

Proceedings of the 2000 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

Corrections

DCA, p. 2268, column 1, paragraph 3: MICHAEL B. WATSON should read B. MICHAEL WATSON.

DCA, P. 2270, Column 1, headline: **Tuesday Afternoon May 9, 2000** should read **Wednesday Afternoon May 10, 2000**.

DCA, p.2274, column 2, paragraph 1: BISHOP LOONEY should read BISHOP MUTTI.

DCA, p. 2274, column 2, paragraph 5: BISHOP LOONEY should read BISHOP MUTTI.

(Continued from page 2274)

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, thank you very much. We need to vote in order on these three items. The Stephenson amendment to the amendment is before you first. This would amend the Ervin amendment. If you support the Stephenson amendment, you'd press 1; if not, press 2. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 251; No, 652] And it fails.

What's before you now is the Ervin amendment to the main motion. If you're ready to vote, press 1 if you favor the amendment; 2 if you do not. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 282; No, 635] And this amendment fails also.

What's before you is the main motion. It comes with recommendation from the committee as amended. We're ready to move to the vote now. If you are ready to vote, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 784; No, 144] And you've approved this recommendation. Thank you.

We turn to Willard Douglas. (Pause) We are receiving reports from the committee. We have another item, and Mr. Douglas will direct you to the proper place.

WILLARD H. DOUGLAS (Virginia) Bishop Mutti, members of the General Conference, page 2093, Calendar Item 1191, Petition 31329; the text is found on page 780 of the *Advance DCA*. The legislative committee voted nonconcurrency, because if we leave here with *The Book of Discipline*, we will have affirmed the judicial administration process.

And therefore, because of the vagueness of this petition, the committee voted nonconcurrency.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, calendar item is before you from committee, the recommendation is nonconcurrency. Do you wish to debate it? I see no cards. I take it you are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 820; No, 62] And you have supported the recommendation of nonconcurrency. All right, we turn to the committee again for another motion.

KATHI AUSTIN MAHLE (Minnesota): Thank you Bishop; General Conference members. We have another constitutional amendment that we need to—

BISHOP MUTTI: You may want to identify yourself, so everyone will know you.

MAHLE: Excuse me?

BISHOP MUTTI: You may want to identify yourself . . .

MAHLE: Oh, I'm sorry! I'm Kathi Austin Mahle, and I'm from the great state of Minnesota

BISHOP MUTTI: That's 'cause I didn't know how to pronounce your name, that's why I asked you to do it.

(Laughter)

MAHLE: Thanks! I invite you to turn to page 2093, Item No. 1192. This is found on . . . this is Petition 30806. It's found in your *DCA* on page 705. This has to do with Article 3 of the Constitution, and we recommend concurrence as amended before you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, it's properly before you from the committee. The recommendation is concurrence with an amendment. You wish to speak to it? Green card, mic 3.

STREIFF: Kathi, I think there is a misprint in the *DCA*. We traced the word formerly also . . . in our amendment.

MAHLE: That's correct. Please scratch the word formerly. Please delete it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, you'll note that correction. Anyone else wish to speak to it? This is a constitutional matter, so it takes two-thirds. The recommendation is concurrence as amended. Please vote when the light appears.

[Yes, 865; No, 32] And you have approved it with the needed majority.

MAHLE: Thank you very much.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you, Kathi.

DANIEL SOLIZ (Rio Grande): The next item is on page 2093, Calendar Item 1193; it's found on page 1891 of the *DCA*. The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence, in order to make the disciplinary language consistent with what is actually occurring.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, it's before you, recommendation of concurrence. Do you wish to debate? I see no cards. We are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 887; No, 10] And you have approved it.

BISHOP MUTTI: Danny do you have another one now? You're not going to do 1194, all right. Have any more for the committee? All right. Danny Soliz.

SOLIZ: I'm sorry, Bishop. On p. 2093, Calendar Item 1194, it's p. 714. The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence. I'm sorry, nonconcurrency.

BISHOP MUTTI: It is printed "nonconcurrency" and that is the recommendation from the committee. You wish to debate it? Yellow card, go to Mike 6. Go to Mike 5.

SHIRLEY PARRIS (New York): I hate to be a nick-picker but, that was just moved to the consent calendar.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, your point is well taken. If it's approved, we don't need to do it again, I take it. All right, Christine, you want to set the scene for these next two?

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Thank you, the next item, before we can hear that, there is according to General Conference rules, I believe, there is a report that is to be heard before this next item can be presented. On Calendar Item 1195, and that is a report from a representative of the General Council on Ministries. I would ask that we give attention to Dr. Carolyn Johnson.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Dr. Johnson.

*Research Plan
for The United Methodist Church*

CAROLYN JOHNSON (North Indiana): Thank you, Bishop, and all mem-

bers of the General Conference. I would call your attention in your *Advance DCA*, p. 595. P. 595. This is report no. 4 from the General Council on Ministries. And it relates to a proposal for the "Research Plan for The United Methodist Church." The General Council on Ministries is proposing a comprehensive research plan for The United Methodist Church, consistent with the disciplinary responsibility to give oversight, to evaluate the needs, to set goals, plan strategies, and to coordinate planning and research for the denomination. You may be aware that many of the institutions within the denomination and many of the general agencies, each have a separate research office. What we have tended to find is that often times during the search it is not coordinated or that the research is not disseminated as widely as might be helpful for the entire denomination. So we're proposing four items. Those four items you will find beginning on p. 596.

The first one is the United Methodist Committee on Research and Planning, and that committee then would have the responsibilities for determining the needs for denominational publication, to publish results from research that happens about other denominations but that happens outside the denomination, to look at methodologies for United Methodist opinion panels, to maintain international demographic profile to The United Methodist Church, and other items as you see listed.

The second major part of that research plan would include a United Methodist "Forum for the Future," and you will see that on p. 597.

Finally, the last two would be the General Council on Ministries Office of Research, which is currently in place but this offers a little more detail about how that office could function in the next quadrennium. And finally, the piece that you might find the most exciting would be item #4, which is the United Methodist Central Conference Forum on Research. One of the issues that continually is facing the General Council on Ministries and faces the denomination is that oftentimes we base many of our decisions without adequately done research prior to doing that. And particularly, if we begin to look at the myriad of issues that face central conferences, one might be, "How does the church address issues in a closed communist society?" When we

look in situations of the Africa Central Conference, what are the needs for leadership as we look at a post-war situation? As we look in Asia, what does it mean to develop leadership, as we look at global economic structures? And so the ability to have a coordinated and collaborative research project that is developed within the denomination where we can share and use those resources.

This is a research plan that would have funding implications and so therefore, even though the legislative committee overwhelmingly did agree to it, it would not appear on the consent calendar, so this is the report and if you have questions, I would be glad to respond to those.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, are there questions? I see no cards. Committee wish to put it before us?

JOHN COOKE (Western New York): This is on p. 2093, Calendar Item 1195, Petition 31392. Our legislative committee recommends concurrence with reference to GCFA.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, it is before you with the recommendation of concurrence, if you pass it, it'll be referred to Council on Finance and Administration. Is there a debate. Yes. Pink card. Mike 1.

EWING WERLEIN, JR. (Texas): I think all of us would support the idea of research and being well informed. We should bear in mind that this is a half-million dollar item which I take it is not in the budget that we have received from GCFA, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

BISHOP MUTTI: We will ask the committee.

COOKE: That information is on p. 599. General Counsel on Ministries will provide funds of approximately \$257,000, from its 2001-2004 quadrennial project. And then it is recommended that the necessary additional funds for this research plan of \$475,000 be provided by action of the 2000 General Conference.

Funding for Research Debated

WERLEIN: That is the half-million dollars in round figures that I had noticed and it seems to me that given the numbers of items that we are already asking GCFA to examine in the millions of dollars, over and above the 0-0-1-2% increase that GCFA has recommended at the outset, we need at some point to

begin to bring some disciplinary thought to our voting and I'd rather suspect that the kind of research that we need to do at our local churches and annual conferences and at the general church can be done at the established church, conference, and general boards and agencies with the other apportioned funds that we are expected to vote for them. I would be inclined to think that this might be one of those areas where we could begin to take note of how much more we're adding to this budget. Instead of going up 3.5% over the quadrennium, if we do all of the things that are being proposed, that I understand are between \$50-70 million, we will be talking about increased apportionments of 15% and 20% and those conferences under the new proposed plan that are expecting to have no apportionments or reduced apportionments are not going to have any reductions. Other conferences are going to have staggering increases. I would suggest we vote no on this one.

BISHOP MUTTI: Speech against. Anyone wish to speak for concurrence. I see only one card. Green card, no, no—do you wish to speak, come to Mike 2

JAMES A. HARNISH: (Florida) Currently praying to St. Jude, the patron saint of lost and hopeless causes, But I would move an amendment, brothers and sister, on page 599. I would move to amend so that the center paragraph in that column would read "the General Council on Ministries will provide funding from its 2001 to 2004 quadrennial budget," period, and delete everything else. And the motion for the amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: All Right! Is it seconded? Do you wish to speak to it?

HARNISH: I think the brother here spoke to it. Somewhere, somebody has got to decide how much we are going to pay for and this seems to be within the mission and purpose of GCOM. Surprisingly, that will continue to exist, and it ought to be funded there.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the Harnish amendment is before you anyone wish to speak against it. I take it you are ready to vote? The Harnish Amendment is before you, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 589; No, 290] And it carries and you have amended the main motion that comes from the committee then. We are back to the main motion as it is amended. We had one speech for and one against, but

now we have a different motion. Yes, over here, mike 1.

AMY TWIGG (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop, as I hear what is before us currently, I ask us to think about four years ago, when indeed we made a discussion on the mission on the church, and how this particular motion that's before us, would ask our general council and ministries to, indeed, look about its life, our life, the life and mission in reestablishing our identity under God's call, when we have recently done that in the last four years. Why that would need to be done in a redundant way, I cannot understand. Also we just gave to the General Council on Ministries the remainder of the work of the CPT folks and all that was before us from the committee that worked on that at this General Conference and we don't even know, I don't think we made that decision yet, whether the GCOM will continue to exist. So I am not in favor of the main motion.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, speech against. Anyone wish to speak for it? The pink card in the back, Come to mike 8 please.

Need for Research Defended

DAVID SEVERE (Oklahoma): I would like to point out for those of us who work at annual conference levels and work with local churches, the research part of this is very important. Right now we have a lot of scattered research going on. It would help us at the annual conference level and working with the local churches, if this were enacted so that there could be a focus of the research of the entire denomination. So I would be in favor of us approving this even though we may have crippled it with our last vote. I would support it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, two for and two against. Yes, mike 1.

ELIZABETH FENNER (Missouri West): I have a question. If this is approved, would this research plan replace the research that is being done by such agencies as the General Board of Global Ministries.

BISHOP MUTTI: Do you want to speak to it? Carolyn.

COOKE: No this coordinates that. This is a part of the regular work of the general conference ministries, this research.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, main motion is before you. We could put the

vote, under your rules, if you wish to do so. We can have one more speech. The Green card, All right, maybe you need to go to a mike to do it, so that everybody will hear the motion. Mike three.

TIMOTHY MCCLENDON (South Carolina): I wish to move the previous question.

BISHOP MUTTI: Is there a second? The previous question is moved, if you favor it, it takes two thirds to pass it. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 780; No, 102] And you have ordered the previous question and will proceed to vote then on the amended motion that comes from the committee. Does the committee wish a final Word.

COOKE: I yield to Dr. Carolyn Johnson for our final word.

JOHNSON: Members of the General Conference I really would urge you to vote for this. I cannot tell you how many times I personally, and I think all of you have had situations where you have been in committee meetings or you have been in situations and you all, many of you, have said this phrase, "If only I had more information." But as we live in a information society, and as we try very hard to make sure that we do do informed decision making, it is helpful to depend upon and to utilize the research that is available from the variety of places that we have in the denomination, as well as beginning to tackle critical issues and questions and doing appropriate research so that we can indeed have that information to make our decisions so that they are well founded, but more importantly so that they bring new meaning, so that what we do is to make a difference as the denomination as we live out our lives in this world. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we are ready to vote, please vote when the light appears. And you have concurred with the committee as you have amended it. [Yes, 616; No, 298] All Right!

HARMAN: I direct the General Conference's attention to page 2158 consent Calendar Item 1379. And under the previous rule I just mentioned a moment ago at this time I would call Sam Wynn to give information about this item.

Report on

National UM Native American Center

WYNN: Bishop, at the 1996 General Conference, GCOM was mandated to provide a coordinating role for an inter-

agency report for the National United Methodist Native American Center. In September of 1998, GCOM, along with the directors of the board of NUMNAC, prepared projected budgets and funding processes based on the ministry of this center for the 21st century. And after these projections were put together there was consultation that took place with GCF&A as well as with the Board of Higher Education and Ministry in addition to the General Board of Global Ministries. The results of the consultation brought about a review of the ministry for the center for the quadrennium, enabling the center to project where its vision would be for the future. And in light of those projected ministries and funding requests, a renewed funding proposal was presented to the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, GCF&A, General Board of Global Ministries as well as to BHEM. And as a result of that, we bring this petition to you for support of the National United Methodist Native American Center for the new quadrennium. Bishop, I would encourage the conference to remember that this is a center that is supported by the entire church. And we have finally moved to the level in the church where its becoming an inter-agency center for the purpose of recruiting, training, employing, and engaging Native American ministries in our denomination.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, thank you for the report. Turn to the committee for recommendations.

HARMAN: Thank you, Bishop. The committee is recommending concurrence as amended as follows. In addition to that which had been previously published, a detailed budget has been attached and that is on the next page, on p. 2159. We recommend concurrence as amended with referral to GCFA.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, Calendar Item 1379 is before you. Recommendation is concurrence as amended. Do you wish to discuss it? Pink card, I don't know which one you're closest to. You head to one and I'll have one turned on. Mike 1.

JOE P. PEABODY (North Georgia): My understanding is that we have around 9,000 Native American United Methodists and if my addition is correct, with this proposal we will currently be funding something in the neighborhood of \$1.5 million for ministries for these 9,000 persons. I'll be quite frank to say I'm confused. I'm not sure

how I explain this to the folks at home, if we agree to this kind of recommendation. I need some help from the chair of the committee that will give us a rationale that makes this understandable.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, I understand that is a speech against. Maybe you'll get some clarification as we continue the debate. Is there someone who wishes to speak for it? Yellow card in the back, the one that was seated. I saw the yellow card of the person seated. That's what the rules say but we really can't see you back there. Mike 8.

LUCILLE VANZANT (Oklahoma): Thank you, Bishop Fritz because many of the bishops have not seen in the back, but thank you for your foresightedness.

BISHOP MUTTI: State your name. I know it but not everybody does.

VANZANT: I rise to speak for this center because too long have we put a dollar sign on people. We have interpreters that are interpreting to maybe only three people, but they are God's children, just like these 9,000, if that's all it is. And we have more than that in Oklahoma. They are God's people and we can't put a price on ministering to God's people. And I just want to thank the conference for remembering that we have brothers and sisters that don't equal the number of the majority. But thank God you're with us! Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you. A speech in favor. We've had one in favor and one against. Does anyone else wish to speak? Any further word? Mr. William—hold on a minute, I see a green card here at mike 4. You wish to speak against? Come and state your position.

PHYLLIS S. FERGUSON (Pacific Northwest): Earlier in this conference we did a very emotional (for me, that is) act of repentance for our sins against slavery. I'm not a very emotional person and those who know me, I don't cry very easily. But I cried that evening, because while we were repenting for slavery, I was also thinking of what we have done for the indigenous people of America and for other immigrants who came early in the life of this country. A million dollars for 9,000 people is not very much, especially when those of you, and perhaps I would include myself, have so much. And as a previous speaker, Lucille, said "If we're going to be in ministry to people who need for us to minister with them, then we need to put our money where our mouth is."

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, a speech in favor. We can take one opposed if someone wishes to speak in opposition. If not, then we'll move to the question. Sam Wynn, do you wish to speak?

WYNN: Thank you, Bishop. I would like to clarify some statistical data in reference to numbers. I would like to point out that in 1982 there were 15,000 Native American persons in The United Methodist Church. In 2000 there are over 19,000. In 1982 there were five persons who were in seminary. Today we have over 40. In 1982 there were 160 ministries. Today we have over 200. In 1982 there were less than 30 persons ordained as elders in The United Methodist Church. Today, there are over 60. And the list can go on. I would say to this conference that this center is making a difference. People's lives are being transformed and, unless my statistics are wrong, we have more Native American persons in The United Methodist Church than any other Protestant church in the U.S.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, thank you. I think you're ready to vote. It's Calendar Item 1379. If you pass this, it'll be referred automatically for financial consideration. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 816; No, 109] And you have approved. Now the chair wants to renege on the point of order awhile ago. Is that what you were gonna do also? You remember at the beginning of this session the coordinator of the calendar lifted items from consideration from the Consent Calendar. One of those was Calendar Item 1194. Point of order was raised saying it was on the Consent Calendar. In fact, we had removed it at the beginning of this session, so I think it can be put forward to the conference at this time. Mr. Soliz, do you want to do that at this time? Do you want to do it? I'm saying if you want to put 1194 before us. That's the one that we started to have Mr. Soliz present and then there was a point of order and I erred on that.

Uniting Date Debated

HARMAN: Okay. All right, it is Calendar Item 1194, p. 2093, Petition 30088 found on p. 714 of the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends nonconcurrency.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, it's properly before you then. Do you wish to discuss it? Yellow card, come to mike 4. It's green, isn't it?

ARDITH ALLREAD (California-Nevada): Earlier in the conference we had asked presenters to give us a brief statement for their rationale. It doesn't have to be a speech, but a statement would, I think, help us to know how to vote.

BISHOP MUTTI: One of the things that's confusing for us right now because part of that motion was also not to do that if there were a certain number of persons. But if you'd like to have it perhaps we could have the committee person address it. Do you want to give us a brief word on that Christine?

HARMAN: The rationale was that it would keep us closest to the day of uniting and that was the date that was referred to.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, one of you with the green card. Mike 4.

JOSHUA A. ELLIOTT (West Ohio): Perhaps I'm still confused on the issue, but from my understanding it was if there were ten votes against anything, or ten votes or less, then it was left on the consent calendar and not off, which would mean we would not have to deal with this at this time.

BISHOP MUTTI: As we explained earlier it was the time factor that caused us to have to lift that today. I think we can deal with this pretty quickly. Probably faster than we can debate whether or not it should be on the consent calendar. So why don't we let us put the question and make the decision. Anybody wish to speak for or against changing the date. In the back, come to mike 7.

(Pause)

RILEY CASE (North Indiana): I personally would like to mark that experience which initially launched us as a movement May 24 and I would prefer that really over against what I would call a union date. So I would like to support nonconcurrency and rather the petition as it originally was.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you. A speech against the recommendation of the committee. Down here in front. Mike 2.

(Pause)

NANCY L. DENARDO (Western Pennsylvania): I sat in this subsection and we debated many different dates, but we came back to the date in April based on the wording in our *Book of Discipline* in Section 268, Heritage Sunday, and it is that, "Heritage Sunday shall be

observed on April 23, the day of 1968, when The United Methodist Church was created by the union of The Evangelical United Brethren Church and The Methodist Church." And the reason being, we did not want to particularly lift up the May date and just Wesleyan tradition because there are so many heritages of our church, including our black churches, that we felt could be encompassed by staying with the date in April.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. In support of the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrency, if anyone else wishes to speak, we've had one for and one against. All right, I think you're ready to vote. The recommendation is nonconcurrency. You push one if you wish to support the committee, two if you do not. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 754; No, 135] And you've supported the committee's recommendation.

HARMON: That concludes our presentation this afternoon.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. If the committee members will just hold here, maybe take a seat. This is going to take a little while, I think. We've, uh, this has been pretty easy. It's going to get more complicated now because we've got a report from the Judicial Council as you requested. It's got several implications to it. One of which came back and was considered by the committee, I think, and it's the chair's understanding that Mr. Douglas would be recognized now to submit a motion for reconsideration. *(Pause)* You want to read the ruling first? All right. Well, we were trying to decide what's the best way to do this and we don't want to confuse you. The secretary would read the ruling from Judicial Council and maybe Ms. Marshall identify the petition that went to the Judicial Council so that we'll know which one we're responding to.

*Judicial Council Rules
"No Vacancy" on Council*

CAROLYN MARSHALL: This is Judicial Council decision No. 888. It is the request from the General Conference for a declaratory decision on the meaning, application and effect of the adoption of Petition 31789 as it relates to the election of a person to the Judicial Council to fill the remaining four years of an existing eight-year term. The conclusion to which the Judicial Council came is this. The General Conference by its own action in the adoption of Peti-

tion 31789 GJ 2602D has negated the election of the person to fill the remaining four years of the eight-year term.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the chair understands the ruling, then the council has declared that the vacancy was not there and we have not, uh, we've voted improperly. Then we need to see what we do next and we're going to try to do that with this motion from Mr. Douglas.

WILLARD H. DOUGLAS (Virginia): Bishop Mutti and members of the General Conference. I voted in the affirmative on Calendar Item 623 and I will call your attention to page 1991 of the DCA. The corresponding text is found in the *Advance DCA* on page 733. This is a motion for reconsideration. If I get a second, Bishop, I would like to speak to it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, I hear a second. You may speak.

*Date Legislation Becomes Effective
Is Questioned*

DOUGLAS: On May 9, this year, which was yesterday, the General Conference adopted that Calendar Item 623 which is on page 1991. This came from the General and Judicial Administrative Legislative Committee which removed the mandatory retirement age. The language in the original petition contains the language that the petition shall become effective upon adoption. But as you can notice, there is no such language on page 733 of the *Advance DCA* and so, therefore, we only have one copy in our committee and the item of the effective date was not given to the subcommittee or the subcommittee did not deal with it, nor was it discussed in the plenary of the legislative committee. And so, we feel that it would be proper for us to reconsider that matter and then I would have a couple of other motions which would rescind it and to refer it back to the Judicial. General and Judicial Administrative Committee to determine what should be the effective date, whether it's immediate or whether it would apply next year.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, Mr. Douglas did vote for it, it's properly made. Is there a second for reconsideration? All right. It is debatable. Let's hear what the house has to say. Question? All right, where are you? Yes? Green card, go to mike 4.

VANCE SUMMERS (West Ohio): There was a statement printed on the petition submitted to General Confer-

ence, not in the DCA but on the petition submitted. Was it on the petition form?

BISHOP MUTTI: You want to answer?

DOUGLAS: It was stated in the petition that came to us at the subcommittee level, but it was not reported, and so we did not deal with it. There was—

SUMMERS: Let, let me understand. It was on the petition, but you failed to see it and to read it.

DOUGLAS: Well, as I indicated, I couldn't, I don't remember seeing it.

SUMMERS: But it was printed on the petition? My question is, was it on the page?

DOUGLAS: I have not seen the—

SUMMERS: Was it on the page, Judge?

DOUGLAS: If I may answer. I have not seen the original petition since this matter came up. I've seen a copy of it, and it is printed on the copy. But at the time of the work of the subcommittee, I can't say whether it was there or not.

SUMMERS: My understanding, Mr. Chairperson, is that the petition gives you the full—the page will give you the full text of the, of the—that is being submitted. And that, therefore, it should have been there. It may have been an oversight, and I, I understand how that can happen because we often do not see. I don't know if an oversight qualifies for us to re—to consider reconsideration.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Thank you. Pink card, mike 4.

JANET ELLINGER (Wisconsin): I support the request for this to be reconsidered. If that information had been clear, I would have voted differently. I, I think it needs to be before us so that we know clearly the effective date that that would come into action. Our conference rules otherwise state that our action comes into effect on January 1 the following year. We have had an election. We have carried these folks up before us and celebrated their ministry and gifts before us that they will bring to the Judicial Council and I think this is inexcusable.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, mike 1. That one in support of referral.

Judicial Council Election Threatened

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): The question and answer a few moments ago about whether the language was on

the page sort of reminded me of the definition of what *is* is.

(Laughter)

Apparently, it was on the page that the committee had and approved and that the conference has adopted. Now what really concerns me about this is that it appears now that since there has been an election and since there's a member of the Judicial Council who would also be affected in terms of tenure, as I understand it, it looks to me like there's now some after-the-fact possibility of manipulation or second-guessing about this. And it seems to me that we should not after the fact undertake to change the action of the conference. And I would support the vote against reconsideration. Understand that there was an election made when we thought there was a position. But if that, if we reconsider now what we're talking about doing, is also removing a person from the Judicial Council. And so there's a severe, a severe action either way we go. And rather than try now, after the fact to decide it, it seems to me we should go and oppose reconsideration, since we in good faith already adopted it without giving consideration to any political context of who would win or who would not win.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Against reconsideration. Let's come back here to the green card.

ELAINE W. T. STANOVSKY (Pacific Northwest): I'm not nearly as interested in what was on the page as I am in whether or not the delegates knew what they were voting at the time that we voted. I was a member of the committee, the legislative committee, that acted upon this. The legislative committee was not aware in our deliberations that this special time provision was in this petition. The legislative committee has asked for reconsideration to confirm whether or not the delegates of the General Conference intended the action that was on the page. I support reconsideration.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Thank you. Someone wish to speak against reconsideration? Let's come over here.

RHETT JACKSON (South Carolina): Bishop, we're a little confused. If we do not reconsider, who will serve on the Judicial Council?

BISHOP MUTTI: The position is not vacant, if I understand the, the ruling of the Judicial Council.

JACKSON: So the person—

BISHOP MUTTI: And we would have to proceed to elect alternates.

JACKSON: So that would mean the person that was already on it would be the—

BISHOP MUTTI: That's what the chair understands.

JACKSON: Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, you wish to speak for it? OK, mike 4.

MAC BRANTLEY (North Georgia): I think the question, sir, is at the time the vote was taken, what was in effect? When the vote was taken for the election, what did—were we going by what's in the *Discipline* now? Was the action that was taken *later*? Was it before or after the election?

BISHOP MUTTI: Do you want to speak to that, Willard?

DOUGLAS: Yes. The vote for the 623, Calendar Item 623 was taken after the members had, the persons had been elected to the Judicial Council.

BRANTLEY: So that when the elections were held, it was in order according to what the *Discipline* states. Is that correct?

DOUGLAS: That is correct. And that was the instruction to the, to the General Conference that there were two vacancies for a full eight-year terms and one for a four-year term. And we voted 5 to 623.

BRANTLEY: Then, it would appear to me that the *Discipline* would guide us in this and lead us to say that the ballot that was taken was taken in good order and should be affirmed by the General Conference.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we've had two for reconsideration, one against. Anyone else wish to speak here?

DOUGLAS: Bishop?

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, Mr. Douglas?

DOUGLAS: I would like to add that when we talk about a paper, we're talking about the original petition, which is not available to the entire membership. We only have one petition that has to be circulated. And I believe that the best information for the delegates to understand what they're voting on is what was sent to you in the *Advance DCA*. And so when you look there you have no indication that the legislation was to become effective immediately. And so, in fairness to all, I think that we ought to get the sense of the legislative committee so that

we can come back and let you know whether it is effective immediately or whether—how we should proceed.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, green card. Mike 3, I'm sorry.

*Discipline Consulted
About Effective Date*

FLO S. MARTIN (South Georgia): As I understand, when we look at a petition that's before us in the *Advance DCA*, and I'm referring to p. 733 and looking at the Petition No. 31789, my understanding is that it says to amend the seventh sentence, ¶2602, which means that then I take my *Discipline* and I look at my *Discipline* and ¶2602 the seventh sentence has been amended. But if I continue to read that paragraph, I turn the page in my *Discipline* and I find that the last sentence of that says this paragraph shall become effective immediately upon passage by the General Conference. So my understanding is that we were voting on that one sentence only and that there were no other petitions related to that entire paragraph without election. Is that correct?

BISHOP MUTTI: I don't know.

(Laughter)

Well, I think it might be a good time for a recess, and we'll get our heads together here and see if we can answer your questions. Let's take a 10-minute recess.

(Music)

All right. Sisters and brothers, I know ten minutes isn't very long, but we want to try to get some decisions made today. Rev. Cynthia Wilson while we listen to music. Just let the music bring us back in order.

(Music)

Well, thank you for being a singing conference. Gave us a chance to get our heads together and, and do a little further clarification. I'm not sure I'm any wiser than I was before.

(Laughter)

We've been debating the motion for reconsideration, and we've had a couple of speeches—one for and one against. We've tried to retrace the, the sequence of events. What we . . . We believe this is the correct sequence. [Could, could you let me finish this before you seek the floor? And let's invite all the delegates to be seated and in order.] We've tried to retrace the se-

quence. The election of a second person, through an eight-year term of a Judicial Council took place on Monday evening. After that, you took action to change the qualifiers under consideration for eliminating ageism. You voted to take out the 70 restriction, but the election had already taken place. There's no reason, no wonder then that someone wondered about the validity of this and asked for declaratory decision. It went and the Judicial Council has issued their declaratory decision. We do think it would be helpful for you to hear the reading of the entire declaratory decision so that you'll know the thinking of the Judicial Council. So I'm going to ask the secretary to do that now.

Summary of Referral to Judicial Council and Path of Legislation

CAROLYN MARSHALL: [Quotes, in full, memorandum #888, p. 2210 DCA] **this is the request from General Conference for A Declaratory Decision on the Meaning, Application, and Effect of the Adoption of Petition 31789 as it relates to the election of a person for the Judicial Council to Fill the Remaining Four Years of an Existing Eight-Year Term.**

In 1996, a person was dully elected to an 8-year term on the Judicial Council. This person would have been required to step down at the close of the 2000 General Conference pursuant to ¶2602 of the 1996 *Discipline*, which states in pertinent part:

“. . . a member of the council whose seventieth birthday precedes the first day of the regular session of a General Conference shall be released at the close of that General Conference from membership and responsibility in the council, regardless of the date of expiration of office.”

On May 5, 2000, the General and Judicial Administration Legislative Committee adopted Petition 31789-GJ-2602-D, without amendment. On Tuesday, May 9, 2000, the General Conference adopted Petition 31789-GJ-2602-D, without amendment. The petition reads in full:

“Amend ¶2602 by deleting the phrase in the first paragraph of this Paragraph with [which] reads ‘*provided however, that a member of the council whose seventieth birthday precedes the first day of the regular session of the General Conference shall be released at the close of that General Conference from membership*

or responsibility in the council regardless of the date of expiration of office.

“This legislation becomes effective upon adoption.”

On Monday, May 8, 2000, General Conference held an election for a person to fill the remaining four years of this eight-year term. That person's term was to begin at the close of the 2000 General Conference. (See ¶2605.)

The General Conference referred this matter to the Judicial Council for declaratory decision on the meaning, application, and affect of the adoption of Petition 31789 as it relates to the election of a person to the Judicial Council to fill the remaining four years of an existing eight-year term. The Judicial Council has jurisdiction under ¶2616.

Since the term of the newly elected Judicial Council member does not begin until the close of the 2000 General Conference, and since the impediment of the Junior, Judicial Council member in office was removed by the legislative action of the General Conference, there is now no vacancy for the newly-elected Judicial Council member to fill.

Therefore, the General Conference, by its own action, has negated the election of the person to fill the remaining four years of the eight-year term.

John G. Cory recused himself and did not participate in any of the proceedings related to this decision.

[End of Reading of Memorandum] And then the digest which was shared previously.

[Digest] The General Conference, by its own action, in the adoption of Petition 31789-GJ-2602-D has negated the election of the person to fill the remaining four years of the eight-year term. [End of Digest]

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, now you hear the entire decision. One choice we have is to just live with that, and we would proceed, then, to elect remaining persons from the clergy side, in order. The other question that's been put before you as a possibility is to reconsider this, send it back to the committee, let them review the entire process and report to you at a later time, where we could do some further thinking about this. Those seem to be the choices we have. What's before you now, then, is the motion to reconsider. And I see yellow cards in the back. Let's go to the one on the right side, on my right. No, further back. Yes.

JOHN SCHOL (Eastern Pennsylvania): My question is, since the member that was affected did not participate, were any of the alternates asked to participate to fill his place?

BISHOP MUTTI: Chair can't answer that question.

SCHOL: Is there anybody who can answer it?

BISHOP MUTTI: I suspect that we don't query the Judicial Council in this setting. All right, I see—let's come over here to the orange card, and then we'll come back to the yellow section. We've got a reconsideration motion before us, if we could speak to that, maybe we could put the question here pretty soon and make a decision. Mike 8.

BEN R. ALFORD (Tennessee): Friends, I think it's clear that the intent of the conference was to remove a limiting factor, and to work for inclusiveness and justice. And I'm concerned that if we vote to reconsider, we may put that in question. So, I hope we won't.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, a speech against. Let's come back over here, the yellow card in the middle. Mike 6.

DAVID L. RICHARDSON (California-Pacific): I wanted to ask a question before I make my speech. Are we actually debating the reconsideration at this point?

BISHOP MUTTI: That's what's before you.

RICHARDSON: Okay, I would speak in favor of the considera—of this motion to reconsider, because when I voted, I did not see on page 733 the part about this taking place immediately. I was operating by what I saw, and I felt that was not—that's not in good faith for me say that that should stand.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, thank you. Now, we've had three speeches in favor. I can take one more against reconsideration, and then we're gonna put the question. Let's go to the green card here, I think yours has been up for a while; come to mike 4. And this has to be against reconsideration.

DONALD R. AVERY (Louisiana): I rise to speak against the motion to reconsider. I am aware of the fact that when a petition is filed the committee has the responsibility of working with the original petition. And it is the original petition that governs and controls, and not so much the reproduced material that is contained in the DCA. At this

point, we do not have any reasonable option, other than to live with the mistakes that we have already made and then to try to do everything that we can to be sure that we move forward and to rectify those mistakes. For us to reconsider, to reopen the question, is going to lead us into something that could end up being very divisive, being very political, and will take away from the entire spirit of what we have been trying to accomplish. I therefore speak against reconsideration.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we've had three for and three against, and we're ready to consider the question now, then. I can only take questions. Yes, over here? Mike 3.

Impact of Reconsideration on Judicial Council Alternate Elections Questioned

JACKSON: Bishop, if this conference votes not to reconsider, will the person affected, who we elected, become the first alternate?

BISHOP MUTTI: No, we will have to re-vote on alternates.

JACKSON: So, we could just keep in mind what happened, then?

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes. We'll list the names of all those nominees. And we'll outline the process for voting when you decide this matter.

JACKSON: Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, what's your point of order? Mike 2, I'm sorry.

JACK W. PLOWMAN (Western Pennsylvania): Perhaps I was sleeping or something, or maybe like Al Gore, I had too much iced tea and was out of the room, but I didn't hear whether or not the proponent of the motion to reconsider voted in favor of it originally.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, he did.

PLOWMAN: Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, I have questions back—orange, back in section D. Come to mike 7. We'll try to answer all your questions, and then we want to take the vote.

THOMAS W. FLINN, JR. (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, did I understand you correctly when you said that if we vote for reconsideration, that this must go back to the committee for their consideration before it comes back to the floor for our consideration?

BISHOP MUTTI: My understanding from Mr. Douglas is that if we reconsider, then he wanted the privilege of putting that motion for referral back to

the committee. You haven't voted that, and we haven't debated that yet.

PLOWMAN: Is that in the rules?

BISHOP MUTTI: It's not in the—it's not before us now, only the reconsideration is.

PLOWMAN: Okay, thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes, one of the yellow cards? Let's take those of you in front. Yes ma'am. Come to mike 6.

Difference Between DCA Petition and Original Petition Is Questioned

BETH CAPEN (New York): Thank you Bishop. It was my understanding from the work in our legislative committee that there is a difference between that which is in the DCA, and that which is on the petitions that we are working with, the actual original petition. If we want to insert the language from the original petition, we must advise the body, and if we fail to advise the body, then it is only that which they have before them that is actually passed, and I would like some clarification on that.

BISHOP MUTTI: I think you're correct. What we have before us is what you passed. And, of course, the declaratory decision said, that's what you have to live with. All right, a green card. Mike 2.

CHARLES L. JOHNSON (South Carolina): I have a question. If we fail to reconsider the action, what happens to the person who is presently seated on the Judicial council?

BISHOP MUTTI: He still remains. The office is not vacant. All Right! Another question. Come here, I see you. We will take all of them, no not yet! Mike 6.

PATRICIA E. FARRIS (California-Pacific): Bishop, I thought that a moment ago in response to Beth's question you said that we voted on what was before us? I got new glasses before I came to the General Conference. Maybe it is written in invisible ink, but the language about the effective date which was read earlier by the secretary as part of the Judicial Council's decision is not, and was never, printed and before this body.

BISHOP MUTTI: That would be one reason for reconsidering I guess. All right, let's see. All right, in the middle, Yellow Card, No, on back here in the red shirt.

TYSON FERGUSON (Detroit): I would like to make a substitute motion to postpone indefinitely, and if I get a second I will speak to it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, I think you complicate the process an awful lot if you try that. Why don't we see if we can dispose of this notion for reconsideration. Yes, come to mike 4.

THOMAS O. GARNHART (Wisconsin): I have a question. If you can, I want help in knowing where we find the relevant procedural rules that establish what is very weird at best in what appears to be a procedure where the whole body can legally vote on something and end up with a totally different decision than they believe they were making, because of something that was written in a single piece of paper that no one had access to and maybe was forgotten or maybe sometimes someone wanted to hide. I want to know where these rules can be found so that we can amend them; to make them so that we can talk about what we need to talk about together and not do all of this fussing around to try to out maneuver each other and snow each other under with parliamentary procedures, so that we are not making decisions together; we are power playing each other.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, there's orders and rules for the conference and it tells you how to present the petitions and how the legislative committee will process those as part of the question that the reason for the motion to reconsider. Now, I hope we don't have to take all of these questions. We will take some of them, down here. As you can see we don't have a lot of light to shed on the question and you may have all ready made up your mind how you are going to vote anyway. All right! Mike 4.

(UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER): Bishop as I understand it the paragraph that we voted on did not need to have printed the section we are concerned. That is in the *Book of Discipline*, paragraph 2602. It's the last sentence. Isn't the concern already . . .

BISHOP MUTTI: Just a moment, a point of order is recognizable. You want to go to the same mike?

(SECOND UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER): It's my understanding, bishop, that you had closed debate. This is part of that debate.

BISHOP MUTTI: Well, you have a good point. A lot of the questions do

sound like debate. We will recognize questions only. Now [You have all ready spoken, I need to recognize somebody else] back here in the orange. mike 8.

JERRY H. MAYO (Tennessee): I am a little confused. Was the information about the expiration date in any petition, or was it just in *The Book of Discipline* in the paragraph just quoted?

BISHOP MUTTI: Nobody seems to have that answer for sure. A different decision about that in several minds of the conference members. At least we know what the judicial council had before them.

MAYO: Did they have the language in the petition before we ordered it?

BISHOP MUTTI: Let me ask the secretary from the declaratory decision; was it there?

MARSHALL: May I clarify that for which you are requesting response?

MAYO: Did the judicial council have a petition before them with the expiration date or was it only in *The Book of Discipline*? Is there a petition anywhere that has the expiration date on or in the beginning date or is it simply a disciplinary matter?

Judicial Council Used Original Petition to Reach Decision

MARSHALL: The Judicial Council requested and received a copy of the original petition, which does have—I would be glad to read it to you: “Amend paragraph 2602, by deleting the phrase in the first paragraph which reads, ‘provided however that a member of the council whose 70th birthday precedes the first day of the regular session of the General Conference shall be released at the close of that conference from membership or responsibility in the council regardless of the date of expiration of office.’”

This additional line was in the petition (but) is not in the *Advance DCA*, “this legislation becomes effective upon adoption” and then there’s three and a half lines of rationale.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. It seems to the chair that we’ve got choices: If you want to accept the ruling of the declaratory decision of the Judicial Council, you would vote against reconsideration. If you want to reconsider and try to go some other way with this, you would vote in favor of the reconsideration. So I would like to move ahead

with this as quickly as we may. But I see a yellow card way in the back. Yes no. 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE, JR. (Detroit): It seems to me—I rise to request a ruling from the chair on the constitutionality of whether the ruling of the Judicial Council which is now before us was based on what this General Conference actually acted upon.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the chair would suggest that you just direct that question to the Judicial Council. I can’t speak for the Judicial Council. All Right, back here, pink card, one more question. Mike 5.

AL W. GWINN (Kentucky): Bishop, I rise to call for the question that is before us.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the motion for previous question is before you it takes two thirds to support the move toward the vote. There is no debate if you support the previous question, press one, if not press two, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 820; No, 112] And you have ordered the previous question we do need to give the presenter of the motion one last statement.

Yes, Mike 1.

WERLEIN: Bishop, the point of order is that Rule 37 provides for the chairman to give the last statement when making a committee report. We understand the chairman’s position, of course, in any event; but he has not given a report for a committee. He spoke as an individual in this instance saying that he had voted with the majority before and inasmuch as this is not a committee report, I do not believe he is entitled to have yet another speech.

Reconsideration of Judicial Council Election Is Rejected

BISHOP MUTTI: I believe your point is well taken. Let’s move ahead to the vote then. The motion before you is for reconsideration. You press one if you favor reconsideration, two if you do not. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 379; No, 551] All right. The motion to reconsider fails. The chair’s understanding then is that we have a declaratory decision from the Judicial Council. The office is not vacant. We will take subsequent votes then on the clergy ballot for Judicial Council alternates. We’re not going to do that right now. We are going to see if they’re prepared to do the vote on the remainder of the lay persons, lay alternates. Can we do

that? Yes? Pink card, mike, coming to one. (Pause)

AUSTIN FREDERICK JR. (Southwest Texas): Bishop Mutti, I move that no matter the cause of the mathematical miscalculations in the election of the Judicial Council members, that those previously seated Judicial Council members be affirmed as announced.

BISHOP MUTTI: I do have a word on that. Would you like to hear that before we put your motion, Austin?

FREDERICK: Not really, sir.

BISHOP MUTTI: Oh, all right. (Laughter) Is there a second? All right. Motion’s before you if you wish to speak to it.

FREDERICK: The reason that I didn’t want to hear that before I made the motion was that I would ask that this General Conference go ahead and affirm those, affirm its intent, which I believe was done in good faith and in good order, so that if we do hear, that the miscalculation, that we will not have to go back and go through the process which we have just done for the last 45 minutes.

BISHOP MUTTI: That’s before you. If you understand the motion. Someone wish to speak against it? Mike 4.

BRANTLEY: I move we table this action until we have heard from your report.

BISHOP MUTTI: You mean the report about the computer program?

BRANTLEY: Yes.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the table motion is in order, I think. How do we do this then? (Laughter) Well, those counseling may suggest that we might be able to avoid the table motion if the conference heard the report and that might shed some light. I told you this is going to be messy, didn’t I? We knew it would. Why don’t we just, why don’t we just hear that report so you know the considerations that the programmers have and then we wouldn’t have to come back to that perhaps.

Voting System Explained and Defended

MARSHALL: This is a statement which was given to me by Jay Vorhees, whom you have met as our General Conference Producer. This was written very, very early this morning and it will reflect this. (Laughter) “Brothers and sisters of the General Conference, we have been working through the night to clarify your questions regarding the

voting tally for the Judicial Council elections. Let me say at the outset that this is the same system that we have used in the past two general conferences. This system is used by The Evangelical Lutheran Church and many corporations. The system has worked well for us in the past. The discrepancies that were raised are based on the fact in how the system determines invalid ballots. For this system only ballots that contain duplicate votes are considered to be invalid. This means that for a three-vote ballot a person can vote only once or twice and still maintain a valid ballot. This vote by abstention lowers the total number of votes needed for election. The system is, in fact, correctly tabulating the results based on this criteria. I have reviewed the rules of the General Conference and have found no specific rules related to the definition of an invalid ballot. As such, after conferring with other staff, I believe that the current system is accurate and within the rules of the General Conference. I recognize that many annual conferences use a different procedure from this and we will work toward bringing any future systems in compliance with standard annual conference procedures. Signed, Jay Vorhees, General Conference Producer."

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. I think in fairness to the one who wanted to put the table motion to us, do you still wish to do that? No, all right. Come over here. Mike 1.

SUELLA BARTO (Central Pennsylvania): I was wondering if it would be possible, as we take this vote, to do it one at a time, take the simple majority, have that person be elected, and—

BISHOP MUTTI: Okay, what we have before us right now is Austin Frederick's motion. You want to hold that question until, until we move into the voting procedures? You understand that the Frederick motion is before us, wanting us to affirm the work that we've done. You need it read again? All right, let's vote when the light comes on. [Yes, 620; No, 124]

Can't hear you. Come to the mike. I don't see anyone moving to a the mike. We're going to move ahead. All right, mike 4.

JOHN D. PETERSON (West Ohio): There were several in this section right here, Section B, that wanted to have the motion repeated so that we could know what we are voting on.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. I'll have the secretary to read the motion. I don't know if it's come up here yet.

MARSHALL: Yes, I have it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Would you read the motion please.

MARSHALL: "Move that no matter the cause of the mathematical miscalculations in the election of Judicial Council members, those previously seated Judicial Council members be affirmed as announced."

Vote to Elect

Judicial Council Lay Member Proceeds

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, that's the motion that's before you. Let's move to the vote now. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 874; No, 139] All right, you've affirmed Austin Frederick's motion and that saves us a little time.

Now is it possible for us to do a, the vote on the lay persons yet we need to elect? Oh, I see we have names up there. It's my understanding those four in red have been elected. Let me clarify how many more that we need to elect then. Two more. We need to elect two persons further, and our procedure has been to vote for one person, then to seek a second vote for the second person. Do you need to have the names read, those of you in the back? No? Yes? Number 2-Lonnie D. Brooks; 3-Evelyn "Lynn" Catterson; 4-James Lamark Cox, Sr.; 7-Daniel F. Evans Jr.; 8-Oscar R. Ferrer; 9-Theophilous Gambe; 12-Edward H. Hill; 15-Steven T. Lett; 16-Marc D. Lowd; 17-Ann Alberty Saunkeah; 18-William L. (Ted) Todd Jr.; 19-William White; 20-W. Clark Williams, Jr..

Our voting procedure will be as it has been. Yes? You have a question at mike 2.

DAVID M. WILSON (Oklahoma Indian Missionary): May we see the last results that we took last night before those?

BISHOP MUTTI: Let's see if we have that. Is that available? On the last vote? Be patient. As Bishop Craig reminded us, maybe this is a good time for deep breaths. Here it is. All right, the last ballot. All right, if we can go back to the other screen then after you've have had a chance to look at these. These have already been elected here. All right, let's have the screen and you press the number of one person. We'll take two votes here. Press the number of 1. Please vote when the light appears. All right, we're

ready to do the second procedure. You press the number of one person different from the one you just voted for. Please vote when the light appears. All right, thank you very much.

It's 5:05. We have adjourned recess time at 5:30. We'll need time for some announcements. The chairperson of the Local Church Committee wanted the privilege of presenting some petitions this afternoon while I was in the chair. Would you allow Tyrone Gordon to present some petitions at this time? We'll take a few in the next 10 minutes, if that's all right. All right, while Doctor Gordon's coming, let's—we have a request from GCFA. Stan Sager, he might be prepared to speak to this. GCFA requested at this noon meeting that two items be placed before the body this afternoon. They're the first two on the list attached, and we need Financial Administration to come and stand if we do need to refer items to GCFA as quickly as possible I think. So maybe we would do that if we have time, we'll do Local Church. Let me ask Stan Sager and the committee to come and then Tyrone Gordon and Local Church. Yes, you have a question?

WILLIAM A. HINES (West Ohio): I'd like to ask the question, sir. A delegate from Georgia asked the Judicial Council to make a declaratory decision on whether the *Discipline* was binding on us all or we were to consider some other means. When can we expect this decision, and could you give us a time, please?

BISHOP MUTTI: I cannot. That's a matter for the Calendar Committee.

HINES: Would the Calendar Committee be willing to do this?

BISHOP MUTTI: I'm not sure if the Council has given us a decision yet or not. So you may want to talk to the Calendar Committee to see if that's come. They may be able to help you, they may not. Before we adjourn here, we hope, Friday night. (Laughter) Yes, green card? Mike 4.

J. ERIC MCKINNEY (Central Texas): I know you have business for this session. I wish to make a motion before adjournment because it requests action prior to our evening session.

BISHOP MUTTI: Well, let's see what we can do with Financial Administration, and then you ask for the floor again.

MCKINNEY: Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes. Mike 1.

DARLENE DAWES (Central Pennsylvania): I'm a first-timer, Bishop, and I was wondering if someone could help me. Is there any place at all in the DCA where those that we have already elected are listed in a complete form? That would be very helpful, and I can't seem to find it.

BISHOP MUTTI: Laypersons?

DAWES: Yes. Well, the whole list. Whatever we've done that's complete.

BISHOP MUTTI: We may be able to show you the results here in a little bit, of the ballots you just took, and then we may be able to see the whole list.

DAWES: The whole—oh, thank you very much.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. All right, let me turn to Stan Sager.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): We have two matters that need to be brought before us this afternoon, Bishop Mutti. One appears on page 2090 of the DCA, Calendar Item 1168; in the *Advance DCA*, it is at page 352, Petition No. 30711. This is a pay-equity report from the General Council on Finance and Administration, and, matters from the General Council on Finance and Administration. Our report is directly to the body, and Bishop Ott, who chairs the appropriate committee, is here to present that report.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, Bishop Ott?

Report on Pay Equity from GCFA

BISHOP DONALD A. OTT (Michigan Area): Conference, I have a three-minute statement presenting this Report No. 12. The eight pages of the report contain a three-paragraph summary at the beginning, and the report ends with proposed resolutions. Again, it is in *Advance DCA* Volume 1, Section 1, page 352 and following. I'll highlight the issue and the GCFA position.

The pay-equity report is a result of a 1988 General Conference directive to GCFA to evaluate wage structures and practices and make such assessment a regular part of monitoring. The task was not a simple one. The report in Volume 1 lists the complications which have led to this delayed reporting. The task is basically unable to be accomplished due to a lack of uniformity in systems and processes and incomplete existing information. GCFA wants the General Conference to know, as the written report states, that this delaying situation is not a result of a lack of com-

mitment by the agencies to pay equity. Self-analysis and change have been embraced by leaders; and GCFA applauds them for that.

Our biblical and belief basis for this pay-equity concern is reflected in one of the fundamental principles of the household of God as noted in Leviticus 25: "You shall not cheat one another." Additionally, in Paragraph 66, our Social Principles declare to ourselves and the world that: "The rights and privileges a society bestows upon or withholds from those who comprise it indicate the relative esteem in which that society holds particular persons and groups of persons." Report 12 on pay-equity enumerates the task that must be carried out if this issue is to be addressed in a comprehensive fashion. To do otherwise would be to exclude some persons from consideration and to produce a product with conclusions and recommendations which would not be acceptable for implementation.

The cost of this proposed response is not small. The figures are listed in the report on page 356 and 357. The amount required is not within the budget which has been presented to the General Conference. GCFA directors are clear that this study cannot be accomplished, implemented, and sustained within current staffing and funding.

The benefits of assuring pay equity are numerous and significant. They are listed, eight in number, on page 356. Those benefits include a wide range of matters from implementing our biblical values, to providing objective and uniform performance evaluations, to protecting the legal interests of the church. If you pass this report and resolutions, you'll assure the ability of your fiscal and administrative agency to fulfill the mandate you've given to assess and monitor equal employment opportunity.

Thank you very much.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you, Bishop Ott. We've heard this statement on behalf of the council, and we turn back to Stan Sager.

SAGER: Bishop Mutti, the Committee on Financial Administration has concurred with the report, voting 74 in favor, 2 against.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, it's before you, with a recommendation of concurrence from the committee.

Anyone wishing to speak? This concurrence would be for referral only. I take it you're ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. (Pause) All right that's carried [Yes, 749; No, 137] and you have a second item.

SAGER: Second item is on p. 2154 of the DCA. It is Calendar Item 1356 in the *Advance DCA*, it appears at p. 364 as petition 30715. This also is a report from GCFA which you heard within the last couple of days. The Connectional Ministries Funding Task Force, and to present that on behalf of GCFA is Tracy Merrick, who is not a delegate, whom I understand has been given permission to speak.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we grant him permission to speak. I hear no objection.

TRACY R. MERRICK: (Member, GCFA) Thank you. Members of the General Conference. We did give our report yesterday. As Stan indicated, this report is on pp. 364 to 386. I do want to remind you of an item; that is the GCFA has met and has indicated that they will accept the change that is recommended by the legislative committee that is outlined, which effects information on p. 374 and is indicated in the committee report. We, therefore, are ready to put that before you.

SAGER: Bishop there was a minority report filed. I believe that Jim Branscome is going to present the minority report and I assume that is in order at this time.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right.

Minority Report on Connectional Ministries Funding Task Force

JAMES L. BRANSCOME (Virginia): The purpose of my Minority Report is to leave the World Service and Conference Benevolences as one apportionment. In the report, p.376, I guess 7, paragraph B3 it states that the recommendation would "Remove the disciplinary requirement that World Service and Conference Benevolences be linked at the annual conference level." Should I speak to that now? That is offered as an amendment to the report.

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes. Why don't you speak?

BRANSCOME: I should speak to it now, okay. I have a great concern that separation, or disconnecting, this apportionment will have a negative affect on the percentage of the World Service collection. It's been my experience, in

about 18 years as the treasurer of the Virginia Conference, that churches tend to pay first that which is closest home. As an example, over the last few years the Virginia Conference has paid conference apportionments at about 4 percent higher rate than General Conference apportionments. I have a real concern that if we do this, that as churches have the opportunity to have a choice between World Service and Conference Benevolences, they will choose Conference Benevolences first. And I quote from the GCFA report, but I think it may be their report 1. But anyway on p. 326, it states "The World Service Fund is the heart of our church's ministry together." Also; "The effects of World Service ministry are making a difference across the globe." The *Discipline* states that the "World Service apportionment is the first benevolent responsibility of the church."

We have been collecting this at the general church level. The World Service apportionment, the percentage apportioned, has been going up each year. There has been a drastic improvement. We have momentum. Why make a change that could stop this momentum? We have, I know this is permissive language, it says "they may separate the two." Even if your conference CFA recommends that they remain together, anyone on the floor of the conference can get up and get a motion passed. We should never do anything that effects our connectional system. We are a connectional church. You cannot describe The United Methodist Church without talking about the connectional system. Leaving this apportionment linked affirms the trust inherent in the connection system.

BISHOP MUTTI: Can you sum up please?

BRANSCOME: It provides the mechanism that best assures sufficient funding for the decisions we will be making on our budget very shortly. If we divide this apportionment we set a precedent that that starts disconnecting the connectional system. I am really concerned that the momentum that we have going, in the collection of this, is going to be severely hurt by the disconnection. I know that in our conference, or I feel that in our conference, in my experience, that if we have a choice we will pay Conference Benevolences first if there is any difference in the collection. And one other point I'd like to

make, if we separate the two, when there's . . .

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, your time is up.

BRANSCOME: Okay, sorry. Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the conference rules when you designate something as a Minority Report, call for a complicated procedure of processing that. I believe what we really have before us is an amendment here, and we're going to call this the Minority amendment so you'll know what we have identified and that's what is before us for debate. All right, it's before us that would keep the World Service Conference Benevolences tied together. All right, go to mike 4, green card. (Pause)

SAM H. SMITH (Western North Carolina): In our conference we believe that clarity in budgeting helps interpret and communicate. I think by allowing us to keep these separate we can bring more emphasis to each of the items to World Service and to Conference Benevolences and hopefully provide more support to both. So I would speak against the amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, is there someone who wishes to speak for the amendment. Yellow card, mike 5. (Pause)

*Separation of World Service from
Conference Benevolence Debated*

DAN O'NEILL (Rocky Mountain): I rise to speak in favor of the Minority amendment. I feel strongly that the general church World Service activity is based on the decisions we will be making here financially in the next 2 days. Unlinking that with Conference Apportionments will allow for conferences to deny or not affirm the activity that we will be working on here. It is very connectional to keep them linked as Jim pointed out during the Minority Report, it will work against the connectional system to unlink them allowing the one-issue anecdotal stories that we all hear within our annual conferences to begin to undermine the support of all of the World Services askings that we generate from this body.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you, you've had one speech for and one against. Would someone wish to speak for it? Let's go in the back; the orange card, mike 8.

KEVIN G. GOODWIN (Pennisula-Delaware): I'm going to speak against it. I assume since we've had one and one as permitted

BISHOP MUTTI: We've had two and one I'm corrected.

GOODWIN: Then am I out of order? Because I'm going to speak against.

BISHOP MUTTI: Against, no, you're in order.

GOODWIN: Our conference for the past two years, with the exception of World Service and Conference Benevolences, has given our churches choice on where to put their apportionments. It has worked very well in our conference. We've heard the same arguments in our conference, and we discussed this for approximately an hour when we passed this and I talked to our treasurer before we came. And, we've had very good success in churches raising their apportionments now that they have greater choice on where to give the money. I am looking forward to have a World Service and Conference Benevolence split 'cause also as a missions resource person for the conference it will make my job easier in telling people where their money is going and I firmly believe with greater choice we will get more money than we know what to do with. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we've had two speeches for, two against. We could put the question now if nobody else wishes to speak. The yellow card, section, back section C, I think. (Pause) Come to mike 6.

GAUNNIE H. DIXON (California-Pacific): I would vote and I would ask that we consider voting in favor of the minority report. Bishop Cornelius Henderson has addressed the surplus funds from missions, and he says that The United Methodist Church can do anything for God that it has the will to do. And when it comes to mission no resources are surplus resources. The funds come from monies incorrectly described as reserves. These funds are dedicated to these minor/major uses and many other smaller ones. The unspent portions of funds committed for mission work that extends over the next few years can hardly be described as surplus. I would suggest that we support the minority report.

BISHOP MUTTI: I thank you very much, I can take one more opposed. Green Card "mike" 4.

*Compromise on World Service and
Conference Benevolences Sought*

DON W. UNDERWOOD (North Texas): I rise to oppose the minority report and urge the delegates to support the majority report. The majority report represents a compromise that was hammered out over a period of days by the members of the subcommittee and the legislative committee. And I would remind the body that the legislative committee passed it by a large majority, and that now the task force and the General Council on Finance and Administration have all agreed that this is a compromise that is best for the church. I can tell from our experience on the legislative committee that it is a delicate compromise which requires all the parts to be in place. And I would think that it would be a very bad legislation for us to rip apart that compromise at this point. I urge defeat of the minority report in passive of the majority report.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we have had three speeches for and three against. I think the question is clear before us, Why don't we move to the vote? We are up against the time for adjournment.

May we have the final speech bishop?

Do you have a question, Yellow Card? Yes,

TIMOTHY RISS (New York): I just don't understand the effect of the minority report. In so far as does the minority concur with the petition as written or as amended by the majority with the extra amendment?

BISHOP MUTTI: Do you want to speak to that?

BRANSCOME: Yes, our only issue is how we deal with world service and conference apportionments. We totally agree with the rest of it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, do you wish a final word? To make for the motion.

SAGER: Just two quick comments, first of all I think that it is important,

BISHOP MUTTI: Wait just a minute I think that we should deal with the minority report we are going to put that vote in question. Amendment first.

BRANSCOME: OK, just a couple of issues. One of the things that I wanted to mention is that it was said that this is a fragile compromise. This issue was never discussed in our committee

when we talked about a compromise. The other thing is that our, when it was presented the other day, yesterday, I guess, there was a constant language of "we are one body." If we are one body, then there is no reason for us to disconnect this apportionment, thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Now I believe Mr. Sager will speak to the committee, if you wish to speak, Stan.

SAGER: I will speak, Bishop, as it has been said the committee strongly supported the report, which means it did not support the minority report. We think that what has gone into the report from the process team-or from the connectional ministries funding task force has been carefully drafted, carefully considered, and represents something that is good for this church. And within the committee we gave it long and careful consideration. I would urge that the minority report be defeated.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, lets move to the question. If you favor the minority report you will vote by pressing 1, if you do not, you will vote by pressing 2. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 250; No, 569] And you have not supported the amendment. The main motion is before you. Are you ready to move to the vote on it? No, green card, front row, come to mike 2. I think, folks, we need somebody to move an extension of the time so we can complete this. Would somebody so move? Yes, Yes, chair of the calendar and agenda committee. Mike 2.

MARY ALICE MASSEY: I move that we extend the session , 15 minutes.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, thank you very much, if you will approve it, please vote when the light appears, All right, if you disapprove too, you're gonna vote when the light appears. (Laughter) All right, just extended for 15 minutes. [Yes, 549; No, 335] Mike 2.

STEPHEN T. DECKARD (North Central New York): My question relates to point four. What is the definition of other benevolence giving as this within the connection of the United Methodist Church? Or, how do we define "other benevolent giving"?

BISHOP MUTTI: Do you want to speak to that?

SAGER: If you are aware of what is in the statistical reports, there is a section dealing with benevolences The item that has been already included in the report was general church apportionments, all the other items that are in that

benevolence category would represent what is referred to in the item four in the addition or the changes to the report.

BISHOP MUTTI: All Right, yes pink card, back here, yes you, no, the one behind you. Come to mike 6, 4 come to mike 4.

LEE B. SHEAFFER (Virginia) I move the question on all that is before us,

*Plenary Supports Committee Majority
Report on Connectional Ministries
Funding*

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, is it seconded? All right, the previous question is before you, please vote when the light appears, takes two thirds to suspend debate. You are getting hungry. [Yes, 851; No, 56] All right, everything is before us. Forget everything else now, we need to go ahead with this vote of the committee , you have defeated the minority report. You have before you the motion of concurrence from the legislative committee on item 1356. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 794; No, 107] And it carries significantly.

All right, we are at the end of our time folks. I want you to know that we do have a report of the ballot, but we can't consider it now. We will do that in the evening session, hopefully, I want to take just a personal privilege to say to Tyrone Gordon, "I tried." We are proud to work with people from Kansas like Tyrone Gordon and Kathy Bannister whom you recognized this morning.

(Applause)

Bishop Handy remembered

Now I would, just let me say if I might, say a word of thanks to you.

Somebody said they were a rookie here and trying to understand this. I know just exactly how you feel. This is the first time I have sat in this chair. For most of the time it has been fun and thank you for your patience with me and with each other. You have dealt with lots of important issue this afternoon. We are grateful for the way you have handled this. (Applause) As I sat in the chair , I gave lots of memories to one of my dear friends and mentors: The Bishop, W. T. Handy Jr. I learned a lot about how to preside in a conference setting from Bishop Handy. You who have been here in the past will know that the presiding officers often asked Bishop Handy to chair in those days when you needed to move with rapid dispatch. I'm a little more laid back

than Bishop Handy, but I have deep affection for his presence and I am sure that he is looking down on us now. Another one of my mentors is Bishop Monk Bryan and I am going to ask Bishop Bryan to come and do our closing benediction. But we may have some announcements. Do we have anything from the calendar committee, Mary Alice? Mike 2.

MASSEY: Bishop Mutti, I think that Carolyn Marshall has an announcement. If she doesn't I will make it.

BISHOP MUTTI: We are going to turn to Carolyn for announcements. Secretary.

MARSHALL: Announcement that the General and Judicial Administration legislative committee will convene immediately after the end of this afternoon plenary. Hopefully to finish. There have been two announcements coming as far as the committee on presiding officers, going by the last one, that group will not meet. But if any of you were planning on it, thought you should have that latest information. And then, the announcement, that I imagine that is the one to which Mary Alice was referring, is that the offering for marshals and pages will be taken at the opening of this evening's plenary.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right! Now I do not want to forget to thank my colleagues from the College of Bishops in the South Central Jurisdiction who have backed me up this afternoon and Bishop Norris and Bishop Solomon, you saw how much I depended on them and I am very grateful. Bishop Bryan was a youth counselor when I was a senior high, and it is a joy to ask Bishop Bryan to come now and do our closing prayer.

BISHOP MONK BRYAN (Retired):
(prayer)

Wednesday Evening May 10, 2000

(Bishop Ernest S. Lyght, presiding)

(Singing, led by Cynthia Wilson, musicians Johnetta Johnson Page and Monya Logan; Hymn 127, "Guide Me, O Thou Great Jehovah"; Hymn 374, "Standing on the Promises"; "The Spirit of the Lord Is Upon Me," by Johnetta Johnson Page, Spanish verses led by Raquel Martínez)

(Applause)

BISHOP ERNEST S. LYGHT (New York Area): Brothers and sisters, let us come to order. I would invite you to take your seats that we might begin our evening session. I welcome you back this evening for our evening session for the work that we will share together. I am Ernest Lyght, the resident bishop of the New York Annual Conference.

(Applause)

I want to introduce two of my colleagues who are backing me up this evening, Bishop Neil Irons, the resident bishop of Central Pennsylvania, and also Bishop F. Herbert Skeete, who is retired but very active in the New York Annual Conference.

(Applause)

I think it is obvious to all of us that we have a great deal of work to do this evening. I want to remind the legislative committee chairpersons of the rules which we have adopted, and also all of you, that we're operating under the rules that we adopted, which will guide our process from this time forward.

As we settle in and direct our attention to who we are, and the purpose for our being here tonight and during the course of this General Conference, I invite you now to be in an attitude of prayer as Cynthia Wilson comes before us to sing in her way, "Sweet, Sweet Spirit."

(Song)

(Applause)

I turn now to the Committee on Agenda, Mary Alice Massey. Mike 2, please.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Bishop Lyght and delegates, our proposed agenda for tomorrow will be pretty much the same as it has been, with the worship service beginning at 8:15, calendar and agenda at 9:00, and we will deal with plenary from 9:10 to 12:10. We'll have announcements, we'll have lunch recess, then we'll reconvene at 2:30, and we'll deal with calendar items again, and have dinner recess, and then have the evening session and calendar events at 7:30, and maybe we'll go home at 10:30. We'll see.

FITZGERALD REIST (Coordinator of the Calendar): I thought you might like to know how much work you have left. At the present time there are 700 items

of business not yet dealt with. Have fun.

(Anxious Laughter)

Offering Received as Gift
to Marshals and Pages

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, with that admonition, let us have fun this evening as we do our work. Now I want to do something that you've been waiting to do, and that I am sure that you are desirous of doing. During the course of this General Conference, we are being served by our marshals and our pages. These brothers and sisters come among us paying their own expenses and serving us of their own free will as our brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ. I'm sure that you will want to be supportive of them, and we're going to receive an offering now, and this offering is for our marshals and our pages. I invite you to participate. I invite you—indeed encourage—each one of us to be generous in our offering. I would ask the ushers if they would now come among us and receive the offering for the marshals and the pages. I see a sign all the way in the back. Mike 8, please.

KEVIN G. GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Who do we make our checks payable to if we want to donate via check, sir?

BISHOP LYGHT: GCFA, General Council on Finance and Administration, for checks. I invite you to make this a very silent offering.

(Pause for offering)

BISHOP LYGHT: Now as the offering is being received, I'm going to turn to Local Church. Tyrone Gordon, if you're ready to present?

TYRONE D. GORDON (Kansas West): Bishop, we've been ready. And as we come before you, I want to also recognize our subcommittee chairpersons: Dennis Blackwell from Southern New Jersey, Richard Jones, Ed Kail, Bernard "Skip" Keels, Terry Clark, Matthew Pinson. And they're here for backup, and as I present some of our petitions, also our secretary, Judy Benson, will be presenting, and our vice chair, Joe Kilpatrick.

I'd like to call your attention to page 2095 in your DCA, Calendar Item No. 1211. You'll also find it in your Advance DCA, page 1122, Petition No. 30275. Committee is recommending concurrence as amended. We are recommending that because it allows for the future

expansion of such groups, and defining examples such as scouting units, whether it's in the U.S. or in the Central Conferences, and it uses permissive language, "may" instead of "shall." The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP LYGHT: The petition is before us. I see no cards. Then, you may vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 795; No, 12*] You have sustained the committee.

Local Churches Enabled to Be Environmentally Responsible

GORDON: We would like call your attention to page no. 1995 in your *DCA*, Calendar Item 647. You'll also find it in your *Advance DCA*, on page 1123, Petition No. 30028. The committee recommends concurrence because it enables the local church to become environmentally responsible, to promote greater awareness of the treasured resources of God's creation, and it also uses permissive language, "may" instead of "shall."

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, the petition is before you. The committee recommends concurrence. Vote 1 for Yes, 2 for No. You may vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 736; No, 97*] You have sustained the committee.

GORDON: I'd like to call your attention to page 2095, Calendar Item 1212. You'll find it in your *Advance DCA* on page 1102, Petition No. 30317. We are recommending concurrence. This is referring to a constitutional amendment that will enable the General Conference to talk about baptism things at the next General Conference.

BISHOP LYGHT: Is this the constitutional amendment?

GORDON: Yes, sir.

BISHOP LYGHT: Okay it will require two-thirds vote. (*Pause*) Appears you're ready to vote. Vote one for yes, two for no, please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) All right, you have sustained the committee with two-thirds. [*Yes, 778; No, 94*]

GORDON: Bishop, I'd like to present Judy Benson who will proceed with the report.

BISHOP LYGHT: Okay.

JUDY J. BENSON (Oklahoma): Would you turn to p. 2095 where you will find Calendar Item 1214, which covers Petition 30857, in Volume One, Section Two of the *DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

We believe that this will encourage focusing on our mission of The United Methodist Church. We recommend concurrence, with amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: Committee recommends concurrence as amended. I see no cards, you may vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 822; No, 41*]

GORDAN: Bishop I would like to also present our vice-chairperson, Joe Kilpatrick, who will bring the rest of the report.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you.

Inclusive Language and UM Publishing House Addressed

JOE W. KILPATRICK (North Georgia): We are on p. 2095 Calendar Item 1216, top right-hand side of the page. This is Petition 30844 and would be on p. 1144 of the *Advance DCA*. It concerns diverse metaphorical images from the Bible. The committee is recommending concurrence as amended. The rationale is that the petition continues an appropriate tradition; calling the church to use inclusive language. It challenges us to avoid metaphors that are exclusively positive or negative. The deleted part of the petition preserves the ability of The United Methodist Publishing House to serve its many constituencies and it preserves *The Book of Worship* as a book of worship rather than making it a textbook for a particular agenda. We recommend concurrence as amended.

BISHOP LYGHT: Committee recommends concurrence as amended. I see a card. Please come to mike 4.

Support Given for "Words That Hurt, Words That Heal"

SUE A. SETTERLUND (Wisconsin): I'd like to know the rationale; why you took out those two; "Be It Further Resolved?" I think the "Words That Hurt, Words That Heal" document is excellent, and I think that we need to continue to use it and so I'd like your rationale.

JOE KILPATRICK: The petition does not address specifically the document "Words That Hurt, Words That Heal" so far as it's references in the first paragraph. It calls upon the Publishing House to use inclusive language, which it already does; and calls upon the Publishing House to establish guidelines, which is not its ordinary role. The Publishing House needs to sustain itself through publishing of materials that are accepted in the market place. It gets

no funding from the collection plate. So to put this kind of a role on the Publishing House would be a bit of a strain. That is a bit of unusual. That was the rationale.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, yes, do you want to follow up? Mike 4.

SETTERLUND: But the last paragraph does say that they will update the document, " 'Words That Hurt, Words That Heal' in order to provide . . . "so we need to continue. You didn't answer the question you know. You told me it wasn't there.

KILPATRICK: The document "Words That Hurt, Words That Heal" can be updated by the original authors; and can be addressed by United Methodist Women, can be addressed by the GBGM; can be addressed by any group that cares to do that. So a petition calling upon the Publishing House or the Council of Ministries to do that did not seem to be necessary.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Yes, do you want to come to mike 4? Okay.

WILLIAM H. WILSON (West Virginia): I would like to move an amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right.

WILSON: The amendment being . . . [amendment not stated here]

BISHOP LYGHT: Is there a second? It's seconded.

WILSON: The amendment on p. 2095; to reinstate the paragraph, the last paragraph. "Be it further resolved that the GCOM or other appropriate body will update the document 'Words That Hurt, Words That Heal' ", etc, through the remainder of the petition.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, then your amendment is to restore that bottom paragraph.

WILSON: To restore the bottom paragraph, yes sir.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Do you want to speak to it?

BILL WILSON: Just simply in response to what has just been said that I believe that it's really important, and that document particularly, "Words That Hurt, Words That Heal," that the encouragement in this paragraph is for study across the denomination as well as the importance of an agency of the church to update that very, very critical and important piece of literature.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Does anyone wish to speak against the amend-

ment? All right, I see no one who wishes to speak against it. The amendment is to restore the bottom paragraph under petition 1216 which begins, "Be it further resolved that the GCOM," etc. Please vote when the light appears.

KILPATRICK: Bishop! Bishop.

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes. I'm sorry. Go right ahead and speak to it.

KILPATRICK: Yes. The petition does a lot more than just say to update the document. The petition says to include the document in the next edition of our *Book of Worship*. The committee did not feel that that would be an appropriate place to put this particular document. And so we would oppose the amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Then we're ready to vote on the amendment. Please vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* All right, the amendment fails. *[Yes, 355; No, 524]* The petition 1216 is before us. All right, I see no cards, it appears you are ready to vote. If you vote yes, push one, no push two. Please vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* *[Yes, 766; No, 134]* You have sustained the committee.

*Church Closings
of Interest to Archives and History*

KILPATRICK: Our next petition is found on the next page, p. 2096, it's Calendar Item 1217. The petition itself is found on p. 1139 and is Petition 30086. This is a trustee-a local church-matter. The committee is recommending non-concurrence. The petition asks that the chairman of the trustees, chairman of the Commission on Archives and History be notified when a church is closed. We believe that this is not a matter for legislation that dedicated clergy and laity, who do have a passion for our history and historical documents, deserves support. However, the committee saw no need for a global legislation of a matter that could be handled more efficiently by just sending annual or quarterly e-mail between conference officials.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1217 is before you. I see a yellow card all the way in the back, would you please come to Mike 5.

FRANCES H. MOORE (North Alabama): As one who has worked with the historical society in our conference and have found the information that they have to be very, very helpful in many, many instances, I think it would

be very well if these people would, if the chair or someone would, notify the director of the historical society. Many now have archivists who take care of all of that for us and I know the ones in our state would really like to have it immediately. So I ask you to vote against this.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, the speech against. I see no other cards. Petition 1217 is before you. Please vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 632; No, 266]* You have sustained the committee.

KILPATRICK: Our next item is right below that one. Calendar Item No. 1218. Committee is recommending nonconcurrence. This petition involved a major re-write of paragraphs 242-244, concerning membership, that included a lot of language that had the professing-member language in it and contained wording as to baptized members and professing members. The committee believed that the re-write of these paragraphs could be done more efficiently after constitutional amendments had been approved or disapproved during the coming quadrennium. So we recommend nonconcurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1218 is before you. The committee recommends nonconcurrence. I see no cards. Please vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 837; No, 51]* You have sustained the committee.

*Disbursement of Funds from Disposition
of Property Determined*

KILPATRICK: Next Calendar Item is 1219 on the same page. This relates to page 1137, *Advance DCA*, Petition 31592. Committee is recommending concurrence as amended. This adds a paragraph to paragraph 2542, a trustee matter. The committee is concurring, is offering concurrence here on a petition which adds the ability to use funds from a sale of property for operating expenses under certain strict conditions. Those conditions have to do as laid out there in paragraph 1219, which is: That congregational redevelopment plan has been developed; that the plan has been developed in consultation with appropriate conference development staff; that has been approved by the cabinet, that it has been approved by the district; and that it has been approved by the annual conference. Committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1219 is before you. Committee recommends con-

currence as amended. I see a green card. Please come to, which mike is closer? Let's come to mike 6.

PAT STROMAN (Central Texas): I would oppose the concurrence and ask that the body not support the committee. I have followed this from subcommittee, to the legislative committee, and now to the floor, because I'm convinced that we are entering upon a slippery slope anytime we begin to sell property to pay the light bill. The exception is listed here and it's very definite. But, I have found that exceptions become the rule. The review plan and future is already covered under Petition 3110 found as Calendar Item 757 that you approved on the consent calendar in the past days. Now that review plan will enable that property to be used for new ministries, but if a dying congregation has already sold off the assets and used it up there will be nothing there for future ministries.

BISHOP LYGHT: You'll need to sum up.

STROMAN: I will. In Texas we find it appropriate when a horse dies to dismount.

(Laughter)

BISHOP LYGHT: I see no other cards. Petition 1219 is before you. Please vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 516; No, 364]* You have sustained the committee.

*Implications of the Word "Employment"
Discussed*

KILPATRICK: Bishop, our final item is there on page 2096. Calendar Item 1220 has to do with the petition on page 1132 of the *Advance DCA* Petition 31152. The committee is recommending concurrence. This was a petition from GCFA, which cleans the language concerning employment. As you know, there is a requirement in the *Discipline* that employees be notified whenever there is going to be a PPR Committee meeting that discusses their employment. The word "employment" has certain implications and what this petition does is simply say that in relationship to a clergy person, that you're talking about their continued appointment, while speaking of lay people, you're talking about employment. So, it separates appointment from employment. There is no change in the notification rules. It preserves the integrity of the PPR Committee having proper notification to the persons involved when they are discussing employment and

appointment recommends concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, Petition 1220 is before you; the committee recommends concurrence. I see no cards, then please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 821; No, 86*] You have sustained the committee.

KIRKPATRICK: Bishop Lyght, that concludes our report for this evening.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. Turn now to Jeff Greenway, Discipleship.

JEFFREY E. GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Lyght, Stan Sager, the chairperson of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee, has asked that I might yield the beginning of my report so that he might care for one timely item.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): Thank you, Jeff, for relinquishing some of your time. There's one item which has been removed from the Consent Calendar. It is on p. 2068 DCA as Calendar Item 916. It has been removed at the request of our brother from the Russian Provisional Conference and others so that the Russian delegate may address this group tonight in Russian at a time when Bishop Minor is here to translate, and I understand that the bishop will be leaving tomorrow. I believe he has been alerted to this. The petition appears in the *Advance DCA*, at paragraph, at p. 453, it is Petition 30097. The committee voted noncurrence. The vote would disqualify me, I believe, from making any comments about it now so I would reserve any recitation of the position of the committee until after hearing statements on it, Bishop, if that's all right.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, then you're bringing Petition 916 before us in order that the statement might be made.

SAGAR: That is correct, sir.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, Bishop Minor is here. Is the delegate here? OK. You want to come to mike 2? Is it agreeable that Bishop Minor translate? It's agreeable. Thank you.

Russian Delegate Speaks of Russian Church's Financial Need

ANDRE KIM (Russian Provisional) [English interpretation from Russian]

I rise to speak against the motion and give some witness about the Russian

United Methodist Church. I have 3 minutes but ask for time for translation.

(*Laughter*)

The Russian United Methodist Church is looking back at ten years of existence this year. The first church was started in 1990, and as the Russian Mission was opened in 1992, there were only three churches. Now we have 70 churches. Geographically they are from Kaliningrad in the Baltic Sea to the far east of the Pacific Ocean and it includes Ukraine and Kazakstan. And Methodist churches are not only in cities but also in villages. And there are new possibilities for church development. So far, churches were mostly in the western part of Russia, but there are new churches in the eastern, in the Asian, and the Siberian part. The churches are not only serving with the world, but they have wide social programs too. For example preventative work with alcoholism and drug addiction; care for children in orphanages; in prison ministry; work with women, children, and youth; and help for families in need, and especially of the poor people with handicapping conditions.

BISHOP LYGHT: We'll need to move to a summation.

KIM: We are grateful that many of these programs we do with the help of The United Methodist Church worldwide. Most of our churches don't have their own buildings and therefore there are some problems. And so, they should not be without the building. And there is a seminary that has 70 students, and there is a great need for these students to finish their studies and be available for appointment. This is the situation of the Russian United Methodist Church. And so the church has been growing quite rapidly. But on the other hand it's just a drop in the bucket on geographically the sixth of this world. And therefore I would conclude with the words of the gospel: "The harvest is great, but there are only few workers." And this is true for Russia too. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: How do you wish to proceed?

SAGER: I would be willing certainly to state the position of the committee of the chair wants to put it to a vote now or

BISHOP LYGHT: Are you ready to place it before the body.

SAGER: I am.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right then, Petition 916 is before us. Do we you want to address it?

SAGER: The petition calls 21 million dollars in apportioned funds. The committee felt great sympathy for the Russian Ministry and the 7 areas which are addressed in the request. However, we also feel empathy for those who are forced to pay. And without sounding crass, or without trying to sound crass, we did not feel that this was the time to begin to commit that amount of money in view of all the other demands that are being made upon this General Conference. So it was the conclusion of the committee and the vote was [*Yes, 79; No, 2*] against nonoccurrence that this was not the time to embark upon this ambitious, but extremely worthwhile project. Perhaps some other time.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, then petition 916 is before us. I see a group of yellow cards. Who is the spokesperson. All right, would you go to mike 5, please.

Substitute Motion for Financing Russian Initiative Put Forth

FRANK L. DORSEY (Kansas East): I'm in charge of congregational growth and development in Kansas east conference. And I've been a part of the Russian Initiative and have been to Russia on two occasions. And so out of that I would like to amend the petition before us. I would like to do that, if you come down the page to where the first "be it resolved" and substitute by amendment to the end of the petition these words: "Be it resolved; in this *kairos* moment at the beginning of the 21st century, that during the 2001-2004 quadrennium, The United Methodist Church increase its missional support for mission evangelism that is expressed in theological education and congregational growth and development in Russia and the CIS. Be it further resolved; that faithfulness to the great commission The United Methodist Church fund this missional effort through an apportionment of \$1,500,000 per year for a total of \$6,000,000 for the quadrennium." We move adoption of this motion with reference to GCFA. If I have a second I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right it is seconded. You may speak, Frank.

DORSEY: I am reminded of something that Bonino said as he talked about sanctification. He said that there is the *kairos* moment, that breaks in and calls for concrete action. I believe in

Russia that it is now that *kairos* moment that calls for us historically to step in and do a concrete action to work with our brothers and sisters and to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ across that whole area that's now Russia and CIS. I believe we have a small window of opportunity and we should act now. We should beg the resources if necessary, but we must answer the great commission to preach the word of the gospel to the people of Russia and the CIS.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right now, is the house clear about the amendment? All right, I see a yellow card all the way in the back. Would you come to mike 5 or 8, either one. Mike 8.

OLGIERD BENEDYKTOWICZ (Poland): I have a question. The petition 916 will withdraw. Also, I would like to ask: That other post-Communist countries should be taken under consideration. In Poland we have probably the oldest Methodist seminary, and we do not have a proper support for our work. So this is my motion. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right I take that as a speech against. All the way in the back standing on the left. Mike 8 please.

*Amendment Proposed for
Funding Eastern European Seminaries*

H. EDDIE FOX (Holston): It is a *kairos* moment in that part of the world. Russia, Estonia, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Czech, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Kosovo, Croatia. A part of the world that has suffered much. And those countries that I named, many of them have been stepped on, and stepped over, throughout history. There is a brand new seminary in Tallinn, Estonia, with 50 students. There is a seminary for training in Poland. There is a seminary in Slovakia where on one occasion, in 1990, one Methodist minister, was left. Today there are 12 young students preparing for the ministry in that country. Therefore, I move, as an amendment that the paragraph "Be it resolved that the amount of \$10,500,000 (for I'm not sure if he amended this or not) be raised over the next quadrennium. If that amendment applies to that \$1,500,000 for CIS I move to amend that, and that this goal be set as an advance special. Yesterday, we approved a motion on this floor that allocated \$4,000,000, \$2,000,000 from Higher Education, \$2,000,000 from the General Conference to be allocated among these seminaries. How can we leave out countries like Estonia, Lithuania and

Latvia, who for more than 50 years were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Therefore, I move a substitute amendment that this money be placed as a goal in an advance special and not be in an apportionment.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, we have a second then we are under discussion of the amendment by substitution. Eddie, do you want to read that amendment again, please, so that the house is clear?

FOX: It's probably better that I read, for if I send it, it will take it too long to get there from the back of the house. It is to move that the funds, whether it is the 10 million or the 1.5 million, that this be established as an advance special rather than to be apportioned money.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, thank you. The yellow card in the back, please come to mike 5.

(Pause)

EDWARD T. PUSLECKI (Poland): Hello. I think we need to support clearly all the post-Communist countries, rather than one, and I think, to the amendment which was just made, we need to add, clearly, that this amendment would take into consideration Estonia, Latvia, and Poland. In the last country, we have the oldest and the biggest seminary in the post-Communist countries. We can't just support one country and forget others who suffered fifty years under the Communist rulership. If there should be a just and fair distribution of money, please take into consideration also other post-Communist countries. This means practically also Warsaw Seminary.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. There's an orange card on my left. Please come to mike 7.

BERNARD "SKIP" KEELS (Baltimore-Washington): Someone said it was a *kairos* moment, and I think that's perhaps worth reflecting on. It's not only a *kairos* moment for the central conferences, it's a *kairos* moment for the American church. How sad it is to hear brothers and sisters from the former Soviet bloc beg for bread, when the Word of God said that we should never be begging for bread. How sad it is to see the central conferences in Africa, who are growing so fast, beg for bread. In many ways, it is we as the American church that ought to be begging for bread the bread that we so foolishly spend on McDonald's and everything else, and on our *[unintelligible]* political issues, is the bread that would feed peo-

ple in the central conferences. As a former district superintendent, it was our pleasure in Baltimore to host Elena Tischenko of the Ekaterinberg church, the Church of the Return. What a powerful name, "the Church of the Return." Their prison ministry itself baptized over 500 prisoners. Probably no church in this General Conference has baptized 500 prisoners. Moreover, probably no church in this General Conference would even *visit* 500 prisoners. So I think there's something for us to learn from amendments that talk about the justice of money. I come from the African Diaspora, but I believe that God does not want any of our brothers and sisters to be begging for bread.

And so I rise to support the initial amendment and to say to the brothers from Poland and the brothers and sisters from Russia, fight not against one another, for you do wrestle against the flesh and blood of this world, and we are the ones who are very, very guilty of forgetting the most historic phrase ever uttered in Methodism: "The world is my parish."

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Now, where we are is that we have an amendment by substitution to the original amendment. We've had three speeches in favor of that substitution. I can hear someone who needs to speak against it. Come to mike 2, please.

*Russian Initiative Tabled Pending Report
from Higher Education Committee*

T. TERRELL SESSUMS (Florida): Bishop, this is perhaps more of a question, but I have the distinct recollection that our Legislative Committee on Higher Education—and then perhaps yesterday, our General Conference—acted on a proposal to expend some \$4 million over the quadrennium for seminary development in Eastern Europe, that our Board of Higher Education and Ministry had worked to develop a coordinated plan to help all of these seminaries—including the ones in Estonia and Poland and Moscow—on a matching fund basis, and we've already acted on that. My memory may be more from committee than from General Conference, but I think that we're dealing with the same subject twice in some of these instances. And we have a number of resolutions that perhaps will be coming forward, and the Higher Education legislative report tomorrow that do deal with the very systematic development of a plan for meeting these seminary needs in

Eastern Europe. So I am inclined to support nonconcurrency, or at least to delay this, until we make sure of what we've either already done or what's coming from Higher Education.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, I'll take that as a speech against the amendment by substitution. Yes, would you come to mike 2, please?

JACK W. PLOWMAN (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop, I move the previous question on all that is before us.

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, we can take one more speech against, if there is someone who wishes to speak against the amendment by substitution. Yes, would you come to mike 6, please?

(Pause)

SUSAN RUACH (South Indiana): Bishop, I move to table this until we have the report from Higher Education.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Do we have a second? The motion is to table. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 640; No, 276] All right, you have moved to table, so the matter then is tabled until further notice.

RUACH: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. We turn now to Jeff Greenway.

*Use of BC and AD in UM Publications
Not Mandated*

JEFFREY E. GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Lyght and members of the General Conference, the Discipleship Legislative Committee has eight calendar items for your consideration this evening. Hopefully, these will be the last eight items you will hear from—or hear about from us. The first five are found on page 1990 in your DCA. 1990. The first Calendar Item is 601. It's Petition 31555. The original language is found on page 286 in your *Advance DCA*. This petition calls for the use of bc and ad in all United Methodist publications. The recommendation of the committee is for nonconcurrency, and the rationale is that with the wide variety of publishing entities within the church, we are not willing to impose this restriction upon them. Therefore I move nonconcurrency.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 601 [sic. Calendar Item] is before you. The committee recommends non-concurrency. I see no cards. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 798; No, 106]

*Financial Support of Evangelism
Approved*

GREENWAY: Remaining on p. 1990, Calendar Item 602. This is Petition 31332. It's found, the original language is found in your *Advance DCA* p. 296. This is a petition to reaffirm our commitment to and financial support of evangelism within United Methodist programs. The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence. The rationale is that we are in agreement that evangelism is a crucial function in our effort to fulfill our mission in making disciples of Jesus Christ, therefore, I move concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 602 is before you. Committee recommends concurrence. I see no cards. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 867; No, 44]

Tything Training Supported

GREENWAY: Remaining on p. 1990, Calendar Item 604. This is Petition 31747. The original language is found in your *Advance DCA* p. 305. This is a petition to emphasize tithing is a part of the spiritual growth and calls for the General Board of Discipleship to develop training and support materials. The recommendation is for concurrence, as amended. The rationale is that we are in agreement that tithing is a biblical principle which should be reflected in the training and resources developed by the General Board of Discipleship. Therefore I move concurrence as amended.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 604 is before you. I see no cards. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 897; No, 25]

Older Adult Ministries Supported

GREENWAY: Remaining on page 1990, Calendar Item 605. This is Petition 31966. The original language is found in your DCA p. 1832. This is a petition to establish a comprehensive plan for older adult ministries within the church. The recommendation is for concurrence with referral to GCF&A. The rationale is that this is a response to a mandate that was given to a group of persons from the 1996 General Conference, and we agree that this is a plan whose time has come. Therefore I move concurrence with referral to GCF&A.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Petition 605 is before you. Please vote when the

light appears. You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 872; No, 43]

United Methodist Men Discussed

GREENWAY: Remaining on p. 1990, Calendar Item 603. This is Petition 30261. The language for this is found in your DCA p. 1816. This petition calls for an amendment to paragraph 1104.1 which speaks to the required composition for voting membership of the General Board of Discipleship. This is a petition to give one of these positions to a representative to be elected by the National Association of Conference Presidents of United Methodist Men. Recommend is for non-concurrency. Here is our rationale. In 1996, I was present in the Legislative Committee on Discipleship, which was instrumental in forming the General Commission on United Methodist Men. In fact, I worked hard for that to happen, and I celebrate the genesis of this ministry. I am fully supportive of all that they have been about during the last quadrennium. But also in 1996, the General Conference voted to downsize general boards and agencies membership, and so the General Board of Discipleship along with all the other general boards and agencies lost a significant amount of their voting membership. And there are many of the conferences that became disenfranchised when those decisions were made. In paragraphs 705 and 706 in *The Book Of Discipline*, membership of these various boards and agencies are defined. There is no place in those paragraphs in which specific entities are given membership on general boards and agencies. And we in the Discipleship Legislative Committee believe that this would be a dangerous precedence to set. Because then every different group in the life of the church could petition General Conference to have specific membership on specific agencies of which they have a passion. Therefore I move nonconcurrency.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 603 is before us. Yes, would you come to mike 1 please.

GILBERT HANKE (Texas): I'm the national president-elect of United Methodist Men. The main focus of this petition is to increase the cooperative relationship between the Board of Discipleship and the General Commission on United Methodist Men. United Methodist Men believe two things on this petition. The first is, the church is always better served when we build bridges. And this petition would widen

the current bridge of cooperation between the Board of Discipleship and the General Commission on United Methodist Men. The second thing is we also trust the collective wisdom of General Conference on this subject and either way this vote should go, the General Commission on United Methodist Men has a strong desire to build bridges to all parts of this great church. The position that we are asking to be placed was in the original legislation which was passed by General Conference in 1996 and was edited out of the 1996 *Discipline*.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Thank you. Have a card all the way in the back. Come to mike 7.

FRANK TROTTER (Baltimore-Washington): I would like to respectfully speak against the amendment in favor of the committee vote. There is also another responsibility in the *Discipline* which calls for the General Board of Discipleship to have supervisory responsibility for several of its constituencies of which United Methodist Men is one of those. You can't do supervisory work when someone is on the same level with you in the board as a voting membership. We feel that there are others that are important constituencies like youth, young adult, other ministries, children, for instance. They do not have voting membership either. And we feel like there is a very excellent relationship right now between the General Board and United Methodist Men and the majority feels like there is no need to change that balance.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. All right, then, Petition 603 is before you. The committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 677; No, 246*]

You have sustained the committee.

GREENWAY: At this time I would like to introduce Sarah Warman, a lay delegate from the Western Pennsylvania Conference who served as the chairperson of the legislative subcommittee on NEMO, Children, Youth and Young Adults.

SARAH WARMAN: Bishop, members of the General Conference, I would turn your attention to page 1979 in your *DCA*, Calendar Item 475, Petition 31238. This petition is calling for each annual conference to have a conference council on young adult ministry or other structure. The recommendation from the committee is nonconcurrency. The rationale is that the material in this

petition is better addressed in another petition already affirmed by this General Conference. We feel this would be redundant and moot. So I move for concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, Petition 475 is before you. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 849; No, 33*] You have sustained the committee.

Petition for GBOD Program to Exit Homosexual Lifestyle Debated

GREENWAY: If you would turn to page no. 2090 in your *DCA*. 2090. Calendar Item 1161, page 2090, Calendar Item 1161, Petition 31774. The entire language for this petition can be found on page no. 1828 in your *DCA*. This is a petition calling for the General Board of Discipleship to create a pro-active program and resources for those wishing to leave a homosexual lifestyle. The recommendation of the committee is for nonconcurrency. The rationale is that after much conversation and conferencing about this petition, we believe that this is not a directive that we were willing to give to the General Board of Discipleship at this time; therefore, I move nonconcurrency.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1161 is before us. Would you please come to mike 2.

NYLE N. HERSHBERGER (Western Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in opposition to the motion of nonconcurrency that they have. United Methodist Church needs to accept this responsibility to minister to the homosexual community, especially to those persons who want out of that lifestyle or who do not want to enter into that lifestyle. It is my understanding that The United Methodist Church has been discussing the issue of homosexuality since 1972 or before that. Here are some questions we need to ask ourselves. How many persons have died prematurely because of living the homosexual lifestyle since that time because history shows that it shortens the life of the person 10-15 years? How many persons have committed suicide because they knew the homosexual life was not part of God's created plan and God's people were not there to show God's love and hope? How many persons are living with a medical problem because they are using their physical bodies in a way God had not created them to be used? How many persons are starting or entering into this lifestyle because they have been told they can't change? How many persons are continuing in this

lifestyle because they have been told the Scriptures about homosexuality are not applicable or the writers didn't know about sexual orientation? We as God's people have the responsibility to minister to all persons, whether they are already living a homosexual lifestyle or contemplating that lifestyle. We need to stop the message of denial: a denial that God is not all knowing, a denial that God is not able to transform, a denial that there are physical and mental problems, a denial that the sexual act between two persons of the same gender is not normal as God has created them. We as the church need to counteract these messages of denial and many other similar messages with the message of love and hope. I urge you to vote against the action of the committee of nonconcurrency.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, speech against. I see no other cards, then please, yes, would you come to mike 8 please.

Science of Homosexuality Disputed

EMERY PERCELL (Northern Illinois): I wish to speak in favor of the committee's recommendation of non because I know people who had been destroyed because the church has rejected them. The scientific evidence that's pointed to in the article is not true; the jury is still out on that. We need to protect those who are gay and lesbian in our midst and I urge a vote of nonconcurrency.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, would you come to mike 2 please?

TSHIBANG KASAP (North-West Katanga): *speaking French*

BISHOP LYGHT: Translator please.

KASAP: We must respect all Christians whatever they think because we are all created in the image of God. The problem of homosexuality then envisions two problems. The first question is to know if their homosexuality is a divine institution. The answer is no. The second question is to know what is the finality of homosexuality. It doesn't have as objective to respond to divine recommendation but human recommendation. I believe that I encourage the idea of the commission. I believe that the church has a mission to encourage what edifies the church itself and not what can discourage the church. I believe that the position of the commission is great.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, would you . . . mike 1 please.

GERALD "JAY" WILLIAMS (Western New York): I just have a question. I was wondering what the source of this petition is, where the petition came from?

BISHOP LYGHT: Can the committee respond to that?

GREENWAY: The first speaker in opposition to the recommendation of the committee was the originator, one of the originators of the petition.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Yellow card right by Mike 5.

CHARLES SCHUSTER (Rocky Mountain): I was a member of the Faith and Order Legislative Committee. We debated this subject and you'll hear about that debate tomorrow. The debate was civil and reasoned and we came to some conclusions that we're not in agreement about concerning this subject. This petition is the philosophical underpinning of some of those people who were outside this building this morning. Mr. Phelps, it is not worthy of this great denomination. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Then would you come to *Mike* number 1.

RAUL CARCIA DE OCHOA (Mexico): I have seen that you are divided on this issue. We grieve with you. We lost one church of ours because of this problem. We are a people called to ministry. We are not called not to minister. We have to set aside our political agendas. We are called to minister to every single person on this world. It is very important for the sake of the well being of every human person—every human being—that we set aside our political agendas. We have to minister to people. We need to engage in creating good programs, in giving healthy leadership to these persons, in ministering to their needs without prejudice. So, I urge you, friends, all of you, to set aside your political agendas. People need to be ministered. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Would you come to *Mike* 4, please. Yes. Are you speaking in favor?

WILLIAM WILSON (West Virginia): I'm speaking against the...

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. I need a speech in favor. We've had three against. All right. Will you come to microphone...

WILSON: I'm speaking for the committee's recommendation.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK. You may proceed.

WILSON: I do speak urging the General Conference to support the legislative committee's recommendation of nonconcurrence. What bothers me in the material presented is the possibility of this kind of misfactual information being presented in print form to the life of our church. I am concerned about the misinformation that is presented around homosexuality and sexual behaviors because there are also heterosexual behaviors that are similar.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. We've had speeches for and against. You are now ready to vote. I'm going to put the question to the body. Petition 1161. The committee recommends nonconcurrence. We'll hear a word now from the chair.

GREENWAY: As I said prior, after much conversation and much prayerful conferencing about this petition, the majority of the legislative committee believed that this was not a directive that we were willing to give to the General Board of Discipleship at this time. Therefore, we encourage nonconcurrence...non-concurrence. We move non-concurrence. Thank you.

*Homosexual Transformation Program
Proposed for GBOD Is Defeated*

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 741; No, 200*] You have sustained the committee. We have one final item.

GREENWAY: This is found on *DCA*, page no. 2037. This is Calendar Item 665, Petition 31143. The original language for this can be found on p. 281 of your *Advance DCA*. I would like to make two editorial corrections that are... that were reflected in the deliberations and final decisions... in the Discipleship Committee, but were not reflected in the print edition that's before you on p. 237 and 238. The first one is in the title, where it says "Subject: Certified Lay Preacher," we would ask that you strike the word "Preacher" and put the word "Assistant." The second is found on p. 238, or 2038. And the paragraph no. 5. There are two references to "lay preacher" there. If you would strike the word "preacher" and write the word "assistant." This petition calls for a new category of lay ministry flowing out of the lay speaking ministry. The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence. The rationale is that for several General Conferences now, there has been an increasing number of petitions coming to this

body speaking about the ministry of lay preaching. We have considered the Judicial Council Ruling 693 in taking a look at refining this particular piece of legislation, and we believe that we have answered the questions of Judicial Council Ruling 693 and kept within the spirit of the original legislation, and kept that in the intent of this petition as it is before you. On behalf of the committee, I move concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 665 is before you. Would you come to mike 2, please.

*Petition to Change Lay Preacher
to Lay Assistant
Referred for Judicial Council Ruling*

ARNOLD RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): I move that this Petition 31143, Calendar Item 665 as amended, be sent to the Judicial Council to determine its constitutionality.

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, first we'll need to determine whether or not the body wishes to adopt it.

RHODES: In the *Book of Discipline*, paragraph 2609.2, it states that the Judicial Council shall have jurisdiction to determine to constitutionality on any proposed legislation when such declaratory decision is requested by the General Council.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, let's put that before the body. Is there a second? All right, do you want to address it. Thank you.

RHODES: As indicated by the chair, it has been a number of occasions in which a variety of petitions have been brought to the General Conference which have been declared unconstitutional. And so, we would like to be assured that as we use the term "Lay Assistant" as well as other items within that particular petition, it is constitutional.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Then the motion is for a declaratory decision regarding Petition 665. Does anyone wish to address that motion? Jeff.

GREENWAY: The members of the Legislative Committee worked very hard on this piece, but we know that no matter what happens at the body, it's going to be appealed to Judicial Council.

So I believe that in the spirit of what we were about in that Legislative Committee that would be in order. We would appreciate that declaratory decision.

BISHOP LYGHT: Very well, then the matter is before you. Request for declaratory decision from the Judicial Council regarding Petition 665. If you affirm that vote 1 yes, no 2. Please vote when the light appears. All right, you have affirmed that and the petition is referred with the request for declaratory decision. [Yes, 792; No, 138]

GREENWAY: Bishop Lyght, pending the decision at the Judicial Council this may be the last item of business you have from the Discipleship Legislative Committee. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. Turn now to Harold Batiste, Independent Commissions.

*Independent Commissions
Committee Report*

HAROLD BATISTE, JR. (Southwest Texas): Good evening Bishop Lyght, members of the General Conference. The Independent Commissions Committee has 7 items to present this evening. But first, let me please allow me to introduce the Leadership Team. The vice-chairperson is David Banks who is clergy delegate from the North Carolina Conference. Secretary is Margie Briggs, a lay delegate from the Missouri West Conference. And the chair of the our sub-committees are Gilbert Hanke, lay delegate from the Texas Conference; Thomasina Stewart, lay delegate from the West Virginia Conference; Jaime Potter-Miller, clergy delegate from the Western Pennsylvania Conference; and Dean Yamamoto, clergy delegate from the Oregon-Idaho Conference. I'm Harold Batiste, lay delegate from the Southwest Texas Conference, and I serve as chair. First, let me call your attention to DCA p. 2094, Calendar Item 1206, Petition 30286. The *Advance DCA* p. 1096. According to the new rules, we would say that the committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, according to the rules the matter is before you and we're required for you to vote on it. The matter is before you, Petition 1206. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the Committee. - [Yes, 704; No, 138]

BATISTE: Our second item DCA p. 2094, Calendar Item 1209, Petition 31585. In the advanced DCA, p. 1827. The committee recommends concurrence as amended.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1209 is before us. The yellow card, please come to mike 8.

DIANNE BAUMAN (Oklahoma): I thought we were to be given rationale for each of these of these petitions, please.

BISHOP LYGHT: You may give a rationale. Thank you.

*Exploring Spiritual Gifts and
Women in the Bible Encouraged*

BATISTE: Thank you. The commission is encouraged to explore relationships between spiritual gifts and women in the Bible. The committee moves concurrence as amended because this study would help both to understand and to receive the variety of gifts we bring to our church.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right the petition is before us, 1209. I see no cards, please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 713; No, 175]

BATISTE: DCA p. 2094, Calendar Item 1208, Petition 31611. *Advance DCA* p. 1089. The committee recommends nonconcurrence because this legislation does not take into account the unique needs of the Central Conferences, particularly during the occasions of conflict.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, I recognize the delegate in the back. Would you come to mike 5?

Open Meetings Legislation Debated

LONNIE BROOKS (Alaska Missionary): I move to amend Petition 31611 by the addition of a new sentence at the end of the existing text, which new sentence will read as follows: "At no time and in no place shall this article be construed as to require that a meeting of any body of the church be open when that action might endanger the life or health of any person." If there's a second, I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP LYGHT: It's seconded; you may speak to it.

BROOKS: Bishop, the mission of The United Methodist Church is to make disciples for Jesus Christ. The partners in that mission are the clergy and the laity of the church. To be fully empowered partners in that mission, lay people must have access to the means to power. In any organization, power is the ability to make or influence the making of decisions, and it is impossible to make meaningful decisions without access to information. Bodies of the church often have legitimate reasons to want to hold closed sessions from time

to time, and most of those reasons have been articulated in ¶721 of the *Book of Discipline*. However, the church is in ministry in parts of the world where it faces hostility from governments and other elements of society. And we of the western world need to be sensitive to that, even as we attempt that meetings of church bodies are not closed to avoid the embarrassment of ideological difference.

BISHOP LYGHT: You'll need to sum up.

BROOKS: I believe that if the General Conference amends the petition as suggested, adequate provision will have been made both for the concern of openness and the concern for security. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. Now we have the amendment before us. Would you come to mike seven, please?

RON BARHAM (Mississippi): I would hope, I would hope somebody would think about the hostility of a cabinet meeting (*laughter*) where all persons might be invited to come. Surely we can find some other way to say "all bodies of the church."

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Chair wish to address the amendment?

BATISTE: Yes. There's a recommendation for nonconcurrence and the committee recommends nonconcurrence again because this legislation does not take into account the, the unique needs of central conference and that's where the focus was.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Is the body clear about the amendment and can that amendment be brought to the secretary, please? Are you ready to vote on the amendment?

BATISTE: Bishop Lyght?

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes?

BATISTE: We also remind that it is the constitutional amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Yes? Would you come to mike number four please?

ALVIN HORTON (Virginia): Bishop, I believe the amendment, as I heard read, does include all bodies of the church, and I also do believe this amendment does address the issue the committee has brought forward. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. That's a speech against. Harold, would you clarify the fact that you indicated that

this is a constitutional amendment, although the committee nonconcur?

BATISTE: One moment, sir. Well, only because it is a constitutional amendment we would have to have two-thirds votes.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The amendment—yes, want to go to mike four?

HORTON: I believe you just said that that was a speech against. I was speaking in favor of the amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: You're speaking in favor of the amendment?

HORTON: Yes.

BISHOP LYGHT: Very well. Yes? Would you come to mike four please, or three is closer for you? All right. Mike 4.

Different Meanings of "Open" Offered

THELMA JOHNSON (West Ohio): What is in the book says "open to the public." Now they're talking, what they're saying now, they are saying to all branches of the church. There's a difference between the two. "Open to the public" means that anybody up the street can come into your meeting, regardless of what the situation is. We, right now, do not have everybody, even the members of the church, in the pastor-parish meetings. So I cannot understand why we would say "open to the public." And when they're talking, they're talking as if they're talking about to the, to the members of the congregation. It does not say "the congregation," it says "the public." And that's everybody, anybody.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. Yes? Would you come to mike six in the middle? You wish to address the amendment? Do you wish to speak against the amendment?

ALLEN AMSTUTZ (South Indiana): Yes, I do. I wish to speak against it. One example of that in the *Book of Discipline* in 262.2e where it says the committee, speaking to the Pastor Parish Relations Committee, may meet in closed session upon recommendation of pastor and so forth. Our brother also recommended—stated—that it's difficult, in regards to the cabinet, that there are times they need to meet in closed session. I'm sure it's true of the Council of Bishops. I think there are many examples where this is true. Therefore, I would speak, I would speak against the amendment as opening the door to the possibility of closed open sessions. And

then I would furthermore encourage us to support the committee.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Yes, would you come to mike eight, the yellow card here directly in front?

NANCY DUEL (Northern Illinois): Could you clarify for us where we can find this in *The Book of Discipline*? We can't find it.

BISHOP LYGHT: Would you clarify your question? Specifically, what are you looking for, please?

DUEL: The reference in the DCA does not help us to find where this is to be inserted in the *Discipline* or the Constitution.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, we'll turn to the committee.

BATISTE: To answer the question, it becomes Article 6, Bishop, and everything else is renumbered.

BISHOP LYGHT: We can't hear you.

BATISTE: It becomes, it becomes Article 6 and everything else is renumbered.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK, it becomes—

BATISTE: It's described on p. 1089, the left column, the third sentence. Insert new text as 6, Article 6, and renumbered accordingly.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Yes? Would you come to mike 1?

BYRD BONNER (Southwest Texas): Thank you, Bishop. The, I speak against the amendment. The subject of this amendment is something that I think is wholly improper to have in the constitution of a denomination. We have other provisions in our Rules of Order and our *Book of Discipline*. Specifically ¶721 on p. 415 of the 1996 United Methodist *Book of Discipline*, is entitled "Closed Session." It is the rule of order for our church as contained in the *Discipline* upon which closing meetings and sessions of the Council of Bishops, as well as groups within the life of the church, is based, and it is the proper place to find that kind of regulatory rule. There's also a good bit of legislation that will be before this body in the next—hopefully—36 hours that relate to Rule 721. So I would speak against the amendment and ask for support of the nonconcurrence of the committee. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. Does anyone wish to speak in favor of the amendment? Yellow card, please come to mike 5. Wish to speak in favor of the amendment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, you already recognized me and I spoke once.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it permitted?

BISHOP LYGHT: No.

(Laughter)

You want to come to mike 2?

DALE SHUNK: (West Pennsylvania) I'm in favor of the amendment, and I'd like to call for the question.

(Laughter)

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, that's, we're already at the question, thank you. The amendment is before us. I would like to ask the—can we have that amendment read, do we have it? We'll ask the secretary if she would read the amendment.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: "At no time and in no place shall this article be construed as to require that a meeting of any body of the church be open when that action might endanger the life or health of any person."

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. Would the committee like to address a final word? No?

BATISTE: Only that we recommended nonconcurrence and we have nothing else to add, sir.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The amendment is before you. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 228; No, 691*] All right. The amendment is lost. Now Petition 1208 is before you. Are you ready to vote on it?

DELEGATES: Yes.

BISHOP LYGHT: Do you have a question in the back? Come to mike 7. I believe the house is ready to vote.

JIM EHRMAN (East Ohio): Bishop, we've constantly heard this referred to as something being with central conferences. Are we aware that this is the Constitution? This applies to every meeting of every body of the church—US, outside the US, to the public?

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes, I think that point has already been made earlier. I'm going to put the matter before you now—Petition 1208. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 808; No, 120*] All right, you have sustained the committee—nonconcurrence.

BATISTE: Thank you, sir. The next item will be brought by the vice-chair, David Banks.

BISHOP LYGHT: Do you have a question in the back? Please come to mike 6.

BATISTE: A correction, Bishop Lyght. The next item will be brought by the secretary of the committee.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you.

BATISTE: Margie Briggs.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK. Would you wait just a minute please? Do you have a question?

STEVE YOOST (East Ohio): I would like to move for a 15-minute recess.

(Laughter—Applause)

BISHOP LYGHT: If you—

(Laughter)

—if you want to take a recess, vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 550; No, 353*] We're in recess, 15-minute recess.

(Laughter)

May we make our way to our seats, please. Let us make our way back to our desks. And we are ready now to resume our time together.

(Music)

Amen. Let us now be in order. Is there a question in the back? All right. Please come to mike 3. Do you have a question, or let us hear your matter?

Debate Limited to Two Speeches For and Two Speeches Against

TIMOTHY MCCLENDON (South Carolina): Bishop, I'd like to make a motion to suspend the rules to expedite time, that we limit speeches to 2 for and 2 against, and then the question be put, and to limit speeches to 2 minutes.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The motion is to suspend the rules, to limit the debate to two speeches for, two against, and each presentation to be two minutes. The matter is before you. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 694; No, 147*] All right, you have suspended the rules, and we have changed our rules. Two speeches for, two against, two minute presentations. All the way in back, the orange card.

North Carolina Conference and Hurricane Floyd

KERMIT L. BRASWELL (North Carolina): I would like to move to suspend the rules to permit the pages to

distribute this document which is entitled, "Glimpses of Grace: The North Carolina Conference and Hurricane Floyd," and also to say just a brief word of appreciation to the General Conference.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The motion is to suspend the rules for the distribution of this document from the North Carolina Conference. If you would suspend the rules, then vote when the light appears, Yes 1, No 2. [*Yes, 690; No, 172*] All right, you have suspended the rules. The document can be presented—distributed—and you may speak for a moment.

BRASWELL: Thank you very much. I will just take a moment because the document is self-explanatory, but on behalf of the North Carolina Conference, I wish to thank this entire General Conference. Conferences responded in such a powerful way when our conference was devastated because of the hurricane. We thank you so much for your support, your prayers, and your gifts. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, thank you. Down by mike 8.

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Thank you, Bishop Lyght. Is a motion to ask the Judicial Council for a declaratory decision in order?

BISHOP LYGHT: You can try.

Referral of Incomplete Petition in DCA Moved to Judicial Council

SWEET: I move to request a declaratory decision from the Judicial Council as to whether a vote taken by the General Conference is valid if only a portion of the petition is made available to the delegates, specifically the portion of Petition 3179 referring to Paragraph 2602 indicating that the action would take effect immediately was not made available to the conference. If there's a second, I would like to make one comment.

BISHOP LYGHT: It is seconded. You may speak to it.

SWEET: I'm very concerned about the precedent that has been set by our action this afternoon.

BISHOP LYGHT: Does anyone else wish to address that? Yes? Would you come to mike 1?

WERLEIN: I would oppose this referral. This is an effort to reopen something that we've spent an enormous amount of time on this afternoon. We have an enormous amount of work yet

to do. We've already now cut our debate time down to two speeches and two minutes. It seems to me that we have got to put some things behind us and go on. And I would ask that we vote "No" on this.

BISHOP LYGHT: Right. Would you go to mike 6 here, the yellow card. Yes.

BETH CAPEN (New York): I would agree with Bob Sweet. There may come a time when anyone viewing any way on a particular issue could suffer as a result of the way things stand currently. Because as it is, the ruling could indicate that we pass legislation where we have not actually seen the full substance of that which gets passed. And it may not hurt someone's position on this particular issue, but it could have devastating effects on another.

BISHOP LYGHT: The orange card should go to mike 8, please. Are you wishing to speak against? You need to speak against.

BRIAN K. JARMAN (South Indiana): I'm speaking against. Every delegate has the opportunity to research each petition pertaining to *Discipline* before the vote is taken. I urge you vote against referring this to Judicial Council on this basis.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. We've reached our limit. We're ready to vote now on reference to the Judicial Council. If you would support that request, press 1, if not press 2. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 337; No, 574*] It is not supported. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm corrected. We did have 20%, so it is referred. Thank you. I want to recognize delegate Don Holladay for a matter of personal privilege. What is your point of order?

BISHOP LYGHT: Do you have a point of order? Go to mike okay 4.

WALTER KIMBROUGH (North Georgia): I'm confused that the rendering of the last vote regarding referencing something petition to Judicial Council and you ruled that it was supported.

Referrals to Judicial Council Require Only 20% Vote

BISHOP LYGHT: What we were dealing with on that matter is that the *Discipline* simply indicates that a vote of 20% is needed to sustain a reference to the Judicial Council. I was corrected and we did have a 20% vote. Paragraph 2609.1. I'm calling on Don Holladay

now for a matter of personal privilege. Mike 8.

DONALD HOLLADAY (New Mexico): Thank you Bishop. Many of us have been aware and concerned about the situation with the forest fires in southern and northern New Mexico and we've just received word this evening from members of this board who are pages with us this week who are residents of the scientific community of Los Alamos, that that community has been threatened for several days and 50 mile-an-hour winds today have caused it to be evacuated. We're concerned about the laboratory there, of course, but more importantly we're concerned with the people, some of whom you may know, one of whom is, at least one, is a former member of this group, Dr. Paul White, and so I would ask if you, Bishop, to lead us in a moment of silent prayer for the people of the Jemez Mountains and northern New Mexico.

BISHOP LYGHT: Let us be in a moment of prayer. Let us be in silence.

(prayer)

I'm going to come back now to Independent Commissions.

*Igniting Ministry Media Campaign
Approved*

DAVID BANKS (North Carolina): Please turn to your DCA p. 1840, Calendar Item 76. Refers to Petition 30473. The petition is found on p. 1395. The title is "Igniting Ministry Media Campaign." The Independent Commissions moves concurrence as amended with a reference to GCFA. The rationale is simple, we are told to go and make disciples. This helps us to engage the world invitationally.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, according to our rules the matter is properly before us. We've heard the statement and we are now under our rules ready to vote. We're voting on Calendar Item 76 without debate. Please vote when the light appears. All right you have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 839; No, 68*]

BANKS: The second item is on the same DCA p. 1840, Calendar Item 77. Refers to Petition 30096 which is found on the *Advance* p. 1377. It entitled "Support Funding in the Igniting Ministry Campaign." We move concurrence on this one as well as it is simply supportive of the action just made.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, the matter is before you, please vote when the light

appears. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 829; No, 73*]

MARGIE BRIGGS (Missouri West): Would you please turn in your DCA to p. 1995, the top left hand of the page you'll find Calendar Item 646. The reference in the *ADCA* is 1378. We will be dealing with Petition 30288. "Create a general commission on drugs and alcohol." The Committee recommends nonconcurrence and the rationale is that this ministry is already being done by the Board of Global Ministries and we recommend nonconcurrence. If you would like to reference their report, that is on p. 1845 of the *Advance DCA*.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 646 is before you. I see no cards, please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee in nonconcurrence. [*Yes, 867; No, 44*]

BANKS: Bishop Lyght this concludes our report for the evening.

*Balloting Resumes for
Laity Alternates to Judicial Council*

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. We're going to go back now to lay persons for the Judicial Council and ask if that screen can be brought up.

The valid votes were 1,824. Valid ballots—931. Needed to elect: 457. Invalid ballots: 2. (*Pause*)

And there is no election. My understanding is that we need to elect two persons. Is that correct, Carolyn? That is correct. We need to elect two.

Now, do you have the numbers? Or do you need that read?

You have the numbers. My understanding is that we will vote twice in order to vote for two persons. Vote for one person at a time. Please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*)

All right. Please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) All right. Thank you very much. Green card, would you come to mike 6?

ERIC MCKINNEY (Central Texas): Bishop, thank you. I know it's hard to see cards over in here, blocked by the numbers. I move that GCFA report to the General Conference at tomorrow morning's session the approximate total of the amount of the non-budget requests, which have been referred to it by this General Conference thus far.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. This is a motion for a reporting from GCFA. It's seconded. You wish to address it?

*GCFA Asked to Report Price of
Programs Approved Thus Far*

MCKINNEY: Yes sir, I would. We have had such tremendous proposals put before this General Conference. So much ministry has been visioned. We can do nothing but celebrate the vision and, at the same time, those of us who are here face the task of returning home and standing before our local churches, seeking to justify the actions of this General Conference. It has been stated that we cannot put a price on any human life, which is absolutely correct. I think it is also absolutely correct to say we are not a denomination of unlimited financial resource. To be responsible and to give us a picture of what it is we seek to do as a denomination, I think we could make better-informed decisions simply knowing what we have referred thus far.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The request is before us. It appears that you're ready to vote on it. Please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) You have sustained the request to GCFA to give us an approximate reporting tomorrow. [*Yes, 717; No, 185*] Thank you. Want to turn now to Financial Administration. Stan Sager. (*Pause*)

STAN SAGER (Chair, Finance & Administration Legislative Committee): I would refer the body to Calendar Item 1170. I don't think I have a mike here yet. Now it's on. I'd refer the body to Calendar Item 117. I'm sorry, to DCA p. 2091. It's late and the numbers are slipping. Calendar Item 1170. In the *Advance DCA*, it is found at p. 469, Petition 31767. The committee voted concurrence with referral to GCFA.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1170 is before you. See no cards—please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) You have the sustained the committee. [*Yes, 817; No, 75*]

SAGER: On p. 2091 of *DCA*, Calendar Item 1172 appears. It is on *Advance DCA* p. 457 as Petition 30485. The committee has voted non-concurrence in favor of Report no. 9 from GCFA on p. 345 of the *Advance DCA*, which is Calendar Item 1358, Petition 30708, which addresses the same issue. So we vote . . . We have urged non-concurrence on that item, since it will be considered under GCFA Report 9.

BISHOP LYGHT: Item 1172 is before you. Please vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 808; No, 103*]

SAGER: DCA p. 2091, Calendar Item 1173. ADCA p. 436, Petition 30006. The committee voted concurrence, believing that to reflect actual receipts in budgeting, information would be beneficial information for the church at-large to have.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1173 is before you. Please vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* You have sustained the committee. *[Yes, 833; No, 70]*

Conference Determines "Young People" Are Between Ages 12-17

SAGER: DCA p. 2091, Calendar Item 1174. The petition is at ADCA, p. 431, Petition 31246. Committee has voted concurrence to clear up some language about young people, to specify between the ages of 12 to 17.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. *[Yes, 854; No, 52]*

SAGER: DCA p. 2091, Calendar Item 1175. This addresses a provision in the Constitution, Bishop. It is found on ADCA p. 425, Petition 30809. It is simply to clear up some language that addresses the Evangelical United Brethren Church and is really in the nature of housekeeping.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1175 is before us, it's a constitutional change, but under our rules is not debatable. Please vote when the light appears. It is sustained with more than a 2/3 vote. *[Yes, 900; No, 15]*

SAGER: DCA p. 2091, Calendar Item 1176, *Advance DCA* p. 466, Petition 31504. The committee has voted concurrence on this pension issue to resolve some inconsistencies and difficulties.

BISHOP LYGHT: Under our rules it is not debatable. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. *[Yes, 877; No, 15]*

SAGER: There is one other petition, Bishop, which is sort of in the nature of housekeeping also, if I might address it. The action which was taken this afternoon with respect to the Connectional Ministries Funding Task Force resulted in what appears to GCFA as an inconsistency with a petition which was acted on the consent calendar and which was brought to you by the Local Church Committee. That would be at Calendar Item 1108, p. 2084, the petition is in the ADCA is at 1117, Petition 31150. The difficulty has come up, that

was voted nonconcurrence and I would move to reconsider that in view of the action taken on the Connectional Ministries Funding Task Force.

BISHOP LYGHT: Stan, would you give us the petition number again.

SAGER: The Petition is 31150.

BISHOP LYGHT: And the page.

SAGER: Page in the *Advance DCA* is 1117.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, you're moving for reconsideration, is that correct.

SAGER: Yes.

BISHOP LYGHT: It has a second. All right, are you ready to vote? All right, mike 1, please.

Need to Clear Up Conflicting Legislation Concerning Connectional Funding

GLENN KOHLHEPP (Western Pennsylvania): We're looking on p. 1117 at Petition 31150. The new material in that petition was moved in that's just above it which actually starts at the bottom of p. 1116, Petition 30064. So if what we need is that new material, it's actually in that other petition which is on the consent calendar.

BISHOP LYGHT: We turn to the committee for some guidance there.

KOHLHEPP: Thank you.

SAGER: I'm not sure that I understood what the question was. The difficulty with the paragraph, if it's appropriate to address in view of the comment which was made. Is that appropriate?

BISHOP LYGHT: Go ahead

SAGER: The difficulty as related to me by GCFA with the passage of this is that it appears that it may be interpreted to conflict with the Connectional Funding Task Force that this afternoon, you recall, split conference benevolences and apportionments out. Is the language refers to that appears to link them again with the World Service and Conference Benevolences funds. That language, and it's a minor difficulty, would appear that that could just be set aside.

BISHOP LYGHT: Ok, so the request then from Finance is to reconsider the matter. If you will reconsider the matter, please vote when the light appears. All right, you have reconsidered. *[Yes, 704; No, 189]* Stan, you want to go ahead. I think it would be helpful if you restate again the issue that is before us.

SAGER: The issue that is before us is an apparent conflict or the possibility of a conflict between the language of the Connectional Ministries Funding Task Force as passed this afternoon and the result which came about in the consideration of Petition 31150. So we would reverse the decision which was made earlier.

BISHOP LYGHT: What was the original disposition? Can you refer us to the petition in DCA?

SAGER: I'm sorry. I could not hear the question.

BISHOP LYGHT: We need to see the petition in the DCA so that we can see what it is that we need to do.

SAGER: The Petition 31150 at p. 1117.

BISHOP LYGHT: Here it's not clear as to the action that you want us to take a look at.

SAGER: The action to take would be to reconsider.

BISHOP LYGHT: We are reconsidering it.

SAGER: The action taken originally on the item Calendar Item 1108 which is on the consent calendar.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, 1108, and what's your recommendation then with regard to 1108?

SAGER: 1108 I believe was nonconcurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: The committee originally recommended nonconcurrence.

SAGER: And we are recommending concurrence.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The item no. is 1108 on 2084. Originally, the committee recommended nonconcurrence that was sustained. Under our reconsideration, the committee is now recommending concurrence. The matter is before us. Yellow card back No. 5 mike. No. 5 please.

SHIRLEY PARRIS (New York): The problem, Bishop, is that we voted nonconcurrence on 1108 but we took that sentence and put it in another petition which is in item 747. So if we reconsider 1108 then we'll have to do something with 747 which now contains 1108.

SAGER: Bishop, I know it is late and perhaps because of the possibility of conflict I believe there is a committee which addresses those issues and perhaps as a last minute reprieve we could simply refer it to that committee.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, we need a motion to refer. It is moved and seconded to refer. If you would refer please vote when the light appears. All right the matter 1108 is referred and hopefully we will have it sorted out at a later time. [Yes, 852; No, 54]

SAGER: Thank you for your patience and there is always a way out, Bishop.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you. That completes your work for this evening?

SAGER: For this evening.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, thank you very much. (Applause) We turn now to J. LaVon Wilson, Higher Education.

Report of Higher Education Committee

J. LA VON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): Good evening, Bishop. I would like to make clarification on a couple of numbers that you possibly might see on the screen. Page 1994, Calendar Item 635 and 640 with Petitions 31452 and 30736 were acted upon on the evening of May 9th, 2000, so we can disregard those this evening.

BISHOP LYGHT: OK.

WILSON: And then, if you would, in your DCA on p. 2079, Calendar Item 1042, Petition 31885, *Advance DCA* 1368. With our previous action, it is now on the Consent Calendar, so we do not really have to deal with that one this evening either. Takes care of three.

BISHOP LYGHT: Are you saying that 1042 is on the Consent Calendar?

WILSON: 1042.

BISHOP LYGHT: 1042?

WILSON: We changed the numbers of how many, and that's been changed.

BISHOP LYGHT: You want to give us the numbers, because what's printed in front of us doesn't show that?

WILSON: I believe that you said that if we had ten or less, that it, it would be placed upon the Consent Calendar. I believe that was what was moved this morning. Am I correct?

BISHOP LYGHT: Very well, under our new rules.

WILSON: Under our new rules, this puts it on the Consent Calendar.

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes. Mike 2. Do you have a question?

ARNOLD RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): Was not that pulled off the Consent Calendar? 1042? So it is before us.

BISHOP LYGHT: I need to turn to the committee for help in that regard. It was pulled from Consent?

WILSON: Since this has been pulled off the Consent Calendar, Bishop, we will deal with it. "Because of the power", "because of their powers", we're speaking of, of Calendar Item 1042, subject matter is, "Because of their powers, bishops shall not publicly violate the *Book of Discipline*." And the Petition 31885, and the material is on p. 1368 in your *Advance DCA*. The committee recommended nonconconcurrence because the petition asks for what is already expected of our episcopal leaders.

BISHOP LYGHT: Petition 1042 is before you. Committee recommends nonconconcurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 627; No, 277] All right, you have sustained the committee.

WILSON: Our next report is found on p. 2093. It is Calendar Item 1200. In the *Advance DCA*, it is on p. 966. The Petition is 30049. To this report, Bishop, we have a minority report. Don Messer will speak to that at this time.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right.

Minority Report Offered on Clergy Performing Same-sex Marriages

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Bishop Lyght, members of the General Conference, the minority report is clearly stated, namely, ceremonies that celebrate homosexual unions shall not be required of our ministers nor be conducted in our churches without the permission of the pastor in charge. Personally, I have never conducted nor even attended a same-sex union service. However, I know and cherish many wonderful gay and lesbian friends who long have lived and loved within committed, caring, and responsible relationships. These Christian sisters and brothers, however, are currently denied the ministry of The United Methodist Church since our pastors are forbidden from celebrating same-sex unions in our churches. The minority report recommends that ceremonies that celebrate homosexual unions shall not be required of any of our ministers nor should they be conducted in our churches without the permission of the pastor in charge. This report is designed to serve three purposes. First, it affirms the sacred worth and dignity of all persons and offers a possibility of ministry to all of God's children. This is

in keeping with what we profess to believe but what in practice we deny.

Just last week, the Greater Milwaukee Synod of the Lutheran Church took this step forward by recognizing, affirming the blessing of such committed same-gender relationships by pastors after counseling of the couple seeking such a blessing. Now is the time for United Methodism to live up to our highest values and truly show love and care for all God's people. Second, this minority report deserves support because it restores the historic, professional, and theological understanding of what it means to be a clergy person. This legislation specifically states that no clergy person is required to conduct such unions but is once again responsible for making such pastoral decisions.

BISHOP LYGHT: You need to sum up, Don.

MESSER: Third, this minority report should be affirmed because it provides all of us a pathway out of the jungle, expense, and tragedy of unnecessary church trials. As Bishop Tuell noted, we are driving the best of our clergy out. We must help them adhere to their high calling. What United Methodism needs is to move away from the lethal legalism and toward the magnificent mercy of God that Bishop Morgan pointed to us. Love is never abstract; it means people. And we urge you to support this minority report. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The chair will need some guidance because we're almost at the time of closing our time this evening. So, Mary Alice, I need to turn to you for some guidance perhaps so that the body can make a decision.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I move to extend the time 15 minutes to allow for this issue to be settled before we close the session tonight.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right. The motion is that we extend the time by 15 minutes to allow closure on this single matter that is before us. Have a second to that? All right. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 791; No, 139] All right. You have extended the time for the purpose of considering this matter and wrapping up the other matters that we need to deal with tonight. Where we are is that we have a minority report which is an amendment to the committee report. Who wishes to speak to the amendment? Yes?

MESSER: Bishop?

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes?

MESSER: I believe it's a substantively different, not an amendment.

BISHOP LYGHT: It's a substitute? But it's an amendment, a substitute amendment. Right. All right. We're going to go back and perfect the original. I recognize the pink card here. Would you go to mike 5?

JAMIE JENKINS (North Georgia): I have a question, Bishop. Regarding the wording of the minority report. I heard what was said—

BISHOP LYGHT: Well, we're actually on the main motion. Do you want to address that? We're going to perfect the main motion first.

JENKINS: Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: Yes? Mike 8?

EMERY PERCELL (Northern Illinois): Bishop, my understanding is that the minority report is an amendment; it is to be perfected first. Is that not the case?

BISHOP LYGHT: No, we're gonna perfect the main motion first. Does anyone wish to speak to the main motion? Yes? Would you go to mike 8?

DANIEL IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): Bishop, with all due respect, I appeal the ruling of the chair. Under the rules, Bishop, you have three minutes to state your position. I have three minutes to respond, then we vote. Three, under the rules. It's a different rule.

BISHOP LYGHT: Originally I was going to treat the matter as an amendment, and then I was challenged on that and we, we shifted over to treat it as a substitute. And, we'll let the house decide how you want to proceed on this. If—yes, come to mike 6 and state your point of order.

JANET STEPHENSON (Iowa): If you look on p. 1263 in the Rules of Order, under Rule 36.2, it says "A minority report shall be processed as a substitution for the report of the committee pursuant to Rule 25, as would any other substitute."

BISHOP LYGHT: That is correct. The chair is going to rule that in light of the reference just made to Rule 36, Section 2, that the way we proceed then is to go back and perfect the main motion. Once that is done then we come to the substitute. Does anyone wish to address the main motion? Yes, green card. Would you come to mike 6?

JUNE GOLDMAN (Iowa): Point of order. Bishop . . .

BISHOP LYGHT: Mike 6. Yes.

GOLDMAN: Thank you. I am just asking for clarification when we perfect the main motion. I am not at all clear as to what this wording actually is recommending. I thought from the title that they were simply moving this matter to the ministry section, but I'm not sure just where the words fit in that section. Perhaps others are not clear either.

BISHOP LYGHT: Can I have a response from the committee?

WILSON: This petition places the language prohibiting our pastors performing same-sex unions in the special provision, provisions paragraph within the ministry section. This would place the prohibitive language within the main body of the *Discipline* rather than only in the Social Principles section. The language does not change.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, yellow card. Come to mike 8 please.

PERCELL: Bishop, I move an amendment to the motion and that is that the word *shall* shall be replaced by the word *should* in both places where it appears. If there's a second, I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP LYGHT: We have a second.

PERCELL: In the Northern Illinois Conference we have had one church trial that has been not only divisive, but destructive. It polarized our annual conference. Church trials are, are destructive of our church, of the family, of our denomination; we cannot allow that. We have people on both sides of the issue. We, we need all of the advice and all of the influence that we can bring to bear to change each others' minds, but we cannot allow church trials to drive some members out of the denomination.

BISHOP LYGHT: All right, that's an amendment to the main motion that where *shall* appears it should be replaced by *should*. Yes, would you come to mike 3?

Same-sex Union Debate Tabled for Faith and Order Committee Report

DAN G. JOHNSON (Florida): I'm also on the Faith and Order legislative committee where we explored this whole issue in great detail. And it seems to me that it fits under that discussion; so I would move to table this until after we have talked about it out of the Faith and Order legislative committee.

BISHOP LYGHT: It's seconded. The motion is to table this matter until the

body gains information from Faith and Order in terms of the material that they're working with. Did we have a second on that? It was seconded. Then it appears you are ready to vote. Motion is to table, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 682; No, 239] All right you have approved the motion to table. All of the matters that are before us with regard to Petition 1200 are tabled. All right we're going to end our time with Higher Ed. and we have some closing details but we'll have to come back to you tomorrow.

Daniel Evans Elected Lay Member of Judicial Council

JOHNSON: Very well, we will see you in the morning.

BISHOP LYGHT: We have a ballot report on lay, the Judicial Council, if that screen could be brought up please. Valid ballots 1799, ballots 918, needed to elect 450. Invalid ballots, 7. (Applause)

We have one election, Daniel F. Evans Jr., 494. We can take another ballot. This time you will vote for one person. One person. Do you need the screen again. All right, they are on the screen. Please vote for one person when the light appears, one person. OK, thank you very much. Let me turn now to the secretary for... Question? You want the screen again? Yes, we will vote one more time. Please vote when the light appears. (Applause)

Ann Saunkeah is elected. Are these persons present? Wave your hand. (Applause) We congratulate you. (Applause) OK, thank you very much. All right we will turn to secretary for a few notices.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: The presiding officers committee is ready to give a report for tomorrow, so you may want to receive that at some point, Bishop. Then the announcements that I have, I believe, are two. One you would like to know, I'm sure, that the offering which we all gave at the beginning of this session tonight for pages and marshals, totals \$13,906.91. (Applause) The Judicial Council will hold oral hearings on calendar item 665, referred in this evening's plenary. The oral hearings will be at 2:00 P.M. Thursday in room R225.

BISHOP LYGHT: We turn now to Paul Extrum-Fernandez, mike 4.

Bishops Solomon, Carder, and Johnson Selected to Preside on Thursday

PAUL EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ: Thank you Bishop Lyght. Presiding at tomorrow morning's session will be

Bishop Dan Solomon of the Louisiana area. Presiding at the afternoon will be Bishop Kenneth Carder of the Nashville area. Presiding at the evening session will be Bishop Alfred Johnson from the New Jersey area. Thank you.

BISHOP LYGHT: Thank you very much. I'd like to express my appreciation to the house for the wonderful spirit in which we have done our work together this evening. And I want to say thanks too, to my colleagues who have backed me up here, Bishop Irons and Bishop Skeete. And I pray that God's blessing will be upon each one of you as you go forth. Know that the end is in sight, but there is much work to do before we end. I want to turn now to my colleague Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher for a moment of prayer.

BISHOP SHARON BROWN CHRISTOPHER: Please join me in prayer. *(prayer)*

BISHOP LYGHT: Amen. Go in peace.

Thursday Morning May 11, 2000

(Bishop Dan E. Solomon, presiding)

BISHOP JUDITH CRAIG (West Ohio Area): Let us pray together. *(Unison prayer)* You may be seated. *(Pause)*

(Singing)
(Applause)

KAREN ALLEY: A reading from the book of Ephesians, Chapter 2:11-22.

BISHOP DAN E. SOLOMON (Louisiana Area): How blessed we have been this morning by the preaching of Bishop Joel Martínez, and also the Agape Children's Handbell Choir and the Agape Methodist Church ministry in our midst from Parnu, Estonia. I know you are deeply grateful for all who have led us so well in worship this morning.

Now, sisters and brothers, as you are taking your places, may we be aware . . . just focus a moment. Our very name speaks to us of who we are. We're not a general meeting. We're not a general convention. We're not a general assembly. We are a *General Conference*. That is, a community of the followers of Jesus Christ engaged in holy conferencing with one another, that is Spirit-led, respectful, honest, and caring. May God's Holy Spirit lead us to be all that our name so identifies on this day.

Now I'm going to ask you to turn in your *DCA*. We're going to address immediately two or three resolutions that have been presented there, and then we'll be calling on the Calendar Committee to set our agenda for us as we move through the remainder of our session this morning.

Philippines Resolutions Discussed

Will you turn in your *DCA* to page 2015, where you will see two resolutions relative to the circumstances and situation in the Philippines. You will notice in the left-hand column there is an explanatory note regarding these two resolutions. The Samson resolution was voted and then reconsidered, and these two resolutions are before us, the Samson resolution and the Rapisora resolution. You notice in the explanation the difference in these two resolutions. The second resolution is being treated as a substitute. Our procedure will be to perfect the first resolution, if you have perfecting that you want to do, or you may simply acknowledge that it stands in its own strength as it is. And then we'll turn to the second resolution. We'll perfect the second resolution, and then we'll proceed to vote on the second resolution as a substitute and from there we will move as you have indicated by your action. Is there a comment or a question that needs to be addressed to the first resolution? I do not see a card, so I'm going to move to the second resolution. Do you have a comment or a question that you would like to address to the second resolution? Mike 3, please.

NIMFA T. PASTORES (Mindanao Philippines): I am from the southern region of the country where painful fights of the Filipinos against fellow Filipinos are going on. The substitute resolution we presented is a commitment to be clear and comprehensive and concise. We endeavor to be clear and comprehensive by picturing the reality that there are two parties involved in and responsible for the continuing violent conflict that is; both the rebels and the government have a hand in the problem. The board of church and society of our conference is involved in a number of dialogues between Muslims and Christians which resulted in some concrete steps towards mutual understanding and respect and reconciliation. We do not want to do—we do not want to jeopardize the progress of our conciliatory effort. This is the basic reason why we are very careful in

giving the real picture. By this substitute resolution, we are keeping the door open for continuing process of dialogue in the spirit of truth and justice, which are the roots of true and lasting peace.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you very much. You would understand that if you prefer the substitute resolution, you will vote yes, for it will be placed before us first. If you prefer the first resolution, you will vote no on this one in order to be able to vote yes on the other one. These are the two resolutions that are before us. I think that our house is ready to proceed to vote on these resolutions. We'll take the substitute resolution first. Please vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 642; No, 165]* You have approved the substitute resolution, 642 to 165. It becomes the main motion. If you will approve as the main motion, please vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 773; No, 50]* The substitute has been adopted as the main motion.

Resolution on Sierra Leone Introduced

Now I would ask you to turn in your *DCA* to p. 2212. We have a resolution printed there relative to the situation in Sierra Leone. It is before us, page 2212. Going to proceed now to inquire if you have comments or questions relative to the resolution number [page] 2212. All right, there is a card at—go to mike 8, please.

TYSON FERGUSON (Detroit): Bishop, is there something we can do to help you. The last couple of days, back here, we've been trying to get the chair's attention. The last resolution, we had people back here waving cards. What can we do to assist you to acknowledge that we're back here? If you could help us or advise us, we would appreciate it. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, you have certainly with your very statement brought an added degree of sensitization. And we'll try to proceed in the fairest possible manner. The resolution is numbered on p. 2212 and it is related to the Sierra Leone Annual Conference, a resolution from the delegates. You've had it before you. You have read it again. Are there comments or questions regarding this resolution? All right. There is a card in the back. Will you please go to mike 8?

ULISES TORRES (New England): I wonder if a friendly amendment could be accepted. In all conflicts, not only human beings and property suffer destruction and mutilation, but also

God's creation, as such. So I would like to offer just an inclusion in the first paragraph at the end. "Destruction of property and God's creation."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I believe the house has heard that. That resolution actually belongs to the house at this point. Is there objection from the house to adding those words? I do not hear any, so I believe that is received as a friendly amendment, and that inclusion is made. The resolution is before us. Are there other comments or questions? Then I sense that we are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. I'm sorry, Excuse me, we had a card I didn't see. All right. I believe we're going to mike 7. Is that correct? Mike 7. Mike 7.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My Lord Bishop, this resolution is very timely and so if it is adopted or passed by this General delegates Conference, we pray that its implementation be immediate. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. Other comments or questions? I believe we are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. You have approved this resolution [*Yes, 844; No, 18*] and in the spirit of the request of the delegate, will you join with me in a moment of silent prayer as we indeed offer special prayers for the victims of these acts of violence on the people of Sierra Leone.

(prayer)

Now, I invite you to continue as we look at additional resolutions that are before us. I believe that on 2211, you have a resolution that is printed here, in French, and then you have, I believe, the resolution also in English, assumedly so, maybe so, on 2212. All right. Please go to mike 3. I'm sorry, there's not a card. All right. Yes there is. All Right. Please go to mike 3.

Motion Made by Congolese Delegation

AKASA OMAMBUDI (Central Congo): Bishop, I want to read the motion from the Congolese delegate to the General Conference 2000.

We the Congolese United Methodist delegates to the General Conference,

Whereas the given situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo has been grave for the past ten years,

Whereas the hopes of the Congolese people were rejuvenated with the new regime in 1997,

Whereas the reason for the invasion was originally given as related to security at the borders. It is now evident that this is not true because the forces from the invading countries are 1,500 kms deep inside Congolese territory,

Whereas the war in the Congo is a war of aggression and not a rebellion,

Whereas Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi's aggression is funded by some western powers,

Whereas Rwandan, Ugandan, and Burundian troops have been assassinating innocent civilians, deporting the Christian and Muslim leaders, raping and deliberately contaminating women with HIV/AIDS, cutting pregnant women's wombs open and are burying people alive,

Whereas despite statements from the presidents of Rwanda and Uganda to end the war, hostilities from both countries against our people have not ceased. Instead, they are perpetrating a genocide in our country,

Be it hereby resolved that our Methodist brothers and sisters in the United States plead to President Clinton and the United States Congress to work with the Security Council of the United Nations and demand the withdrawal of Rwandan, Burundian and Ugandan troops from Congolese territory. If these countries refuse to heed the call to withdraw, both the US and the UN should impose an arms embargo on those countries. The embargo should also cover the purchase of diamonds and natural resources looted from Congo.

Be it hereby resolved that the General Conference will adopt a resolution to support financially, politically and spiritually, the peace process initiated by the All Africa Conference of Churches under the leadership of Bishop Onema and accepted by the government of Democratic Republic of Congo. We plead to the General Conference to provide continuing financial support to UMCOR, which has been instrumental in assisting people displaced from the war. In addition, the General Conference should ask Christians from Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi to pressure their governments to withdraw their troops to their respective countries.

Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you.

It has been helpful to have it read before us. So, now it is before us? Is there a

comment or a question? Yes, in the very back. Please go to mike 8.

CHARLES S. G. BOAYUE, JR. (Detroit): Although no resolution before this General Conference would ever be perfect in everything it calls for, I invite every delegate voting this morning to help this General Conference by casting your vote in favor of this resolution, so that all of us would give a 100 percent support to this resolution and, at least show on this one issue, that all United Methodist people are solidly united. I would appeal that not one dissenting vote be placed anywhere else but in support of this resolution.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's a speech for the resolution. Other comments or questions that need to be addressed to this resolution before we take our vote? Yes, the ... Please go to mike 2.

AKASA J. UMEMBUDI (Central Congo): *(Interpretation from French)*

The situation in the Congo is a dramatic situation. This is an injustice war in the Congo. The silence of the great powers and of the church is also an unjust silence. I believe that this General Conference could speak to the president of the United States and to the leadership in Belgium so that this war will end. There are women and children who are dying because of this silence. All of the witness we are hearing about this war is very sad. And we are hoping for something from this Conference. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Okay. Thank you. We have...yes; there is a pink card. Please go to mike 5. *(Pause)*

*Congo Resolution
in Both French and English*

MEL R. BOWDAN, JR. (Kentucky): Bishop, earlier you mentioned that the resolution on 2211 in French and the resolution on 2212 in English are the same and I don't... am I correct in that?

BISHOP SOLOMON: No, I noted earlier we had the two resolutions and there was some difference in these two resolutions. We are on the resolution 2212 in English; it has been read for us.

BOWDAN: All right and with ... then that's the one we are adopting. I wanted to be sure that we were not thinking...

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, thank you very much, all right. We had a card. All right. I believe that we have had the opportunity to speak and I sense that you

are ready to vote. I'm sorry, there is an orange card. Please go to mike 7.

WOLFGANG RUHNOW (Germany East): I speak in German.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, please proceed.

RUHNOW: (*Interpretation from German*) I do not speak against the content of this resolution but I would like to speak against the way in which it has been made. Those who ask for a uniform vote in this kind of resolution make it into a kind of instrument. I come from the eastern part of Germany and we have had much experience with uniform resolutions and uniform votes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you very much. I had...all right, card, mike 2.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Our deepest apologizes to the persons who presented this resolution from the Congo. It was presented and given to be Calendared in both English and French and somehow or another the English has been omitted. Please forgive those who were responsible for that omission. Perhaps we can be supportive anyway.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. I...green card, mike 4.

PHILIP L. HATHCOCK (North Arkansas): Does not the English translation appear in the right-hand column of page 2212?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'll turn to our secretary to answer that for us.

MARSHALL: Yes, it does Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'm sorry, proceed. All right, we're going to take this pink card. Go to mike 2 please. Now I've not observed as clear a count as would have been required. There have been questions and comments, not so much for or against, but comments relative to procedure and I'm going to give the opportunity, in a moment, for those who wish to speak against and then I'm going to call the question after this vote, or this speech, because depending on how this speech goes, so that we will be in proper order in our speeches. You may proceed.

ASHEMA ASOPO (Central Congo): (*Interpretation from Swahili*) I would like to ask with the heart full of sorrow and the heart full of humility when I remember our brothers and sisters. They continue to die up until now. I would like to ask the sister who is leading us in songs with us together to lead us in a

song that will unite us when we sing so we can all put our hearts together when we think about our brothers and sisters who are dying in the place of Congo. And I will ask that we all pray together before we go on with the vote. Thank you.

Congo Resolution Approved

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we have had two speeches for. We're going to call the question. May we spend just a moment in silent prayer prior to the taking of the vote. (*prayer*)

Will you please vote when the light appears. Yes. We're in the midst of a vote. We have approved the resolution [*Yes, 862; No, 15*]. All right, would you state your inquiry at mike 4 please.

LEICESTER LONGDON (West Michigan): Bishop, didn't our brother just ask whether we could sing before we prayed?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, he surely did. We have not ended our session this morning and there will be the opportunity for us to be gathered into such a witness of song. You're quite correct.

LONGDON: Thank you for that clarification.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Now then, I'm going to turn to delegate Massey who chairs our Calendar Committee. We have other resolutions, but the reality is we have a calendar we want to put before us and we want to adopt our calendar and proceed on the calendar items and we'll return to the resolutions as we have opportunity so to do. Yes? Mike 5.

BOWDAN: Bishop, in response to my question, I assumed that you were going to ask the body to also look at the resolution in French on p. 2211. That is not the same. There are some differences. The English version we just passed is a much shorter version. It leaves out several words and anyone that reads French can see that it is not the same. Now are we going to just adopt the one and not the other? If that's what we're going to do, well we just need to know that. But they are not the same.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I'll defer to the house on that matter. We did have a delegate read in its entirety in English the petition or resolution as it's printed and if we need to do something different in that regard, the expectation of the chair was that we were able to proceed.

BOWDAN: Excuse me, Bishop. He read the English one, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: That is correct.

MASSEY: Bishop, he read the translation from the same man that did the French-did the translation in English that presented it this morning.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now we're being advised that the person who presented, if I'm understanding it correctly, the original resolution presented it in French and then has translated it this way in English.

MASSEY: The presenters from the Congo needed a translator to translate their French resolution and they selected this gentleman who translated and then because he did not realize it and neither did I that it was separated from the Sierra Leone resolution, that it was indeed on the right-hand column on page whatever, 1112, he presented it in English. But it is the same man, the same translator, who they selected to translate their resolution.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now just hold steady for a minute. Sisters and brothers, we want to be participatory and we want to be fair. By the same token, if we can agree that the spirit of what is intended has been conveyed in the resolution that we have adopted, and if we can find some unanimity around that, then we'll save ourselves a discussion in a body this large about how you translate one word to another. So I'm going to appeal to the house to allow us to proceed with the English translation that has been adopted in order for us to implement this resolution and not to engage in a lengthy discussion about particular words in translations. I would like to appeal to the house in that regard and I hope you will be agreeable to that. We're going to try to do that and we thank you for your cooperation. Now, Delegate Massey.

MASSEY: Thank you, Bishop. The calendar will be...the agenda will be presented today by the secretary of the committee, Theodore Collier.

THEODORE C. COLLIER (Missouri West): Good morning. Praise God from whom all blessings flow. I move the agenda found in today's DCA.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. If you will approve this agenda, will you vote when the light appears. Or if you choose to disapprove it, you can vote when the light appears. It is approved [*Yes, 852; No, 5*]. Now we'll proceed.

*Consent Calendars A05, B05, C05
Adopted*

FITZGERALD REIST: Good morning. I'm Fitzgerald Reist, coordinator of the calendar. Now are you ready to do an old fashioned vote by raising your hands? Okay. I'm going to give you three choices. How many items are left for us to consider? 365, 502, or 669? Okay, I think voice makes it very clear, you're right, 669 items. Just to keep that in mind what we have left to do. If you would turn in your DCAs to Wednesday, May 10, 2000, Vol. 4, No. 8, p. 2135. The fifth consent calendar begins there. On p. 2135 Consent Calendar A05 begins with Calendar Item 1221. There are no changes to report.

COLLIER: I move the approval of consent calendar A05.

BISHOP SOLOMON: The motion is before us. Please vote when the light appears. It is approved [*Yes, 892; No, 4*].

REIST: On p. 2142, Consent Calendar B05 begins with Calendar Item 1265. On p. 2142, Calendar Item 1265 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p. 2144, Calendar Item 1270 has been removed at the request of delegates.

I move the approval of consent calendar B05, with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP SOLOMON: It's before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have approved by [*Yes, 891; No, 7*].

REIST: On p. 2147, Consent Calendar C05 begins with Calendar Item 1279. On p. 2147, Calendar Item 1280 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p. 2149, Calendar Items 1295 and 1300 have been removed at the request of delegates.

COLLIER: I move the approval of the consent calendar with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP SOLOMON: It is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have approved. [*Yes, 876; No, 32*].

REIST: I want to thank the delegates who have helped me correct mistakes and I invite you to continue to help me to locate and correct mistakes. I also want to help you with a couple of things. You do not need to submit forms to lift from the consent calendar items which are not on the consent calendar. (*laughter*) You also must wait until an item is printed on the consent calendar before you can submit to remove it from the consent calendar. If you have..some of you

have turned in things with a petition number and signatures and it's not yet on the consent calendar. Those will not be removed until you submit one that lists the consent calendar it's on. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you for that clarification. We'll proceed now to Faith and Order and the presenters will be leading us.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Faith and Order. I'm going to be holding steady onto this agenda. We have a very heavy agenda this morning. And we're going to follow our order. There will be opportunity for additional motions to come if, as time permits before we recess for lunch. But we're going to be in order for Faith and Order. And we'll ask that you'll come and lead us at this time please. All right, you may proceed.

Faith and Order Committee Report

ROBERT HAYES: (Chair of Faith and Order Committee) Thank you, Bishop. To the delegates of the Annual, to the General Conference. The bishop has granted me an opportunity to say a word to you on behalf of the committee on Faith and Order. I'm going to ask that the Committee on Faith and Order please stand where you are.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

HAYES: Bishop, Bishop, we just want to say to this General Conference that the Committee on Faith and Order stands in solidarity this morning to demonstrate our unity in spite of our diversity and our differences. For the last eight days we have sought the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit to direct us. And on last Saturday, in Room 230A, the Holy Spirit visited us and delivered a very transforming presence that not only changed everyone in that room, but enabled us to hear one another—some for the very first time—and to treat each other with respect, compassion, dignity, and love. We have laughed together, we have cried together, we have prayed together, and we have held hands together. And in our last session on yesterday we ended by holding hands and by singing together "We Shall Overcome." And for Faith and Order committee to end it's session by singing "We Shall Over-

come," truly God's kingdom has come closer to us.

The experience of that second Pentecost and the richness of our time together will be a part of our lives forever. And I want to express my appreciation to every member of that committee as well as to the capable vice-chair, Scott Jones, and to the secretary, Mary Elizabeth Moore. And I thank you so much. Thank you, Bishop.

(*Applause*)

*Petition to Retain Current Language
Calling Homosexuality
Incompatible With Christianity*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you very much. We'll proceed now to hear the report from Faith and Order.

HAYES: Bishop and members of the General Conference, the legislative committee on Faith and Order brings for your consideration this morning Calendar Item 1372, found on p. 484, in the *Advance DCA*, and p. 2157, in the *DCA*—484 in the *Advance DCA*, and p. 2157 in the *DCA*. It is Petition 30083, 30083. The committee recommends concurrence with this petition asking that the current language finding the practice of homosexuality incompatible with Christian teaching be retained. And the rationale simply is this paragraph best represents the church's stance and conforms to the clear and true teaching of Scripture.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. This petition is before us. Yes. There is a card in the back. Will you go to mike 5, please?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, I think there's a minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Oh, I'm—would you hold just a moment? I'm advised that there is a minority report, and my apologies. Let's hear the minority report, then we, of course, will proceed to address the minority report, or perfect the majority report, and then the minority report. Thank you.

*Minority Report Offered on
Incompatibility Language
for Homosexuality*

PHILIP WOGAMAN (Baltimore-Washington): Thank you, Bishop and sisters and brothers. The Faith and Order committee has indeed been a remarkable experience for all of us, so united on many things, so deeply and consistently divided on others. Our divisions on homosexuality are those of a

church that has been troubled by this for thirty years. We in the minority had hoped it would be possible to join with those who disagree with us in a creative compromise that could have helped to heal the church and to have spared much discussion and plenary. It was not to be so.

So we bring this compromise proposal before you as a minority report. We take seriously the long tradition of the church, but on a matter where that tradition seeks to apply the deeper wisdom of faith to the ongoing progression of factual knowledge and the continuing witness of the Holy Spirit, we must be prepared to acknowledge our limitations and to respect divergent views. We do not do so casually, nor by accommodation to a less-than-Christian culture. This minority report does not change the church's excellent teachings about human sexuality—against promiscuity, against abuse in all its forms, against the disconnection between sex and love. About such things there is a deep consensus among us. All of us, wherever we live, all of us are prone to voice the biases and the values of our cultural setting. That is plainly evident in all of our debates on these matters.

But all of us are called to reach deeper into the faith we hold in common as we seek to relate that faith to the facts at hand, as they come to be better understood. Again and again we have learned as a church that we were wrong about women, about slaves, about racial minorities, about monarchy, about futilism. Will we one day have to hold a service of repentance for our gay and lesbian sisters and brothers? We are not asked to answer that question today. We are divided today; we will still be divided when we leave this city. Can we not acknowledge that truthfully and thus pave the way for a piece of mutual respect?

Yesterday Archbishop Carey said to us, "What I dislike is when one part of the church says we have the truth and nobody else does." Is that not equally true in this context, on this question? When the minority report says, "We acknowledge with humility that the church has been unable to arrive at a common mind," that is not about vote counting or poll taking. It is about humility; it is about our inability yet to arrive at a common mind on the deeper meaning of Scripture and the leading of the Holy Spirit.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please sum up.

WOGAMAN: The differences cannot be wished away. Nor should we want to, for there may be something of God's truth lurking in each of us that will be needed one day to complete the whole.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Dr. Wogaman, please sum up now. Would you please sum it up now?

WOGAMAN: All right. I conclude with the heartfelt words of a voice from Africa, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, out of his compassion for gay and lesbian people, he wrote, "We make them doubt that they are the children of God, and this must be nearly the ultimate blasphemy. We blame them for something that is becoming increasingly clear, they can do little about."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WOGAMAN: Why should we want homosexuality persons not to give expression to their sexuality in loving acts? Why don't we use the same criteria to judge them that we use to judge whether heterosexual relations are wholesome? I know that the Lord of the church would not be where his church is in this matter." With great respect, with great respect, we ask you to support the minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, the minority—report has now been presented. We're back to the majority report, and it is before us contained on p. 2157. The Petition No., or Calendar No. is 1372. Is there—all right, would you, in, the green card. Go to mike 6 please. All right.

JUNE GOLDMAN (Iowa): Bishop, I would support the decision of the, or the recommendation of the legislative committee to concur with the present language. I have frequently been called unloving and a bigot because I have voted in favor of this phrase that we do not condone the practice of homosexuality. The people who have called me unloving have not bothered to learn that frequently in my home, around my table, I have entertained my gay and lesbian friends. And we have laughed together and cried together and talked together. And one of those friends said to me three or four years ago, "June, please do not compromise the church that we love just to accommodate me." And so I—

BISHOP SOLOMON: Excuse me, June. I'm going to interrupt only for the purpose of reminding us that we're perfecting the majority report, and I was not aware you were going, not go-

ing to make a motion but a speech. I will come back to you when we come back to the majority report and or the minority report. Would you allow me that privilege please?

GOLDMAN: I would, I would gratefully appreciate that, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. Now are there any amendments, any perfecting, that needs to be done regarding the majority report? We're treating it that way now. All right. The—let's go to the very back and the second yellow card in. Go to mike 5. The card that was just lowered, if you'll now stand and go to mike 5.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, you recognized me previously, and then—I'm at mike 5 here.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, is it appropriate to make a motion to amend the rules at this time.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I'm sorry. I did not acknowledge that I'd recognized you previously, and so I'm going to stay with the person I did recognize, recognize, and we'll try to be responsive in just a moment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. All right, mike 5 please.

*Amendment Offered to Change
Social Principles Language*

RUTH DAUGHERTY (Eastern Pennsylvania): Bishop, I would like to vote, make a motion for an amendment in the sentence in the *Social Principles* 65g, the paragraph that we have before us beginning "Homosexual persons." The sentence in that paragraph beginning "Although we." I move that we substitute the word *many*: "Although many do not condone the practice of homosexuality" and continued. By the second, I will speak to it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Is it seconded? It's supported. You may speak.

DAUGHERTY: And really it doesn't take a lot of words. I think it's very explanatory that this states where we are in the church. That many do not, but we do all affirm, as we continue in that sentence, that God's grace is available to all.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's an amendment and a speech for. Is there someone who wishes to speak on

the opposite side? There is a orange card back here waving. If you'll go to mike 8 please.

Delegate Says Compromise Not Possible

ROGER ELLIOTT (North Carolina): I wish to speak against this amendment. The majority and minority of this General Conference are divided over issues of biblical interpretation and divine revelation. I am not sure of how we have come to this impasse, but I do not doubt the sincerity of any who gather here. For those of us who believe that the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teachings, this is not an issue on which we can compromise. This does not mean that we are homophobic or unloving or mean-spirited. We do not believe that homosexuality, when practiced, is a greater sin than others, but we do believe that it is a sin. For us to acquiesce in any way on this issue would be to sacrifice our integrity and accommodate to our culture. I urge us to concur with the committee's recommendation and defeat all amendments.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. That's a speech against. Now then we're on the Daugherty amendment. We have a card here. Go to mike 1 please.

*Appeal to Scripture
Against Homosexual Practice*

WILLIAM HYNSON (Texas): I also rise to speak in opposition to the amendments and in favor of the committee. Those who would deny women's equal rights and use the Scripture to support them had to ignore the Old Testament prophetess Hulda, Deborah the judge, even a queen in Israel, the fact that women could inherit property just as males, certainly the ministry of Jesus, who chose women to preach the Resurrection. Those who would use the Bible to support slavery had to ignore the fact that oppressors disliked the Bible most and refused to let it fall into the hands of those who were oppressed. The Bible, the Word of God, has freed more people from bondage than all the armies of the earth. However, when we come to the question of the practice of homosexuality, even our Committee on Study of Human Sexuality finally concluded that every Scripture that refers to the practice of human, of sex, the practice of homosexuality is negative.

On this issue we do not have ambiguity. On this issue the Scriptures are

clear. I support the committee. I'm opposed to all of these amendments.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Is there someone wishing to speak for? There's an orange card in the very back. Please go to mike 7.

FRANK E. TROTTER JR. (Baltimore-Washington): This is one of the most complex issues that has ever faced our church. Some recent polls suggest that there is a 1/3 of us firmly in favor of keeping the language as it is. There may be another 1/3 of us firmly committed to changing the language. And there's another 1/3 of us in the middle. And I would address my remarks today for the duration of the debate to those who are still deciding, because that is where the church lies in terms of the future. I hope that in the spirit of the debate we can keep open minds about what happens in the debate and not close ourselves to any creative compromise. I believe the amendment is a good one, a healthy one, and moves us a step forward toward healing, and I encourage all of us to prayerfully consider it. Thank you.

Social Principles Amendment Defeated

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, according to the rules that you have adopted, we have 2 speeches for and 2 speeches against on the Daugherty amendment. It is now before us. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 439; No, 507] The Daugherty amendment fails by a vote of 507 to 439. We are on the main motion, which comes from the committee regarding Calendar Item 1372. Are there comments or questions in regard to this particular report? Yes, I did recognize a delegate earlier at Mike 5 and indicated I would return there. All right.

JEFF SPELLMAN (Northern New Jersey): Thank you, Bishop. Is it appropriate to make a motion to amend the rules at this time?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, you'll need to put it out there and then we'll have to decide whether it is appropriate or not.

SPELLMAN: I move that for petitions related to homosexuality, that we return to 3-minute speeches as per printed rule 8-C, and to 3 speeches for and against as per printed rule 37.2.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. You're moving, I would conclude, to suspend the rules that we have already

adopted in order to consider the motion that you are about to make, is that . . .

SPELLMAN: That is correct.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The motion to suspend the rule is non-debatable. It requires a 2/3 majority. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 314; No, 630] And the motion is not sustained. We're back on the main Calendar Item 1372. Please go to Mike 8, yellow card in the back.

DAWN TAYLOR (Eastern Pennsylvania): We are a church of differing understandings, differing perspectives on scripture, differing . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: Excuse me, may I just ask, are you perfecting the original motion by an amendment, or are you making a speech for or against the original?

TAYLOR: Speech against the original.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. If you'll hold that, we will come back to you. We're perfecting the original. I don't believe we have other perfecting amendments that are before us, so we're going to return now—or turn to the minority report. The minority report is before us and it is open for your amendment and/or your discussion. We'll perfect it and proceed to address it. Are there any perfecting amendments regarding the minority report?

I don't believe we have perfecting amendments, so you are invited to address the minority report as you may so desire. A pink card here. The woman delegate in this section, will you please go to Mike 4?

ELLEN A. BRUBAKER (West Michigan): Four years ago I stood before you, my family, and said that given all of the respect for the authority of scripture which for me is the Spirit of Jesus Christ, for the doctrines of our beloved church, that when I considered this issue I saw the faces of people that I love before anything else. Four years later I rise to say to you that some of those persons in whom the image of Christ is so alive are persons in my very own family; a son, a daughter, a nephew who has been called to the ordained ministry of this, our church, and is not able to serve in that way. But in a greater sense, they are all my children and all my brothers and sisters and all my family. Nothing we're going to do here can change that truth: that God is a God who has spread the table wide and everyone has an equal place at that table.

And the broken body and the life of Christ poured out for us all means just that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you need to conclude. Thank you. We have a speech for the minority report. Is there someone wishing to speak on the other side? There is in the very back an orange card. Please go to Mike 8.

Committee Member Describes Legislative Session as a Pentecost Experience

ALBERT J. BOWLES JR. (Holston): Bishop, I stand in unity of shared pain with my sisters and brothers from the Faith and Order Legislative Committee to be opposed to the minority report. Last Saturday was truly a Pentecost experience. We heard each other speaking in different languages for 11 hours. There were tears, there were prayers, hand holding and sharing. I think little changed in our positions, yet we were united in a shared pain. I believe that we need to leave the language in *The Discipline*. While it's very painful to many, I still believe it gives us a positive position from which we can embrace each other in our differences, keep us in a pastoral approach, and continue the dialogue of Christian love. Let us trust in the mystery of God's grace to bring some healing in a mysterious and gracious way.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. There is a green card, so if you will go to the center of this section to Mike 4, please.

Pastor Describes Church With Many Gay Persons

GRAYSON ATHA (West Ohio): Six years I was appointed to a church and when I arrived there, discovered that there were some fifty gay persons. They were on Trustees, Finance Committee, Pastor-Parish Committee, in the choir. They helped with the rummage sale, paid apportionments, gave generously to the church. They were all over the place. One in particular came to me and said, "I tried for ten years after leaving the church, I tried before leaving to pray that Jesus Christ would change me. And when Christ didn't, I left." But ten years later, a person in their late eighties came and said, "There is a place for you in the church. And so," he said, "I came back." Sunday, those fifty plus others will be at our home for dinner. I thought it appropriate to invite them following this conference. I will need to talk with them about this con-

ference. I would like to be able to not have to say to them, one by one, as I looked them in the eye, "The church says you are not compatible with Christian teaching."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. You need to sum up.

ATHA: I'll sum up. I want to say to all the gay delegates, all the gays gathered in this auditorium today. Come home. Come home, you who are weary, come home. And I hope that all of us together can go out with the father of the prodigal son to greet them, to put on the golden ring, to kill the fatted calf, and to embrace them. We need them as a part of the church. We together must go into the world to make disciples for Jesus Christ. I'm done, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. There is a pink card back here. Please go to mike 5. Are you speaking against the minority report? That is correct. I'm so signaled. That will be our second speech and we will be under the call for the question following this speech on the minority report.

TIMOTHY WHITAKER (Virginia): I'm a Faith and Order Committee survivor. The most profound thing Aristotle said in this great book on ethics is, "It is hard to be good." As all of us struggle with the issue of homosexuality, we discover how hard it is to aim at this issue and to hit the target of goodness and truth. If we try to practice love for our homosexual neighbors, we may undermine the moral position of the church that homosexual practice is outside the Christian norm of the covenant of heterosexual marriage. By trying to love our neighbors, we may violate the commandment to love God, which involves delighting in God's moral law and God's purposes for creation. If we try to defend and secure the church's moral position, we may be smugly self-righteous and fearfully moralistic in our relationships to homosexuals. It is hard to be good. The present position of our church is better than that of the minority report, because our present position holds together a loving pastoral response to homosexuals with a confident moral position. The minority report rightly emphasizes the church's pastoral response, but it fails to provide a moral position.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please sum up now.

WHITAKER: Our present moral position is based upon the clear witness of

scripture and the trans-national, trans-cultural Christian tradition. It is the position that represents the most faithful listening to the whole tenor of scripture and the tradition of a historic and global Christian community.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We have two speeches for, two speeches against. We are under the call for the vote and this is on the minority report. The minority. You may go to mike 8 and state your point of order. All right.

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Bishop Solomon, what a wonderful name for this morning.

BISHOP SOLOMON: God help me.

SWEET: Amen. When I gave the minority report yesterday, the bishop ruled that the person giving the minority report had the last word. I believe Dr. Wogaman is entitled to that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: That is correct. That is correct. We're clear that we're going to move to the vote but prior to the moving to the vote, I was going to turn to the chair or to the person presenting the minority report for a summation.

WOGAMAN: Thank you, Bishop, and if you're Solomon I'm pleased that I am not a baby. You're the best kind of Solomon and I appreciate that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you.

Closing Statement of Minority Debate

WOGAMON: Well, you have a little bit of a hint of what we went through in Faith and Order. I want to bear witness again. In the testimony we heard in that committee and hear about the work of the Holy Spirit among gay and lesbian people who are perfectly normal and perfectly good as committed Christians. One of the members of our group, Mark Miller, gave eloquent testimony. A winsome, wonderful personality. It is not a violation of conscience on either side to recognize that there is in fact a deep division among us. Rather, it is a grace to acknowledge that others may have a portion of the truth. Our moral position as a minority is stated in that whole section of the *Discipline*, where a wonderful epic of sexuality is laid forward. Wouldn't it be a wonderful signal to the world, torn by division among people who are all convinced that they are right, to see a humble recognition by The United Methodist Church that we accept one another in deep yet unresolved differences. I conclude with a deep scripture, which ap-

plies to this kind of a question of division. "Love is patient and kind. Love is not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way. It is not irritable or resentful. It does not rejoice in wrongdoing but in the truth. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Now I know, only in part, then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. And now faith, hope and love abide, these three. The greatest of these is love."

And now we are testing whether the division in our committee represented exactly the division of the General Conference, or whether the General Conference may be prepared to move further. Thank you

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, your time is up. Thank you very much. Now we are on the motion as the minority report. I only have several points of order and we'll start with the orange card. Go to mike 8, please.

Well are you serving as messenger for someone else. Or do both of you wish to speak?

DAVID A. BANKS (North Carolina): I had a point of order Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Then I need to hear your point of order. Did the other delegate have the point of order.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Yes, Bishop,

BISHOP SOLOMON: Let me hear yours first. Since you are last, the last shall be first.

WILKES: Bishop, I simply would request rule 17.8 right before the vote.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You are in order.

WILKES: Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You're in order, all right. Now would you state your point of order in mike 8 please.

BANKS: Yes, Sir. P. 1263, rule 36, section 3, the last sentence reads, "In closing debate of the minority report the member presenting the minority report shall speak first and the chairperson last." We have not heard from the chairperson

BISHOP SOLOMON: I think you have been helpful to us. We'll allow the chairperson to speak.

Faith and Order Chairperson Makes Closing Argument

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Thank you, Bishop. I would just simply like to say to this General Conference that the eyes and the ears of the entire United Methodist world are watching and listening at this very moment. The church is waiting to see and waiting to hear a very clear message come from this place today. It is now your opportunity to send that message back to the people who sent us here. And that message is to declare that homosexuality is indeed incompatible with Christian teaching but that God's grace is available to all. This paragraph conforms to the clear and true teaching of Scripture. It reflects the historic tradition of the Christian church. It is consistent with the true understanding of Christendom around the world and expresses the view of an overwhelming majority of the people called United Methodists and true and faithful Christians throughout the world. We realize that we are not of one mind here, and if we prevail in retaining the language in this petition, there will be no celebration or rejoicing, simply because we agonize and we struggle with the fact that we have brothers and sisters who are in pain over this issue and the stance that we take. However, in our agony and in our pain, we must be as compassionate as we can while being faithful to God's Word. In closing, there is indeed a discipline that is higher and greater than the one that is made for United Methodists. It is the Word of God as printed in the holy scriptures and it is to that discipline that we must be faithful.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you.

HAYES: So I urge you to defeat the minority report this morning.

Compatibility Language Minority Report Is Defeated

BISHOP SOLOMON: May we be in a time of silent prayer. (*prayer*) The minority report is before you. Please vote when the light appears. The minority report is defeated [*Yes, 585; No, 376*]. Now we are on the main motion, or the main petition, Calendar Item 1372. I think we are ready to vote. Well there is a card at mike 5.

TRACI WEST (New York): Yes, I wish to speak against the main motion.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You may.

First Speech Against Majority Report of Compatibility Language

WEST: The Word of God says, "Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man. She is to keep silent." The Word of God says, "Slaves obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling in singleness of heart as you obey Christ." The Word of God repeatedly says that women must be submissive. Every woman here, every woman here, if she were to obey the true teachings of the Word of God, would be silent. Every Black person, every African here, if they were to obey the true teachings of God about obeying our masters would be on our knees to our White brothers and sisters and saying "Massa, I obey you as I would obey Christ." I say to you, church, this is our opportunity not to use the Bible one more time as a club to beat up our brothers and sisters. Admit we are divided on this issue, seize this opportunity to step into the grace of God and embrace the love of Jesus Christ for all of us. Is there not enough hate, enough war in your countries, is there not enough prejudice, is there not enough use of the Bible to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation? Let us say not to the world and worry about the newspapers but worry about the outcasts. Worry about the one that Jesus calls us to worry about: the oppressed. I ask you, church, seize this moment and oppose this main motion, vote no.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you have made it. Now let's hold our applause. Sisters and brothers, we are in an attitude of holy conferencing. I had interrupted delegate June Goldman previously and had indicated that I would return to her for her to complete. We'll ask you, June, to sort of pick up where you left off there and complete the statement that you were wanting to make. You were in the midst of making a statement for the main motion. We have had a speech against the main motion. You may proceed.

First Speech For Majority Compatibility Language Report

JUNE GOLDMAN (Iowa): Thank you, Bishop. I am not going to quote scripture, but out of love I would just like to share with the body some helpful, maybe new, information. On December 2, 1999, the American Association of Blood Banks, located in Bethesda, MD, sent a bulletin to all

blood bank institutions across the country. And it is a listing of things they must ask prospective donors in order to protect those who would be recipients of the blood from those blood banks. And one of those criteria says, "Men who have had sex with another man even one time since 1977 cannot donate blood." Now I speak from a perspective of love. Because I love my homosexual friends who are with me around my table in my home in Iowa, I cannot just be silent, but to warn them that the practice of homosexuality can be very, very damaging to them. I think we need to focus on that phrase. It is not that we are saying that homosexuals are incompatible with Christian teaching as the previous speaker implied, even though he may not have intended to say so. But it is the practice. Please if we see a person on the beach wading out where there is a warning that there is a dangerous undertow, we would certainly try, in love, try to warn them and help them. And I think that the church is at this point that because we are . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: You'll need to sum up.

GOLDMAN: Because we are loving of our neighbors and those who are our homosexual brothers and sisters we would just lift up this medical truth.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you very much. There is a green card I recognized in, will you go to mike 2 please.

ROGERSON (South Carolina): I'm not so much concerned about the headlines in the paper tomorrow. I'm very concerned about the headlines in heaven. And I would like to say that I do not believe the decision on this issue can rest in the hands of the 1/3 who may be undecided. Someone much wiser than me, taught me that as I became a Christian and led the Christian life, that I had to order my life by the book that you and I call the Bible. And this man also taught me that when this Bible needs no interpretation, and when it is clearly understood, that I should not mess with it. And when interpretation was needed that I should rely on the Holy Spirit to pour himself out and through me from the pages to me, to understand that. And that sometimes the word of God tells the people of God, no.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We have room for one speech which will be against the main motion. I'm going to go to the pink card near Mike 5. Someone help us

out. Yes, thank you, that is the delegate that I recognized. You may go to Mike 5.

YUMBA NUMBI BISONGO (North Katanga): *(speaking in French)*

BISHOP SOLOMON: May I just interrupt for a moment to be clear for all of us that you are speaking against the calendar item.

Call For Methodist Holiness

BISONGO: I would like to say one thing. I'm not against the homosexuality, what I want to say towards serving what is going on here, I would like to say, I believe that The United Methodist Church has to keep its holiness. I would like to say that The United Methodist Church, even though you have the people who are the minority, who are speaking for or against this principle, The United Methodist Church has to go back to the holiness of itself.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I'm going to ask the delegate to abide by our rules. And that is, we have already had two speeches in favor of the main motion. If I'm understanding the tenor of this speech, then we'll have to move now to a person who wishes to speak against the main motion and you may state your point of order by going to Mike 2.

DEBORAH PRITTS (North Central New York): It's my understanding that there were two delegates who wanted to speak previously to the main motion. Mrs. Goldman and a young woman whose name I didn't catch. You asked both to be seated with the assurance that you would recognize both when we turned to a debate on the main motion. I believe Mrs. Goldman was given that opportunity but not the other young woman who is a delegate to this also. Could you check on that please, sir?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I would be glad to make inquiry of that and ask our secretary if there is a record of such. I want to continue on and if we discern such in a moment we will ask the house to help us work through this. Is there a person who wishes to speak against the main motion? All right, we have a card, a yellow card, all the way in the back. Yes, you're standing and you may go to Mike 8.

DAWN TAYLOR (Eastern Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, all right, you were the person originally that we

had talked to, and I recognized another, but I'm going to ask the flexibility of the house at this point. Will you go ahead to speak, and we will see if this is going to work. Then I will allow three speeches. I know this is outside the bounds of our rules but, I'm trying to help us move out of where we are without spending a great deal of time in parliamentary. We will see if it will work, all right?

TAYLOR: Thank you very much. We are a church of differing understandings, differing perspectives on scripture, differing theological beliefs. I believe we are all seeking to follow God's will for our church. We all want to be faithful to Jesus Christ, and yet, we do not agree on the way to live out this faithfulness. We do not agree, this is not news, but it is the truth. The truth is fearful to so many, but in love there is no fear. Please, don't dismember the heterogeneous body of Christ. Please, don't cut off the branches. Let us for once speak the truth of who we are. We, who are many are one body. Amen.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. The person at mike 8 has a speech against the main motion and I'm going to accord that privilege by your permission for an additional person, and then we're going to proceed to vote. You may speak at mike 8, you're against the main. I'm sorry, we have two speeches against the main motion, I have miscounted so there will be one more who can speak for. If you're speaking against.

Please proceed.

*Gay Delegate Addresses Proposed
Compatibility Language Change*

MARK A. MILLER (Northern New Jersey): I was in the Faith and Order Committee and I believe Phil Wogaman spoke about me. I don't know if I was born that way, but from an awfully early age I knew that I was gay. And I have been in this church all my life. My grandfather and father are Methodists ministers. My cousin, my sister are United Methodists ministers. My annual conference that elected me knew that I was gay, but that's not the reason they elected me. They elected me because I was a child of God.

I find myself in an interesting place because I want to be in this church. I don't want to be outside of it. When I meet people on the street and they might find out about my sexual orientation, and they say, "Oh, that's fine. Anything goes with me." I say, "Oh,

that's not fine with me." I have integrity in my life. I live in a committed relationship that I thank God for every day. I am surrounded by a community that calls me to accountability when it says, "Mark, love in mutuality with respect, without exploitation or abuse or violence." I become increasingly uncomfortable when the majority begins to quote Scripture against a minority. There are a handful of delegates in here who might be gay or lesbian. The rest of you are heterosexual people making decisions about us. I know that hearts can change. Many people in here use scripture to separate the races, quoting the book of Nehemiah. We learned that we can live together and not worship separately as people of different colors, but we came together over that issue.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you'll need to conclude.

MILLER: All right. All you people in here, including myself, we're gonna press buttons, and we think abstract thoughts, but I would urge you to remember that this is my life. This is the lives of all of us.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Now I'm going to rule that the delegate with whom we shared conversation and translation a moment ago was speaking for the main motion. There have been three speeches for, three speeches against. We are ready to vote, and it is now before us. The Calendar Item is 1372. It is the main motion. It is the report of the committee. We've already heard the chair of the committee. Do you wish to add an additional word to the word you've already shared?

HAYES: I'd just simply request that the committee uphold the recommendation.

Conference Uphold Current Language

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I'm going to ask us to be in just a moment of silent prayer. At the ending of that silent prayer time, we shall be voting. May we pray.

(Pause)

Hear our prayer, God; help us all. In Jesus' name. Amen.

Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee by a vote of [*Yes, 628; No, 337*].

We turn to the committee, now, for the next calendar item that they will be presenting to us. We'll ask that you guide us in our next matter.

HAYES: I'm going to ask that Elizabeth Quick, who is going to present the Minority Report, come forward, and the next item can be found on p. 2157 of the DCA. It is Calendar Item 1373, Petition 30208. Calendar Item 1373. It's on p. 523 of the *Advance DCA*, page 523 of the *Advance*; page 2157 of the DCA. Petition 30208.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you may proceed.

Petition to Retain Language Denying Ordination to Practicing Homosexuals

HAYES: Bishop, this petition deals with keeping the language excluding homosexuals from ordained ministry, and the committee recommends concurrence, with the simple rationale that it is the understanding that since "homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching", that they not be allowed to enter ordained ministry.

Witnesses Take Places Before the Platform

BISHOP SOLOMON: The matter is before us. One moment, please, in our Minority Report, prior to proceeding on. There are persons who are gathered here, some of whom are not delegates. They are obviously standing in our midst to make a witness, and we receive this witness. And now having received this witness, we would ask those of you who are not delegates to move to the balcony area, which is reserved for persons who are not delegates. We would appeal to you at this time to assist us to not only honor your witness, but to maintain the decorum of this body. I'm going to ask you in as cordial and as sensitive a manner as I know how as your presiding officer: If you are not a delegate, will you please move to the sections of our assembly hall that are reserved for those who are not delegates. Yes, just a moment please. If you will, hold steady.

(Long Pause)

BISHOP SOLOMON: A representative of the group that is making its witness in our midst has requested the opportunity to address, for two minutes, this body. I cannot give that without your granting it. And so now I shall inquire, would you be willing to grant two minutes to hear from a spokesperson of the group that is making this witness? If you would, please lift your hand. If you are opposed, please lift your hand. Permission is granted, and you may speak.

Witnesses Make Statement to Conference

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM THE GROUP MAKING WITNESS: I am one of thousands of faithful homosexual United Methodist Christians. Together with many non-gay allies, we have followed procedures. We have tried to gain voice in our churches, and once again we have been dismissed.

The General Conference has broken faith with gay and lesbian United Methodists. It has voided its own theme, "We Who Are Many Are One Body." We are not the ones breaking faith. The voting body has tried to cut us out. Clergy have broken faith, not honoring your vow to be in ministry with all people. Laity have broken faith, putting up welcome signs for your own comfort and putting up walls to us. "You have treated the wounds of my people carelessly, crying, 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace."

SECOND UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM THE SAME GROUP: And so in the spirit of our broken peace, my brothers and sisters, we ask you prayerfully to declare a moratorium for four years on all of the exclusions in *The Book of Discipline* on homosexual persons fully participating in the life of this church. And we say to you that we who are in front shall not be moved, that we must be moved nonviolently by the police if in fact this moratorium is not lifted. So again, brothers and sisters, we call upon you, prayerfully, as your brothers and sisters in Christ, to lift the exclusionary policies of this United Methodist Church and make us one.

Presiding Bishop Requests Witnesses to Leave

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, my sisters and brothers, you have been very faithful and disciplined in staying within your time limits, and I am most grateful to you, and I'm sure the rest of the Conference is as well. As I understand it, you have placed a request before us. Such request will have to be implemented, if in fact it is implemented, through our processes of deliberation which are pertinent to our life together in this assembly. However, we cannot proceed to implement such a request—or any other request or concern that may be on our agenda that is pressing in our life together and reflects voices that come to us from many quarters—if we cannot have the kind of order in our assembly that enables us to

do the work we need to do with decorum and with dignity, and certainly, always, with a sense of deep respect. And so I am appealing to you again now, will you please, if you are not a delegate, take your place in the balconies or in places in the convention hall that are reserved for persons who are not delegates so we may proceed to address the very matters that you've raised, if that's the will of this body, or certainly to proceed to address other matters that are on the mind of this General Conference. Once again, I'm asking you if you will respect the decorum and will respect the setting we are in and allow this Gen-

eral Conference to proceed so that we may do our work. I am in the midst of a conversation right now, my brother, and I'm not willing to recognize a point of order, just hold steady. Now I speak to the two spokespersons who have been in our midst. Will your group—will your group take leave so we can continue our business?

All right. All right. All right. All right, now, let's . . . let's ask you . . . let's ask you, my sister, to please take your place in careful fashion, now. All right. Now I'm going to turn to these two spokespersons. I understand that there

are persons who are making their exit at this time from our floor, and will you allow these persons to continue to make their way? All right, these persons are leaving, as I understand, and . . . we will ask these persons to continue to make their way from the Convention Center. Will you please continue to do so? I've been advised that persons, as a matter of their conviction and conscience, are going to remain here to invite being arrested. Therefore, I am declaring, as of this moment, a twenty-minute recess and a request that delegates vacate the hall. You are in recess.

(Continued in Next Issue)