, mic 3. Only questions at this point before we vote on the amendment.

KATHI AUSTIN MAHLE (Minnesota): Can I raise a point of order? I do not believe we had speeches; two speeches for or two speeches against the amendment. Kathi Austin Mahle, clergy delegate, Minnesota.

BISHOP KAMMERER: No one has chosen to speak to the amendment. The discussion from the floor has been by debate. So are you wanting to speak to it?

MAHLE: I would like to make an amendment to the amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That is before us.

Replace "Council" with "Agency"

MAHLE: I would move that the word "council" be stricken and replaced with the word "agency." As I heard Rev. McLeod talk about this organization that is proposed, a new organization, we are talking about a place that we would combine program ministries, administrative ministries, and budgetary ministries, all within the same agency. Therefore, rather than calling it a "council," I would move that we change that to "agency."

BISHOP KAMMERER: Could we have a response from the committee from Rev. McLeod?

MCLEOD: Yes, it was our desire not to create another general agency. We do not see the connectional table as being one agency among many agencies, and we do not see it as being some giant "super" agency that encompasses all agencies. We see it as creating a place for collaboration, conversation, mission, and decision-making. It's a very different entity than an agency.

BISHOP KAMMERER: I turn to Rev. McLeod because we asked her to speak to the amendment on the addition of "council," so I thought you would want to have the committee's response to "agency" as well.

Now the amendment to the amendment is before us. Would anyone like to speak to that? Mic 1, please.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop Kammerer, Beverly Wilkes, Illinois Great Rivers Conference. I'd like to speak to that, but I want to know where I am first. Have we taken action on Petition 40094, which is on Advance *DCA* 923?

BISHOP KAMMERER: We have not.

WILKES: OK, but that's the original Living Into the Future document. Is that correct?

BISHOP KAMMERER: That is correct, and we are perfecting the

minority report before we get to the step you mention.

WILKES: Correct. Clarification. If we create another general council, it is my understanding that a council is only accountable to General Conference, unlike an agency. I also understand that in the original uniting document from back in 1968, is that we were actually authorized two councils—a Judicial Council and a Council of Bishops. We later created the General Council on Finance and Administration, but I was thinking that one of the proposals that's coming to us is this minority report is that we're going to have a smaller group of people making the decisions. When we attach the word "general council," we're saying basically that there will be no accountability for that group other than General Conference. Would that be correct if we attach the word "council"? That's a question.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Response from the committee?

MCLEOD: There's also a Council on Finance and Administration. You need to know that you basically need to decide what the shape of this table is going to be. The General Administrative committee has legislation prepared for you addressing the 700 paragraphs of general provisions, the 800 paragraphs of the relationship between the Connectional Table and the GCF, and the 900 paragraphs. So you really need to think about what the table will look like. We are not looking to create an "agency" or a "council," but a "table." It's a new thing.

BISHOP KAMMERER: The Mahle amendment to the amendment is before us. Does someone wish to speak to the Mahle amendment? I see you in the back. Mic 8, please.

DAVID L. SEVERE (Oklahoma): David Severe, Oklahoma Conference, and thank you for widening your vision, Bishop. I speak against the motion for "agency" because I think that muddles it up. I am in favor of the word "council" or "council status" because I think that you have to have some anchor here, and "connectional

table” is—I’m sorry, my dear friends—it is just out there in nowhere. Status in the conference says who has the right to bring a report to the General Conference. So I would speak against the substitute motion and in favor of the motion for council. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: All right, that is a speech in favor of the amendment, against the Mahle amendment. It’s actually supporting the other amendment. Yes? Mic 4. You may help me after you identify yourself by stating if you wish to speak for or against the Mahle amendment which is before us.

JERRY RINEHART (East Ohio): Thank you, Bishop. Jerry Rinehart, East Ohio delegation. I rise to speak against the Mahle amendment. We’re at a crucial state here of doing a very new thing; and because of that, the name needs to be something very distinctive. And using descriptive words that we’ve used throughout our *Book of Discipline*, like “council” or “agency,” would make it relatively confusing and may, you know, let us combine things in our minds that should not be combined. I have been debating or trying to educate the folks in my annual conference the difference between lay leader and lay speaker for a long time. And so we just need to pick a new distinctive word. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: All right. Let me remind the body we have now one speech for the Mahle amendment, and I apologize to the body because I believe we have three against. My apology to the body. So I will only recognize you if you want to speak for the Mahle amendment. Yes, right here. Excuse me, in the middle? No, no, no, in the middle please. Mic 2.

MARK A. MILLER (Greater New Jersey): Bishop, Mark Miller, lay delegate from Greater New Jersey. I was about to call the question on these amendments; but since we had three speeches, I don’t know if that’s in order. But I would call the question on—

BISHOP KAMMERER: It is not in

order. Sorry. Yes? Now I’ll recognize you at mic 2.

AMY VALDEZ BARKER (Wisconsin): Bishop, Amy Valdez Barker, Wisconsin. It seems to me, Bishop, that we are stuck in definitions; and if I could ask us to turn to Petition No. 1516, p. 1927, I’d like to offer a substitute motion to what’s before us. And if I have a second to that, I’ll speak to that if that’s possible, or an amendment to the amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: I can’t do that at this point. We cannot do a substitute motion. We have to clear the amendments first before we could do that.

BARKER: So, would it be in order for me to make an amendment to the amendment or—

BISHOP KAMMERER: Not right now. We have two, so unless you want to speak to the Mahle amendment . . . alright. Yes? Right here, please. Mic 2.

MORENIKE IRVING (Mississippi): Morenike Irving, Mississippi Conference. I rise to speak in favor of the Mahle amendment because an agency is exactly what the legislative committee has come back to propose, and so I think we should just recognize the legislation for what it is. Thank you.

BISHOP KAMMERER: All right, friends. We have had the required number of speeches for and over the—and against the Mahle amendment. I hope that you are now prepared to vote. I will have the secretary read the amendment, which uses the word “agency.” Let us hear the reading, and then I will ask you to vote. Do you have it? “There shall be an agency” is the language “known as the connectional table.” All right, that is what is before you. Are we clear? Please vote now. [*Yes, 128; No, 761; Abstain, 5*].

Whether the Table is a Council

The Mahle amendment is not sustained, and now we return to the amendment that addressed the word “council” by addition. Do we have that to read please? (*pause*) Secretary, do we have that to read please? Do you have the copy?

(*unintelligible*)

All right. That was the original amendment that’s before us, and we are—we have had the speeches on that. Do you have a question, sir? No, excuse me. I was recognizing the other gentleman. Sorry.

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): My question to the chair—and I think this will go a long way to help us. I heard in an answer earlier all the enabling legislation that we’ll have from the 600s, the 700s, and the 800 paragraphs. My question is, has this been fly-specked so that things that councils can do are picked up by whatever we call the Connectional Table? So, so—

BISHOP KAMMERER: Would the committee respond?

HARRIS: I didn’t hear the verb he used: “. . . has this been—”

BISHOP KAMMERER: Lift your microphone a bit, sir.

EHRMAN: I guess it has been editorially checked so that everything that the Connectional Table needs to do—if it were a council—can be done under the legislation that you will be proposing. And I guess—because if it has—then all this is irrelevant. If it hasn’t, then we need to bring it in; but as long as we know that you’ve done that editorial work . . .

BISHOP KAMMERER: The delegate would like to know if the committee has done that work. Your response?

HARRIS: Yes we have. We worked very closely with Irene Howard, general counsel. We’ve gotten advice on the 700 paragraphs, the 800 paragraphs, and the 900 paragraphs. The table does have a definition. It is accountable to the General Conference and has the power that it needs. It is a new thing. This is critically important to our carefully negotiated compromise that we use the word “table.” I think it would be a deal-breaker if we went to another term. “Table” is what it needs to be. I urge you to defeat the amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That was a response to the question. It was also a speech in regard to the

amendment that's before us, which adds the word "council." Are you ready to vote? Please vote now.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Are you ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 173; No, 724; Abstain, 6*]

This amendment fails. The minority report is before you. Would anyone care to perfect the minority report? I'll recognize you, sir, mic 3.

Change to Effective Date

RANDALL F. FLANAGAN (West Virginia): Randall Flanagan, West Virginia Annual Conference. I would move to amend p. 1915, center column, beginning with the paragraph, the first word "effective." I would amend by changing the date listed there to "effective January 1, 2006," and then the rest would go from there.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, is there a second? It's been seconded; you may speak to it.

FLANAGAN: Bishop and delegates to the General Conference, I believe that the January 1 date is extremely too fast. It does not take into accountability the realities of what the rest of this year will be for our church. There will be annual conferences; there will be jurisdictional conferences; there will be organization of boards of agencies; there will be training that will be done under the accountability and responsibilities of both GCOM and GCFA. I do not believe there is enough time between now and the end of this year to effectively do all that this document calls for us to do. Therefore, I would encourage you to set off another year so that we can appropriately and specifically do the things that need to be done to bring the connectional table—which I do support strongly—into existence.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That's a speech for the amendment which would order the date to be changed to January 1, 2006. Yes, back here. Mic 5.

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Jim Harnish. Bishop, members of the conference, I would urge us to defeat this

amendment specifically because this is such a great opportunity for us. I feel great excitement about what the committee has brought to us. One, because it combines mission and gives us a clear place to define and work our mission. Another, because it brings together the resources of the general church in a very effective model, in a very broadly representative way. Mostly because right now, in this time, when we have experienced great pain and great division within our body, I see this conference, this table, as a relational place where we can come together in a common center represented broadly in our church. And that I really believe this can be an instrument that the Spirit might use to lead us out of our divisions and into a common commitment to the central mission of this church.

I would hate for us to delay that for a whole year. We desperately need the healing that this table might be able to bring to the fractured parts of our church body. I urge us not to delay but to do it as quickly as possible.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, that's a speech against the amendment to change the implementation date. Yes, right here. Mic 2.

JONATHAN O. BAKER (Peninsula-Delaware): Jonathan Baker, Peninsula-Delaware Conference. A point of information, if I could, Bishop. I agree with my brother's concern about transition. What is not before this body, at this point, is a plan for transition that includes a continuation of GCOM staff into the year 2005, and other ways to try to assure those functions. Those of us who worked hard to try to provide an assurance want to bring in a few moments—if this is passed—that plan. So I want to simply assure the group that the functions of GCOM will seek to be addressed because those are critical functions for us as we live into the future.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Were you serving on the legislative committee?

BAKER: Yes, I was.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Alright, he's alerting you that there will

be information about a transition team and matters that would be more specific. We have two speeches against and one for. Are you ready to vote? The amendment would change the implementation date to January 1, 2006.

MCLEOD: Bishop, am I allowed to speak before the vote is taken?

BISHOP KAMMERER: Yes.

MCLEOD: OK, we appreciate the concern about General Council on Ministries' programs and their funding and continuation, and want to assure you that we have cared for that in the transition team that we will create by resolution. If this is passed, there is up to 13 months for the continuation of that work and a careful look at how each of those important functions and staffing would be carried out.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, a speech from the committee and the minority report. Are you ready to vote on the amendment to change the date? Please vote now. [*Yes, 202; No, 702; Abstain, 5*].

It is not sustained. The minority report is before us. Yes, mic 7, please. We're perfecting the minority report. I've recognized someone at mic 7.

Add Other Caucuses to Membership

CLAUDIA G. HARRELSON (Western North Carolina): Good evening, Bishop. Claudia Harrelson, Western North Carolina. I would like to make an amendment in your *DCA* on p. 1916, in the middle column, at the top of the column. This is section (e) under the section of "Membership," and let me just simply read how I would like this sentence to read: "One member from each of the racial ethnic caucuses, as well as one urban and one rural representative"; and then it would continue, "as elected by the CT upon nomination from..." Then follows the list of caucuses. If you go down to the next-to-the-last "National Federation of Asian American United Methodists," strike the word "and," [before] "Pacific Islanders National Caucus United Methodists," and then the addition of "and other appropriate caucuses."

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Is there a second to the Harrelson amendment by addition? Is there a second? Alright, thank you. You may speak to it.

HARRELSON: Let me simply, very quickly, say that those who serve in both urban and rural areas know that they face similar problems when it comes to ministry. We also know that these churches are usually under-represented when it comes to the table. While I cannot speak for the numbers in urban churches, I know that there are 3 million rural United Methodists who are very rarely represented on any agency or board; and this simply gives us an opportunity to bring everyone to the table.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. The Harrelson amendment is before us. A response from—excuse me. I did see a card here. Yes, sir, no. 1.

RANDALL L. ROBINSON (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop Kammerer, I'm Randy Robinson from the Illinois Great Rivers Conference. I'd like for the last speaker to help us know who or how "other appropriate caucuses" is defined.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, I'll ask Claudia Harrelson to return to the mic and elucidate what you meant by "other appropriate caucuses." This is for information.

HARRELSON: Bishop, I left the information vague on purpose because I do not know the name of the urban caucus. I know that there is Town and Country Agency as well as The United Methodist Rural Fellowship, and those would be among those appropriate caucuses.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That's the response to your question. Yes? Mic 1. Please state whether you're speaking for or against the Harrelson amendment.

DEBORAH K. CRONIN (South Indiana): South Indiana Conference, Deborah Cronin, clergy. I love that amendment, but I'm going to speak against it. There are too many caucus-

es. There are too many different caucuses, and I think we open the door with this to have—what, we just created a caucus over here a few minutes ago. The folks that sit-at-the-end-of-the-table caucus. It's just too many caucuses. Thank you.

(laughter)

BISHOP KAMMERER: That is a speech against the amendment. Yes, right here, please. Mic 3.

Clarify Language

PHILLIP KERLIN (East Ohio): Phillip Kerlin, East Ohio, lay delegate. For clarification, I ask the maker of that amendment to except a friendly—to say "other appropriate urban and rural caucuses," as it is more specific; and also by doing that you have to change the number from 47 to 49 on the left-hand column because you'd be adding two more persons. So I suggest those as friendly—I move that as a friendly amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. You wish to amend the amendment by clarifying the language "other appropriate caucuses" to "other urban and rural caucuses" in two places. Is that correct?

KERLIN: No, to "other appropriate urban and rural caucuses."

BISHOP KAMMERER: Correct.

KERLIN: And then the other thing that would need to be changed is in the left-hand column, the voting members to 49, that's just clarification. They would need to go to 49 if this does pass.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, make her the motion.

HARRELSON: I would accept that, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. We now have—I will count that as a speech for. We have two for and one against. In the back please, mic. 8.

FORBES MATONGA (West Zimbabwe): Bishop, Forbes Matonga from Zimbabwe West. It's just clarification; maybe we are not clear about this rural caucuses. Is it one caucus or

there are many other? Because if you say it will be 49, you assume there is one rural caucus and there is one urban caucus. Is that the assumption?

BISHOP KAMMERER: The information shared by the maker of the motion is that there is more than one recognized rural caucus within The United Methodist Church. She did not know the information about that in regard to urban caucus. Yes, in the back please, mic 8. We're on Harrelson amendment as has been...

DAVID L. SEVERE (Oklahoma): David Severe, Oklahoma. I speak against the amendment. Ladies and gentlemen, we have taken a lot of time this evening. What we have before us is an opportunity to try to do some things that are new. I would like to urge this body to quit nit-picking at it, and let's get on with it. Let's live into to it. We want to change it four years from now we can. I am against the amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, we have the required two for and two against, now. I'm going to turn to the committee for a response, and I remind you, please, not to applause, to applaud, to show your feelings this evening. I'll turn to the maker of the—to the committee chair.

MCLEOD: On p. 1916, letter (e), that is a paragraph about racial ethnic representation. This would not be about racial ethnic representation, but additional kinds of representation. We believe that the general agencies are the places with the larger membership; the place for the wider representation. The mandate from the General Conference was to create an effective group, and we believe the operative word here is "smaller." So I would urge you to defeat the amendment.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, do you have a question, sir? We're ready to take the vote. Do you have a question? Mic. 5.

BRENT SALSGIVER (Central Pennsylvania): Brent Salsgiver, Central Pennsylvania Conference. I call the question on all that's before us.

BISHOP KAMMERER: We're ready to vote, so we will vote. Now, the Harrelson amendment had the friendly amendment added to it, so I'll ask the secretary to read the new language of the Harrelson amendment.

We don't have it. Alright. The amendment stated that there would be, by addition, in point (e), p. 1916 of the document, "as well as one urban and rural and other appropriate caucuses." That was perfected to be "as well as one urban and one rural and other appropriate urban/rural caucuses" and the change of the number from 47 to 49 in the first column on 1916. That is what is before you. Are we ready to vote? Please vote now. [*Yes, 144; No, 755; Abstain, 6*]

It is not sustained.

The minority report is before us. Yes right here, mic 2.

Adding Up the Numbers

M. KENT MILLARD (South Indiana): Bishop, Kent Millard from South Indiana. I just have a question on p. 1916, Item No. 1. It says "the voting members shall consist of 47 persons," 28 elected one way, 21 elected another way. 21 and 28 is 49, I think. Is that an addition error, or is that what you intended?

BISHOP KAMMERER: May I have a response?

MCLEOD: 21 are coming from the jurisdictional conferences. An additional 7 are coming from the central conferences. That's where the number 28 comes from.

MILLARD: So the total membership is still 47.

MCLEOD: The total membership is 47.

MILLARD: Thank you.

MCLEOD: The 28 come from the jurisdictional and central conferences, and the others come from the general agencies presidents and general agency secretaries, and one from the council of bishops.

BISHOP KAMMERER: I believe he is pointing out that the math does not add up.

MCLEOD: The paragraph below it explains that 28 is 21 plus 7.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, before I recognize anyone else, let's get this cleared up so that the body is clear on the numbers.

MCLEOD: There's a place where you see, in paragraph (a), it says 28 persons. The next paragraph describes that 21 come from the jurisdictional conferences and then an additional seven come from the central conferences. It seems that some language has been left out of our petition. There are seven from the central conferences.

BISHOP KAMMERER: We still need the explanation of how you get the total of the 47, I believe.

MCLEOD: The remainder of the 28 are the general secretaries and the president of each of the general agencies and one member of the Council of Bishops.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, the committee is clear that the number is accurate. That—is that correct?

MCLEOD: Yes.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Now, back here, mic 8's been trying to speak. Excuse me, point of order! You may come to mic 4.

DARLINE D. BALM-DEMMELE (Iowa): Darline Balm-Demmel, Iowa clergy. I thought the motion was to suspend debate, to close debate on all that was before us. And we didn't vote on that, and we're continuing debate. That's a question of clarification.

BISHOP KAMMERER: My understanding was the motion was framed only in regard to the amendment, and thus I responded that way. Yes, mic 8.

THOMAS J. BICKERTON (West Virginia): Tom Bickerton, West Virginia. Debbie, I have a question. In that same paragraph, the 21 from each of the jurisdictional conferences, what's the breakdown of how many members would be coming from each jurisdiction?

MCLEOD: It would be one from each jurisdiction and the rest is proportional.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, let's—let's bid attention here, murmuring, and it's hard to hear. Let's hear the committee response. One from each jurisdiction and...

MCLEOD: We would ask the general secretary—the secretary of the General Conference to do the math on the proportional membership. That's what that's about. I have it written down, but it's at my desk. I believe it goes like this. There is definitely one from each of the five jurisdictions, and then the rest are apportioned by membership. I believe that that's a two additional for a total of three from the western jurisdictional... from the Western Jurisdiction, six additional for a total of seven from the Southeast, and four for the remainder of the jurisdictions.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, over here. Yes, mic. 1.

JAMES H. RUSH (South Georgia): Jim Rush from South Georgia Conference. I'd like to move that we move on everything that's before us.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. Sir, you would have to move to suspend the rules to do that, would you care to, or not?

RUSH: I move that we suspend the rules so that we can act on all this before us, because if we keep nit-picking, we'd be here the rest of the evening.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright. That is before you. Is there a second? This will require a two-thirds vote for suspension of the rules to vote on all that's before you. Are you clear on the intent of the motion? Please vote now. [*Yes, 744; No, 166; Abstain, 6*]

You have suspended the rules and we will now proceed to the document that's before us, the minority report, and I will turn to the committee chair to make a statement.

MCLEOD: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Then we will take questions.

MCLEOD: In our proposal the functions of the General Council on Ministry are accounted for and cared

for. They are important. This is a holistic and collaborative small table and it will work. The Connectional Table becomes a full partner with the General Council on Finance and Administration in the budgeting process and in the annual reviews. That's a very new thing, and it's part of the principle that came out of "Living Into the Future." It's diverse. It's inclusive. It's functional. It will hold the general agencies accountable to the annual conferences and the local churches who have the majority of the voting members of the table.

The General Council on Finance and Administration, at our request, estimated that the smaller table will do all of this for \$6.8 million dollars less than "Living Into the Future." The General Council on Ministries distributed some talking points last week in support of "Living Into the Future." We have fulfilled all but one of the General Council on Ministries' stated goals. I urge you to vote "yes" for this proposal to approve it, as it has been amended. Let's live into a new day.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, thank you Rev. McLeod. Now, I'm going to turn to Bishop Paup, who also has the privilege of making a statement.

BISHOP PAUP: Thank you, Bishop and I want to thank all of us for the way in which we are seeking to be lead by God's Spirit this night. I would simply want to say that in relation to the proposal that came in from GCOM, this proposal from the committee does not connect the connection. The fact is that we were seeking to create a table where we would have a finance committee that would be a part of the discernment related to our mission and money. But, by keeping GCFA as a separate entity with General Administration, Episcopal Fund, and other monetary matters at that table not coming to this Connectional Table, we have not yet created the place where all of this comes to the whole. It is not possible, therefore, we believe, to have a holistic approach with this table.

I would also want to say that we sug-

gested to the body that this was the first step. It has been portrayed as if this is going to be so much larger than what might be a much smaller connectional table. We are intending to commend to this connectional table, the one we are proposing, that they continue the process of reordering our life. It may be that this table we propose of some 130 members becomes a far smaller table than the over 500 directors that currently work on all of our agencies now. Thank you very much.

Closing Questions

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, thank you. Now, questions only. Do you have a question? Mic 8.

LONNIE CHAFIN (Northern Illinois): Bishop, Lonnie Chafin, Northern Illinois Conference. I noticed the presidents of the general agencies are on the group of 47. A good number of those are bishops. I'm wondering what would be the total number of bishops of the 47 in the committee's report a.k.a. minority report.

BISHOP KAMMERER: We're moving close to debating again, but I will allow a brief response to that question. Total number of bishops?

MCLEOD: I understand from Miss Johnson that there's no rule on whether a president of a general agency is a bishop or another elected person. So it would depend on who the president of the agency is as to how many bishops. There would be one bishop selected by the Council of Bishops that would be the chairperson.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, over here, question only. No, the woman behind you. Excuse me, sir. I saw her hand first. Mic 1.

MARY HOYENGA (Dakotas): Mary Hoyenga from the Dakotas Conference. My question is, if we vote up or down on this vote, is there any chance then to go back and vote for the report from the Council on Ministries?

BISHOP KAMMERER: If the minority report prevails, it becomes your main document. You would not or may return to the majority. That's for information

only. If it fails, if the minority report fails, we would be back at the majority report. Now, are there questions, questions only, please? Back here, mic 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop Charles Boayue, Detroit Conference. One of the original concepts behind a Connectional Table was to link the financial and the program responsibilities around one table. My question is, does this Connectional Table as represented in the minority report allow for GCFA to come directly to the General Conference with an alternative budget when it disagrees with the Connectional Table? Or does the Connectional Table have a final say on which budget or what budget comes ...

BISHOP KAMMERER: Charles.

BOAYUE: ...to the General Conference?

BISHOP KAMMERER: Charles, I'm, I'm sorry, but I need to state that you are now speaking, you're debating. You've raised the question and I'll allow a brief response from the chair, to the primary question.

MCLEOD: The minority report insists that the General Council on Finance and Administration and the Connectional Table work together and agree on what they bring to the General Conference.

BISHOP KAMMERER: Alright, yes; back here please. Mic 6. Friends, I'm trying to move us to a break soon if you will help me to that. Mic 6.

DEBORAH O'CONNOR-SLATER, (North Central New York): Yes, Deborah O'Connor-Slater, North Central New York, clergy. I'm wondering if you would share with us the rationale that you have lifted up from the minority report for the proportional members to the committee or to the council. And how has that proportion, besides membership, how has that number been established? And of what benefit will this council be to the conferences...

BISHOP KAMMERER: I'm sorry

O-CONNOR-SLATER: ...that are smaller?

(Continued with the May 8th issue)