

Proceedings of the 2000 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

Corrections

DCA, p. 2346, column 1, paragraph 7:
ASHEMA ASOPO (Central Congo)
should read KALIMA MUTOMBO
(North West Katanga)

(Continued from page 2354)

(After Recess)

(Music)

(Song, Prayer, and Hand-holding)

BISHOP DAN E. SOLOMON: Thank you. Even as the singing is continuing, I'm asking the Conference to reconvene. Will the delegates please take their places? Will you take your places even as we're singing? It is important that we reassemble so we may continue our work this morning. Delegates, will you please come quickly to your places? Will those who are in the hallways advise those who are outside this hall or the floor area that we are beginning? Will you please come quickly into our plenary session? The plenary session is now underway. Please come and take your places as quickly as possible. (Pause) All right. Will you please come and take your places? (Pause) Come as quickly as possible, delegates. Get the word out into the hallways that we need to be underway.

CYNTHIA WILSON: If you need me to do a rousing song, not rousing but something . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: Something contemplative. Will the delegates please come and take their places? Please come and take your places as quickly as possible. (Pause) (I'm sorry I can't recognize you. Just please be seated.) Delegates please come and take your places. We're going to sing ourselves under Cynthia's leadership back into our plenary session. We'll sing one song, we'll ask that you join in singing the song and encouraging those who are within the sound of my voice and are delegates, to please come and take their place here on the floor. (Pause) Delegates, please come and take your places. And will you assist us to announce the word around the Convention Center that we are back in session at this time? Thank you for your

cooperation and indeed, for your punctuality. (Pause)

WILSON: The song says, "God has smiled on me, he has set me free. God has smiled on me. God's been good to me." Would you stand to your feet and join me in singing all over this building?

(Music-singing)

WILSON: And as we continue to gather, if every hand would take a hand. All across the aisles. (Music) All across the balcony, every hand should be touching another hand. And if we could close every space. (music) let there be no gaps all in the balcony. Each one just reach one. I invite us to just close our eyes a moment. (Music) If you choose to bow your head, if you choose to turn your faces toward heaven, it's your choice. Pray this with us.

(Singing—Cynthia Wilson)

*Bishop Solomon Reveals Understanding
Reached With Gay Witnesses*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right now, delegates. We're asking you to be seated and we're asking you at this moment to limit your conversation to the point that you're just having your conversation with God, now. Delegates will you please be seated? (Pause) Now sisters and brothers, the chair is going to presume what I believe to be a gracious assembly and I want to have a conversation with you. In the spirit, I pray, of holy conferencing. When we ended our time right prior to the break, there was the request, even demand, on the part of these who had gathered here—some have returned to the balcony, others are here—to be arrested for trespassing.

As you left the hall, we have engaged in discussion. I cannot speak for any of you, but I can bear my own heart's witness in your midst. And that is, that we sought earnestly to find a way to do the business of the General Conference and to avoid an arrest for trespassing. Our sisters and brothers who are making this witness have indicated the following, in light of the conversation, if in fact, I am interpreting it correctly. And I have just gone and asked them to be alert to my words so that if, in any way, I do not state the consensus that is re-

flective of our conversation, then they will know that it is surely not intentional and that I will be ready to be corrected so that it may be a careful and fair and accurate reflection of our conversation.

It is my understanding that these who are gathered here, now kneeling or sitting in our midst, are under conviction that they must stay here. The request that has come from this group of persons is that we have, at least, a motion relating to moratorium. And the parliamentary procedure would unfold in the light of that. The inquiry was made as to whether persons would be willing to be seated or in kneeling posture for a period of time, or if they must stand, to stand around the edges of the hall. What has finally been discerned, or determined by the group in our midst, is that they will remain in a kneeling and sitting position while we have the discussion relative to moratorium—if you so permit. Likewise, if that discussion does not produce a moratorium and, in fact, we move in directions other than the directions that are being espoused by the group of persons in our midst, then they will remain in our midst but in a standing position in the center aisle—at this point—until such discussion occurs that bears the fruit of their concern or until the conclusion of the General Conference on Friday night or until they are arrested.

My sisters and brothers, I don't know about you, but I have preached in settings that have been filled with the noisy voices of crying children and I've been able to preach and been glad children are around. Hello church, we need children in our churches. I have preached and done the business of the church in settings where the temperature is so hot that the discomfort level was enormous and we did the business of the church. Now you're just allowing the Chair a little homiletical digression here this morning—I understand that. And I have preached and I have done the business of the church in a variety of settings that I would consider, upon further reflection, far more formidable and difficult than doing the business of the church with a few folks who are kneeling and praying. But such a step could not be taken if you as a body are

not willing to grant such an opportunity for these persons.

My understanding is that if such is granted then we'll proceed on with our business. If that which is related to moratorium is not approved in manners that are in keeping with the thinking of this group, then they will move from a kneeling or sitting posture to a standing posture in this position. And we'll continue right on with our business, not unmindful of their presence, respectful of it, but also very aware of the responsibilities we have to conduct the business of this General Conference. That's my best understanding of our situation at the moment, and I do not see any of these persons who have indicated that I have represented it inaccurately, but in fact, have nodded that it has been represented fairly to their understanding.

Now I realize that I've been rather forthright to indicate that as long as I'm presiding-but I certainly cannot indicate for any others-I would have no difficulty in presiding over an assembly where such persons are located, either kneeling or standing.

*Conference Votes
to Accept Presence of Witnesses*

Now you as a body will have to decide where we go from here, so will you be prepared. The voting machine is going to assist us and I'm simply, as the Chair, going to put before this body that if you wish to approve these persons staying in either the sitting, kneeling, or standing position, in light of the understandings that I have shared with you, then you have that opportunity to vote yes. You have the opportunity to vote no. Please vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* And you have approved by the vote of [*Yes, 621;* *No, 328*]-let's not applaud. This is not a winners-and-losers gallery, this is the church of Jesus Christ at work here-I recognize the delegate standing here, at mike 2.

JOHN W. EDGAR (West Ohio): In keeping with what you just said, I move that we would adjust Rule 11 so that the Bar at this conference would include the opportunity for peaceful signs of conscience in the manner that you have already described.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I think it's before us and I'm not sure but what we haven't already covered it, but in the formalizing of that, it's before us and I believe it was seconded. Please vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* And

you have approved it [*Yes, 651;* *No, 289*]. I recognize the delegate. Please go to mike 6.

*Motion Made to Declare Moratorium
on Implementing Action
on Homosexual Issues*

RICHARD PARKER (New York): I move that the General Conference declare a moratorium on the implementation of all action regarding homosexuality in the current paragraphs of the *Discipline* in order to enable the church to have an opportunity for a time of healing in this quadrennium.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. Is it seconded? It is seconded. Let the chair be very clear and help the body to be very clear that the Parker motion, as I understood it, would be to declare a moratorium on all present language in the *Discipline*, *vis a vis* its implementation and/or applicability-if that is an accurate statement on my part-as well as any petitions that we are dealing with now or in the later and remaining sessions of this General Conference. Is that a correct restatement of your motion?

PARKER: Yes, Bishop, it is.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you may speak to it.

PARKER: Bishop, the purpose of this motion is, as stated in the motion, to give us time to continue the process of discernment and healing in the life of the church. We have heard this morning already a number of witnesses from people whose lives have been diminished, whose ministries have been denied, whose relationships have been destroyed. There is enough pain now in the life of this church around these issues and it is our feeling that we do not need in this coming quadrennium more battles, more confrontations, and more trials.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You need to sum up now.

PARKER: What we need now, Bishop, is a time of loving, care, and respect for each other and healing.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I'm going to recognize the delegate in the green. Now sisters and brothers, in the spirit of what we have agreed to, I'm going to ask the press and I'm going to ask persons who are here near this mike, you don't have to move very much, I'm going to ask you to come, well you can go to mike 4, but this allows me to ask you to have access for

mike 2 and I'm sure these folks have already indicated their willingness to allow that to happen. All right, mike 4.

*Moratorium Impact: Will Remove
Current Discipline Language*

TOM WATSON (Nebraska): I have a question about what the effect of the motion for moratorium is. Would the effect be the same as removing the language from the *Discipline* for the next four years?

BISHOP SOLOMON: The maker of the motion will have to respond to that. Let the chair simply note that the point that was made is suspend implementation. I did not hear language about removing it; I did hear language regarding suspending implementation. The maker of the motion is at the mike. He can speak for himself.

PARKER: Bishop, that is exactly correct.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you very much. We're now on the main motion and we...All right, there is...You may state your point of order. Mike 1, excuse me.

WILLIAM H. HINSON (Texas): Bishop, isn't the effect of not implementing the *Discipline* to, in reality, repeal the work that we have done here and the *Discipline* itself?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'm not in a position to answer the implication of this or other things this General Conference often enacts. All right, we're going to the delegate...I'm sorry, I had a yellow card in the very back. Mike 5, yes that is correct. We're on the Parker motion.

MICHAEL T. MORGAN (North Alabama): It seems to me the implication of this is indeed to repeal the language that's in the *Discipline*, to remove that, and I think to declare a moratorium on that language would indeed violate what we have already done, so I am speaking against this amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. Now then I'm going to turn to the green card right. Will the delegate please go to mike 2. Are you speaking for or against the moratorium motion? All right, you may speak.

RESSIE MAE BASS (Florida): I do not believe that putting a moratorium on all discussions regarding the issue of homosexuality is to say, "Violate the *Discipline* of The United Methodist Church." For me it just seems that we cannot get away from doing violence to each other and I plead with us, in the

name of the gospel and in the name of Jesus Christ, to stop the violence and let us set aside all of these issues since we cannot come to any common understanding and leave it alone. Give it a rest for a quadrennium. Please!

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, yes you may. I've recognized you. You may state your point of order. Just hold steady. You're the one standing and shouting so go to the mike please.

KALIMA MUTOMBO (North-West Katanga): My point of order is a point of clarification.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

MUTOMBO: Am I correct in my understanding that we're in a situation where most of us are in a very complicated situation bound within our surroundings at home, and here faced with developments where we have to answer and react. And, so I want to know if a moratorium means to have a clear implementation way also. This means, I want to know is a moratorium stable, only waiting and praying or does it mean to lead to a process where everybody knows what the steps of this process is, so that the end of a moratorium we have a more clear picture view. Because I think this is what we have to explain at home, what is going on. And I would highly recommend such a process to be indicated which will qualify a moratorium.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I believe you have raised a very helpful question for clarification. I'll return to Richard Parker, the maker of the motion, to receive guidance in the answer to the question that you have so helpfully put before us.

PARKER: Bishop, I wish my name were Solomon. It is difficult to

BISHOP SOLOMON: You may proceed. I'm not going to walk down that road. (*laughter*)

Motion-Maker Clarifies Intent

PARKER: Bishop, it is hard for any of us in the brief time available now to think through now all the implications of this moratorium. My assumption would be that we would continue to engage each other in dialogue around the issues, that we would continue to hold each other in the church together, to work through the specific acts which may come to our attention, but without confrontation and without implementing the negative requirements of the current disciplinary paragraphs.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I think that's the best we can do on the clarification. Now sisters and brothers, I'm going to ask us to hold steady to the notion that this motion is before us. We have had one speech for, we have one speech against, and I will be willing to recognize a delegate in the orange card back at mike no. 8, if you will go there at this time. Yes, thank you.

You are the delegate that I'm recognizing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Which of us, Bishop?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I'm recognizing the one who is not speaking. Thank you (*Laughter*)

ROGER V. ELLIOTT (North Carolina): A moratorium does not solve anything for us. First Corinthians 14, "When the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who will prepare themselves for battle?" I want to tell ya that we need to make clear where we stand as a denomination. And I think to postpone this is an act of cowardice. I speak against it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we have room for one speech before I'll go to . . . (Pause) I'm going to a yellow card in the back. Mike 5. (Pause) This is a speech for the Parker Amendment. That's the only one we have room for at this point.

A Call for Dialogue and Discernment to Discuss Church and Homosexuality

FRANK D. WULF (California-Pacific): I move an amendment to the Parker motion "that we would direct the GBOD to develop a plan for discernment and dialog that engages all parties in this matter and a plan for having this discernment and dialog throughout our church."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Is it seconded? It is. You may speak to it.

WULF: Bishop, I believe that the church has yet to engage in honest dialogue and discernment on those matters, on this matter. We have people with far differing views who need to be heard and a moratorium would permit us to do us in order to discern God's will for us and to return to the 2004 General Conference better prepared to follow the leading of the Spirit. The experience of those of us who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered assures us that God's spirit has entered our lives, filled us with grace, given us gifts for ministry and service and called us for full participation in the church. It is

time, we believe, for the church, in the spirit of Acts 10, to recognize that those whom the spirit has called the church should not deny. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people need to be heard in a respectful and in a considerate way that has not yet been done because of the kind of prohibitions now in the Book of Discipline and therefore, I urge, not only that we have a moratorium but that we

BISHOP SOLOMON: Will you please close?

WULF: ...develop a process to bring it about. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, this is the Wulf amendment that's before us. We've had one speech for. Is there someone who wishes to speak against. There is an orange card, please go to mike 6.

PEDZISAI KANGARA (Zimbabwe): May I ask, bishop whether we are not now acting under direct intimidation?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'm sorry, the house. let me just respond. The house has made its mind known and we're proceeding in the light of that. Do you wish to speak against or for this amendment?

KANGARA: I want to speak against this amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You may proceed.

KANGARA: May I remind General Conference that there are times we need to speak with that voice; that lead people like Joshua to say, "As for me and my people, we will follow God." It would appear General Conference is vacillating. We don't want to take a stand and condemn, outright, that the practice of homosexuality is wrong and then we will proceed. We are moving from liberalism to laxity and then into lawlessness, and as a church we cannot. we are being asked now question the Holy Scriptures because of orientation.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You need to sum up please.

KANGARA: May I kindly request General Conference 2000 not to betray the church in Africa by supporting homosexuality. We are going to destroy the church that is growing in Africa. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We're on the Wulf amendment. One speech for, one speech against. I'll recognize. I'm sorry, I'm going to recognize

the delegate that's located right here. If you will please go to mike 2, please.

KALIMA MUTOMBO (NorthWest Katanga): (*Interpretation from French*)

I would like to ask..I want to continue the discussion right now about the matter we're talking about because all these people who are sitting here-there are just few in comparison with those brothers and sisters in Africa those who cannot accept homosexuality. If we had transportation to bring all of them here I believe that there won't be any seat left. I want to end by asking please don't kill the church in Africa. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We have room for one speech for on this amendment and I'm going to go to a green card. Yes, the delegate who is standing and moving to mike 4. This is a speech for the amendment.

KAREN P. OLIVETO (California-Nevada): I'm here in favor of the amendment. I speak because we're in various cultural contexts and the way the current Discipline stands, we are not able to do ministry in all our cultural contexts. I need to go home to a church that if we decide not to move to moratorium, we'll need to grieve the deep wounds of being rejected by this church one more time. So I ask that we continue to be in dialogue with our gay and lesbian, bisexual, transgendered brothers and sisters that we listen to their wounds, listen to their pain, put a moratorium on this; so that in four years we might see what fruits we finally allowed to blossom. I ask that we understand that people are willing to put their bodies on the line and risk arrest because the church has already put them under arrest. They already in jails of inhospitality, we have jailed calls, we have jailed lives and we have jailed love. So I vote in favor of the amendment so that we might be in dialogue and hear the gifts that can be brought to this church.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. We're under our order to vote now. The Wulf amendment is before us, to the Parker motion. I believe that you are aware that this amendment calls for the GBOD to be directed in a plan of discernment regarding conversation and actions. The Wulf. .this is for a question. All right, if you'll go to mike 4.

GRAYSON L. ATHA (West Ohio): I understood from the delegates from the Central Conference that this moratorium would affect them. Whatever de-

cision we make here, are they bound to that? That's my question.

Dialogue and Discernment Amendment Fails

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I believe that I'll just proceed on with this vote. Thank you very much. Now then, the plenary is before us on the Parker amendment and please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 323; No, 633*] The Wolf amendment to the Parker motion is not sustained. We're back on the main motion. There have been two speeches against. There has been one speech for. I'm willing to recognize someone who wishes to speak for the Parker motion and we'll turn, yes, to mike 1, please.

DIANE M. NUNNELEE (Missouri West): My sisters and brothers, in that we are, we are all sisters and brothers who joined hands and sang together, "Draw me near, near, near precious Lord to the cross." Are we willing to finally hear the words of our Savior? The last prayer prayed for the people for whom Christ died which means all of us. Father, forgive them, for they not know what they do. Somebody is wrong and somebody is right. But in our prideful ways, I believe that we stand in a place where we need to humble ourselves and come to know one another, which I believe is what the moratorium would give us time to do. So that we can live as a people who stand at the foot of the cross and know that some day, together, we will stand in our faith before the Savior, who prayed those words for us. If we can't stand here now, we can't stand there together.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. You may sum up. All right. We've had two speeches for and two speeches against. We're under our rules. I'm going to put the question before us at this time. All right, if we have a question, you may go to mike 3 to state that question.

Moratorium's Effect on Clergy Ordination and Same-sex Marriage Questions

JOHN E. HORTON (South Georgia): Bishop, this has to do with the question with regard to implementation and application. Does this mean that for the next four years conference boards of ordained ministry would not be bound by the prohibitive language with regard to the prohibition of ordaining self-avowed, practicing homosexuals, and would it

mean that the statement in the Social Principles, it says that homosexual unions, ceremonies shall not be conducted by our ministers and in our churches?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, the chair has been privy to the same amount of information that the rest of the body has been privy to. I will note, with an indulgence of the body that the word that has been used is moratorium. It is not repeal. And I'm going to proceed on that basis. I believe we're ready to vote on the Parker motion that is before us. And that is that we proceed with the moratorium as in the manner that has been discussed. All right, go to mike 4 and state your point of order.

(UNIFIED SPEAKER): My point of order is the following. Are we now discussing only the moratorium or also a way how to get along with each other?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Let me respond to your question so we can limit our time. We are discussing the moratorium. All right. Thank you. I'm going. .is it a question or a point of order? I'll go to delegate at number 5, the yellow card.

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Bishop Solomon, is a substitute motion in order at this time?

BISHOP SOLOMON: We're under the requirements to vote. In affect, the call for the question has occurred because we have completed the two speeches. It is not admissible. All right. We'll move. Yes. .state your point of order. mike 4.

THOMAS W. EBLEN (Kentucky): I think we need the motion repeated because I believe it's different from what the chair stated. The motion said "implementation," which has more implications than just moratorium on the issue and I'm making the distinction between moratorium and repeal.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Correct. You're quite correct and I stated earlier to the body that the motion did include the matter of implementation. However, the maker of the motion, in accordance with the understanding of the chair, recognized the difficulty that will be involved in walking down the path of implementation. It is an invitation to try to make that journey if I'm reflecting the actions of the maker of the motion in a correct fashion. Is that correct? I received the word that that is correct.

EBLING: However, the motion still includes the word "implementation"

and that bears interpretation in different ways.

Conference Defeats Moratorium

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, it does. Well, we have come at interpretation and the chair does not in any way want to come across as argumentative. I hope that this is not the case. But we have heard efforts made on three occasions now to answer the question of what this means. You have the same information that I do. We'll have to trust our judgment collectively as we move along. Please vote when the light appears. The Parker motion on the moratorium has been defeated by a vote of [Yes, 320; No, 637].

I turn now to the Faith and Order Committee so that we may resume our deliberations at the point where we were when we made this journey that we have now been on. Will you please lead us?

*Petition to Retain Exclusion
of Homosexuals from Ordination*

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Yes, I would like to reintroduce the petition that is before us. It is on page 2157 of the *Daily Christian Advocate, DCA*, 2157. It is Calendar Item 1373, also found on page 523 of the *Advance DCA*, 523. Petition No. 30208. It is a request to keep the language excluding homosexuals from ordained ministry and the Committee recommends concurrence on this particular petition. Since "the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching," we feel that we are not able to accept as candidates, ordained as ministers, or appointed to serve in the United Methodist Church is our rationale. There's a minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The main motion is now before us. There is a minority report and we turn now for the presentation of the minority report.

*Minority Report on Clergy Ordination
Delivered*

ELIZABETH QUICK (North Central New York): I had a speech all written out that I would use to present the minority report to you, but I can think of no more excellent witness that we have seen here before us and all around us today. And so I urge you to listen to our brothers and sisters and see how they're excluded from fulfilling God's call to them for ordained ministry, if we uphold the recommendation of the

committee. Therefore I urge you to support the minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. Now the chair is going to presume, if I can get away with it here, that we do not necessarily need to try to perfect the majority report because it's retaining the language that is presently applicable in our *Discipline*. If that is agreeable to the body, and I sense that it is, we're going to move to the Minority Report, and it is before us. Are there any comments or questions that you wish to address to the Minority Report? And if you will go, green card, Mike 4, please.

(Pause)

*Clergy Ordination
Minority Report Debated*

BENONI R. SILVA-NETTO (California-Nevada): Bishop, thank you for setting your eyes to the west over there. I rise in support of the Minority Report. I'm afraid, Bishop, that we might be using the legislative process that we are engaged in right now to wield some swords to chop off the heads of those who don't obey; or pierce the hearts of those who disagree with us with our uniform theology. God forbid that the decisions we make become baseball bats that eventually we use to smash people's heads—especially those who do not conform to us. God forbid that we structure our covenant community—which was raised, the issue was raised at the beginning of this conference—the covenant community based on the preservation and maintenance of uniformity rather than the appreciation and organization of our unity and diversity. God forbid that we define Christian discipleship only, or primarily, as adherence to creed or theological formulation rather than genuine relationship with the person of Christ and all the peoples whom God loves. May our task be guided by the ancient benediction that says that, "We are all simply asked to make gentle this bruised and hurting world as Jesus did, to tame its savagery, to have love and compassion for all including ourselves—the enemies in this stranger's soul." Bishop, I support the Minority Report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I'm going to an orange card in the very far back. Will you go to Mike 7, please? Are you wanting to make a speech against the Minority Report?

MARK FENSTERMACHER (North Indiana): I rise to speak against the Mi-

nority Report. My brother Ben, it hurts me to hear those of us who would vote against the Minority Report being described as people who would wield a baseball bat. We are people, many of us in this hall and many of us across the church, who want the church to be a place where we are all welcome, where grace abounds, but we speak and vote against the Minority Report because we understand the importance of clarity. I would vote against the Minority Report and call the church to be clear, to be truthful, to be gracious, and to be loving. And I think we have to live with the paradox of that. It is not either/or. It is both. We are a people of grace, we are also a people of truth.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. I recognize the delegate in the pink card here in this section. Will you please go to Mike 4. We've had 1 speech for and 1 speech against the Minority Report.

THOMAS O. GARNHART (Wisconsin): I want to speak in favor of the Minority Report because I know no one intends to express bigotry. But the very expression "practicing homosexual" is literally meaningless. I happen to be a "practicing heterosexual." Do any of you have any idea what that would mean in particular? You'd have to ask me whether I'm chaste, or promiscuous, whether I'm married or single. I'm a "practicing heterosexual," but it doesn't say anything about me. And so when we condemn the "practice" of homosexuality, we're not condemning any offensive act. We're condemning a class of people who call themselves gay or lesbian or transgendered or bisexual because the word is a word filled with nothing.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You'll need to sum up and complete your sentence.

TOM GARNHART: That's the summary.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you very much. I go all the way in the back to a yellow card. If you're making a speech against the Minority Report, we have heard 2 speeches for. All the way in the back. The delegate who is standing, please go to Mike 8. Thank you.

OKENGE M. AKENDA (West Congo):
(Interpretation from French)

*Denial of Ordination to Homosexuals
Has Global Effect*

TRANSLATOR FOR REV. AKENDA: Thank you, Bishop. If I clearly under-

stand, we are not discussing the matters that concern the United Methodist Church in the United States. The General Conference is a global for all people of United Methodists in the world. How will you understand that Methodist pastor who goes to Africa? It's a reality. The reality is that we have the witness that one of the pastors who started this practice of homosexuality in our church was in trouble. We had the people who started leaving the church. If this thing is a loss for the church in the United States, it will be a chronicle loss for the people in Africa. As we are taking decisions as a people of God in the world we have to deal with, we have to recognize the consequences. How will you understand that the pastor who is accepted here because of his practice cannot be accepted outside in another annual conference? This is the reason why we are against the report of the minority.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We have two speeches for and two speeches against. We're under the order to vote, and I'm going to—I'm sorry, yes, you do have the right to speak, but I'm trying to say I'm going to call the speaker of the maker of the motion, if we can understand that's where we're going. All right, I think folks are trying to help me and I appreciate it. All right.

We have the Minority Report presenter who certainly has a chance to speak along with the Majority presenter. You may speak.

QUICK: Thank you. We need to allow our brothers and sisters to step forward into ministry without, at the same time, asking them to deny a part of themselves, as we would not ask anyone else to do. So I urge you to accept the Minority Report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We turn to the Chair of Faith and Order Committee.

Chairperson Closes Debate on Ordination of Homosexuals

HAYES: Thank you, Bishop. Under the section in *The Book of Discipline* called "The Ministry of the Ordained", it says that, "the experiences of the Church and the needs of its ministry requires certain qualities of faith, life, and practice." And we feel that the practice of homosexuality is not only incompatible with Christian teaching, but we feel that we must exclude practicing and self-avowed homosexuals from ordina-

tion. Keep the message clear, and please defeat this motion.

Minority Report on Ordination Rejected

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Please vote when the light appears. You're voting on the Minority Report. Please vote when the light appears. All right, the Minority Report is defeated [Yes, 645; No, 306]. I'm going to. Please state your point of order at Mike 4.

ROLAND SIEGRIST (Austria): I am sorry that I have to ask for another point of order, and another clarification.

BISHOP SOLOMON: No apology is necessary. You are certainly in order. You have been recognized. Please proceed.

SIEGRIST: Thank you. To my understanding, the whole process here shows the brokenness of our church. And the church is not only from this world, and I think we should realize that at this point. The procedure we deal with each other is not fitting for the very serious purpose of this matter. I'm sorry.

Ordination of Practicing Homosexuals Remains Forbidden

BISHOP SOLOMON: Now my brother let the chair raise a point of order. The point of order is that our speeches are completed, and we have voted on the Minority Report. It is true we are on the Majority Report. You have the opportunity to speak on that, and I do not wish to deny that. My sense is, if I am reading the house correctly, we've had a discussion about both sides of this issue in the process of having a discussion about one side, and I believe that we are ready to vote. The main motion is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have supported the committee [Yes, 640; No, 317]. I turn now Paul Extrum-Fernandez, who has sent a note, or I have gotten a note, that he wishes to be recognized, and I call upon him at this time. Let me give you a road map of where we're going. We'll hear his report, whatever the nature of that report is. We'll receive announcements. And then we'll be in recess for lunch. May you hold steady, please. I'm sorry, mike 4.

Bishop Solomon Requested to Continue Presiding in Afternoon

PAUL EXTRUM-FERNADEZ (California-Nevada): Thank you, Bishop Solomon. Yes, to update on the Committee on Presiding Officers. We have not completed the business with Faith

and Order, and the committee has decided to continue to ask Bishop Dan Solomon to preside through the afternoon session. (applause)

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please don't press me to call the house out of order. Please be seated, all right. Thank you, Thank you very much. Continue.

EXTRUM-FERNADEZ: Bishop Alfred Johnson will continue to preside this evening. Bishop Kenneth Carder will be representing the Council of Bishops this afternoon and dealing with the press. So, therefore we've asked Bishop Solomon to preside this afternoon. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. Before I move away from this to the Secretary, let me just acknowledge the gratitude that I owe to bishops Huie and Hearn, who not only backed me up today, but I'm in the process in your presence of asking them to hang in there with me this afternoon, and I know you appreciate that as well. (applause) And then it would be impertinent of me if did not at least acknowledge my debt of gratitude to the house. To all of you for the manner in which we have conducted our business this morning, makes me proud to be a United Methodist. (applause) We call on our Secretary for announcements, and she will also advise us of the time we are to reassemble this afternoon.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: There are two announcements. One is that the Discipleship Legislative Committee will meet for five minutes at the close of the afternoon session. Notice: afternoon session, in front of Section A. Be mindful of that as we break this afternoon. Secondly, it seems to be feast or famine as far as comfort control is concerned. Again, we say to you that we are working to make you as comfortable as possible and realize that for many of you that is failure a good deal of the time. At this point, we're cold. Realize when you're cold there; we're burning here. And so we will change the blowers again, and we will do the best we can. Thank you for keeping us informed, and be mindful of the fact that we are not really trying very hard, or trying at all to make you uncomfortable. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'm going to ask Bishop Paul Granadosin. I had the unusual experience of being the Philippines with Bishop Granadosin. The episcopal area built a completely new episcopal residence. And it was just fin-

ished on the day that I arrived. And so the Granadosins said, "Well, you should be the one to spend the first night in the new episcopal residence." That is kind of an unusual experience, but it reflects the marvelous hospitality that I experienced all across the Philippines, and indeed, all across the life of the global nature of our Church. So I'm going to ask Bishop Granadosin to lead us in our prayer as we move to our noon recess.

BISHOP GRANADOSIN (Davao Area): Let us rise at this time. (*Prayer*)

Thursday Afternoon May 11, 2000

(*Bishop Dan E. Solomon, presiding*)

BISHOP SOLOMON: . . . be seated. We are needing to begin. We're going to ask Cynthia Wilson to lead us in a gathering song, and then we'll be underway this afternoon.

CYNTHIA WILSON: 512. When the storms of life are raging, "Stand By Me."

BISHOP SOLOMON: As you remain standing, as you remain standing, as you are able so to do, hear these words: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called with all humility and gentleness, with patience bearing one another in love, making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all." Eternal God, pour a veritable flood of grace upon our time together now, that we find an uncommon hope and a great, great sense of your abiding presence in this journey in Jesus' name. Amen.

Will you be seated, please? I turn now to Robert Hayes and the committee, Legislative Committee on Faith and Order. Let's be attentive to their leadership at this moment. All right.

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Thank you. Bishop, the Committee on Faith and Order would like for you to know that the next item on the agenda is found on page 2134—2134, of the DCA, and page 484 of the *Advance DCA*. It is Petition 30052, page 2134 of the DCA,

Page 484 of the *ADCA*. It is Petition 30052.

BISHOP SOLOMON: And the calendar number is what?

HAYES: Oh, Calendar Number is 1183.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

Petition to Prohibit Clergy from Conducting Same-sex Marriages

HAYES: The intent of this petition is to retain the current language that prohibits our ministers from conducting same-gender services and conducting such services in our churches. Paragraph 65C is the disciplinary reference to this particular petition. The committee recommends concurrence to retain the language, based upon the rationale that the language is clear and succinct, carrying with it consequences and accountability, and throughout the paragraph.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I believe there is a Minority Report, and we're going to turn to the presenters of the Minority Report in order for them to proceed to make their Minority Report. All right. Please state your point of order.

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Bishop, last evening the motion was to table the action related to this until—of the Higher Education and Ministry—until such time as this matter was brought before us. Therefore, I would like to have the Minority Report from the Higher Education and Ministry Committee lifted from the table as was decided by the body last night.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Now, we have a procedural issue here before us, in that we have this report recognized to be presented both in its majority and minority form. We have a report that is on the table. We'll take a, have to take a vote to bring it back off the table, which is certainly the spirit and intention of it having been laid on the table in the first place. The matter is, which comes first? And I must say that I, having recognized the committee to bring this report, and then we could proceed to address the motion that was laid on the table following this report. If you are in agreement, we'll proceed in that manner. All right.

Minority Report on Same-sex Marriages

EMERY A. PERCELL (Northern Illinois): The Minority Report is an amendment to change the word *shall*, in

the two cases it appears, to the word *should*. What this does, very simply, is to make it something other than a chargeable offense. I come to this point reluctantly. I am not a crusader, but I have been convinced over and over by the pain and rejection, the exclusion of young people, children, others from our churches by people who do not accept them for being gay or lesbian as they are.

I am quick to tell you that I need these people who are standing here to bear witness to me, of the fruits of the Spirit in their lives, their love for the church. I also want to tell you that I need my conservative friends to hold me to the truth of the tradition, the truth of the good news of Jesus Christ to all people. But I need to hear from these people the great biblical truth that we are people of a promise. The Bible is not full of rules, but is full of promise. We don't know where the Lord is leading the church. These people have a vision. They have a vision of, of what the Kingdom of God can be, . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

PERCELL: . . . and I need them to help me—

BISHOP SOLOMON: You need to wrap it up.

PERCELL: —go in that direction.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. We have the Majority and the Minority Report before us. Now it seems to me that there is, in the spirit of collaboration in relationship to these petitions—and I realize I may be leading the body here just a minute . . . Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were through with your Minority Report.

PERCELL: Not quite, Bishop. Let me, let me say that church trials in Northern Illinois cost us \$130,000. That was the least of it. The destruction, the trauma, the polarity that is caused by church trials at our church is enormous. I do not think that we want to spend another four years tearing ourselves apart by church trials, and that's the reason for this amendment.

Two-part Minority Report

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you.

DONALD H. FADO (California-Nevada): I participated in a holy union a little over a year ago that many of you may have heard about.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Excuse me, now, are you in the—

FADO: Part of the Minority.

BISHOP SOLOMON: —process of presenting the Minority Report?

FADO: Yes. Yes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: It's . . . A part of this report is something you are presenting, or is this a speech for?

FADO: No, this is part of the presenting of the Minority Report presentation.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you.

FADO: I'll leave that up to you. My brother got enthused with it, and I think the time. . . How much time do we have—time? May I have time to—

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, my—the point I'm wanting to make is if you have substantive material that is a part of the text or the essence of the Minority Report, and you're a dual-presentation team, then we need to hear your part of it. If you are here to speak to the Minority Report, then I must ask you to defer until we put the matter before the house.

FADO: Of course, *my* feeling is it's substantive, but—part of it is the definition of what a holy union is—which might be helpful—but I'm willing to wait.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you for that. I appreciate it.

Now, I'm going to go back to where I was a moment ago and see if this could be done in the spirit of collaboration and consideration of petitions in terms of their wholeness. There is a tabled motion that we have in our midst—not formally yet—that relates to holy unions and reflects a Minority Report to the Petition [*sic*, Calendar Item] No. 1200, which is on page 2093.

If we take an act down one road then we've automatically, obviously subverted the potential of the process that you would want to have the opportunity to address. So the point I'm raising is whether by common consent if Don Messer can speak to this; by common consent we lift this matter from the table and it be considered as an amendment to the minority report that is now before us. It's a bit awkward but it may be a way for us to consider these in a unity. Where's Don Messer, and if Don Messer is available, you could tell me if you want that even tried, then I will try it and see where the house is.

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Yes.

*Attempt to Lift From Table,
Motion on Holy Unions*

BISHOP SOLOMON All right, we will try it and that's just all we can promise to do at this point, and that is by common consent. Are you willing to have it lifted from the table so that it can be—

Well, I'm explaining where I'm trying to go but I'm going to listen to the house ultimately. I understand that it takes a motion to lift from the table. I understand that about as clearly, I believe, as anyone in this room understands it. Now I'm trying, and asking you to walk with me, to see if we could bundle this up and address it as a unity. If you as a house decide we cannot, then we will not even try it, but we won't know whether we can or not unless you're willing to let us try it. All right? So the question is, are you willing to let us try it by common consent to lift it from the table and treat it as an amendment to the minority report that is before us, or move it in that direction. Perhaps that's the more of a stretch than you're willing to go. Please state your point of order.

AL GWINN (Kentucky): My point of order is that we're dealing now with the paragraph in the Social Principles. The report to which Don Messer refers in the minority report, is on paragraph 332 of the *Discipline*. They're two different sections.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, your point is well taken and perhaps for the sake of clarity regarding, though the substance of the concern is similar, the location in the *Discipline* is different. We will just not try to go down that road anymore. I think it will get more cumbersome than I. I will get myself into more difficulty than maybe I can easily get out of. So, let's go back to the minority report, I mean the majority report. It is before us.

Are there any perfecting amendments that need to be made on the majority report? I do not hear any. We will go to the minority report. The minority report is before us and I will hear any comments or questions that you wish to raise in regard to the minority report. I think you—all right, all right. You're speaking for the minority report.

*Clergy Delegate Tells of Officiating
at Same-sex Ceremony*

FADO: I don't expect to change anybody's mind here. I think we've made up our minds on this issue of homosex-

uality, for now at least. But I want to you to understand the setting out of which we come in my commitment. I do it out of a commitment to Jesus Christ and the love of the church. I consider the sections of the holy scriptures that are dealing with homosexuality part of the patriarchal system. It said that "man shall not lie with another man as a woman" meaning don't treat men like they're women. I believe that it sets in the same cultural context as those who said "women, keep quiet in church," and so forth. It's out of a commitment that I operate, it's out of a commitment to a *Discipline* that says it's an inclusive church, that homosexuals are people of full worth and value. It's a commitment as much as it has been a commitment to the civil rights movement for minority groups and for women, it's a movement now for gays and lesbians. It's an act of conscience. I cannot turn down members of my church who request for ministry. We did a holy union service for two people, two women who—one a lay member to this General Conference, the conference lay leader—her partner of 15 years, and a conference trustee and these people—so, 95 clergy in our conference committed themselves to stand in solidarity, 25 could not be there with us. We felt so committed to this. Now, some of you feel we broke covenant to do that. I hope our covenant is based on something more than one rule in our *Discipline*. Do you know there are 2,351 times the word "shall" or "shall not" appears in our *Discipline*. That's almost 4 times as many as in the whole Torah. United Methodists out-Torah the Torah. We've got the rules there for everything and I know that there are some of you by the report that we had earlier, that do not do Peace With Justice offerings. That is a "shall" in the *Discipline*, but we're not bringing charges and charges against each other for this. We accept the integrity of our pastors and so on.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You need to sum up.

FADO: Okay. I would ask if you would use "should." I'm not asking for the language to be removed. It will be difficult for many to go back home with removing that at this point. I'd like it removed, but change it to "should" so there would be no more trials, so they could be free for the ministry in the area where they are. And you know we have an Igniting Ministries putting millions

of dollars on TV. One trial does more harm than all of those do together.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. This is a speech for the minority report. I see an orange card, a person in the very back. Please go to mike 8. We're on the minority report, calendar item 1183.

*Same-sex Union Defined in Terms of
"Faith and Order"*

PAUL LEELAND (North Carolina): I wish to speak against the minority report. Our church continues to define the boundaries that make our life together as United Methodists unique. We purposely define how faith and order are to be lived out in light of Holy Scripture. We define everything from educational requirements for ordination to the necessary trust clauses regarding property. These expressions are appropriate means for clearly defining how United Methodists live within a connectional church. This is also a defining moment. It expresses how our denomination identifies the common ground that makes us a family of faith. Our efforts to clearly mark boundaries of faith and order are not meant to deliberately hurt others as much as it is offered to refine what makes us unique as far as The United Methodist Church. In the spirit of the pentecostal experience within the Faith and Order Legislative Committee, I invite us to express the collective wisdom of this General Conference by defeating the minority report and embracing the legislative committee's recommendation. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I turn to a green card. Mike no. 4, please. Or no. 7 may be closer. We have had one speech for and one speech against the minority report.

REBECCA C. CARVER (Iowa): I speak in favor of the Minority Report. As Don Fado has said, we know that the language isn't going to change, that we're not going to change our stand, but we can change words. It would make things easier for me as a pastor to be able to do what I'm called to do, serving the people that I serve, and to perform marriages and unions as people ask me. I serve a very rural parish right now, and so it isn't a question. But the day may come when I am asked, and, after due counsel, would make sure that the persons who are speaking with me are joined together in love and covenant. I urge you to support the change of the word from *shall* to *should*.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. There is a pink card in the center, will you go to mike 6, I believe? If you are speaking against the Minority Report, we have the opportunity only if you are making a speech that'd be against the Minority Report.

ILUNGA DIKONZO (North Katanga):

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, may . . . may we have translation?

DIKONZO: My name is Dikonzo, coming from North Katanga, Congo. Bishop, thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I know that we are a church, and when we want to respect Jesus Christ as our King, we have to respect him according to the Bible. We do love everybody because we are Christians. However, there is something that we do not like—the practice of what is not in accord to the will of the Bible. We cannot allow people in because they are bringing money or something else. The Bible is very clear, "If you do not want to worship me, rocks are going to worship me." I am urging you not to support this Minority Report. Let us join together and support the Majority Report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. We're under the rules our deliberations. We have two speeches for, two speeches against. I'll turn to the maker of the Minority Report, or the presenter, for a concluding word, followed by the chair of the committee.

*Closing Speech for Minority Report
on Same-sex Marriage*

FADO: I would like to say a word specific to my brothers and sisters from Africa. I've been there five times. I've lived in a coastal village, in the Transkei. It's a different culture. And we are a global church. You will be able to vote on this, then you will go home, and you will be able to write your own *Social Principles* in your conference. They're quite different from ours. Your present *Social Principles* allow bartering of wives, divorce being appropriate if there's childlessness. I do not pass judgment on yours. I ask you, then, this is in our country. In terms of my country, where I am, the Western Jurisdiction is also part of the global church, and it's quite a different world-view there than is elsewhere. You are putting a major stumbling block in the way of our ministry to gays and lesbians. Keep the word *should*—and that, and that says it—but let's not have any more trials and the divisions that we are in. Your

message, if you keep *shall*, is, Don Fado and people like you—who, out of conscience to Jesus Christ must act—there's not room for you in our church unless you obey every one of these rules, that the rules are more important than your conscience and your commitment. And all I can say to that: The conscience is captive to the Word of God. Here I stand. I can do no other. I plead with you to please change the word to *should*.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, and then we will hear from the chair of the committee.

*Committee Chair Closes Debate on
Minority Amendment*

ROBERT HAYES (Texas): Thank you, Bishop. I'm sure that to some people, changing a word from *shall* to *should* doesn't seem like much; but it is. Keeping the word *shall* brings to bear the full weight of our *Discipline* and our church law. The word *should*, at best, is both ambiguous and unacceptable. Over the last few years, our denomination has been wrought by those who would interpret the existing language as being vague and unenforceable. And if we allow a change at this point, the church would have no leverage at all in such cases, and would destroy even further the tapestry which holds our church together. I urge you to defeat the Minority Report.

"Shall" Retained; "Should" Rejected

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, the Minority Report is before you. Will you please vote when the light appears? [Yes, 338; No, 599] All right, the Minority Report is defeated

Prohibition on Same-sex Unions Remains

Now we're on the main motion that is before us. I think we've had ample discussion, and my sense is that we are ready to vote. The main motion is the report of the committee. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 646; No, 294] You have approved Calendar Item 1183.

I turn now to Robert Hayes to take us to the next report.

*(Persons Making a Public Witness Begin
Singing "We Shall Overcome")*

BISHOP SOLOMON: My sisters and brothers . . . I am inviting you to abide by our covenant that we have made together . . .

(Singing Continues, Grows Louder)

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

(Singing Continues)

*Presiding Bishop Asks Witness-makers
to Explain Their Behavior*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now, sisters and brothers, you'll have to give the chair a little bit of liberty here. We had entered into a covenant, and I now join with you in the awareness that this covenant has been amended, if not, in fact, broken. I'm going to turn to these two persons as spokespersons for those who have maintained this vigil of conviction and conscience. They need to explain to you, this body, in my judgment, the nature of their most recent actions and their particular perspective at this moment. I'll grant you two minutes to speak.

*Spokesperson for Gay and Lesbians
Explains Demonstration*

RANDY MILLER: Thank you Bishop Solomon. And let me thank you first of all for your graciousness in dealing with our demonstration. We have decided as a group to non-violently break the covenant that we made with Bishop Solomon, because we believe that this church has broken covenant with us. We are your gay and lesbian bisexual and transgendered brothers sisters, mothers, fathers. We are not strangers to this church. We were baptized in this church, raised up in your Sunday schools, confirmed as adults and as we came into adulthood were told that we because of who we are, are not longer welcome, and are second-class citizens of God's kingdom.

We affirm not only for ourselves, and not only for gay and lesbian people in the United States, but that my dear brothers and sisters, for our gay and lesbian brother-gay and lesbian people of faith in Africa, in Asia, in Europe. We implore you, we tell you that the covenant is already broken. The tapestry is unwoven. You will force us now to be forcibly removed, and we take that as an act of conscience to be forcibly removed from General Conference, to symbolize the broken covenant that has occurred here today and throughout a twenty-five year history of our church. And in so doing we know that we do not stand alone. I am reminded of Richard Allen, an African American who was hit over the head while praying at the altar and removed because he was

not white. I am reminded of women delegates who were not seated at this conference in the 1880's simply because they were women. The Bible has often, often been used to discriminate, but we call upon the power of Jesus Christ. And we call upon the claim that Jesus' redeeming blood is sufficient for gay and lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons as well. And that neither height, nor depth, nor legislation of this church will deprive us from Christ love. Thank you my brothers and sisters.

BISHOP SOLOMON: My sisters and brothers, I cannot speak for you, but I speak with anguish in my own voice, for the circumstances that are now about to unfold in the General Conference of The United Methodist Church. And I bury my head in prayer. I cannot witness what is now about to occur.

(Singing by protesters)

We're asking you again my sisters and brothers to please leave the chancel area. To do so would be to reestablish the covenant. I plead with you to leave the chancel area, to leave the platform area, and take your places again. Will you do so?

MILLER: No, sir.

(Singing)

*Presiding Bishop Recesses Conference
Because of Demonstration*

BISHOP SOLOMON: Conference is in 15-minute recess. This will allow some opportunity for conversation, pastoral care.

(Recess continued)

We believe this is important. So, just be aware that we are allowing about 10 more minutes for this conversation time. Thank You.

We turn to Cynthia Wilson to lead us in a song and then we'll be underway. Please take your places as quickly as possible.

(singing)

*Bishop Solomon Recites
Afternoon Agenda*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right delegates. Thank you Cynthia so much for the blessing of your leadership. We're grateful to you. *(applause)* Now let me try to give us a bit of a roadmap for the rest of the afternoon. We're all, of course, carrying enormously conflicted emotions now. We understand that. We

understand also that we have responsibilities to which we must now give ourselves. And we will seek to do that, always with a continuing prayer in our hearts and lives for all who seek to bear witness as they understand God to lead them so to do—those of you here in this assembly and in this conference and others elsewhere. So we're going to address the remaining petitions that relate to the issue of homosexuality, including the lifting from the table here shortly (I'll get to that in just a moment) of that particular petition. And then we'll move to address—now we have several of those petitions. Some of them relate to financial concerns or the expenditure of funds in relationship to homosexuality issues. And when we finish this, we'll move then into the dealing with calendar items relative to petitions that have financial reference implications to them. We need to do this this afternoon, in order to get this into the hands of GCFA for what will obviously be another late night session for them, as we come to our session on tomorrow. So we have much that needs to be done.

*Bishop Solomon Commends Delegates for
Conduct During Gay/Lesbian Witness*

I just want to take a moment and express again my gratitude to you, this body. You have handled your life and you have helped us to handle our life together in a steady way and in a loving way and in a flexible way, and I am deeply grateful. I trust this General Conference will be known for sensitivity and unity, even while we also may be known for anguish and shared concern. So I thank you for that and I thank you in behalf of one another for that.

All right, we turn now to Robert Hayes and the Committee on Faith and Order.

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Yes, Bishop. Thank you. Faith and Order now brings a petition on p. 2134. It is Calendar Item 1186. You can find that on p. 497 in your *Advance DCA*, p. 2134 in the *DCA*. Calendar Item 1186, Petition no. 30108. It does have a minority report. This petition seeks to amend paragraph 65G in our *Book of Discipline* by adding the word *some* to the existing sentence. The legislative committee recommends nonconcurrence in favor of the original petition 30083, which was dealt with earlier.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we'll hear from the minority. My under-

standing is that the majority report is a simple word of nonconurrence. Do you want to proceed to try to perfect that report? I think we'll proceed on with the minority report.

STEPHEN G. FRANTZ (Oregon-Idaho): I had a speech prepared, but in light of what just happened this stage is holy ground and a prepared speech would be inappropriate. I came to this General Conference believing in Christian conferencing, prayer, and the work of the Holy Spirit—and I'm not sure any more. The minority report before you has words that we can all agree to. In fact, words we do all agree to. Every single one of us here believes that one way or another the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with some Christian teaching. Everyone here believes that. Nobody should ever vote against their conscience. Nobody should be asked to vote against their conscience, and I won't do that here. But every one of us believes the minority report and everyone of us should vote for it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it's presented before us along with a speech for it, I believe. And now we turn to any other questions or comments that you wish to make relative to the minority report. All right, I see a card in... Yes, you may go to mike 5.

Motion to Change "We" Do Not Condone to "Most" Do Not Condone

RUTH DAUGHERTY (Eastern Pennsylvania): Bishop, I would like to amend the minority report by changing the word *we* (after although) to "although *most* do not condone the practice of homosexuality." If I have a second I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: It is seconded and you may speak.

DAUGHERTY: Earlier we tried to amend that with *many* and it's obvious that most of the body found that that was an inaccurate word to describe where we are. The votes which we have taken on every vote related to this issue indicates very clearly that most of our church does not condone. *Most* is an accurate word where we are as a church. I will wait to see if we have the integrity to place in the *Discipline* words which reflect where we surely are as a church. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that is a speech for the amendment, as it has been made. Is there someone who wishes to speak on the opposite side.

Yes, here is a card, the pink card. You may go to mike 4.

"We" Is the Mind of the Church

LEICESTER R. LONGDON (West Michigan): In the discussion we had in the Faith—I want to speak against the amendment. In the discussion we had in the Faith and Order Committee, one of the arguments that came out there was that there is a difference of opinion about what it means to speak about the mind of the church and the church's teaching. The distinction that came out there was that there is such a thing a sociological mind of the church, which means all the different opinions that you can add up. But there's an ecclesiological traditional church sense of the mind of the church, which means that mind which continues across the ages which includes the saints and martyrs who died for the faith who gave it to us. That is the faith that many of us think is being spoken here when we talk about Christian teaching. Now some people here feel they're being left out. They want to say *some* Christians don't think this is incompatible. Well, some don't but they do not speak the whole mind of the church and I think by including this what we would do, we would institutionalize a difference that overlooks what it means to talk about the established settled mind of the church. Prophets may speak, but prophets may be tested. And that's part of what we're doing here and it's gonna take us awhile to do that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's a speech against. We've had a speech for, a speech against. The amendment is before us. Here is a green card in this section. You're invited to go to mike 4.

DEBORAH PITNEY (Oregon-Idaho): Two years ago my daughter went to the fair. The mind of the Baptist Church told her she was going to hell because she didn't agree. I don't want The United Methodist Church to tell my daughter that she is going to hell because she cannot agree with this statement. I speak in favor of an amendment that allows room for us all.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, is there anyone else wishing to speak? We are able to have a speech against. Otherwise, if there is no one who desires to speak, and we don't need to do that of course. We have to give you the opportunity for that. Yes, here is a card, the pink card. Please go to mike 1.

BISHOP SOLOMON: If you are going to make either an inquiry or to speak against the amendment.

RAUL CARCIA DE OCHOA (Mexico): To speak against the amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Are you speaking against the amendment?

CARCIA: Yes sir.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you, will you proceed.

CARCIA: I understand *The Book of Discipline* is not a book of opinions or a book for exceptions for then we would have the need to include a huge variety of viewpoints. *The Book of Discipline* is the book that clarifies and says what the church stands for as a whole. Thank you.

"Most" Defeated In Favor of "We"

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I'm going to put the vote to you. The Daugherty Amendment is before us which would insert the word *most* so that we would have it read "although *most* do not" replaces the word *we*. I believe we are clear on that. Please vote when the light appears. The amendment fails, [Yes, 361; No, 565].

We're back on the Minority Report now. The Minority Report asking us to insert the word *some*, you have it in front of you. I think we're ready to vote, so we'll proceed to the vote. If you will now vote when the light appears. I'm sorry, yes. Of course. My apologies, you do have that opportunity to speak. I also will acknowledge the chair's opportunity to speak.

STEVE FRANTZ (Oregon-Idaho): It's pretty clear you're not going to vote for it, although, it is indeed something that you all believe. Everybody here believes that the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with some Christian teaching. We can all say that with integrity and truth. I'm not asking you to compromise, I'm not asking you to go against your belief or conscience, I'm merely asking you to say that it is indeed a fact that we are here. That we are Christians, and we have a place in The United Methodist Church. I'd urge you to affirm strongly, that we are a part of the church and we belong here. Please press 1.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we'll turn to the chair of the committee.

ROBERT HAYES (Texas): I simply ask that you maintain the original language at its clearest and most succinct form.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Now I believe we are ready to vote. Will you please vote when the light appears. The Minority Report is defeated, [Yes, 559; No, 387].

FRANTZ: You've made it clear that I don't belong in this church.

*Conference Retains Language
Not Condoning Homosexuality*

BISHOP SOLOMON: We turn now to the Majority Report, which is the calendar 1186, I believe that we are ready to vote. That is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have approved Calendar Item 1186, [Yes, 612; No, 285]. We turn back to the committee now.

HAYES: Thank you Bishop. The next report is also on p. 2134, it is calendar item 1184, p. 523 in the *Advance DCA*. It is Petition 30146, calendar item 1184. It simply seeks to remove the language excluding practicing homosexuals from ordination in paragraph 304.3 of the *Book of Discipline*. It seeks to remove the language excluding practicing homosexuals from ordination in paragraph 304.3 of *The Book of Discipline* and the committee recommends nonconcurrency with this petition in light of the language that's there and we would want you to sustain it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it's the recommendation for nonconcurrency. I think we are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. You've sustained the committee recommendation, for nonconcurrency, [Yes, 650; No, 285].

HAYES: We have just a few other petitions if Scott Jones, the vice-chair will lead us through those.

*Families and Churches Implored
Not to Reject Gays and Lesbians*

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Bishop, as a matter of information for the body before we turn to the first calendar item for action, let me ask the body to turn to p. 2042. This is a matter of information only to call your attention to something to an action that was taken by the Legislative Committee and placed on a consent calendar that was approved. That's p. 2042. I'm calling your attention to calendar item 709, which amends paragraph 65g by adding these words: "We implore families and churches not to reject or condemn their lesbian and gay members and friends." That's a matter for information only, the conference has already acted on that.

*"Full Ministry of Church"
Rejected as Vague and Ambiguous*

Our first calendar item is on p. 2092, it is Calendar Item 1187. That's 2092, Calendar Item 1187. This refers to your *Advance DCA* p. 498. The Petition no. is 30693. The committee recommends nonconcurrency. The original petition sought to place these words in paragraph 65g of the Social Principles. "We affirm that all persons are entitled to participate in the full ministry of the Church and to receive pastoral care regardless of sexual orientation." It was the Committee's judgment that the section of this about pastoral care is already taken care of elsewhere and that the words full ministry were vague and ambiguous and, therefore, we recommended nonconcurrency with the petition.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. The recommendation is nonconcurrency. I believe the body is ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. You have supported the committee, for nonconcurrency, [Yes, 669; No, 254]. All right.

JONES: We are still on page 2092. The Calendar Item is 1188. It refers to a page in your *Advance DCA*, no. 495. The Petition is 3005. Our committee recommends nonconcurrency. The original petition is addressed to paragraph 65F in the Social Principles, the last section of the last line of the section on women and men. The petition proposes to replace the word "sex" with "gender." The committee's rationale is that the meaning of this change would be ambiguous. We are not sure what the implications were and therefore we voted nonconcurrency.

BISHOP SOLOMON: It is before us. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 690; No, 237] You have sustained the committee for nonconcurrency. All right.

JONES: On the next page, at the top of the page, that's page 2093 now. The petition, the Calendar Item is 1189. It refers to *Advance DCA* page 1283. The petition no. is 30007. The committee recommends nonconcurrency. This petition changes the word sex to gender in another paragraph of the Social Principles.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. I think you are ready to vote. If you would please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 690; No, 235] You have sustained the committee's recommen-

ation of nonconcurrency. You may precede.

JONES: Bishop, the next calendar item is on page 2134. It is Calendar Item 1190. It refers to page 1280 in the *Advance DCA*. The Petition No. is 30725. The committee's recommendation is concurrence as amended.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right

*Report on Higher Education
Identical Petition on Clergy
Performing Same-Sex Unions Alleged*

JONES: The substance of what the concurrence as amended would do is not delete the word about same sex unions from the Social Principles; those would remain as they are. But to repeat those same words in paragraph 331 in the section entitled, "Responsibilities and Duties of a Pastor." This is the petition, Bishop, that was referred to earlier, because there is another calendar item on page 2093, Calendar Item 1200, reported out of the Higher Education legislative committee. The wording is the same. The two different petitions came from two different annual conferences that proposed the same wording. But the petition that I'm offering you would place it in 331 under responsibilities and duties of a pastor.

The petition from the Higher Education legislative committee puts the same words in a section called "Special Provisions" in paragraph 332. I have consulted with the chair of the Higher Education Legislative Committee. It's our judgment that the force of the placement is identical. There is no practical difference, although the body may prefer the ordering of one or the other because it would make more sense. But the actual import and practical meaning of what this would do in the life of our church is the same. The rationale is, from our committee, that the full matter of whether or not pastors would do same sex unions most appropriately belongs in the 331 to 332 area and not in the Social Principles. And this is in effort to make sure that it is dealt with in the proper place.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now is there a minority report? Thank you. We will hear from the minority report.

*Fear of Church Trials Claimed as Reason
for Language Change*

PERCELL: Bishop, I have an acute sense of *deja vu*. And I realize that we have acted on this before. I do, however, want to move the amendment that

the word "shall," in each case, should be replaced with the word "should." I want to say that I hesitate to think of the disruption, the destruction that will happen in our church if we go down the route of church trials. And I beg you, I beg you to support the amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, the minority amendment is before us. As you've indicated, we have addressed this matter on a previous occasion in another relationship in placement in the *Discipline*. All right, there's a card, a yellow card. Please go to mike 6.

TIMOTHY RISS (New York) Bishop, I am wondering what happens to the minority report from the other calendar item.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, the plan will be, since we are dealing with different locations in the *Discipline*, that we are going to let the process unfold in the way that it is numbered. We will address this matter when we have addressed this matter and finished up with a Faith and Order Commission. I am going to turn to the minority report and majority report on Calendar Item 1200 on page 2093 and the ministry motion was laid along on the table along with the rest of that report. We'll bring it off the table if there is a motion to that effect. And then we'll proceed to act upon it. Now we are back on the minority report. All right, the minority report is before us. I think we are ready to vote, and you will note the substance of the minority report. If you support the minority report or if you vote against the minority report, either one, the point being vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 338; No, 580*] All right, the minority report is not supported. We are back on the main motion and my sense is...all right, yes, we have a card in the back. Please go, the pink card, to mike 5.

AL W. GWINN (Kentucky): Bishop...

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'm sorry, I believe I recognized the person, well, you had a pink card awhile ago. How did you do that? Oh, I see. [*Laughter*] Well, I'm learning something here. Let me encourage you to stay with the side that you started on, all right. Of the card, that is. All right, you're in order.

FRANK L. DORSEY (Kansas East): As I understand what we're, what we have before us, it says do not delete the words from 65C, but add the words "also" to 331.10. And I would like to make an amendment for this.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Proceed.

*Motion to Move Prohibition
from Social Principles to Discipline*

DORSEY: I would simply move to delete from the Social Principles the words in 65C and then send those words to 331.10.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that amendment is before us. Do you want to speak to it other than what you've just said.

DORSEY: Yes. I just have an awful lot of problem, and it just makes common sense to move it to one place or the other, and this motion simply puts it to where it should have been in the first place. I know at the last General Conference, I tried and tried to get the floor to call attention to the fact that this was very spurious indeed to put it there. It simply followed a political strategy that I did not agree with. And I think we have to move it to the rightful place and I don't believe that it's proper for it to be in two places.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you very much. We have an orange card in the very back. Go to mike no. 8, please. (Pause) We've had one speech for the amendment.

BEN R. ALFORD (Tennessee): Bishop, I cannot find 331.10 in the Discipline.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We'll turn to the Chair of the committee.

JONES: Bishop, we reported out the petition as it came originally. The petition is very clear that what it refers to is the paragraph under the responsibilities and duties of a pastor. 331 is the right number. It would probably create a 331.10, which does not currently exist.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. They're anticipating the editorial revision should the petition be passed. I believe that is the answer. The Dorsey amendment is before us. We've had one speech for. We have in the very back and closer to mike no. 8. No, all right, maybe somebody's helping you to get attention there. All right.

*Where In the Discipline to
Place Prohibition Debated*

KATHARINE W. LEHMAN (North Indiana): Bishop, I believe there is no 331.9 and I would suggest that the committee may be looking at 331.1 and to either put it in a subsection of .1 or adding a new subsection called "R."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Now let the Chair just note that we have a committee on editorial correlation and

revision. They'll handle all the numbering of the discipline and the legislation that we enact will be placed appropriately. I believe we're at least agreed it's on 331. We have a green card here. I'll treat that as an inquiry or comment and not a speech on either way. We've had one speech for the amendment. Do you wish to speak for or against? Mike 4.

CHARLES D. "DENNY" WHITE, JR. (Western North Carolina): Bishop Solomon, I would like to propose an amendment to the amendment, please, sir.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You're in order.

WHITE: I believe, sir, that this will care for the concern that arises in the, or arose, in the committee on Higher Education and Ministry as to where exactly is the best place to put these words, assuming that now we're going to put them somewhere.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, all right, let's hear your amendment.

WHITE: The amendment would be to essentially incorporate what is in the Calendar Item from Higher Education and that is that these words not be placed in 331, but rather in 332 where they would become .6 and if I might have a second to that I would be glad to explain.

BISHOP SOLOMON: No, I, the Chair needs to note that what you are doing is simply making a speech against the passing of this, if I understand it, or are you suggesting they be moved to another location?

WHITE: I'm suggesting, sir, that it be moved to another location. It would be an amendment to the amendment by Mr. Dorsey.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I understand. Would you give us the indication as to where you're going to be moving it?

WHITE: Yes, sir, I thought I did.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Say it again. I'll try to be more on board.

WHITE: Okay, thank you, thank you, sir. To Paragraph 332 where it would become .6 and if I might have a second I would be glad to explain.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Excuse me.

JONES: Bishop?

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

JONES: Bishop, on behalf of the Legislative Committee I will accept that as a friendly amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The Legislative Committee is willing. Now, this is owned by the house, so is there objection in the house to the Legislative Committee accepting this as a friendly amendment to the Dorsey amendment? That's where we are right now and I'm not sure you can accept an amendment for the Dorsey Amendment.

JONES: No, sir, I apologize. I was wrong.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Well, we're going to try. All right.

Positive or Negative Language Debated

WHITE: Bishop, may, may I make just one quick observation? The language in 331 is all stated positively. The pastor is to do this and to do that and to do this other thing. The special provisions in 332 are, if not negatively worded, at least some of them are that way and a prohibitive kind of statement seems much more appropriate in 332 than amongst the positive admonitions of 331 and it is for that reason that I propose this relocation of it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. There is a card at mike no. 5.

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Bishop Solomon, is this not supplanting the Minority—and Majority—Report of Higher Education and Ministry by acting on it before we've had an opportunity?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, we discussed earlier the reality that the sequence in which things come before us requires us to take action in relationship to the sequence. And I'm going to have to hold to the sequence that we are in right now.

MESSER: But we would still have an opportunity to present?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes. I'm not going to deny that opportunity at all. The amendment before us—we've had one speech for placement in 332. I believe the body is ready to vote. This is on the amendment to the amendment. If you will now vote... I'm sorry. Yes? What is it? Is this a speech for or against? It is a question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we vote for this, will it eliminate the possibility of the motion that would remove it from the *Social Principles*?

BISHOP SOLOMON: My understanding is that if you vote for this, you are voting for placement in 332, and this is amending the Dorsey amendment,

which called for it to be removed from the *Social Principles*. This is an amendment that relates to placement only. The understanding of the chair is if you vote this, then it will become attached to the Dorsey amendment, and then we will proceed to address the Dorsey amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sir, we would still have the opportunity to move it out of the *Social Principles*?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

*Discipline ¶332
Selected as Site for Prohibition*

BISHOP SOLOMON: You're welcome. I think we're ready to vote. The amendment to the amendment is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have approved the amendment to the amendment by [Yes, 587; No, 326]. It comes attached to the Dorsey amendment. The Chair would understand that the Dorsey amendment recommends that we delete this passage from the *Social Principles* and locate it now in the 332.6, I believe it is, or somewhere like that. It'll be picked up on editorial revision. That becomes a part of the Dorsey amendment. We've had one speech for. Is there anyone who wants to speak against? All right. I think the house is ready to proceed. I'll have to give you the opportunity. Do you want to speak for? Well, hearing no speeches against, I must accord you that opportunity. Please go to mike 6.

JANET E. STEPHENSON (Iowa): I rise to support the Dorsey amendment. The *Discipline* is confusing and unwieldy enough without putting the same statement in two different sections. So please support the amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. I believe we are ready to vote. It is before us. I'll turn to the chair of the committee for any comments that you wish to make.

JONES: While this matter was discussed in the legislative subcommittee, it was not discussed in the whole committee, and so I must urge you to support the committee.

*Conference Moves Prohibition of Clergy
Officiation at Same-sex Unions
to Discipline*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Now the Dorsey amendment is before us. We

understand what we're voting on, I believe. So please vote when the light appears. The Dorsey amendment is supported [Yes, 517; No, 405]. It now becomes a part of the main motion of the calendar item that is before us, Calendar Item 1190. I believe the House is ready to vote. Would you please vote when the light appears? [Yes, 670; No, 222] And you have supported this amended report of the committee. We turn back now to the presenter.

Conference Votes for Continuing Dialogue on Church and Homosexuality

JONES: I think the tragic events of today indicate to all of us that we need to figure out a way to continue the dialogue on these matters. I invite you turn to p. 2157, Calendar Item 1374. This is referring to p. 554, Petition 31708, about The General Commission on Christian Unity and Interreligious Concerns sponsoring a series of dialogues in the next quadrennium on homosexuality and church unity. Let me also flag the body, God-willing and the agenda running smoothly, I will be back this afternoon with another proposal for a Committee on Faith and Order that will be another way we continue talking about our doctrine and theology together. But that's not before you yet, that's just another way of indicating a proposal. These were two proposals about how we talk together that are going to come. This petition suggests that modeling on the commission's previous work; that the commission consult with the Council of Bishops; that it would forego developing legislative changes on this matter, and that it would find ways of helping the whole church continue the dialogue. We think this is a very timely and crucial matter to help us move forward on these issues. We urge your concurrence with it. There are no financial implications because the General Commission indicates that it can do it within its current budget and normal procedures of special grants from the General Council on Finance and Administration.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. It's before us. I believe you've already indicated you're ready to vote. The committee's recommendation is concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. It is supported [Yes, 766; No, 172].

HAYES: Bishop, that concludes the Faith and Order legislation for today. I want to thank the house very much.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We thank you very much.

(Applause)

BISHOP SOLOMON: Is there a motion from the body to remove from the table Calendar Item No. 1200, p. 2093? That includes the Minority Report presented by Don Messer. Would you go to a mike and state your name? If you're moving such . . .

KERMIT L. BRASWELL (North Carolina): So moved.

*Majority Report on "Should" or "Shall"
Returned from the Table*

BISHOP SOLOMON: It is moved. Is it seconded? It is not debatable. If you would approve, would you vote when the light appears? Or if you disapprove, you can also vote when the light appears. [Yes, 721; No, 148] You have approved taking this item from the table. The Minority Report—I believe the summary of where we were when this was put on the table—is that the main motion was placed before us, and there were no speeches for or against. There was an amendment that we—I'm not clear. I believe the amendment was to the main motion. I'll have to have some clarity from the secretary's table on that. And then we had the Minority Report. I believe I need to turn to LaVon Wilson, the chair of that committee, so she can guide us in terms of the committee's report and any amendments that we may need to perfect to that, prior to moving to Don Messer and the Minority Report. We'll look for your guidance.

Yes, if you'll go to mike 8 and state your point of order.

PORTER J. WOMELDORFF: (Illinois Great Rivers): I may be losing my eyesight, but it appears that we have an item, 1200 on 2093, which was just announced, and another item, 1200 on 2135.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'll turn to the secretary for clarification. In the interest of time, while we're discerning what may need to be harmonized here, I'm going to—and please know, I'll get back to you with your answer. I'm going to turn to La Von Wilson—Delegate Wilson—who will lead us in this time of presentation.

J. LA VON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): I believe, Bishop, that when this was tabled last evening. We had brought the majority report and, at the time, the minority report—was given—was at the

time of the table. And, and the reason was that they wanted to have everything before us. So if, if Don Messer can speak to his minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, if you will just assist the chair at this point on notes that have provided me, there is an indication that there is a Percell amendment that is attached to the main motion. Is that the case?

WILSON: That is the case.

BISHOP SOLOMON: And if so, what is that amendment, please?

WILSON: The amendment to the main motion was to change *shall* to *should* in those two places.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, and we have not voted on that of course, because that is an amendment that we're perfecting. Now, my understanding is that we then moved because there were no, well there should have been at least one speech for because it was an amendment, but none against. And that means we have then, we need to have the presentation of the minority report, then we'll come back to the amendment. All right. We'll turn to Don Messer for the presentation of the minority report. And will you guide us again to the correct location to where this language is clearly before us?

DON MESSER: You have two choices actually, Bishop. That's why there is some confusion. Page 2093 or 2135.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, let me ask you this, Don. Which one are you going to be working off of? And that's the one I want to be on.

MESSER: I believe I'm working off 2135. It's simply a misspelling that was corrected. It should have said "nor" instead of "not." It should read "Ceremonies that celebrate homosexual unions shall not be required of our ministers, nor be conducted in our churches."

BISHOP SOLOMON: And your p. no. is 2135. Is that the case?

MESSER: I believe that's correct.

BISHOP SOLOMON: And the number—

MESSER: Item 1200.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. You've helped me and I appreciate your help. You may proceed to present the minority report.

MESSER: Friends in Christ, much has happened since I last stood at this platform to address you. Our hearts are

heavy. I take hope in the dialogue that we just approved of, sponsored for the Commission on Christian Unity, because we know we are a divided church, whether we admit so or not, we know it. Also I take hope in the action the Faith and Order did that told us to insert into the *Social Principles* those words—that we are advised not to reject our gay and lesbian friends and brothers, either personally or our churches should reject. I take hope in that legislation that we just adopted.

Therefore, I would urge us to adopt the minority report, because here we will affirm profoundly, number one, the sacred worth and value of all God's people. Secondly, we will have reestablished the historic and theological understanding of the clergy and their role in our church. We will, third, have found a way out of the jungle, an expense and morass and resulting hateful publicity and so forth that might result in the days ahead.

If we would adopt this legislation, which simply and clearly states, "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." I have never conducted such a service, nor attended one. But I believe, as Bishop Tuell said, "We must not defrock the women and men called of God to serve when they are seeking to fulfill their calling." And I believe in the new dimension of our *Social Principles*, which we just adopted a few minutes ago, that we will not in our ministry or in our personhood reject our lesbian and gay brothers.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

MESSER: We are a family divided.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We need to end.

MESSER: We are a family in love. Please support this minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: The minority report is before us. There is an orange card in the very back. Will you go to mike 8 please?

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop, I would like to try an amendment to the minority report, if that is in order.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You're in order.

*Proposed Amendment Could Allow
Charge Conference a Say in Same-sex
Union Celebration*

WILKES: The amendment would read as such. Where you have the period, we would strike the period, and it would continue to read, "And where two-thirds of the voting members present at a duly called Charged Conference decides that offering this ministry is necessary to fulfill its mission in the context of its Faith community." If I could get a second, I'd like to speak to that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, it's seconded. You may speak to it.

WILKES: Bishop, for the last however long hours we have been in anguish, we are a divided house. And there have been consistently three hundred voting one way, and six hundred voting the other. In ¶212 in our *Discipline*, we give local churches and pastors the authority to respond to its context of ministry. My context in Springfield, Illinois, is not the same context as may be present at Glide Memorial United Methodist Church. Therefore, what I am asking of this body is that we consider that it may well be wiser for us to give this issue an opportunity to be lived out in the local churches where the people back home, wrestling with their pastors, can decide for themselves the extent and breadth and depth of their ministry with the community in which God has called them to serve. This will not cause any of us delegates—

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WILKES: —to vote against our conscience. If you adopt this amendment—

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WILKES: —you would be affirming our conviction—

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please sum up.

WILKES: —that there is no religion but social religion, and no holiness but social holiness.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WILKES: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. There is a card here, That is the pink card. Please go to mike 4. We're on the Wilkes amendment. There's one speech for.

*Claim Amendment Would Fight
Connection and Be "Congregational"*

B. WILEY STEPHENS (North Georgia): I rise to speak against the amend-

ment and the amendment that it's amended to. Both strike at the heart of the connectional church. Both would make us a congregational system. It would make 38,000 charge conferences making the decision that we have spent hours and years wrestling with. I committed myself to the United Methodist ministry and ordination to be in a connectional church united, and I urge us to stay united. No, we all don't agree with everything the church stands for, but we are part of the body and can be faithful to the wisdom of the body and follow that wisdom.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. I recognize a yellow card over close to mike 5.

CHARLES SCHUSTER (Rocky Mountain): I speak on behalf of the amendment. There's something I think we've been struggling to find. It's something that we had about a week ago, and the debate that sort of brought this thing forward had to do with interpreters for those for whom English is not their first language. And this General Conference was in a position to shut down until we found the interpreters, which we did. And I think if that wasn't unanimous, it was close as unanimous as it's been. One of the arguments that was most persuasive was something that came in the form of these words, "Anything less than full participation is unacceptable." That's what we're searching to find. This petition amendment allows us to find just a trace of it. I urge us to accept it. Thank you, sir.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. There've been two speeches for the amendment, one against. Are there any other persons? Yes, a green card far back on the left side. Mike 7. Mike 7, please. Just a moment. We're having some technical difficulties. Mike 7. Will you please go to mike 6?

KARL K. STEGALL (Alabama-West Florida): Our General Conference today, by its previous action, has made it abundantly clear what our stance should be on all issues regarding the practice of homosexuality. All of us have great pain for those who differ with us on this issue. However, I have great pain, today, that a minority of persons are continuing to bog down our process with all kinds of amendments when it is very evident that all of these amendments are going to fail while we have hundreds of petitions to act upon before tomorrow evening. I would like

to say that I think that those who voted in the majority today have acted in great grace, while our reserve delegates have not been able to enter this floor, while my wife, a nonviolent person, has been unable to come down and bring me a message. We have acted with grace as we have listened to those on the other side. But I think it is time for us to understand that with all the pressing issues, we need to move ahead, and I earnestly ask you to defeat this minority report.

Charge Conference Amendment Defeated

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. We have had two speeches for and two speeches against on the Wilkes amendment. The Wilkes amendment would indicate that there would be the opportunity for two-thirds of the members of the charge conference to decide as to the offering of ministry as has been indicated. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 322; No, 605] The amendment is not supported. We are now back on the minority report. It is before us. I sense—all right, there is a card here, yes. You may go to mike 4. All right.

RENAE D. EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ (California-Nevada): Thank you, Bishop. I rise to speak in favor of the minority report. What divides this denomination and this General Conference is not our profound disagreement on the morality of homosexuality. What is moving our beloved church, again, toward the kind of separation and segregation that we repented from last week is the use of this broad disagreement by one body of opinion to narrow the scope of our practice of ministry and therefore our general church membership. I don't know how many more times we will take these votes. I know that we will continue to take them until the close of this General Conference session. But brothers and sisters, no matter how many times we take these votes, "might makes right" is not a posture faithful to our Lord Jesus Christ, who counted not equality with God a thing to be grasped, but poured himself out. Nor is it ever going to be faithful to Mr. Wesley's conviction that charity should prevail in issues of theological diversity. Nor is it faithful to our historic commitment as United Methodists to be an inclusive and diverse community of faith. This motion would allow those who feel bound by their deepest commitments to Jesus Christ to serve gay and

lesbian persons in the fullness of their ministerial office and to do so without in any way binding those who would not choose to. I appeal to you to move us back away from the chasm of division by supporting this motion and refusing to use your votes as a sword of exclusion.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we have had one speech for the minority report. There is a yellow card in the very back. Please go to mike 8.

MANUEL T. JARMILLA (Northwest Philippines): I believe that everybody can enjoy the fruits of victory. But I am equally certain that everyone, before enjoying such victory, has to understand few simple rules. I believe that many of us here are praying very seriously for the approval on the relationship of homosexuality. But mind you, my dear friends, that also many of us here are praying not to sustain the issues of homosexuality. Maybe the practice of homosexuality can be acceptable to other countries, but mind you, in other countries this practice is not acceptable. And if you are going to approve this amendment, this is already inconsistent with a previous amendment, with previous legislation, that we have disapproved a while back. So, I am in favor of this amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You are making a speech in *favor* of the amendment, did you indicate? Or *not* in favor?

(Pause)

JARMILLA; I am *against* the amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, all right. I . . . We've had one speech for and one speech against. All right, there is a yellow card back here, close to mike 6. You may speak.

BETH CAPEN (New York): Thank you, Bishop. Although I am from the New York Conference, I am from the *northern* part of the New York Conference, from a rural farming area where the average attendance in the larger of the two-point charges of which I am a member is about 60 a Sunday. The reason why I like this is because it's something that both of the churches in our two-point charge would be able to live with. It is something that would allow ministry to go on in other places that perhaps would not affect the people in our congregations who are really struggling with this issue. The other reason that I like this is because it does respect the central conferences, in that the cen-

tral conferences can continue, if they so choose, to refuse to have these unions go on in their churches. I think this is a respectful amendment, and I would urge that we would support this minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. We have two speeches for the minority report, one against. There is a green card here by mike 4.

RODNEY G. STEELE (North Arkansas): I speak against the minority report, but I preface my comments by saying I believe there are good, faithful Christians on all sides of this issue.

I don't think this is good legislation. I think it'll set up a dynamic in the local church where the pastor can come in, very autocratically, and say what he or she is going to do. I think it goes against the idea of the pastor and the laity working together in ministry. And I urge your vote against the minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, the minority report is before us. We've had two speeches for, two speeches against. We are ready to vote on the minority report. Please vote when the light appears—I'm sorry, I—I do this occasionally, don't I? So I need to return back to you. My apologies, Don.

*Closing Statement on Minority Report
Allowing Clergy to Officiate
Same-sex Ceremonies*

MESSER: Forgive me for struggling to speak today, but this is a final moment of this conference, perhaps. A last opportunity for us to follow in the great tradition of John Wesley, who had courage of his convictions, went to the prisons to minister to homosexuals when everyone else around him told him no, it would damage his reputation or the movement or the membership. But John Wesley had the courage of his convictions that he was called to be a minister of Jesus Christ and would work to overcome injustice and to live out Jesus' teachings to reach to those in prison.

Here is our opportunity to vote our conscience, our conviction, to remember that we did extend the ministry of the church to gay and lesbian friends, brothers and sisters. So I urge you: Vote your conscience. Don't wish tomorrow or ten years from now that you had voted differently. I urge you, I plead with you: Stand up, speak out, vote for the minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we turn to the chair of the committee. Do you have any summation you wish to provide?

J. LAVON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): I would like for Al Gwinn to come and give that statement.

Closing Statement Legislative Committee

AL W. GWINN (Kentucky): Thank you, Bishop. Members of the Conference, I speak on behalf of the legislative committee against the minority report, because the minority report puts the responsibility and the decision-making on this issue solely into the hands of clergypersons. It is not fair nor conscionable to either put this contentious matter upon the shoulders alone of our clergy, or to take it completely out of the hands of the laity. We do not believe that decisions of confidentiality should rest in the hands of the clergy alone, and so we have placed words in Paragraph 332.5 accordingly. We do not even allow clergy to decide on their own to engage an evangelist outside The United Methodist Church without permission of their district superintendent, and thus point 1 of Paragraph 332.

Your Legislative Committee on Higher Education and Ministry has carefully weighed and debated this matter. This is the logical and appropriate place to house these words to make clear to all that this is where we presently stand as we remain open and prayerful in our quest for unity on this issue. And we urge you to defeat this minority report in favor of receiving the new language from recently passed Petition Item No. 1190.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now the Chair needs the indulgence of the house for just a moment. I've had information in front of me that I must just confess is either difficult for me to understand, or that it is inadequate. And that is that the main motion, which I understood was perfected before we put this on the table—but that's what I want to check with the committee—had an amendment that was proposed, it was the Percell amendment, that indicated that the word *shall* should be, or, was requested to be changed to *should*. And yet my information does not have in front of me whether that amendment was approved or disapproved. Now, that being the case, the chair is inclined to think that we've moved a little further down the road perhaps than we'd intended, and we have not completely

perfected—or maybe we have—the majority report before we perfected the minority and have proceeded to come very close to the time to vote on it. Perhaps the chair of the committee can give me some guidance.

WILSON: Bishop . . . Bishop, I believe we did not vote upon that. It was to amend the main motion from *shall* to *should*, but I believe it was not voted on on the floor.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now, the chair is going to do this. In order for us to get in order—I believe we can do this—we’re going, before we have the vote on the substitute, even though we’ve had closing speeches, we’re going to return and perfect the main motion, then we’ll come back to the vote on the minority, if you are willing for us to do it that way, just so we can get our legislative process in clear order. We’re . . . All right.

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): I might be able to help clear this up.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We’ll appreciate it.

JONES: Emery Percell is a member of the Faith and Order Committee. He delivered the minority report on the petition that was dealing with this same paragraph earlier, and we voted it down.

Clergy Forbidden Option of Performing Same-sex Unions

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. That’s information that is helpful to us, and if that corresponds to our understanding, then we are in order. We’re on the minority report, and we’re prepared to vote. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 323; No, 614*] You have not supported the minority report.

Now we’re on the main motion of the committee. I believe that you are ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 666; No, 265*] You have supported the committee’s recommendation.

All right, thank you very much. I want to . . . Do you have other items that are in our legislative flow? My schedule indicates that we need to turn to some finance issues . . . Stan Sager. Yes. All right We’re going to ask Stan Sager, with GCFA, to be coming, as he is . . . I’m sorry, with the legislative committee of . . . All right. Stan is here . . . and we’re going to turn to him to make this presentation. I’m going to call in a moment for a report that is in response to a

request that was made earlier. I believe a request was referred to GCFA regarding the amount of expenditures of funds that have been referred to GCFA in excess of amounts already budgeted. The question was asked, and we’ll try to provide an answer for that. I understand that answer was to come back today. Stan Sager will proceed now with this report. All right.

Petition Forbidding Funds to Support Gay/Lesbian Causes

STANSAGER (New Mexico): Bishop, I have three petitions to present in the matters which have been at issue all day. All of them relate to ¶806.12 of the *Discipline*, and it may help orient the body to make reference to that. It is on p. 426 of the *Discipline*. This is the paragraph which gives to the council, the General Council on Finance and Administration certain responsibilities to assure that no United Methodist funds are given to any gay caucus or groups or otherwise used such funds to [technical difficulties]. Hey, hey, one, two. Now that I have your attention—

(*Laughter—Applause*)

and now that I’ve lost my place.

(*Laughter*)

This relates to 806.12 of . . . The council, the General Council on Finance and Administration has been given the responsibility to see that for, for insuring that no board agency, committee commission, or council shall give United Methodist funds to any gay caucus or groups or otherwise use such funds to promote the acceptance of homosexuality. The council shall have the right to stop such expenditures. This restriction shall not limit the church’s ministry in response to the HIV epidemic.

The first petition before us is on p. 200, 2155 of the *DCA*. It is Calendar Item 1362. The petition to which it refers is on p. 437 of the *DCA*. It is Petition No. 31547. This would seek to amend the current provision by adding certain language with respect to the church not supporting, would, that would show that the church could not limit the church’s support of events for its members. There is a minority report. The committee has voted nonconcurrency with this amending language.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We’ll receive the minority report at this time. Excuse me, we’ll want to have the mike on for the platform area please.

Minority Report on Funding Gay/Lesbian Causes

RUSSELL F. McREYNOLDS (West Michigan): Again what we’re trying to do with the minority report is add this one sentence after, at the end of the word *epidemic*: “Nor limit the church’s support of events for its members, which would provide for the sharing of diverse perspectives in our denomination.” This sentence, by addition, gives a clear distinction between not supporting homosexual activity with apportionment dollars and yet creating a climate in our local churches for conversations, exposing differences, and different perspectives on the issue of homosexuality.

It’s already been said at this General Conference, but there is not sameness and uniformity in our local churches. So we, we propose that we let our differences be shared and treated as gifts. This sentence enhances communication within our local churches and within our fellowships. I raise this question: If not in the church locally, then where will these conversations take place? In front of a convention center? locker rooms? In restaurants? We believe that the church should be the place for these events which provide opportunities for holy conversation on the issue of sexuality and homosexuality.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

McREYNOLDS: Finally, let’s overcome the demons of fear and ignorance and let the conversations take place within our local churches. So we just strongly encourage that you support the insertion of this sentence to enhance conversation within the life of the church. Thank you very much.

BISHOP SOLOMON: The majority report is before us to be perfected. However, it is a vote of nonconcurrency. I think, with your consent, we’ll go to the minority report to see if there are any amendments and/or speeches that you wish to give in regard to the minority report. It is before us. I sense then that you’re ready to vote, so will you please vote when the light appears. I’m sorry, I did not see any cards earlier. Well, I think we’ve halted the voting process. We’ll go back to the voting process unless there is a speech or an amendment. I suppose there is. All right. You may go to mike 1.

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): I, I sought recognition, Bishop, to state my

opposition to the minority report. I was a member of the legislative committee. Section 806 of the *Discipline* is entitled "Fiscal Responsibilities." It describes the fiscal responsibilities of the General Council on Finance and Administration of the church. The proposed, the language that is already in the *Discipline* does not limit and could not limit conversations in the church such as the minority report seems to suggest. There's no effort to restrain anyone from conversation. And I think no one would expect that that would be possible in our church, certainly. However, this language would be inappropriate to be inserted into the *Discipline* dealing with the fiscal responsibilities of the General Council on Finance and Administration. And I would suggest that the body vote against the minority report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We've had a speech against the minority report. I see a yellow card back about mike 6.

BUD WRISLEY (California Pacific): I'd like to take issue with the last gentleman who spoke. I believe the Supreme Court of the United States has determined that money is equivalent to speech.

*Conference Refuses
Minority Report Request
Concerning Funding Gay Causes*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we have one speech for and one speech against. We've got it before us. Do not see other cards. I believe we are ready to vote on the minority report. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 349; No, 560*] You have not supported the minority report—[*Yes, 349; No, 560*]. We're back on the main motion, which is the motion for nonconcurrency. I believe that we're ready to vote on that. If you will please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 630; No, 269*] It is supported—630 for nonconcurrency, 269 against. The committee's report is sustained. Now then, I'm going to turn back to Stan Sager.

SAGER: The next item is on p. 1847 of your DCA. It is Calendar Item 156. It refers to ADCA, p. 438 and Petition 30955. This petition, you will note, has an incorrect name given to it. It is titled "Delete Section 807.12," yet, if you read the petition it is endeavoring to delete Section 806.12. And the committee has treated it as though the language of the petition were correct and the title were

wrong so that we considered it as an effort to delete 806.12. We have nonconcurrred with this petition on the basis that past General Conferences, and now of course this General Conference, have taken a particular stand with respect to issues of homosexuality and that it would seem appropriate to have some measure of fiscal responsibility regarding the church's expenditures of funds. And we did not concur with the proposal to delete the paragraph.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The recommendation is nonconcurrency on petition, Calendar Item No. 156. Yes, go to mike 4 please.

DENNY WHITE (Western North Carolina): Bishop, thank you. I would like to ask the chair at what point in the process of considering matters related to ¶806.12 would it be in order to propose an amendment to that paragraph, subparagraph from the floor?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, that depends on what kind of legislation you feel you could attach such an amendment to. I cannot make that determination for you.

WHITE: It would be a matter of inserting three words, but I would hope they would be three words the body would want to insert. But under a recommendation of nonconcurrency I have no clue as to how to get about it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, you could ask the committee if they want to accept that, but I don't think so since it's concurrence. We don't have a positive motion before us at this point.

WHITE: Might I ask the chair of the committee if there is to be a report from them which would open this paragraph to the possibility of amendment from the floor?

BISHOP SOLOMON: That's an appropriate question. We'll turn to the committee.

SAGER: I'll make a comment, but I'm not making any warranties, you understand. There is another paragraph to come up, another petition to come up, which endeavors to amend the provisions of the paragraph by inserting certain language. We have nonconcurrred with that. So that will be before the body. I can't make an evaluation whether that's more appropriate than the current petition. But we do have that one remaining to be brought forward. And that one is Calendar Item 1164, for your information.

WHITE: Bishop, it strikes me as passing strange that the General Conference could be in a position where it might wish to amend the paragraph of the *Discipline* but cannot yet add it because the legislative committee is proposing nonconcurrency and, in effect, then the subparagraph is closed.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I'm going to afford you the opportunity to make a substitute motion if you wish.

*A Motion to Add "The Practice
of Homosexuality" to Discipline ¶806.12*

WHITE: Thank you, sir. With whatever introductory language may be required to make this legal I would propose that ¶806.12 be amended at the end or toward the end of the first sentence. Where it now reads "to promote the acceptance of homosexuality," I would propose to insert the words *the practice of* so that it would read "—or otherwise use such funds to promote the acceptance of the practice of homosexuality." And if I could have a second, I would like to speak to that.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Is there a second? It is seconded; you may speak.

WHITE: Mr. Chairman, all of us are deeply grieved to the depths of our being about what has transpired in here today. And I would not want to go back to Western North Carolina or for you to go back to your conferences with any piece of legislation passed by us or retained by us which might give to anyone the slightest reason to believe that we are not accepting of homosexual persons. I think we have very clearly stated in our actions on ¶65 that all persons whom God has made are of sacred worth. And I do know that from time to time ¶806.12 has been cited in one way or another to suggest that the church is not accepting of all of the people of God. Therefore, sir, I respectively propose this as a substitute that the conference amend that subparagraph in the way I have indicated. Thank you, sir.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's before us. It does provide us some parliamentary challenges, and I'm going to test this one out with you and the rest of the body. And that is that we would treat this as an amendment to the report of the committee, meaning, the committee's report is stated in the positive and therefore nonconcurrency. And you could amend that report by including these words. We're going to test that and see if, in fact, we can make it work that way. The amendment is be-

fore us. I'll invite—there's speech for it. If you wish to speak on the amendment you may, you may so indicate. I see a card in the very back that is a yellow card.

Motion Questioned About Implications for Dialogue and Discussion

LINDA CAMPBELL-MARSHALL (New England): I'd like to know, if we pass this and the local church is having a forum in which they want to look at the various dimensions of homosexuality and they feel the need to hire someone, several people perhaps, for a panel, does this mean that we cannot pay those persons? If we were looking for very highly qualified leadership, would we have to find someone that we wouldn't have to pay or could we pay the person who would not promote homosexuality, the person who is in favor of the church's stand, but not pay the other part of the forum because they might promote homosexuality? Are we in a place where we can only pay half of a panel if we pass this?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I'll turn to the chair of the committee if he wants to respond or I'll be willing to observe in your midst that the local church is not mentioned in Paragraph No. 12.

SAGER: I would endorse the comment just made by Bishop Solomon that the local church paying these funds would not be covered, I do not believe, by this paragraph. And in responding further, I can refer only to some experience through the General Council on Finance and Administration in endeavoring to set up a procedure to address these issues. And in doing so it is my belief and understanding that they have endeavored not to do anything which would stifle discussion or exchanges of ideas and opinions.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. This amendment is before us. You know the language of the amendment, I believe. There is a card, a pink card, Mike 6, please.

JANET STEPHENSON (Iowa): I rise to speak against the amendment. Denny says that these are only three little words, but the implications are more sweeping than that would indicate. To say the "practice of homosexuality" implies there's a choice. The current language says "homosexuality" which is an orientation. The last I knew there is no biological or other evidence to indicate whether or not homosexuality is a choice or an orientation. But to say that

the practice of homosexuality implies there is a choice. So please don't vote for this amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I have a green card here on mike 3. We've had one speech for and one speech against.

PAULA LYTLE (South Georgia): The current petition we're working on—I am on the Financial Administration Committee—the current petition is for 807.12. However, there was also a petition related to this on p. 436, Petition No. 30121, that the committee dealt with and I think that was also pulled off the consent calendar, but have not been able to find that. So this discussion, even though we're talking about 806.12, this petition that we're dealing with, Petition No. 30955 deals with Paragraph 807.12.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you. One speech for and one speech against. There is a pink card. Go to mike 5, please.

MEL BOWDAN, JR. (Kentucky): Bishop, I want to speak for the amendment. Am I in order?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, you are. Please proceed.

BOWDAN: I think the White amendment is well thought out. We have dealt with and heard throughout this day the belief that one of the problems in our church is a lack of acceptance of these individuals, persons, men and women, who are homosexuals. And we've heard the other side that it's not a matter of their persons, but it's a matter of the practice. Our discipline speaks of prohibitions against practice and I agree with the White amendment that changing that word from "acceptance" to "practice" will certainly help with any interpretation that might imply or could be inferred that we do not accept the persons, but rather we deny and prohibit the practice. I support the amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. Now we have the opportunity for one speech against the amendment. If you choose to make it. There is a yellow card in the center back. Center. The yellow card in the center, please. Center of this section. Thank you. Would you please go mike no. 8? Are you speaking against the amendment?

MARY ANN HAXTON (New England): Yes, I am.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you.

HAXTON: I believe that putting in the term "the practice of homosexuality" in this does, indeed, indicate that we are not accepting of the wholeness of a person. It is difficult to say that a person is only the sexual part. We are more than that and it is not appropriate in any place in the *Discipline* to talk about only the practice. When we call it incompatible we're saying that the person is incompatible. I believe that we do not need to put it in another place in the *Discipline*. Please defeat this amendment.

Motion to Add "The Practice of" Defeated

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, the amendment is before us. The amendment is the White amendment that would add the words "practice of," in place of, "acceptance of." I believe we're ready to vote, please vote when the light appears. You have defeated the White amendment. [Yes, 386; No, 533] We're back on the main motion. The committee's recommendation is nonconcurrence on Calendar Item 156. Please vote when the light appears. You have supported the committee, [Yes, 671; No, 238]

We turn now to Stan Sager.

Petition to Give Responsibility to GCFA to Stop Expenditures

SAGER: The next petition is found on p. 2090 of the DCA. It is Calendar Item 1164. It appears at p. 436 of the ADCA as Petition 30255. This petition addresses the same paragraph and would seek to change the word "right" when it refers to GCFA having the right to stop expenditures. It would change "right" to "responsibility and authority." The vote was for nonconcurrence. The reasoning was that changing the words to "responsibility and authority" would seem possible to be interpreted to enlarge GCFA's responsibility so that they would be put into a more activist role. And we did not think that they should be devoting their resources to going out and looking for violations, but to address those that were taken to them.

"Right" to "Responsibility" Defeated

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The committee's recommendation is nonconcurrence. Please vote when the light appears. You have supported the committee's recommendation on nonconcurrence, [Yes, 801; No, 85]. Now we're going to turn to Higher Education and ask them to bring petitions. As you are

aware, we're trying to deal with all the petitions that are related to the issue of homosexuality. And we're going to continue our work in order to try to accomplish that this afternoon before we recess and in addition, try to receive some petitions that have financial implications that we are led to understand are really imperative to get to GCFA for their meetings. So those who are making the presentation for Higher Education as it relates to the petitions, we dealt with one of these petitions already. It had been on the table, we brought it from the table and we now have it cared for, so we are addressing two petitions that relate to Higher Education and then we'll move to address matters of the financial issues involved. We turn now to the committee. Will you please lead us in this report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Unless it's a Point of Order or a question, I'm proceeding on to receive the report of the committee. Please proceed to mike 5.

*Question Raised
About Almost Identical Items*

BECKY HAASE (California-Pacific): Bishop, I would just like to ask clarification on the actions that we took on Items 1200 and 1190. I believe that, in effect, those are almost identical items. However, in 1190 we did, with a substantial vote, I believe, agree to delete that same wording from the *Social Principles*. We were given the opportunity to also look at 1200 because of the minority report that was listed there. I think we did not notice, perhaps, as we were looking at the main motion of 1200 that the wording there changed moving the wording from the *Social Principles*, and was, instead, amended by the committee to simply insert the words in 332. And so I would ask since we have two actions, almost identical, but the second action did not include the deletion from the *Social Principles*—I'm asking if that deletion would still stand?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, the chair's understanding is that we had two petitions, and Don Messer presented the petition by consent of the body which was the one that was before us, and we were acting in that regard. We approved along this process . . . the Dorsey amendment, if you recall, enabled it to be located in one place and removed from *Social Principles*. That is the understanding of the chair, and if that is the understanding of the house,

and if that is acceptable to your concern then we're going to proceed.

HAASE: Yes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: I believe it is. All right. I believe we'll go to the committee.

JUNE WILLSON (South Carolina): Bishop, the petitions that I have pertained to homosexuality, and not to finance. Did you just want me to take two of those?

BISHOP SOLOMON: There are two, 2158, the page number, I believe, and 2160 according to my information.

WILLSON: I have 2158 and 2160, but I also have . . . I have five more.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, I would like you to handle those two because they are under the category of the issue we have been dealing with all this day long, and that is only . . .

WILSON: And the others that I have mentioned . . . the other five are also.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Oh, they are? I'm sorry. I didn't have my records indicating that. Well, let's see if we can move through those quickly, please.

WILSON: All right. Katharine Lehman will present those at this time. Katharine

KATHARINE LEHMAN (North Indiana): Good afternoon. The first item is found on p. 2158. 2158 of the *DCA*. It is Calendar Item 1383. Calendar Item 1383. It's found in the *ADCA* on p. 965, and is Petition 30187. The committee is recommending nonconcurrency. The title is "Ordained Clergy May Perform Holy Covenants Between Persons of the Same Sex". This refers to paragraph 331.1 and you can see by the majority vote of the committee that the committee felt that the current language reflects the understanding of the majority of the United Methodist Church at this time. Therefore, the Committee recommends nonconcurrency.

BISHOP SOLOMON: The recommendation of the Committee is nonconcurrency. I believe that we are now ready to vote. Please vote when the light appears. You have supported nonconcurrency, [*Yes, 681; No, 226*]. We'll go to the next Calendar Item.

*Petition to Change "Marriage" to "All
Covenant Relationships" Defeated*

LEHMAN: Thank you. The item is found on 2160. 2160 in the *DCA*. The Calendar Item is 1390. 1390. It's found in the *ADCA* on p. 947 and is Petition

30635. This would delete the word *marriage* and add the phrase 'all covenant relationships.' This is in the paragraph which is dealing with ordained ministry and the qualifications for candidacy. The committee is recommending nonconcurrency for the same reason. The current language reflects the language of the majority of the United Methodist Church at this time.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. It is before us. I believe we are ready to vote. The committee's recommendation is nonconcurrency. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee's vote, [*Yes, 681; No, 228*]. Thank you.

*Conference Votes to Retain
"Fidelity" and "Celibacy"*

LEHMAN: The next item is right before that, the same p. 2160, Calendar Item 1389. It appeals that the same paragraph as the action that we just took. The recommendation is still for nonconcurrency. This would have removed the words 'fidelity' and 'celibacy'. "Fidelity in marriage, and celibacy in singleness." The rationale is the same, and we recommend nonconcurrency.

BISHOP SOLOMON: The recommendation is before us for nonconcurrency. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrency, [*Yes, 728; No, 189*]. You may proceed.

LEHMAN: The next action is also on that p. 2160. The Calendar Item is 1387. It's found in your *ADCA* on 954, and it deals with Petition 31459.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I understand that we are on Calendar Item 3187.

LEHMAN: Correct.

BISHOP SOLOMON: And the recommendation is nonconcurrency.

LEHMAN: Yes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrency, [*Yes, 717; No, 172*]. Please proceed.

LEHMAN: The next item is found on p. 2094. 2094 of the *DCA*. It's Calendar Item 1205. 1205. Found in the *ADCA* on p.954, and it is dealing with Petition 30637. This would also delete the word 'marriage', and add 'all covenant relationships' in the paragraph that deals with candidates for ordained ministry.

The committee recommends nonconcurrency. The reasoning is the same.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Recommendation is before us. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee's recommendation for nonconcurrency, [Yes, 724; No, 195]. Please proceed.

LEHMAN: The next item is on page 2242. It's Calendar Item 1561. It deals with a whole group of petitions, all of which deal with the footnote to paragraph 306.4. The committee recommends nonconcurrency. This footnote contains a variety of information and again, the reasoning is the current language reflects the understanding of The United Methodist Church at this time.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. The committee's recommendation you have heard. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 723; No, 163] You have sustained the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrency. How many more do you have?

LEHMAN: I'm finished. I turn it back to LaVon Wilson.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, I think there may be one or two other matters. I'd like to recognize delegate Massey and she'll give us some guidance.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I'm just going to be so popular, chair of the Agenda Committee. I move to extend the afternoon session by 30 minutes to enable the conference to deal with additional items that need to be addressed by the body before adjournment before dinner.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You've heard the recommendation of the Agenda Committee and I now invite you to express your thinking in that regard. The committee is recommending an extension of 30 minutes of our time. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 650; No, 269] You have supported the committee's recommendation, I believe, yes.

LAVON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): I only have one more, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Please put it before us.

Petition to Delete Discipline Footnotes

WILSON: If you will turn in your books to page 2242, Calendar Item 1558, in your DCA is 948. It is Petition 31454. This happens to be on the deletion of the footnotes to paragraph 306.4f in the *Discipline*. The committee recom-

mended nonconcurrency. However, Bishop, we do have a minority report submitted as follows: to amend the Petition 31454 by the addition in the following ways . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, excuse me.

WILSON: Traci West will speak about it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you, I was going to ask if you had a presenter for the minority report.

WILSON: Yes, I do.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. We'll hear the presenter of the minority report now.

TRACI WEST (New York): Bishop, shall I describe what the minority report suggests and then go back to the original?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, if you'll just present the minority report for us, defining the nature and purpose of the minority report, we'll come back for comments at another time.

*Minority Report Urges
Change of "Fidelity in Marriage . . ." To
"Ethical Sexual Conduct"*

WEST: Okay, that's what I was thinking; I'd speak to it later. I just wanted to make sure I understood. I'm sorry. I just want to describe what my intent is here with the minority report. As you know, it's on page 2242. Let me make a suggestion to you, however. If you would open your *Discipline* to page 176, it allows you to actually see the footnote and the sentence that the footnote refers to. I just think that's helpful to follow along what we're looking at here. In the minority report I want to amend this petition by addition. There are three steps. I am urging support of the petition, which deletes the footnote in paragraph 306.4. Secondly, this footnote is supposed to refine our understanding of the sentence in 306.4. So the footnote relates to the sentence which begins "to this end they shall agree to exercise responsible self-control by personal habits conducive to bodily health, mental and emotional maturity, fidelity in marriage and celibacy in singleness, social responsibility and growth in grace and the knowledge and love of God." What I am asking is to delete the words "fidelity in marriage and celibacy in singleness" in that sentence, and to replace those words with three words "ethical sexual conduct." Are you with me, does that make sense?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, I'm with you. Now, just stay for just a moment if you will. My understanding is that the majority report is simply nonconcurrency of the minority report unless the majority wants to involve in some discussion here, which I do not see how you are going to perfect the majority report. We'll turn to the minority report and ask you to speak to the minority report and we'll proceed to address and develop—perfect the minority report, rather. The minority report is before us and we should give the house the opportunity to make any amendments and then we'll certainly come to you for your witness on this as well.

WEST: Should I speak to it?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Let's hold that for just a moment, let's find, mike 5.

FRANK DORSEY (Kansas East): Bishop, I call for a point of order. I believe according to rule 32 that you can only take this report in the day after, and it was in today's DCA.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We'll turn to the Calendar Committee for any guidance they wish to give to us in that regard. Well, I'm not sure that—all right, thank you. I'm advised that that rule was changed yesterday. Now I'm geared into that fact as well. And we did vote to be able to address these matters on the day that they appear in the DCA. All right, thank you, but you've helped us to be sure we're in order and we are grateful to you for that. Now then, this minority report is before us. Anyone wishing to speak to the minority report?

WEST: Bishop, may I speak to my amendment.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Oh, you surely may, I was just going to say, I believe others are not ready to speak to it, but you are, so proceed.

WEST: Before it's debated, is that appropriate?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I haven't seen others who wish to speak to it, so you can speak to it and we're going to put it to a vote.

WEST: Okay, I . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, excuse me, I see a card now. So, please go, green card, mike 4.

PHYLLIS FERGUSON (Pacific Northwest): In light of all of the other petitions that have gone before us, I sense that the intention of this petition in reference to all of the other homosex-

ual petitions. But I would say to you that our heterosexual male counterparts have been called up on many sexual harassment issues. And I would vote in favor of the "ethical sexual conduct," which I think the words are.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that is the speech for the minority report. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on the opposite? The pink card on my far right, please go to mike 1.

JIM BRANSCOME (Virginia): We're debating changing the footnote in 306 it's quoting the language from 304.2. Isn't that where the change would have to be made?

BISHOP DAN SOLOMON: I will turn to the presenter of the minority report.

TRACI WEST (New York): Could you please repeat the question?

JAMES BRANSCOME: The footnote quote is a quote from 304.2. We are talking about changing the language in the footnote. It would seem that the change would have to be made back in 304.2.

WEST: Ok, I understand you now. No, my amendment is to agree with the petition which deletes the footnote, and if I may, if I could speak to the petition before it is debated it might add clarity.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You surely may proceed, thank you.

WEST: The reason I have proposed this is because the footnote consists of a mishmash of information. A lot of that information is not at all about the personal and social habits expected of candidates which the sentence describes. The footnote is suppose to be related to the sentence. The sentence describes personal and social habits. But the footnote describes, for example, a summary of the ordination process. Secondly, delete the footnote because its reiteration of the United Methodist stands on tobacco, on alcohol, on homosexuality, is vastly inadequate as a description of what we expect from a candidate for ministry in terms of their personal and social habits. For example, if we truly cared about racism—I'm not just talking about being able to refer to it when we are forced to at a General Conference worship service—but if we truly cared about racism we would specifically state—not in a general statement about social responsibility as is in the sentence—but state that opposition to racism is what we expect from candidates. Its omission speaks volumes. Delete the footnote because in a world where there is so much hate and preju-

dice and where children are tormented and spit on because they are even accused of being gay or if they actually are gay to repeat over and over and over and over not just in the text but in the footnotes as well, our case about our policies of discrimination and prejudice is over-kill. Insert "ethical sexual conduct" because it matches the language social responsibility that is in the sentence and most importantly because the vast amount of clergy sexual misconduct that boards of ordained ministry across our denomination now face is committed by married clergy.

BISHOP SOLOMON: You need to sum up.

TRACY WEST: I am. We must signal that to married, loving, supportive of your wife is not sufficient. We must have a broader, higher standard of ethical, sexual conduct that must be demanded of our candidates for ministry.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, it is before us. We have two speeches for the minority report. Does anyone wish to speak? I do not see any cards that are before us. Before we take this vote on the minority report, is there a comment from the chair of the committee, or a designated person from the committee?

LAVON WILSON: Bishop, Al Gwinn will speak for the committee.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

AL GWINN (Kentucky): Thank you bishop. Members of the conference, the language, "faithfulness in marriage and celibacy in singleness" is a clear, concise, positive statement that affirms our classical Christian tradition that faithfulness in marriage and celibacy in singleness is very important. It affirms our past and present societal experiences and beliefs that faithfulness in marriage and celibacy in singleness is very important. It affirms our reason that marriage and celibacy in singleness is very important. And it affirms sacred scripture that faithfulness in marriage and celibacy in singleness is very important. And so our legislative committee urges you to defeat the minority report in favor of the committee's report.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you may state your point of order, mike five.

TIM JONES-YELVINGTON (New York): Could the man who just spoke on behalf of the committee please define the term classical Christianity?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I don't see any indication that he is prepared to make that response, so we now have this amendment before us, or the minority report. You may make one comment briefly, please.

WEST: When I was in campus ministry, a young man came to talk to me who described something that happened to him recently when he was in his youth group. But it happened about a year ago before he was in college. He was out with his youth group at a Burger King and some people who were not part of the youth group started to call him "fag" and "pervert" and they started to torment him and then they started to hit him. And they beat him up so badly that he had brain damage. And the question that he brought to me was that what happened was his youth group left him there as the people who were beating him up. These were nice good kids who left him there. And he said, "You know when those kids were asked, 'Why did they leave him?' they said they didn't know what to do." Our language in this footnote I wish you would vote against. I wish you would vote in favor of my minority report in part because you've moved by not having language that says "yes, but" and confuses our young people about what to do when someone is being beaten up.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WEST: But if not that, I wish that you vote in favor of this amendment, simply because this footnote is unnecessary and "ethical sexual conduct" beyond the marriage is imperative.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you. Now the amendment, or rather the minority report is before us. Please vote when the light appears.

The Minority Report is not sustained. [*Yes, 313; No, 603*]. We're on the main motion, which is for nonconcurrency on Calendar Item 1558. Please vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee. [*Yes, 675; No, 227*].

WILSON: Bishop Solomon, this completes the Higher Education section on this particular subject. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I understand and we do thank the committee very much. I do understand that there is a Calendar Item 336 on Page 1963 that was passed on the Consent Calendar in error. It does have financial implications and we turn to Fitzgerald

Reist, the Consent Calendar chair, to guide us in our next steps.

FITZGERALD REIST: If you'll turn in your DCAs to p. 1963, Consent Calendar A03. Calendar Item 336 was reported to the calendar as having no financial implications. That was a misunderstanding on behalf of the committee. It does indeed have financial implications. Therefore, I must report that its placement in Calendar A03 was incorrect. It is therefore not a part of Calendar A03 and must be considered by the body according to the rules of our General Conference.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Now my understanding then is that it was approved, ostensibly, on the Consent Calendar which meant that it was greeted in the affirmative. But if we are to keep ourselves in order, we will need to approve with reference to GCFA, if that is the will of the body. Is that the case?

REIST: That is the case and that came from the Conference committee and Charles Courtoy is here and would be willing to address that issue.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Let's just try it. I believe that it's before us and it's clear and our house is ready to vote. If you would approve this Calendar Item with reference to GCFA would you please vote "yes" when the light appears, or if you don't want to approve it you can vote "no." Please vote when the light appears. And you have approved it and with reference to GCFA, [*Yes, 853; No, 36*]. All right. Thank you very much. Does that complete the items that you need to address?

CHARLES COURTOY (Florida): There is one other, Bishop.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Let's hear it.

COURTOY: If you'll turn in your DCA to p. 2089, Calendar No. 1156, p. 161 in the *Advance DCA*, Petition 31612.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

*Possibility of Increased
General Conference Delegates
Has Financial Implications*

COURTOY: This has financial implications. Yesterday you approved a formula for the way in which delegates to General Conference are elected. This is a constitutional amendment and what this amendment does is to increase the number of possible delegates to this body to 1200 and makes the minimum number 800. It would read that the Gen-

eral Conference shall be composed of no less than 800 nor more than 1200 delegates. Currently the language is, the number specified in the *Discipline* is, no less than 600 nor more than 1,000. The committee votes concurrence as amended. What this does is would bring more delegates to the table and will lessen the chance of loss of delegates by any conferences as a result of new formula which we adopted yesterday.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, so the understanding of the chair is that what's before us is an action that is constitutional in nature, along with reference to GCFA. It would require two-thirds vote and it is focused upon increasing the number of General Conference delegates. 1156. It is before us. You have comments, yes, there are yellow cards in the very back. And the person who's standing may go to mike 5 and then I'm going to take the liberty because there were not other cards. There was a delegate immediately behind you in the black that was standing and I'm going to call on that person next and then I'll come over in some other directions in a moment.

JACK RYDER (Northern Illinois): Thank you, Bishop. The Petition 31612 on p. 161 of the *ADCA* that I've got says 900 and 1300. The speaker mentioned 800 and 1200. What are the numbers we're voting on?

COURTOY: Bishop, that was amended to be 800 and 1200.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Amended by the committee?

COURTOY: Yes, sir.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, so we will be operating on that notion. I recognize the delegate in the back that was raising the yellow card just a moment ago. You may . . . all right. We'll turn here to pink card. Mike 1, we'll go here in just a moment. Oh, please hold just a moment. The delegate had already moved to the mike no. 5, please.

MONTY STABLER (North Alabama): Bishop, clearly the most dramatic change that has occurred during my three General Conferences has been the growing presence of the delegates from the Central Conferences. The delegates from around the world have brought to us a realization that we can truly become a global church. The Central Conferences now have 152 delegates to this Conference. We adopted a new formula yesterday that is projected to give

them at least 16 more delegates in the next conference. If they grow as we hope that number will be even greater. If the conference in this country wants to continue to have delegates of comparable size to where they are now enjoying it will be necessary to increase the number of delegates. If this proposal passes, I would like to float an idea with more delegates we could organize with at least one additional committee. We could then reduce the workload of each committee. With less work on the committees, we could take the long overdue step of shortening the conference for a day or two. A shorter convention would save money for the conference, its boards, its agencies and most of its delegates. Frankly, I believe it would be a better conference, too.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's the speech for the main or the motion of 1156 or the Calendar Item. Anyone wishing to speak against? Yes, you may do so.

*General Conference Size
Compared to U.S. Congress*

EWING WERLEIN, JR (Texas): I would speak against this amendment. Already we have approximately 1,000 delegates. This is ten times the size of the United States Senate. It is more than twice the size of the entire United States Congress. We then go to a number of committees where we have more than 100 as a rule, or approximately 100 or more, in committees. We have delegates with 1,000 of us so far back that they complain that they cannot see the numbers on the screen. And the thought of increasing or squeezing in another 20 percent over the size here and expecting for people to be able to be heard and considered is beyond my imagination. I think that every Conference will always be assured delegates, but it seems to me that the larger it becomes beyond 1,000, the less practicable it becomes to do our work efficiently. And I would urge a vote against this proposal.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, green card here, please come to mike 2. We've had one speech for one speech against.

JIM HARNISH (Florida): First I'd like to ask an utterly irrelevant question. Does anybody have any idea what this might increase the cost of the General Conference?

CHARLES COURTOY (Florida): Jim, I would assume it would increase it, and increase it 20%.

HARNISH: I think the fact that we are ready to vote for this without the faintest idea of what it would cost is pretty consistent with the way we do our budgeting here; but none the less, I would submit to you that we have missional needs. We almost lightly turned away the need of the churches in Russia yesterday. I would submit to you that increasing radically the funding to have General Conference is pure administrative money that could be much more effectively spent in effectiveness to reach to a broken and lost world. I would urge us to vote against the increase in size.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. There is a yellow card two-thirds of the way back. Please go to mike 6. We have room in the formula of our rules for only one speech and that would be a speech for the main motion.

BETH CAPEN (New York): I raise a concern which would end up being a speech, I think in favor.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I'll mark it that way.

CAPEN: Thank you. My concern is the discussions that I've been hearing over the last two days. And it grieves me that I'm seen a tendency to argue and express feelings more, and I recognize it particularly in this conference, this General Conference this time, on a regional basis. If there was someone who were to get up and speak against this who is going to lose membership, then I would probably be influenced. But when there's a conference that's going to gain General Conference delegates speaking against gaining, I mean speaking against increasing the size of the conference, I'm not as influenced. And I hope that we would just take all things, all conferences and all people into consideration when we vote.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. It is before us and that is the motion of the committee. I turn to the chair, if you wish to make an additional comment.

COURTOY: Bishop, I'd let the body make the decision.

*Conference Votes Against
Increasing Delegate Numbers*

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. The motion is 1156 calendar item to increase the number of general conference delegates. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 380; No, 546] And the motion is defeated. I am going to turn now to Scott Jones. I understand that

there is one other matter that is essential that we have before us. I'm well aware that our time is close, but we'll see what we can do and keep faith with the calendar as it has been presented, or the agenda, rather.

*Faith and Order Committee, Accountable
to Council of Bishops, Proposed*

SCOTT JONES (North Texas): Thank you, Bishop. Delegates, I would direct your attention to page 2240. Twenty-two forty. The calendar is 1545. We recommend concurrence as amended with the Petition 31696 which is on 551. However, it's not going to do you much good to turn to the DCA unless you want me to go through the whole history of how we got to this. This is one of those compromises that represented a huge coming together of different members from different perspectives in the Faith and Order Committee with the strong conviction that our church needs ways to strengthen our ability for dialogue and doctrinal discernment. We are recommending that there be a committee on Faith and Order appointed by and accountable to the Council of Bishops that will not be a group to dictate doctrine to anybody, but will be a group to help lead the church and its doctrinal dialogue so that, to quote the words of the *Discipline* that are included in point 2, "It will assist the Council in finding ways of fostering doctrinal reflection and theological dialogue at all levels of The United Methodist Church, thereby helping the church recover and update our distinctive doctrinal heritage, and thereby enabling doctrinal reinvigoration for the sake of authentic renewal, fruitful evangelism, ecumenical dialogue and social witness." Bishop, we move concurrence as this petition has been amended.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. It's numbered 1545 and it is before us. You may speak, the green card. Please go to mike 6.

ERIC MCKINNEY (Central Texas): Bishop Solomon, yesterday we passed a motion asking for a report from GCFA concerning the amount of non-budgetary requests which had been referred to it thus far in the conference. This is but another proposal that does have financial impact. I would ask for that report to be given before we take action on this. We have referred, and referred, and referred. I think it's only prudent that we know what we

have asked of them to this point before we add any more to it.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. I indicated earlier that we had that report coming and I had hoped that we would be able to receive it. I don't think this is inappropriate to make an inquiry of that nature, if in fact that information is readily available to us. I'll have to turn to representatives of GCFA to find out if such information is available at this time. It might have been available earlier in the afternoon, but it may not be available now. Is there anyone from GCFA who could make a response that would give some information or some guidance and therefore be of assistance to us? Well, I think we face the difficulty of not having that information available and we apologize for that. We're now on Calendar Item 1545. It's before us. I believe we're ready . . . All right. There is a green card here. Please go to mike 4

WILLIAM PEEPLES (Louisiana): Bishop, I would speak against this proposal because we have some fine seminaries of great integrity in which the issues of faith and order, I think, would be great to be developed, struggled with and have that new voice coming out of our seminaries, shared rather than some think tank created to do that. We already have them.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. Thank you very much. There a green card over here to mike 3. That is a speech against the committees recommendation

BISHOP SOLOMON: Are you speaking for or against the committee's recommendation?

THOMAS V. WOLFE (North Central New York): I am offering an amendment in the . . .

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, you may proceed.

*Proposed Faith and Order Committee to
Study Theological Differences*

WOLFE: I would like to propose, Bishop and delegates, to section B, third section, which would be directive of this commission, that number one, "that they would assess the reality and impact of the theological differences within our church." Two, "determining if the diversity characteristic of our church can encompass our differences, and discerning if it is possible for our church to move forward as one body

where our differences are truly celebrated as resources one to the other.”

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. By the way, I did not mention that the amendment was before—is properly before us. I believe it was seconded. All right. And you have made your speech for. Anything else you want to say?

WOLFE: Well, I think we appear to be at impasse over deeply held understandings and interpretations and beliefs. There exists no current process to bring us to constructive dialogue between sessions of General Conference. And I think we find ourselves debating it on the floor in a very short period of time. And if we do not directly address this issue through a process of love and integrity, it will continue to tear at the fabric of the church that we love.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. That’s a speech for. Is there someone wishing to speak? Here is a pink card, here, in the center. If you will go to mike 4, please. I will be going to the orange card in the back. We’ll take that in a moment.

K. EDWARD TOMLINSON (North Georgia): Since we do not have the report from GCFA—

BISHOP SOLOMON: Excuse me, I just learned a moment ago, just this very minute, in fact, that Bishop Looney has information that is available, and I would ask him, if you would permit me, sir—

TOMLINSON: Yes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: —to share that information. The inquiry, as I understand it, is what is the amount of funds that would be involved if all were granted as extra-budgetary, to this point at least, budgetary funds. Is that correct?

*GCFA Reports \$42 Million
Unfunded Requests*

BISHOP RICHARD C. LOONEY: My apologies for not being immediately available. I was on my way to GCFA meeting, being forty minutes late, when I heard the request for the report. The latest information, before what we have just done, is that the General Conference has added \$58 million to the budget. There was, at least the time when we were preparing this, another \$12 million waiting for your decision. Before you get completely excited, the proposed budget is \$526 million. Built into that was \$16 million available for your discretion; which means, then, \$42 million not in the proposed budget.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right

BISHOP LOONEY: There may be \$7 million available for some of the proposals that are currently being funded. Which leaves set us million over the proposed budget. And if the other twelve million are acted upon, that would be a total approaching forty-seven million. We’re trying to work—have been all day and are trying to work this evening—in time to get the material in the DCA, so you can see what you’re working on. You should know that we will be struggling with the recommendation we made prior to General Conference to try to hold the budget in a way that’s healthiest for the local church while recognizing some of the very special claims that are being made.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

BISHOP LOONEY: We know that ultimately this decision is in your hands, and GCFA wants to be your servant in the matter. But I do think you need to know the figures that we’re approaching.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, thank you. You’ve made the inquiry. You’ve received the information. We have this amendment before us. One person has spoken for the amendment. We have other speeches yet that can be made. I know I am presuming upon the calendar. We are really pressing some of our meetings. This is going to be the last petition we have, though we have some others that have financial implications that we hoped we would be able to address today. We simply cannot do it. There’s an orange card in section . . . near the back, go to mike 7, please. We’re on the Wolfe amendment.

J. PHILIP WOGAMAN (Baltimore-Washington): I speak against the amendment, but in a friendly spirit, because I believe the purpose of the amendment is a good one. However, I think the kind of dealing directly with conflict is going to be better served by the previous action, which you’ve already approved, directing the Christian Unity group to deal directly with those issues.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right.

WOGAMAN: We have established today the importance of serious theological work that probes in depth without quite so much heat, but with a good deal more light. And so far as the financial implications are concerned, as along with Scott, one of those who

worked at putting this together, it seemed to us best to leave that in the form in which you see it, trusting that between the Council of Bishops and the GCFA, it will be possible to work this thing through in a way that will be consistent with the budgetary resources available. As a long-time theological professor, I can tell you that the kind of people who are likely to serve on this commission are used to doing things on a shoestring. And that may be what we’ll have to do. But the work of such a commission will be very vital in the life of the church. Thank you.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right. We have one speech for, one speech against the Wolfe amendment. I believe we are ready to vote on the amendment. I do not see other cards. So I am going to ask us to vote. The amendment is before us. Will you please . . . All right, I’m sorry. Mike 4.

MAC BRANTLEY (North Georgia): The question I have is, before we vote on this, can you tell us what this will cost?

BISHOP SOLOMON: I’ll turn to the chair of the committee.

*Cost of Proposed Faith and Order
Committee Estimated at \$50,000 Annually*

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): It is my intention that this cost approximately \$50,000 a year, simply to cover meetings and minimal secretarial help. But Phil and I agreed that we’re not quite sure about that, and the GCFA are the experts. But we regard this as a small item in the overall budget of the church, and yet one that would have huge impacts, disproportionate to simply the cost of the meetings.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, now, let me keep us in order, here. We’re really on the Wolfe amendment, however, the information you’ve requested is applicable to the entirety of the calendar item. I believe we’re ready to vote on the Wolfe amendment. We’ll note that there was an amendment proposing additional criteria in this. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 145; No, 754] The amendment is not sustained. We’re back on the Calendar Item 1545. All right, I’ll go all the way to the back, the nearest delegate with the orange card, to the mike 8. Hold steady. Mike 8. Still believe we have the wrong delegate going, but I’m not sure. Let’s try again. Let me see the cards. Oh, yes, well, we have lots of response now. Go ahead. Mike 8.

MARK CONARD (Kansas West): I would move an amendment, two places, under section A, the third line; it would read "3 active bishops, 7 persons chosen on the basis" and then it would follow. Then a few lines down after "5 ordained elders," it would be "5 ordained deacons or diaconal ministers." That would be the same number, but would add to the diversity of the commission, or the committee, and would add a significant component to what is being proposed.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that amendment, the Conard amendment is now before us adding these numbers that have been so identified. Is there anyone who wishes to speak to that amendment? There's a green card by mike 4. You may speak.

LANE WINN (Louisiana): Is it in order to make an amendment to the amendment?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Yes, it is.

WINN: Also, in A further down towards the middle, it would say "In appointing the committee, the Council will make intentional efforts towards racial, gender, lay, clergy, regional diversity" and add "age diversity."

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, if it, is it seconded? It is seconded. Do you wish to speak to it?

WINN: Hello. We've been trying to be an inclusive church for years now and I think that in order to do that fully we need to add age diversity on all of our committees. And since we're going to be starting this one from the bottom up, we should just go ahead and do that from the start.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, we're on the Lane Winn amendment; it's before us. There is an orange card in the very back. Please go to mike 7.

PHIL GRANGER (North Indiana):

BISHOP SOLOMON: May I interrupt you for just a moment? I took liberties that were premised upon expectations not yet realized on my part. And so, to be in order, is there a motion to extend the time until we complete this report? That's one option. The other option is just to end the journey right where we are and leave.

GRANGER: Bishop, this a motion for referral. It might help you out.

BISHOP SOLOMON: We'll find out after we hear it, all right? Please proceed, but only after I find out the will of the body. I'm not going to try to do the work

of the Agenda Committee here, but I need to know the sentiment of the house. If you're willing to extend the time until we can complete this matter, will you please indicate either direction. Please vote when the light appears.

(Laughter)

All right, we'll stop right where we are. May I—hold steady please, hold steady. May I express again—please do not make any response to this expression—my gratitude to the house. It's been a long day and I pray in this journey that we have experienced, as well as expressed, a sense of collegiality and conferencing, sensitivity, care and concern that mark our life in this journey together. Will you remain seated. I'm going to ask Bishop Emilio de Carvalho to come and pray us into recess and to dinner. Yes, I'm sorry, I must ask Bishop de Carvalho to hold one minute. There needs to be a word from our Calendar Committee, I believe. Mike 2.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I'm not sure, could you give us some direction. I really don't feel that it's fair for us to adjourn at 6:15 and expect the delegates back at 7:30. Could you give us some direction to that? What is the will of the body?

BISHOP SOLOMON: Well, I think you need to put some specific figure in front of us. It would seem to me either 7:45 or 8:00 and . . .

MASSEY: I move that we adjourn the adjournment and the evening session begin at 8:00.

BISHOP SOLOMON: All right, that's the motion before us. If you would approve lift a hand. If you're opposed, lift a hand. It is supported; we are to return at 8. However, Bishop de Carvalho, one moment. I need to check to see with our secretary if there are announcements that must be made at this point or can they be held until the end of the evening session.

MARSHALL: Just one, Bishop Solomon, and that is the Discipleship Legislative Committee will meet immediately after the close this afternoon in front of Section A for 5 minutes.

BISHOP SOLOMON: Thank you very much. Bishop de Carvalho will you come and we'll remain seated and will you lead us in prayer.

(Prayer)

BISHOP SOLOMON: Amen. You are in recess.

Thursday Evening May 11, 2000

(Bishop Alfred Johnson, presiding)

BISHOP ALFRED JOHNSON: You may be seated. Let us begin our evening session in a continuance of prayer and music that we've begun in this moment of centering and prayer. Guide us, O thou Great Jehovah. We are merely pilgrims in this barren land. We are so weak, but thou art so mighty. Hold us with thy powerful hand. Bread from heaven, bread only made in heaven, feed us 'til we want no more. Gracious God, indeed, as we proceed through this part of our journey, we can do nothing save you feed us with your special food for this part of the journey for which you will use us. Be with us, guide us, inspire us—indeed, drag us—to become those persons as one community to lead our church. But in all things, pour out your extravagant grace and mercy upon us. For that is the only way we can be useable for thee. In the name of Jesus Christ, we pray with thanksgiving. Amen.

We have at least an agenda in a number of nearly 400 petitions that can last us until next Wednesday, and we have an agenda time to be ending for this evening at 10:30—at this point. God indeed has been with us in many ways this day. We have reached some mountaintops and some very deep valleys. But we know, indeed, that God's grace is more than available for all of our needs as we proceed together to be the table that God will use to send forth God's specialness. I love making the expression that whenever two or three of us gather, indeed, Jesus is powerfully in our midst. However, that's always a promise and a threat. The promise is that Jesus is in our midst, and the threat is that Jesus is in our midst. And what I can assure you, for this small part of our journey as previous journeys, is that none of us will leave here the same way we came in even at this moment. For indeed, every moment with Jesus is transformative, and we will indeed find a new level of transformation. So as we proceed through this evening, let us be cognizant of every nuance of the Spirit that will lead us towards being

God's people. I am indeed especially privileged to have powerful vehicles of grace supporting me this evening in the person of Bishop James S. Thomas and Bishop William Boyd Grove. We look forward to us being a team as we've already begun in prayer with Cynthia, and I invite you to see yourselves as a part of our team working for God and looking forward to the way that God will use us to bring, indeed, scriptural holiness and transformation through this land. We'll ask that we have a report of our Agenda Committee, and then Carolyn Marshall will bring to us announcements and also read for us the declaratory decision, and we will follow that this evening with the continuation of the voting for alternates for the Judicial Council.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Bishop Johnson and delegates, tomorrow we will follow the same order that we've been following with music and worship service until 9:00, and then we'll have a report from the Agenda Committee, and all morning we will be working on calendar items and elections of various sorts. We will try to adjourn at 12:15 for lunch, and then we'll come back here at 2:30 and we'll be working again on elections and calendar items. We will again try to recess at 5:30, and the evening session will begin again with calendar items and elections, and goodness knows when we will adjourn. I'm not making any predictions. It says 10:30, but this is the proposed agenda. We'll talk about it in the morning. Thank you, delegates.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you so much for your hard work in ordering us for the Spirit's work. I call upon Carolyn Marshall, who will bring to us any prior announcements that will be helpful for the body, as well as then reading a declaratory decision by the Judicial Council, after which we will take a clergy vote for alternates.

Judicial Council Rules It Does Not Have Jurisdiction To Decide Legislation Effective Date

CAROLYN MARSHALL: This is the Judicial Council regarding the request for the General Conference for a declaratory decision as to whether a vote taken by General Conference on a legislative petition is valid if only a portion of that petition has been printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* Advanced Edition and in the *Daily Christian Advocate*. "On May 10, 2000, at a plenary session, a General Conference member moved

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 31789 regarding para. 2602 indicating that the action would take effect immediately was not made available to the delegates of the conference. Fewer than a majority of the members of the General Conference present and voting, but greater than one-fifth of those members, voted in favor of the request, and the matter was referred to the Judicial Council pursuant to Paragraph 2609.1, which reads, "The Judicial Council shall determine the constitutionality of any act of the General Conference upon an appeal by a majority of the Council of Bishops or one fifth of the members of the General Conference." End of that quote from the paragraph.

"The Judicial Council does not have jurisdiction in this matter. Paragraph 2609.1 deals specifically with a request for a determination of constitutionality, and as such, provides for referral to the Judicial Council with less than a majority affirmative vote for a request from the General Conference. In the instant matter, the request was for a declaratory decision, and, with no constitutional question at issue, the request comes under Paragraph 2616. Although that paragraph could be more clearly written as to the affirmative vote required for referral, there is no reference to less than a majority affirmative vote for a request for a declaratory decision. In this matter, a majority of the General Conference members did not vote for referral. The Judicial Council does not have jurisdiction. A request for oral argument was denied for the reason that the Judicial Council does not have jurisdiction. John G. Corry recused himself and did not take part in any of the proceedings related to this decision." And the digest: "Requests for declaratory decisions which do not deal with constitutional issues require an affirmative vote from a majority of the General Conference members present and voting. In this matter, there were fewer than a majority of the members who voted affirmatively for referral and, therefore, the Judicial Council does not have jurisdiction."

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Move to mike 4. Name and conference, please.

GARNHART: I'd like to request two points of information from our conference secretary, if I might.

BISHOP JOHNSON: You may. We'll try it.

Delegate Questions Original Petition or DCA as Official

GARNHART: The first point of information is in regard to Rule 33 of our General Conference, which is found on page 1262 in whichever volume that happens to be, that would seek the interpretation of that paragraph, in particular, the middle of the second sentence that says, in regard to petitions that have gone through committees and have been submitted for printing, "The report as printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* becomes the official copy, subject only to grammatical or other obvious editorial changes, and shall be regarded as in the possession of the Conference." That's the first point that I would like clarified. The second point is, if this does not mean what it appears to mean to me, which is what we have presented to us in writing is what we're dealing with and not something that's in another sheet of paper in only one person's possession—if my interpretation of this is not accurate, I would request to know which rule it is that tells us that we must refer back to that original piece of paper signed by the original petitioner, even though that petition has now become the property of the Conference once it's gone through a committee.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. You're asking the secretary to respond to that, so I will refer that to the secretary.

MARSHALL: Thank you, Bishop. The words mean exactly what the words say. The report to which he is referring is that middle sentence there, which says, "The report as printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* becomes the official copy, subject only to grammatical or other obvious editorial changes and shall be regarded as in the possession of the Conference." As a matter of explanation, I would simply say to you that this refers to the processes under which we operate here at General Conference. It refers to the *Daily Christian Advocate*, not to the *Advance* edition. Obviously, people work very hard to have things in compliance. One of the things which was emphasized in our time of training with chairs and vice-chairs was the fact that the

original petitions are always in the possession of the legislative committees, and they are urged, requested—as much as you can tell people to do—to look, to go from what is on the original petition. The *Advance Daily Christian Advocate* is furnished for guidance and is hopefully as error-free as possible. That is not to say that human error cannot happen at some point, and that is what has happened in this instance.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very much. I want to remind the body again that it's about 8:30 now, and we have an adjournment time of 10:30, with about 400 different petitions, and somehow we are to finish. I also want to remind the body of Rule 21, and that is, whatever is unfinished will simply be unfinished. The General Conference will not do anything with anything that we don't get finished with, and so it's important, I think—particularly for these two sacred hours we have—that you spend time doing the best you can to be the body of Christ as we need to be, and move it quite forthrightly.

I see you again. You want to follow up on the question?

Delegate Asks What Conference Rule Governs "Official" Status

GARNHART: The point of order is, I believe, that was an answer to my first question, but that made the second question very relevant, then: Which is the rule that tells us that we must go back, even after something has reached this floor, to the original petition signed by the petitioner? I want to just know, since this apparently is a rule. Which rule is it? Where is it?

MARSHALL: Do you want me to respond to it? Friends, rules are going on toward perfection too. One of our delegates here chairs that Rules Committee, and I would more than pleased, your Secretary of the General Conference would be more than pleased, to have Jerome Del Pino respond to that. Then let me simply say that the text as printed on page 1991, to Calendar Item 623, does not repeat, but is . . . any additional material. And so what we were voting on was what was in the *Advance DCA*. When I talked about, previously, the fact that committees, chairs, vice-chairs, leadership in committees are given the petitions, those in reference, the Reference Committee also are aware, that the petitions are in the various committees. It is probably a rule that has come as much from practice as

from what has been in print. But that has been one of the tenets on which legislative committees operate—that the petitions themselves are that which has been dealt with. And so I leave it in your hands. I simply give you what practice has been and what the instructions in the committee were and the fact that we talked very specifically about some of the concerns as far as the printing in the *Advance DCA*, and the ways in which the staff was working very diligently to deal with those and to be as accurate as possible, and to please refer to the original petitions, that it was even more important this time than, hopefully, some other times. We'll go on to perfection again.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very much. We know the enormous work that you do, and the staff, and, as you say, we're all moving towards perfection. Recognize the person with the yellow card. Please go to mike 6 or 8.

*Conference Debates
Question of Effective Date*

PATRICIA E. FARRIS (California-Pacific): Bishop, maybe I'm misunderstanding the secretary's explanation, but I believe she just told us, then, that the sentence about the effective date was not before us when we acted. Is that correct?

BISHOP JOHNSON: I believe that is correct. Is that correct?

MARSHALL: Yes.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes.

MARSHALL: It was in the legislative committee on the original petition that was available for use. But that's instructions, and I'm not saying it's down on . . .

FARRIS: I understand that, but that means, then, that when this body voted, that sentence was not before us. No action has been taken on the sentence about the effective date. Is that correct?

BISHOP JOHNSON: That is correct. OK, I'm seeing . . . with the green, mike 4.

CHARLES D. (DENNY) WHITE, JR. (Western North Carolina): Thank you, Bishop. As I recall, a speech was made a day or so ago about this matter, and the question was raised about whether it really mattered or not whether that sentence was before the committee. If the members will get Paragraph 2602 and look at it, I think it would be correct to say that the amendment proposed removing the age limit occurs in the first

paragraph of Paragraph 2602. Now, if I'm wrong about that, I can sit down and be quiet. So I guess I should ask, is that, in fact, correct? [The podium indicates 'Yes']

Now, to continue reading that paragraph, 2602, you flip the page, and lo and behold, at the end of it is this sentence: "This paragraph shall become effective immediately upon passage by the General Conference." Now, I suppose it is a reasonable question to ask, to what does that refer—to the original paragraph as printed in the book, or to anything which might ultimately appear in the paragraph? But I think it is at least arguable that it really doesn't matter whether that sentence were before the committee; it's already in the book.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. OK, the secretary would like to respond. I know this has been before us and we've gone over these same points on a number of occasions. The chair would like to see if the body would like to move in some direction with the information that is before us, and we'll ask the secretary, who would like to speak, to perhaps move us in those directions.

MARSHALL: For those who are looking at a *Discipline* at Paragraph 2602, you will note that it is done in two paragraphs. The sentence that says "this paragraph shall become effective immediately upon passage by the General Conference" is at the end of the second paragraph. The term—the sentence that we're working with—that we're dealing with—that creates our concern and our opportunity at the moment, is in the first paragraph. So in reality, understanding "paragraph" to mean a singular paragraph, it does not refer to the paragraph in question. Or it would not seem to.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes, mike 6.

RICHARD PARKER (New York): Thank you, Bishop. Some of us concerned about this issue have tried to look at those questions very carefully. It is clear that the sentence in question does appear at the end of the second paragraph in 2602. However, it also is clear, it seems to me, that that sentence applies to the initial adoption of that paragraph and clearly cannot be construed to stretch into the future and to apply to future action of the General Conference in regard to 2602. That is done, it's in the past, and has nothing to do with action we are taking today. I believe that we acted correctly on the printed material in the *DCA*. We did

not act on the handwritten item on the petition, which held that it should be effective immediately, and therefore that sentence is not included in the action which we took, and it's not included in a relevant way in the *Discipline*.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK, we are sharing a goodly amount of information. We're not moving in any direction at this point. Please. Mike 1, please.

Motion to Discontinue All Discussion of Effective Date is Passed

M. DIANE NUNNELEE (Missouri West): I'm not really sure how to do this, but I would move all that is before us, which has been before us before. We have the work of God to do. Four years is not going to make a whole lot of difference in the whole Kingdom of God with one person. There are hundreds of thousands of children that have died while we have been meeting, and therefore—I don't know how to do it, but can we just move this and vote as a house to close all discussion, except what has happened, and move on?

(Applause)

BISHOP JOHNSON: The chair will take that as a motion. Would anyone like to second it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Yes.

BISHOP JOHNSON: It is properly moved and seconded, that we, quote, "move on." Any further discussion? If you would like to move on, vote when the light appears. [Yes, 785; No, 94] It prevails, and we're moving on.

I want to have Keith Boyette stand and be recognized. He was elected as a clergy member of the Judicial Council, but he was not present. It's wonderful to be elected when you're not here. Keith, would you stand and let us recognize you? He is from Virginia. He's up there.

(Applause)

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. We will now move to elect your alternates. You'll be voting for six persons. I'll ask the secretary if she would read the names and numbers for you, that we might begin to vote.

Ballot for Clergy Delegates to Judicial Conference

MARSHALL: 2-Elsie J. Crickard; 3-Frank B. Davies; 4-Ralph Laurence Dill III; 5-Philip Fenn; 6-Thomas H. (Tom) Griffith; 7-Susan Henry-Crowe; 8-Belton F. Joyner; 10-Thomas

Shanklin; 11-Robert K. Sweet Jr.; 12-Francine Taylor-Thirus; 13-Jane Tews; 14-Linda Thomas; 15-Theodore "Ted" Walter.

BISHOP JOHNSON: It is the chair's understanding that you will be voting for 6, and that you will be voting on 6 occasions. I see a number. One of you may go to mike 8, the person who is standing.

JANE TEWS (Desert Southwest): I should have realized when I saw that I was No. 13 that that was an omen. Brothers and sisters of the General Conference, I do want to thank all of you for the love and support that so many of you have given me in this difficult time. Needless to say, in 48 hours I went from a great deal of joy to a great deal of despair. Unfortunately, despite assertions from a number of delegates from the floor that this was not a political process, many believe that this judicial election was extremely politicized, and worse, that judicial integrity has been called into question. There have been whisperings of maneuvering, manipulation, and regionalization. Frankly, folks, I have found the process most distasteful. In an effort to bring this election back to higher ground, and in an attempt to alleviate any feeling that I may be entitled to the position as an alternate because of all that has happened; and because I do not want to be a bone tossed to the Western Jurisdiction and all those who have felt completely disenfranchised by many actions of the General Conference, I respectfully withdraw my name.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. [Applause] Mike 3.

RHETT JACKSON (South Carolina): Would it be possible to put on the screen the last results of the last ballot?

BISHOP JOHNSON: We're working.

JACKSON: Thank you.

BISHOP JOHNSON: This may take a few moments. Do you feel you need to see this in order to vote properly? [Cries of "no"] I am hearing a wide "no", so let's begin to vote, if you will. You may . . . each one takes a majority vote. We will vote 6 times in succession. You may vote when the light appears or when the names are on the screen again.

[Voting]

OK, you may again vote when the light appears for your second choice.

[Voting]

You may vote again for your third choice.

[Voting]

Now for your fourth.

[Voting]

Fifth.

[Voting]

And finally, the sixth.

[Voting]

OK. We will get the results a little bit later. We'll move to a motion that I understand was left to Faith and Order. We'll ask those persons if they'd come at this time. [Pause] Scott Jones, would you bring us up to date so that we may begin to move?

SCOTT JONES: Yes, sir. Delegates, I call your attention again to page 2240; twenty-two forty. The Calendar Item is 1545. The Faith and Order Committee recommends concurrence with this petition.

Proposed Committee on Faith and Order Discussion Renewed

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It's my understanding that you've had two amendments, and that upon leaving delegate Granger was at the mike and making a motion for referral. I'd like to call delegate Granger back again to see if you'd like to continue in that process. Are you present? And if you would move to mike 7. [Pause] Just to check, is the body clear as to where we are? Do you remember where we left this? Does anyone need to be brought on board? OK, let's proceed.

PHILIP R. GRANGER (North Indiana): I would like to move referral to GCOM; and if seconded, I would like to speak to it.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I hear a second. You may.

GRANGER: Yes, I believe this is a significant event in the life of our church. I also believe that the underlying responsibilities already rest with GCOM. I would suggest that rather than making a significant decision like this "on the fly" on the floor of this Conference, that we ask GCOM to look at this over the next four years, recommend how we might implement this. In the interim, the most significant discussion that we have to do as a church has already been

referred to the Commission on Interreligious Affairs, [sic. GCCUIC] and I would move that because of this, we allow sufficient time to develop this opportunity.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Is there anyone who would like to speak either for or against the motion for referral? This would take all that is before us and refer it to GCOM. Seeing none, we will ask the chair of the committee if he would speak to it.

JONES: Delegates, this is very similar to a proposal that was passed at the General Conference in 1996. But because it did not have funding, it was not ever entered into the *Discipline*. I think the funding we are talking about is .0005 of the apportionments. This is not a big-dollar item. When I was a pastor, we had potluck dinners. It was my practice to be last in line so that I could speak to all the people and especially greet the visitors. Just because I am last in this lineup of people looking for funding, I think there is still some good casserole and maybe even dessert left over. I urge you to pass this and let GCFA wrestle with the funding, and we'll see how it all comes out tomorrow.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It is now before you. We will move now to vote. I would ask . . . is there a question or a point of order, or a question of clarification? Mike 4.

LEE B. SHEAFFER (Virginia): GCFA looked at this Committee on Faith and Order during the dinner hour, and we project that this would cost \$408,000 over the quadrennium.

*Faith and Order Committee
Referred to GCOM for Study*

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you, very much, for the information. OK, it is now before you. If you would vote to refer this matter, vote when the light appears. [Yes, 524; No, 387] You have referred it. Thank you very much.

We move now to Church and Society. I'm sorry, we move to Independent Commissions, Harold Batiste, and we'll ask him to introduce the business at hand. Following that will be Church and Society, and we'll ask Terri Rae Chatten to be available to proceed.

Independent Commissions Report

HAROLD E. BATISTE, JR. (Southwest Texas): Thank you. Good evening, Bishop Johnson.

BISHOP ALFRED JOHNSON: Good evening.

*Distribution of General Conference
Materials for Central Conference Delegates*

BATISTE: All the members of our leadership team are David Banks, Margie Briggs, and Gil Hanke who is a lay delegate of the Texas Conference. We have a resolution and you will find it on page 2118, in Wednesday's *DCA*. The title is, "Translation and Distribution of Materials for Delegates of the Central Conference." Perhaps you've had a chance to read it.

Members of the Independent Commissions Committee express enormous concern about appropriate translation and timely delivery of printed materials for delegates of the Central Conference. So we appointed a resolutions committee, chaired by Odell Thompson, lay delegate of the Wisconsin Conference, Ben Alford, clergy delegate of the Tennessee Conference, Charles Johnson, clergy delegate of the North Indiana Conference, and Ida Power, lay delegate of the Virginia Conference, and they framed the resolution. I move its acceptance.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It is before you. Yes. Mike 4, the pink card there in the middle.

ODELL THOMPSON (Wisconsin): This will have to be deferred to the GCFA because it does have financial implications.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. The chair recognizes Molly Stewart who would like to speak to this.

Materials Translation Debated

MOLLY STEWART (North Alabama): Thank you, Bishop Johnson. To the conference: We the Commission on the General Conference agree with the spirit of this resolution. However, there are some concerns there, and we would like to make a friendly amendment to the resolution if the independent commission will accept that. It's in the area where it says "Be it further resolved that the . . . and number 2, "that all necessary translated materials such as the advanced *DCA*, be in the possession . . ." And we'd like to speak to the area of the word "translation," that if you would accept, let the commission determine the languages that would be translated. Because at that time, in 2004, we are not sure what they might be. So we would ask if you would allow the

commission working at that time that privilege.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you.

BATISTE: Bishop, we can accept that as a friendly amendment.

BISHOP JOHNSON: It's been accepted as a friendly amendment. I recognize that it's really the privilege of the body to allow this to happen, but if I don't see strong objections, we're going to allow them to move in that direction. I see a card in the middle. If you would, move to Mike no. 5. There was a pink card in the middle here . . . move to mike no. 5 if you will.

DOROTHY RAVENHORST (Virginia): I would like to make an amendment after no. 2, there, in "Be it further resolved . . ."

BISHOP JOHNSON: Just before you do that, I want to – and I will certainly allow you to do that. There is a friendly amendment that is being offered, and the commission is accepting that. If I don't hear a loud protest from the body, I'm going to assume that you'll allow that. Can I assume that?

Thank you very much. Now you may speak.

RAVENHORST: After the words, "translation and printing of such material," add the words, "using professional translators, rather than relying on computer translation." This is a very difficult job for translators . . .

BISHOP JOHNSON: Let me see, if you will, and I don't mean to interrupt you – is there a second?

It's been seconded. Please speak.

RAVENHORST: May I speak now?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes indeed.

RAVENHORST: Translating for a church group like this is somewhat different from the ordinary translation you might have in business or other affairs. When the Board of Global Ministries can enlist people that know the church language and church procedures and use professional translators, it's much better than attempting to rely on volunteers. And at the end of the third paragraph, add a sentence that carries out what I was saying. Paid translators should be provided for all plenary sessions and legislative committees if a sufficient number of qualified translators cannot be secured as volunteers.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Does anyone wish to speak to it? Hearing none,

I'll ask the committee chair if he would like to speak to this.

BATISTE: I have a closing statement. Effective preparation is an absolute requirement for delegates to do the work of the General Conference. And this advice is no less true for delegates of the Central Conference. I move acceptance of the resolution, Bishop.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Now, Mr. Batiste, you do recognize that right now we have an amendment before us; and I am assuming that your closing statement was simply to speak to that amendment as well. If you would amend the resolution as it has been given to you, would you vote when the light appears. [Yes, 667; No, 305] Thank you, you have amended it, and we thank you for your work at this point. Mr. Batiste, do you have other items for us?

*Translation of General Conference
Materials Approved*

BISHOP JOHNSON: I'm sorry. Thank you. If you would now support the motion as amended, would you again vote when the light appears. [Yes, 841; No, 58] Thank you, you have now amended and supported the motion as it is. I see cards waving. I'll go all the way in the back, in the middle. If you will, move to mike number 8.

H. EDDIE FOX (Holston): Thank you, Bishop. I am impressed with your eye sight, so thank you for seeing us.

BISHOP JOHNSON: It's the glasses.

FOX: I need to know your optician.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I'll be sure to share her with you.

(Laughter)

FOX: Bishop, the only people behind us are the general secretaries, between us and Lake Erie.

(Laughter)

And I must report that they're all awake. I'm moving to take from the table a motion that was tabled last evening dealing with Calendar Item 916, p. 2068, dealing with Petition 30097, in the *Advance* p. 453. If I could have that removed from the table, I would like to let the house know that I would like to make a substitute motion to those items.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Is there a second? It is before you as a non-debatable motion. If you would so approve this matter to remove it from the table for

the purposes mentioned, would you vote when the light appears. [Yes, 736; No, 136]

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Yes.

*Theological Education in Europe
Recalled from Table*

FOX: Bishop, on Tuesday evening we passed Calendar Item 638, Petition 30595 that came from Higher Education dealing with theological education in Europe. That dealt with the matter of the seminaries in what is sometimes called Eastern Europe. I'd like to move a substitute motion to that which was taken from the table and the substitute is as follows:

- that the General Conference establish an Advance Special goal of \$10 million for the quadrennium for church congregational development for the following countries in Europe: Bulgaria, Croatia, CIS (including Russia), the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Slovakia, Yugoslavia—I name those so that there is no misunderstanding—

- that this fund be allocated by the bishops of the areas of Northern Europe, Russia, Central and Southern Europe, in cooperation with the national church leaders,

- and that this Advance Special be promoted by the General Board of Global Ministries,

- and in addition that \$1 million be apportioned, and \$1 million be requested from the reserves of Board of Global Ministries at this *kairos* moment for church development for the quadrennium for the same countries to be allocated in the same manner.

Bishop, we all agreed last night it is a *kairos* moment, and I would urge that this conference would take this step to enable our brothers and sisters who suffered much for 50 to 70 years, to be able to step forward in establishing congregations that would make possible people coming to know the healing hope and salvation that is offered in Christ Jesus.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Is there a second? It is now properly before you. It is a substitute, and under your rules we first then would move to perfect the main motion. The main motion is listed as is. Are there amendments or questions that anyone would like to make to the main motion? Then, we would move to perfect the substi-

tute. All the way in the back, mike 8. We are now working on the main motion.

SAM WYNN (North Carolina): I would like to amend to add Austria to this. If I get a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP JOHNSON: We are amending the substitute. Eddie Fox, how does that sound to you?

FOX: Was the question asked to add Austria to it?

BISHOP JOHNSON: That's correct.

FOX: It was not in my list as we met last evening. We talked about the countries that had been in what was known as the former communist countries of Europe.

BISHOP JOHNSON: The answer, Eddie, is "Yes" or "No." Would you be willing to add that?

FOX: I have no problem.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you.

FOX: You just vote the rest of it. *(laughter)*

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Is the body willing to just allow that to be added? Thank you, so now you have the substitute that is before us. Again we're back to main motion. I did see a hand over here somewhere. We're perfecting the main motion. Yes, mike 1.

BROOKE CONKLIN (Troy): I guess it's partly on the main motion and partly on the other one there. The fact of taking the \$1,000,000 from the Board of Global Ministries; I don't see how we can do that until we here from GCFA how many other requests are coming out of Global Ministries.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. We are again on the main motion. Basically, that means as we perfected you can amend it, you can change it. Yes in the middle, down front in the middle. Yes. Mike 4

ULF RICKARDSSON (Sweden): Bishop, first I need to know if I am in order. I have an amendment, a suggestion for an amendment to the motion put before us by Eddie Fox. Is that the one that we are on now?

BISHOP JOHNSON: That's okay, we are the main motion, the one that the pages were showing before, but proceed with your question. I didn't hear at first and I was trying to listen for your name. Would you repeat it please?

RICKARDSSON: My question is basically, are we discussing the motion of Eddie Fox or are we discussing the motion that is in the *DCA*?

BISHOP JOHNSON: We are discussing the motion that is in the DCA.

RICKARDSSON: OK.

BISHOP JOHNSON: That is the main motion and that's the only one we are dealing with at this moment. We will come back to the substitute as soon as it seems the house has perfected the main motion. Yes, mike 2.

ARNIE RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): (*identifies himself*)

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes, just a second, did I hear a point of order? Mike 8 Are you raising a point of order? Mike 8, please, mike 8

*Confusion Over Which Petition
Is Being Considered*

OYBIND HELLIEN (Norway): Would you please repeat the number of the petition? I think we are on the wrong petition.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Would you show on the screen again the number and page of the petition. Okay, while it's coming you will find it on your *Advance DCA* p. 1024, 1024, Petition 30595. It's at the bottom of the page, beginning at the bottom of the page on the left page. You are saying that is not the correct petition.

HELLIEN: That's the wrong petition. The Petition is 30097.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I hear the body, some persons in the body. Can we get this on the screen so that we have the correct information please?

HELLIEN: The number is Petition 30097. "Raise Money for Russian Seminary and Church Growth" is the text. The one we were dealing with is already passed and was about the seminary.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Just a second, you have not been recognized. Just a moment please. Okay, I think it is on the screen now. And let's see if this is the correct one that the body is to be dealing with so that we are all on the same page. Someone raising a question about whether this one is the correct one or not? Is this one the right one? I'm hearing a yes. Mike 2 unless I hear point of order. I'm hearing a point of order.

RHODES: My point of order is that I have indicated that we have amended this motion with some words in regard to an Advance Special. And I'd like to know if that's what we are considering?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. I'll turn to the secretary and ask if we have

an amended version of what is in the DCA. And if it is an amended version, if she would read what the amendments are. Okay, we don't have record of the amended version. Point of order. Let's try it all the way in the back. It's wonderful to have so much help. Mike 7

CAROLYN JOHNSON (North Indiana): Bishop, my question on Calendar Item 916 relates to the process of perfecting the original. On the motion from the committee, the motion is for non-concurrence. What would be the affect of perfecting a motion for nonconcurrency?

BISHOP JOHNSON: That's a very good question. It is still before us. Let me try responding. If we have not taken action on the motion, it is proper to amend in any way you chose before we move towards finally disposing of the motion itself. And so it is properly before us, even if it's amended since we've not taken any action at all. I'm seeing another point of order no. 2, and then we'll try those in the right side of the room.

TERRELL SESSUMS (Florida): Bishop, you may remember that last evening when Petition 30097 came up, I suggested that the Legislative Committee on Higher Education and Ministry had been working on a resolution dealing with theological education in Europe. And this particular petition was tabled to be brought off the table when we took up the resolution from the Board of Higher Education and Ministry. Do I understand, that we have already acted on Petition 30595 dealing with theological education in Europe?

BISHOP JOHNSON: The chair is not fully aware, we are checking the record. We think we have an answer. Up front here, please, mike. Mike up front, if you will. On the portable mike, please.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): I'll try it again. OK. My battery's working this evening. Bishop, since last we discussed this issue, I've had occasion to meet with La Von Wilson, who chairs the Committee on Higher Education, and with Roger Ireson, the general secretary of the Board of Higher Education. Both confirmed that the other petition, which has been referred to, was indeed passed, that it of course addresses seminaries and similar education in at least a portion of the region which has been identified in the Fox amendment. That petition is at p. 1994 of DCA, Calendar Item 638. Sorry, I gave you those—well, I didn't give you

those backwards. The petition is at p. 1024 of the *Advance DCA* as Petition 30595. So the matter which came before you before was here because of a committee report. Our committee reported it out as nonconcurrency. There was pending, I understood when we quit, a motion made by Frank Dorsey to reduce the amount requested to \$1,500,000 per year for a quadrennium, and to make it an advance instead of specifying that a portion of the \$21,000,000 which the original petition sought be apportioned.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK, the secretary does have the full record. Would the body like to hear how we've been proceeding with this? Would you please, Carolyn?

CAROLYN MARSHALL: Would you like the entire sequence of events? Is that where you are?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes, I think that would be helpful for all of us. At this point we have a motion, we have a substitute, we have an amended version, and even a request, a question as to whether we've taken action already. And it would be helpful to hear the record of how we've moved at this point. We'll ask the secretary if she would give us the sequence of events.

*Secretary Summarizes Actions
Taken on Petitions So Far*

MARSHALL: This motion then that came from Frank Dorsey, Kansas East, in charge of Congregational Development, Growth, and Development involving Russian Ministry moved: "Be it resolved in this *kairos* moment at the beginning of the twenty-first century that during the 2000—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 in faithfulness to the Great Commission, The United Methodist Church fund this missional effort through an apportionment of \$1,500,00 per year, or a total of \$6,000,000 for the quadrennium. Move adoption of this motion with reference to GCFA. And then the Fox motion was that any money going for the Russian seminary/church be set as an Advance Special and not as an apportioned amount. And then it was tabled.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. Do you feel a bit clearer about where we are? OK Mike no. 2, again.

SESSUMS (Florida): The Legislative Committee on Higher Education recommended concurrence with Petition 3059—nonconcurrence. They recommended it with an amendment that took the individual items and consolidated them into a total at the end that permits some adjustment. The amendment in question was an amendment that was offered to the amendment that was being discussed last night, which was then put upon the table until the Higher Education amendment came up. I think there's some confusion in the records, but I'm quite clear from my notes and my participation on the Committee on Higher Education that that committee did recommend concurrence with the petition that came out of Higher Education with an amendment. And I think if you'll look further in the records that that is correct.

BISHOP JOHNSON: In the back to the right with the yellow. Moving to mike 6.

OYVIND HELLIEN (Norway): If you see on p. 1994, Petition 638, we voted concurrence with that petition. The only thing we did with it, we deleted the dollar amount in listening, but we kept the amount on \$4,000,000. So we are finished with that petition. The petition that Eddie Fox wants to take off the table, you will find on p. 2068, and it's Calendar Number 916. I think what confuses us a little bit is that those petitions are mentioning seminaries and theological education. But this last one that Eddie Fox took off the table, and that we shall deal with now, is really a petition about church growth in eastern Europe, and has really nothing to do with seminaries. (Unintelligible) something about Russian seminary in here, but if we listen to Eddie Fox once more on the right petition, we will understand what this is all about.

(Applause)

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very much. While that's certainly helpful, we are asking that there be no applause. The chair's going to follow the path of the last statement and assume that the petition that needs to be perfected still is the one listed 916 on p. 2068. And we have had some conversation about that in terms of perfecting, and would really like to help us to move ahead on this in a way that's responsive. Recognize the person in the yellow—mike 5. We're on p. 2068, Petition 916. We have the main motion that we need to perfect so that we can move to the substitute.

*Funding Amendment Proposed
for European Theological Education*

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): I would offer an amendment to the main motion that we're trying to perfect. And that is to apportion \$2,000,000, deleting, therefore, the \$1,000,000 to be taken from the reserve to the General Board of Global Ministries. If I have a second, I'll speak to it.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Is there a second? You may.

MESSER: The intention of this motion, by those who are involved in the discussions last night, is that it was to parallel the action that this General Conference has already adopted and sent to GCFA. The parallel is that the first petition regards theological education. And that has been passed and sent on, which was \$4,000,000 of which \$2,000,000 was apportioned and the other \$2,000,000 came from the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. To make this parallel we should say \$2,000,000 apportioned and send it on to the General Board of Global Ministries. The reason I do not want it to be listed as reserves is that currently this work is being supported out of the income from those reserves and we shouldn't be taking it twice. So I'm sure that if we would change this to \$2,000,000 from apportionment, send it to GCFA, they are going to adjust it, probably dramatically—however they have to—to deal with the issue. But we will then have it in the same category. This latter petition deals only with church growth and congregational development, not with seminaries.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Understood. We're now on the amendment. Anyone like to speak for or against the amendment? Yes, mike 3. On the amendment.

*Motion to Refer Theological Education
to Unnamed Committee*

CREEDE HINSHAW (South Georgia): Bishop, I don't know if this in order, and I don't know how to do it. But I'd like to figure out some way that we could let some subcommittee of our conference deal with this for about a half an hour or an hour and straighten this out. We've heard a lot of excellent advice on this floor in the last hour, but we're nearing the end of two weeks. We've had a long and emotional day. We're all confused and I think if, perhaps, for instance, the subcommittee of the Higher Education and Ministry

Committee would get together with Don Messer and Eddie Fox and anyone else who wants to gather in some little room and straighten this out and bring us back something that we could listen to. Now I don't know if we can do that in a parliamentary way, but I would move that we refer this to the subcommittee of the Board of the Higher Education and Ministry Committee and let them try to work out a proposal that they can bring back to us.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. That's before you as a referral. Is there a second? Been properly moved and seconded to refer this to the subcommittee as noted. Point of order. Mike 1.

RUTH PALMER (Texas): Bishop, this petition did not come from the Board of Higher Education and Ministry. I'm just raising that point to see if that's where you want it referred or if you want it referred back to Finance and Administration where it came from.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. The chair is advised, but if the motion that is made is to be referred to wherever and the body may do with that as they chose. The motion is still before you to refer it to the subcommittee on Higher Education. You could offer another amendment if you like to redirect it somewhere else. But at this moment this is the business before us. Okay, all the way in the back, the last person on the right—yellow. We're on a motion to refer. Mike 5.

BOB PIERSON (Oklahoma): Just in terms of information, in trying to decide where this point of order, where the referral should go. Last night, in trying struggling with the whole issue we're dealing with, the very persons that were mentioned a moment ago got together and tried to form a motion that would bring it all together, and Eddie Fox made that substitute motion a moment ago. We did the work last night. A group of persons from Central Europe met with us trying to work out something that would make sense. The substitute motion is that attempt. If we could simply finish the perfection of the original motion, which I think we've done. If we note that the perfections that Don Messer just made in terms of, the motion he made was really a perfection of the substitute motion. We could finish with those two things. I believe that we've already done the referral and we could act on that and I would, and urge us to do it in that fashion.

*European Theological Education
Referral Defeated*

BISHOP JOHNSON: Chair will hear that as a speech against referral. Is there anyone who would like to speak for referral? Seeing none, the motion is for referral to the committee that was listed. If you would do so, would you vote when the light appears? [*Yes, 404; No, 451*] Thank you. We're now back to the main motion. We are again perfecting the main motion. Maybe you perfected it enough already. I'm hearing people say we perfected enough of the main motion. Then if that's the case, let's move to the substitute. That's the Eddie Fox substitute. That is now before us for perfection that we might begin to move in some direction or action. Chair recognizes, yes, in green. You may go to mike 2. We're on this, the perfecting of the substitute, the Eddie Fox substitute.

EMILY ANN ZIMMERMAN (Florida): Bishop, I just wanted to clarify that both of these petitions are about education. Although one says church growth, the way to get the church growth from this amendment, petition is through theological education. I want to clarify that if that's any help to the group.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Right down front and you may go to mike 4. Yes, or mike 2. We are perfecting the substitute.

Russian Church Growth

ELENA TISCHENKO (Russia): At this moment I have two problems. One, my English, but I'll try. And second problem, I will ask you about financial support, and I think you will try.

(*Laughter*)

I'd like to explain about our understanding. We would like to say here about church growth. I am one of oldest Russian Methodists. Because ten years ago in our country we have no Methodist church. But now we have 70, and I am from the biggest district in the whole world. My district start from the border between Europe and Asia to the Pacific Ocean. We have seven different times [sic. zones] in our region. And we have 12 United Methodist churches, and we have only one building. My church will construct our building three years ago—only one. And every day our church have to demonstrate what is Methodist church. We think not

only about situation inside; we think about the situation outside.

BISHOP JOHNSON: You're going to need to bring it—

TISCHENKO: Yes, very short. Sorry. And now in my country very difficult time. A lot of our factories closed. And we have very good members in our church as they would like to help for process church growth, but a lot of our members have no salary for six months. This is reason why we ask about this financial support, and I hope, no—I believe, no—I know, I know—

(*Laughter*)

in our country will be very good future because I love my country and I know when our future real good, we will help everybody who will need us. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you very, very much. And again while they are wonderful speeches we are asking you not to applaud. We are on perfecting the substitute. That means you may amend the substitute; you may change it so that we may begin to move to vote. After we have perfected the substitute we will vote on the substitute to see if you want to make that the main motion. But we are not at that point yet. We are still perfecting, merely perfecting the substitute. I hear points of order. Go to the man on mike 5. Yes.

MESSER: Bishop, we are confused. Did we vote on the motion I made, or did we not? And if we did what did we do with it.

BISHOP JOHNSON: It was voted and it did not prevail. No?

MESSER: We think we voted on setting up that committee.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. Let me check again. Thank you. We have not voted on the Messer motion. It was an amendment. So, thank you, body, for bringing us back to that. We are going to hear the amendment again. The amendment is to the main motion. Is that correct Don?

MESSER: It is an amendment to the one that Eddie Fox presented tonight. I am not a skilled parliamentarian so I don't know which is the main and which is the substitute. But the one that he presented tonight, in which he suggested that \$1 million come from apportionments and \$1 million come from the reserves of the General Board of

Global Ministries. That's what the amendment is directed toward.

BISHOP JOHNSON: That is in order now, we are perfecting the substitutes now. Okay let's, Dr. Messer before you leave, let's just hear it again so the body knows what it is we are voting on. We are perfecting the substitute so we move towards voting on this matter. Yes.

MESSER: The motion I made was to apportion these funds for church growth and congregation development for Eastern Europe in the amount of \$2 million, there by deleting the \$1 million reference in Fox's motion that was to come from the reserves of the General Board of Global Ministries.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. We are in perfecting the substitute and we will try to do the best that we can so that you can vote properly. All the way to the back. Only on the amendment. Mike 7. We are on the amendment.

JAMES KING (Tennessee): I move that we vote on all that is before us.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I am afraid that is out of order at this moment. We haven't actually had speeches for or against, but the chair thanks you for trying to move us in a direction. OK, we are—point of order, yes. We are at this point, as the chair understands it, we are perfecting the substitute. Yes, mike 8.

TYSON FERGUSON (Detroit): My point of order is simply that we are using the points of order and question and information as debate. A question when it comes to the floor should be stated as a question and that is it. A point of information is asking for information, period. A point of order is when there is something going wrong on the floor. I would ask that the chair maybe some smart people that could help make sure that we can limit that or make a decision on if the question turns into a debate or not. That may speed things up.

BISHOP JOHNSON: And your point of order is, sir?

FERGUSON: My point of order is that when the debate comes to the floor it needs to be— if a question comes to the floor—it has to be stated as a question. And so far the chair has not made, when a question goes beyond a question .

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you.

FERGUSON: The chair needs to make a decision where that goes.

BISHOP JOHNSON: And the chair will. Thank you very much. All the way in the back waving to the left. We are perfecting the amendment to the substitute, The person who is moving now to mike 8 is the person who has been recognized.

ROGER ELLIOT: (North Carolina) I move that we suspend the rules so that we can move the question on all that is before us.

*Substitute Motion
for European Theological Education Passed*

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Just a second. Properly moved and seconded to suspend the rules. Requires 2/3 vote. If you do so you may vote when the light appears. [Yes, 799; No, 53] Thank you, what is before us we move directly to voting unless there is some point of order for sure, but let's try to move this. We are moving on the Messer amendment. If you would support the Messer amendment would you vote when the light appears? [Yes, 487; No, 365] Thank you, you have supported the Messer amendment. The next thing we do now, then, is to vote on the substitute that the Messer amendment amended. If you would support the substitute that was given by Eddie Fox and amended then by Don Messer would you vote when the light appears? [Yes, 731; No, 130] Thank you. You have now made this the main motion. If you would then make this the main motion and affirm its' action would you again vote when the light appears. [Yes, 472; No, 45] Okay, looks like we have got to do it again. All right, all that is before us now is the substitute. We have already amended the substitute. We have made it the main motion. We must vote simply to affirm the main motion as an act of the General Conference. If you would then again make now the substitute the main motion, will you vote when the light appears.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. I cannot tell you how much the chair appreciates so much wonderful, gracious support.

(Laughter)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Point of order.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes?

Original Motion on European Theological Education Was for Nonconcurrance

SAGER: This all started out with a motion for nonconcurrance on the particular petition. I'm not sure where the chair is going, but I haven't had an opportunity to lay that out. And I would assume that because this is substituted, then the issue would be whether there is to be concurrance or nonconcurrance.

BISHOP JOHNSON: We might get there.

(Laughter)

OK. We will then hear—and that is correct—under the rules, of course, the committee has an opportunity to speak, and I've not given the committee a chance to speak. So if you would indulge at least the committee to speak on their position, which was nonconcurrance, and we will allow that to happen at this time.

SAGER: I have a question first, if that's in order?

BISHOP JOHNSON: I don't think so. I think a call for the previous . . .

SAGER: OK. The committee voted nonconcurrance on this petition, as you know. And it's a considerably different petition. But frankly, I don't know what it is. And the reason I don't know what it is because there are two requests in the original petition for \$10,500,000. There was an amendment to substitute for \$4,000,000 for Congregational Growth and Development. And it looks to me like there's \$10,500,000 left in there for seminaries. Now, maybe I'm wrong, but I would challenge any of you to stand up with authority and say what you understand it is. And that is an illustration, I think, of the problem—one of the problems—that was confronted in the Financial Services Committee. And that is: Proposals that don't go through the regular course of work through the agencies that we have set up to address these kinds of issues, sometimes have some problems associated with them.

And we agree with the excellent ministry that is involved. And we understand that pleas for fiscal restraint are regularly unpopular, especially in the face of impassioned pleas for ministry. But we would call for some fiscal constraint. And it seems to me like we have before us something which was really cobbled together by a very large group, and it reflects that kind of difficulty. So I would urge that the action of the com-

mittee be upheld and that there be nonconcurrance in the name of reporting responsibly to the people that you are responsible to, who sent you here, who too often go-come-out and talk to you delegates and find that you have spent a lot of money. And yet you do not have the fire and enthusiasm for encouraging them to give to support those wonderful causes that are exhibited here on the floor. It just doesn't work that way, folks.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. Thank you. We are under the movement of a previous question, and so there are no other discussions at this point unless there indeed is a point of order. We move towards voting. You have heard the substitute, which is in opposition to the committee's motion. And you have heard the committee chair now explain why the committee voted the way they did and how they choose to proceed. If you will once more again vote—yes, all the way in the back, to, to the left. If you would move to—I recognize the person with the orange card in the back. I think that's Mr. Fox. Mike 8.

FOX: Thank you, Bishop. I simply ask if it would be possible for the secretary to read the substitute motion that was passed, as amended. It is handed up there—

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes.

FOX: —and the people can hear exactly what was passed.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. We can do that. We want the amended version of the substitute that has, that has now been passed by the body. Can we have the mike for the secretary, please?

MARSHALL: Got it. "Let the General Conference establish an advance special goal of \$10,000,000 for the quadrennium for church/congregational development for the following countries in Europe: Bulgaria, Croatia, C.I.S.—including Russia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Slovakia, Yugoslavia and Austria. That this fund be allocated by the bishops of the areas of Northern Europe, Russia, Central and Southern Europe, in cooperation with the national church leaders. The advance special to be promoted by the General Board of Global Ministries and \$2,000,000 be apportioned for church development for the quadrennium for the same countries, to be allocated in the same manner. And that the \$1,000,000 not be

requested from the General Board of Global Ministries.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Now, let me try to spell out what we're voting on. The committee is bringing to us a motion for nonconcurrency. If you vote yes, if you vote 1, you will be voting with the committee, as I best understand it, to nonconcur. If you vote 2, which is no, you will be voting in opposition to what the committee is recommending. Therefore, the substitute then will be the action of the body. Are you clear about that? If you vote yes, you vote with the committee which is nonconcurrency. If you vote no which is no. 2, you vote with the substitute, which then becomes the action of the body. Yes? Here, and go to mike 5 if you will, Jamie.

JAMIE E. JENKINS (North Georgia): Bishop, my understanding is, and what I'm trying to get clear in my mind, and I think some others may have the same question. We understand, I understand that the Fox motion, as amended, was a substitute for the main motion. Is that correct?

BISHOP JOHNSON: That is correct.

JENKINS: Then when we approved that substitute, did not that substitute then become the main motion?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes.

JENKINS: And if that substitute is the main motion, it seems that the committee had voted nonconcurrency on another petition which we have now set aside, and have a completely different matter in front of us that the committee has not concurred with nor nonconcurred with. Is that correct? So it seems to me, that the Fox amendment, substitute, as amended, is the main motion, with no recommendation from the committee because it has not even been to the committee. So all we have to vote on is the Fox substitute, which we have already adopted. Is that not correct?

BISHOP JOHNSON: The chair will proceed in that direction. So then, the substitute, if you voted already as the main motion in this situation, if you vote yes—I am reversing—if you vote yes, then you will adopt the substitute as the main motion, in lieu of the committee's recommendation.

SAGER: Point of order. Point of order.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes.

SAGER: Forgive me for raising one more, Bishop.

BISHOP JOHNSON: That is perfectly OK.

SAGER: But it seemed to me that when Mr. Fox got on his feet, the first thing he did was to move to reopen what had been considered last night. He did not throw something new in front of the body, and therefore I believe that it is appropriate to consider this as an amendment of the petition which was voted nonconcurrency. Just an idea. I believe it is valid, however.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. The chair's going to rule in the way we are proceeding at this moment and that is: If you vote yes at this point, you'll be voting the main motion as the substitute. If you will vote when the light appears. If you vote 1, which is yes, you will vote for the substitute, which will take the place of the committee's recommendation. [Yes, 616; No, 203]. Were you confused in your voting?

DELEGATES: Yes.

European Theological Education Passed

BISHOP JOHNSON: All right, we'll do it again. If you vote 1, you will then vote for the substitute, and that will be our final action. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 661; No, 232] Thank you. It is passed and the substitute is the motion and the action that we will take. Thank you very much. Mr. Batiste, do you have other items before us?

HAROLD E. BATISTE JR. (Southwest Texas): Yes, Bishop Johnson. We have one additional item. And Gil Hanke, lay delegate of the Texas Conference and a member of the leadership team, will present it.

*Expanded Commission on UM Men
Referred to GCOM*

GILBERT C. HANKE (Texas): Last night we failed to refer one of the items that we passed to GCFA and so I would like to move to reconsider for the purpose of referral to GCFA on the-the p. no. is 2094, the Calendar Item is 1206, the Petition 30286, the *Advance DCA* p. is 1096. This is a petition that would increase the commission membership for the General Commission on United Methodist Men. That part of the, that increase is included in the budget. But, in our Legislative Committee we added two additional members to represent other regions of the Central Conferences and that one portion which comes to approximately \$64,000 is not included in our budget and therefore,

we would ask that it be referred to GCFA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you, I believe you're voting first for reconsideration. Is that correct? Any questions about this motion? We want to reconsider it to then follow that with a motion for referral. If you would allow this committee to reconsider this action, would you vote when the light appears. Vote yes, 1 for yes, and 2 for no. [Yes, 727; No, 140] Thank you it has passed and you have voted for it to be reconsidered. We'll now hear a motion for referral in that order.

HANKE: We move that we refer this to GCFA for their action.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you it is now before you. Any questions? If you would support this action, would you vote when the light appears. Vote 1 for yes, 2 for no. Thank you, you have referred this matter, it has passed. [Yes, 808; No, 58]

We have an election result. I'll ask the secretary if she would bring to us that report as it comes before us. Election regarding Judicial Council. Thank you. We have, as you read this, you have 5 elections. I'll ask the secretary if she would read those who have been elected and then we will vote once for the remaining person that needs to be listed.

*Crowe, Walter, Thomas, Joiner, and
Davies Elected Judicial Council
Clergy Alternates*

MARSHALL: Those elected are Susan Henry-Crowe, Theodore "Ted" Walter, Linda Thomas, Belton F. Joyner, Jr. Frank B. Davies.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you, you have to vote for one person. Chair recognizes person here, mike 4 Dr. Kimbrough.

WALTER L. KIMBROUGH (North Georgia): Bishop, I rise as a point of order. I'm concerned about the number of ballots needed to be elected. Ballots 846, my calculation shows then 424 are needed for election, a simple majority. Based upon the returns there are two elections.

BISHOP JOHNSON: We are researching. We have information to this effect. Would you mike for the secretary please.

*Secretary Explains System for Electing
Judicial Council*

MARSHALL: This is the statement which was shared with this body yesterday. Realizing that the time difference will make a difference as far as the wording to make it current. "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 2 general conferences. This system is used by the Evangelical Lutheran Church and many corporations. This 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. This 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 by J. Voorhees, General Conference producer."

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. This was read before and we do recognize there is some disagreement with that, but I think we've moved beyond that as such. We have one person to still elect in this regard and we would certainly like to move in that direction and we will do that almost immediately. Yes mike 4 and we are moving towards a possible break, as we move towards an adjournment at 10:30.

*Motion to Make Judicial Council
Clergy Alternate Election Null and Void*

MAC BRANTLEY (North Georgia): Bishop, I would like to make a motion that we declare the last election null and void and that we begin to vote again and instead of using the system

which does not appear to be a correct that we vote by delegation.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I think the body answered. Is it seconded. Has it been seconded. I don't hear a second, so we will proceed. Okay, we will now vote for one one person. Vote when the light appears.

Thank you, we will get a result. We have no election at this time. We will work towards this in the future. You can vote again. You may vote again indeed. Vote when the light appears. You can keep going. Vote when the light appears. And again, vote when the light appears.

(Applause)

Thank you, you have completed this process, and we are more than thankful for your graciousness and your ability to jointly bring about decisions we need. You have a twelve-minute break. Please come back at about 10 past 10. Yes.

(Music)

(Recess)

(Song)

BISHOP JOHNSON: We're going to ask the body to reconvene as we are led to be spiritually centered in music. Please come that we might move our agenda. Delegates, please take their seats. We're calling the delegates back to order. It's OK to sing, but we'd like you to sing in your seats. Would you please come back to order?

(Music)

Now if the conference would begin to come to order. You may take your seats that we might begin to see if the Lord will order our steps throughout the rest of this evening. Would you please take your, take your seats at this time?

(Applause)

Thank you so much. Let us adhere to the prayer that has called us back to order that we might order our steps for these moments we have left for business. The chair will call upon Terri Rae Chattin. If she would then bring to us calendar items regarding Church and Society. And again, we're moving towards a 10:30 adjournment time, and as we move close to that, the chair will inform you of that as we move towards closure.

TERRI RAY CHATTIN: Thank you, Bishop. Church and Society has only one petition that they need to bring for-

ward that has financial implications. It comes from our world community subcommittee and the chairperson of that is Mousa Dassama, and he'll be presenting that petition for us.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you.

MOUSA A. DASSAMA, Sr. (Liberia): Bishop and members of the conference, our lone petition for tonight from Church and Society is found on p. 462 of the ADCA, it's Petition 31302, and found on p. 2090 of the DCA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Please give us the calendar number again.

DASSAMA: The Calendar Item is 1160.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Page 2090. It is now on the screen. Yes?

*Motion for Native American Center to
Develop Alternative to Gambling*

DASSAMA: This petition states financial support to complete a task undertaken by the National United Methodist Native American Center, which is in a developing and innovative and economically strategic report for a God-centered alternative to gambling centered economic development on the Native American reservation. The committee's action, we voted with concurrence and wish to refer the petition to GCFA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It is before you. Yes? Mike 2.

DAVID M. WILSON (Oklahoma Indian Missionary): Bishop, perhaps a question for the chair. The Committee of Global Ministries also looked at this petition, which is 31291, and had recommended concurrence with no funding because the Native American Comprehensive Plan already has this part of their initiative in the, in their plan, plan that we passed a couple of days ago.

BISHOP JOHNSON: So your question, sir—

WILSON: Well, the question is—

BISHOP JOHNSON: —to the chair?

WILSON: Perhaps the question, if we look at the amended part—31291—that originally, there was no financial allocation to that if the Native American Comprehensive Plan has already taken care of that in, as part of their initiative.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Would you speak to it please?

DAMASSA: The financial publication that we have is according to the re-

port is the petition is \$10,000 that is prorated over the quadrennial period, and that's why we are referring this matter to the GCFA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Okay, in the middle. If you would go to mike 7. Name and conference please.

CHRISTINE Dean KEELS (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, I chair the Committee on Global Ministries. I'd like to turn to my secretary, Jerry Russell, who's in the back, also carrying an orange card, and mike no. 8. And he's prepared to submit a friendly amendment.

BISHOP JOHNSON: You may. Mike 8, name and conference please.

JERRY W. RUSSELL (Holston): Bishop, I'd like to ask permission for a substitute amendment, if I might, please. And then I'll offer it, and then if I have a second, I'll speak to it. The petition that was presented to us—Petition 31302, Calendar Item 1160—that is asking for funding, we had an opportunity to look at that in our committee. And if the General Conference would take a moment and turn to p. 2241, Item 1557, you'll find that the petitions are totally identical, and I would like to offer the substitute amendment for some deletion of a couple of paragraphs out of these petitions. To proceed: Looking at the petitions, I'd like to offer as the substitute the deletion of the second paragraph of the second "whereas," deleting that whole paragraph. And as the General Conference can see: No. 2, in the column towards the right-hand edge of the page, the first two lines are deleted, or struck, there with the addition "that the Native American Comprehensive Plan", which is in bold, be substituted. Then I would amend that No. 3 be totally dropped, and then the financial implications of No. 4; and then the substitution or renumbering by entering a new paragraph numbered 3." That the Native American Comprehensive Plan and the Native American Economic Development and Empowerment Task Force under the leadership of the Board of Church and Society develop an innovative and economically strategic report for a God-centered alternative to gambling-centered economic development for the Native American communities with a recommendation that this be brought back to the 2004 General Conference."

BISHOP JOHNSON: Okay. I've heard a second. We move to perfect the main motion. Are there amendments or

perfections that anyone wants to make on the motion that the committee is bringing first?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Seeing none, we move to perfect the substitute that you have just recently heard. Is there anyone who would like to amend or perfect the substitute motion? Seeing none, then I would assume that you are prepared to then vote on the substitute as the main motion. We'll ask the committee if they would like to speak to the matter.

*Development of Gambling
Economic Alternative Approved*

DASSAMA: Bishop, and members of the conference, the committee is in agreement with the substitute motion and so we are in agreement.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. That is the speech. We are now on the substitute motion, which will become the main motion if you should decide to vote it in. If you will vote, vote when the light appears. We are on the substitute. Vote 1 for yes, 2 for no. [*Yes, 813; No, 56*]. You have made then the substitute the main motion in lieu of the committee report. If you would then vote to motion this as the main motion of action again, would you vote when the light appears, 1 for yes, 2 for no. [*Yes, 855; No, 28*]. You have made this the motion for this particular calendar item. Thank you. Are there others? Second? Thank you. The secretary would like to share some information with us.

MARSHALL: It is very important that the leadership of the executive committee, the chair, vice-chair, and secretary of these three legislative committees meet by the exit sign at mike 1 immediately. We need to sign off on a few things in order to make a 10:30 deadline to have the DCA on our desk in the morning. Local Church, Independent Commissions, and Global Ministries. Will those nine persons please come over here to the exit sign by mike 1 immediately. Thank you so much.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Now, we are at the 10:30 adjournment time. There are at least two items for Financial Administration. I have no idea how much time they will take. Stan, do want to give us any hint on this? We do have at least two matters that need some information for you as such. I know it's been a long, draining day but it is entirely up to you how we will proceed this evening. Can you hear him? OK. Mike up front, please.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): I don't think they will take very long, Bishop. One of them is 916 and that may have gone away with the Eddie Fox proposal which was adopted. And I think, ruled it to be separate but perhaps that should be disposed of.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. What is the will of the body? We either will move toward adjournment at this time or we will entertain a motion for extension. Mike 4.

*Motion to Change Consent Calendar
to Twenty Names*

ROBERT CASEY (Virginia): Bishop, I'd like to move that we suspend the rules for the purpose of placing all the remaining calendar items of less than twenty opposing votes on the consent calendar—both those that are current and those who will be published tomorrow. I would like to do that and I would also like to extend the time for this particular motion. I don't plan to do both of those at the same time.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I don't either.

CASEY: I'd like to suspend the rules first.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Certainly. Is there a second? Properly move in second to resuspend the rules. If you would, vote when the light appears and for this one, for the purposes of, what was your first item? Mike 4.

CASEY: The purposes of placing all the remaining calendar items with less than twenty opposing votes on the consent calendar, both those that we have remaining in our DCAs and those that would appear in tomorrow's DCA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Are you clear on what you're voting on? OK. If you would do so, would you vote when the light appears to suspend the rules first. [*Yes, 766; No, 122*]. It does prevail. You may now, if you like, make a motion towards direction you would like to move. We just suspended the rules but you may make a motion to...

CASEY: Oh, oh, here we go.

BISHOP JOHNSON: I'm sorry, mike 4.

CASEY: Thank you. Bishop, I move that we suspend the rules for the purpose of placing all the remaining calendar items with less than twenty opposing votes.

BISHOP JOHNSON: We've suspended the rules, so...

ROBERT CASEY: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm moving "to replace all the remaining

calendar items with less than twenty opposing votes on the consent calendar—both those that are current and those that we will publish in the *DCA* tomorrow.”

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. Thank you. This is now before you. I see cards in the back. I see a pink card in the middle. You may go to mike 8. It is before you.

DAVID SEVERE (Oklahoma): Bishop, do I understand there will be no opportunity to sign off to pull anything then off of the calendar that comes under this category. Is that correct?

BISHOP JOHNSON: I believe that's the intent of the motion. But why don't we ask him to speak to that. Is that your intent, sir?

CASEY: Yes.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK.

SEVERE: And I would oppose it.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. The chair wants to try something because we're in a bit of a dilemma of sorts. We are already at the order which calls us to adjourn. Are you willing to extend the time for fifteen minutes? Thank you, then we'll proceed in that way. Mike 8. The yellow card that was flashing. Mike 8. It's right down here. Yes.

BETH CAPEN: Bishop, I'd like to offer an amendment that if there is something that is on a calendar item that was published today or prior to today that had between ten and twenty votes, if there's a person who desires to lift it, then they go through the procedure of being able to lift it by 11:00 tomorrow. And the reason why I would offer that amendment is because there are some people who have relied upon the former rule and didn't lift particular calendar items.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Is there a second? It's been properly moved and seconded. Do you want to speak further on the matter? I think it was self-explanatory. Anyone wishing to speak pro or con. I see a card all the way in the back. Are you speaking to the amendment? Going to mike 8.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Just want to clarify the items that were previously pulled from the calendar do not fall under this amendment and still will be discussed tomorrow.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Is that the intent of the motion maker and the person making amendments?

CASEY: Yes.

BISHOP JOHNSON. OK. Some information that you should be aware of whether we move on this or not, is that the consent calendar for tomorrow has already gone to press and so it cannot be printed. We can certainly bring the information but it will not be printed in the *DCA*. That's just information for you. OK. The amendment is before you. Do you need to hear the amendment again? You know where you are? Yes, mike 4. We're on the amendment.

WILLIAM J. RISH (Alabama-West Florida): I think I have a question as much as that. Some of these that did not receive that amount of votes, I believe, have been filed as minority reports. Now, I've been told that making church laws is kind of like making sausage: that they taste better if you don't see 'em being made. And if you aren't careful you're fixing to make a bunch of sausage unless some of those things can be preserved. So my question is, would this motion also apply to those that might have minority reports already been filed.

BISHOP JOHNSON: The intent of the motion maker, is that your intent? What kind of sausage are you making?

CASEY: Bishop, I think it's only fair for those that have been pulled off to not be considered in this motion. I'd like for that to be accepted.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK. Now hear the intent of the motion. The amendment is now before you. Does anyone else care to speak? If you would support the amendment, would you vote when the light appears. [Yes, 695; No, 183]. It does prevail and is now a part of the main motion. Anyone else wishing to speak? If not, let us assume it is perfected. If you would then approve this motion, would you vote when the light appears.

Thank you. [Yes, 801; No, 82]. You have supported this particular motion. We have a few more minutes left. I'll ask Stan if he would come forth and bring items regarding financial administration. Mike in the front, please.

*Native American Center Legislation
Referred to GCFA*

SAGER (New Mexico): For clarification, Bishop Johnson, I would assume that Calendar Item 916 is not necessary to bring before the body in view of the fact of Mr. Boxer's action. So I nevertheless have two and one of them is p. 2068 of the *DCA*. I'm sorry, 2156 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1363. In the *ADCA* it is p.

461, Petition 30301. This is the Native American Center. The funding for that is shown on p. 2159 of the *DCA*, and you should perhaps take a look at the financial implications there. The committee voted concurrence and referral to GCFA.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It is before you. I see no cards. I assume then that you're ready to vote. If you would support the committee, would you vote when the light appears. [Yes, 807; No, 72]. Calendar Item 1363 is supported. Proceed.

SAGER: There is one other matter that we've identified with financial implications. That will be presented by committee secretary, Phyllis Rodriguez from the Wisconsin conference.

*Motion to Change Starting Date
of New Bishops*

PHYLLIS R. RODRIGUEZ (Wisconsin): Thank you. The next item is found on *DCA* p. 2156, Calendar Item 1365. You can find that on p. 446 of the *Advance* edition. This is Petition 30958. This petition deals with a change in the effective date of dispensing funds from the Episcopal Fund from the date of assignment, of September 1, to the date of consecration at the Jurisdictional Conference. The legislative committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. It is before you. I see a card here to the left, my left. Go to mike 8. Name and conference please.

EUGENE W. MATTHEWS (Baltimore-Washington): I'm speaking against this petition as a member of GCFA and also Chair of the Episcopal Service Committee. There are three key points I would like to raise that support the current starting date of the newly elected bishops.

Number one, if GCFA were to administer the Episcopal Fund by beginning to pay salary and expenses for newly elected bishops after election and consecration, which incidentally can take place either at the session or later time designated, that's according to paragraph 406, then we would be recognizing more bishops during the six-week period of election prior to the authorization of starting time. An example of this would be the North Central Jurisdiction that has ten bishops and during that period of time would have 13. This means that the Episcopal Fund would be providing salary and expenses for more bishops than allowed in para. 405.

Second is a constitutional issue of para. 47, Article 5, which provides that bishops shall have residential and presidential supervision in the jurisdiction of all central conferences in which they are elected or to which they are transferred. Again, newly elected bishops do not have residential or presidential supervision until September 1 of the assigned date.

And the third and last reason is that it is fairly common, although not uniform, for the local congregations or other appointed position to which an elder is appointed to continue to provide salary even after election and consecration of a bishop.

There is strong sentiment in the church that a newly elected bishop should not be placed in a position where she or he is, to use a colloquial term, is perceived as double-dipping. Therefore, in order to maintain the understanding and the continuity of a process that has begun in 1988 until the present, I trust that the body will vote nonconcurrence on this petition.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. That's a speech against. Is there one who would like to speak for. Yes, right in the middle. Mike 6.

PATRICIA E. FARRIS (California-Pacific): I'm speaking for the Western Jurisdiction Episcopacy Committee. We lifted this after we began to recognize the inequities that exist across the connection on this matter. As the previous speaker stated, some bishops are compensated after their election and before their assignment. Some are not, if they are elected out of positions such that their pay stops on the date of election. We feel that this is an injustice and a sign of disrespect to our new bishops. This also gets to our theology and our understanding of the Episcopacy. Bishops are bishops of the church from the moment of consecration on. We should recognize them as such and we should make provision to compensate them. I urge support of the committee's action for concurrence.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Is there someone who'd like to speak against this motion. Speaking against, mike 2.

FRANK H. FURMAN, Jr. (Florida): This concern has been before GCFA and before this General Conference in years past. The concern is, what is it we're trying to do? A bishop is elected, let's say July 15, is a bishop from that day but does not assume any authority

as a bishop until they're assigned to their area, which is about six weeks later. Therefore, if we follow this petition, we are putting up a figure somewhere between \$120,000 to \$150,000 to provide a salary when the person so elected is not fulfilling the duties of that office. This has come before us to consider this fully, because that person elected has a responsibility of going back to where they came from and to make a proper and effective transfer of responsibilities from the local church or the agency from which they come. So, I have found this to be the case. I've served on the Southeastern Jurisdictional Episcopacy Committee for 12 years, the chairman in the last year. I've served on the Episcopal Services Committee for four years and the secretary during those four years, and I am not aware of anytime that a bishop-elect or bishop in this particular time was not properly taken care of by the Episcopal Fund already in place. The Episcopal Services which looks after a bishop from the standpoint of salary, from benefits, housing, all of the various concerns that a bishop will have, those are already provided and we do not need to vote another \$150,000 for a short-term situation. It's not necessary and I request that you vote this down.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. There are two speeches against. The Chair would be willing to listen to a speech for before we move to voting. Yes. Then move to mike 7.

TWILA M. GLENN (Iowa): We'll be getting a new bishop this year and that person will be joining us officially on September 1. But I can assure you we have many plans for that person between July 15 and September 1. We hope that they will be acting like a bishop when they come to visit us. And we expect to treat them like a bishop when they do. I would ask this body to pay them like a bishop during that time.

BISHOP ALFRED JOHNSON: Thank you. We will ask the committee chair to make the final statement before we vote.

RODRIGUEZ: At the time of election and consecration of our bishops, their membership shifts from the annual conference to the Council of Bishops. They are no longer under appointment to the place from which they are elected. The legislative committee recommends concurrence with reference to GCFA to establish fairness and eq-

uity throughout the connection for our bishops.

*New Bishops to Be Paid
Starting With Date of Consecration*

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you, it is now before you to vote. Vote when the light appears. Calendar 1365 has been supported with a vote of [Yes, 448; No, 428]. We are at the point of adjournment. There is one pastoral item that needs to come before us. I will recognize one more card and then we will move toward adjournment because we are at that time. Yes.

K. EDWARD TOMLINSON (North Georgia): Bishop I move that we refer this to the Judicial Council for a decision on its constitutionality.

BISHOP JOHNSON: OK, it is before you. Is there a second? Thank you. Would you like to speak anymore to it or move right to voting?

TOMLINSON: I think it speaks for itself.

*Decision on New Bishops' Starting Date
Referred to Judicial Council*

BISHOP JOHNSON: If you would do this would you vote when the light appears. Thank you, you have referred it as such with a vote of [Yes, 488; No, 368]. I will call upon, I don't know if we have other items from the calendar committee. I see no. From Carolyn Marshall?

CAROLYN MARSHALL: Do we need a Presiding Officers. (Report)

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes, we need to hear from Presiding Officers. Following this I'll ask the secretary of the Council of Bishops to bring us a report and a pastoral concern.

*Bishops Hearn, Fannin, and Talbert to
Preside on Friday*

PAUL EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ: Thank you Bishop, tomorrow, this is our last report so, tomorrow morning we have presiding Bishop Robert Fannin from the Birmingham Area. Tomorrow afternoon Bishop Woodrow Hearn from the Houston Area. And then at our final session tomorrow evening we'll have Bishop Melvin Talbert from the San Francisco Area. Thank you.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. I'll ask the secretary of the Council of Bishops, Bishop Sharon Rader if she would come to bring a pastoral concern before us, and a reporting.

MARSHALL: Bishop Johnson.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Yes. I'm sorry our secretary will bring that report to us in the person of Carolyn Marshall.

MARSHALL: Prior to doing that, since it would be an appropriate way in which to close, may I make a couple of other announcements that need to be made?

BISHOP JOHNSON: Please do.

MARSHALL: One is a note from the coordinator of the calendar, Fitzgerald Reist. Based upon tonight's plenary decision regarding tomorrows consent calendar, calendar files are currently being reconstructed. There is a 50% chance that the updated calendar will be printed. The DCA is holding the press.

And then another one for our information you probably would want to know before tomorrow: the lost and found at the information desk has two boxes full of belongings from somebody here. Umbrellas, sunglasses, DCA's, and so forth could probably be replaced. However, when you get ready to go home you may want the car keys that are there. *(Laughter)*

Now, let's put a postscript on some of the calendar items and legislative committee business that we talked about. And that is a bit of information which was just brought to us, to the secretary here, that there were instances in which less than 20 people were in attendance when a vote was taken in a legislative committee.

*Twenty-nine Gay/Lesbian Witnesses
Arrested*

Now, for our closing item. Earlier today 29 of our sisters and brothers were arrested. As of 10:00 tonight all have posted bond and are released on bail. Arraignment will be Saturday at 9:00 A.M. And then another piece of information to share with you. If anyone is interested in contributing to the bail fund for those arrested, you are invited to go to the AMAR Resource Center at the Sheraton tonight or tomorrow.

BISHOP JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you before calling Bishop Hassinger to close us out in a word of prayer, I want to express my sincere appreciation to your cooperation and the many of you who helped me so much. We were indeed a team and I always look forward to vote the surprises of the Spirit and especially the direction of the Spirit as it moves through God's people. It has been a joy to be with you this

evening and I know it's been a long, hard and tiresome day. But I'm also assured that some souls have been saved by our actions, some spreading of scriptural holiness has happened. And we will indeed inform the continent by the things we have done, one way or another.

And I thank God for the grace and opportunity to share with you in such a team work responsibility. I want to thank the two persons who have been advising me, again, Bishop Thomas and Bishop Grove, who have been indeed close, loving, and compassionate counselors through this time and event. At this time I'd like to invite Bishop Hassinger to come and close us out in prayer. *(Applause)*

BISHOP SUSAN W. HASSINGER:

(Prayer)

Friday Morning, May 12

(Bishop Robert E. Fannin, presiding)

*(Korean Community Choir
United Methodist Church of New Jersey
singing in Korean and English)*

BISHOP ROBERT E. FANNIN (Birmingham): Good morning. I call upon Bishop Galvan, president-elect of the Council of Bishops for a special concern and prayer.

BISHOP ELIAS G. GALVAN (Seattle): Mr. President and friends, we have received word that yesterday, our sister Lucia Fernandes, mother of our colleague Bishop Moises Fernandes, (Eastern Angola Area) died. Will you please join me in a moment of prayer?

(Prayer)

BISHOP FANNIN: Amen. Thank you, Bishop Galvan. We keep growing in numbers. The Northeast Philippine delegation has just arrived, and we welcome them to General Conference 2000.

(Applause)

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you, Bishop Swenson, for that wonderful message and for the choir for the dynamic fallthrough music to a life in Jesus Christ. This is a wonderful day, the day the Lord has made and we're excited about it, and we're alive, and ready to move forward in building the Kingdom of God in this place. I've already sent my quarterly income tax re-

turn in to Cleveland and to Ohio, so we're all in order. I call Mary Alice Massey to bring us our calendar and agenda report.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Good morning, Bishop Fannin and delegates. There's a smile on my face, you probably know why. The agenda for today is found on the daily DCA, on the inside page, 2276. The agenda is as printed with these exceptions: At 11:50 today or thereabouts, we will honor our retiring bishops. In the afternoon session where we have report of the GCFA, we must take up three calendar items that have financial implications before that report comes to the floor. We cannot take them up this morning because of the time frame in which they were presented. Other than that, I move that the agenda be approved as announced.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, it is properly before us. Any questions? If you will then, if you approve press one when the light appears, or two if you do not approve. *[Yes, 782; No, 9]* The agenda is approved.

FITZGERALD REIST: Good morning. Please turn in your *Daily Christian Advocate* for Thursday, May 11, 2000, volume 4, number 9, to page 2222. I've been asked to repeat the numbers because apparently I'm moving too quickly, so that's page 2222. On page 2222, Special Consent Calendar A91 begins with Calendar Item 1152.

*Consent Calendars A91, B91, and C91
Approved*

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar A91.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, this is before us. If you would approve, press 1, if not press 2 when the light appears. *[Yes, 798; No, 11].*

REIST: On page 2222, the same page, Special Consent Calendar B91. B91 consists of Calendar Item 1201.

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

BISHOP FANNIN: Consent calendar B91 is before us, any questions? All right, if you would approve, press 1, disapprove 2 as the light appears. You have approved by a count of *[Yes, 783; No, 28].*

REIST: On the same page 2222, Special Consent Calendar C91 begins with Calendar Item 597.

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

BISHOP FANNIN: C91 is before us. Any questions? If you would approve, press 1, disapprove press 2, when the light appears. You have approved [*Yes, 814; No, 19*].

*Consent Calendars A06, B06, C06
Approved*

REIST: On page 2223, the very next page, consent calendar A06, begins with Calendar Item 1391. On page 2224, page 2224, Calendar Item 1394, that's 1394, has been removed at the request of delegates. On page 2225, page 2225, Calendar Item 1397, 1397, has been removed at the request of delegates. On page 2226, page 2226, Calendar Item 1407, that's 1407 has been removed at the request of delegates.

MASSEY: I move the approval of consent calendar A06, with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, A06 is before us, as the changes were noted. If you would approve, press 1, if not 2 when the light appears. You have approved with a vote [*Yes, 841; No, 17*].

REIST: P. 2227, Consent Calendar B06, B06 begins with Calendar Item 1419.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar B06.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, any questions? This is before us. If you would approve, press 1, if not 2, when the light appears. You have supported it with a vote of [*Yes, 846; No, 14*].

REIST: On p. 2231, that's p. 2231, Consent Calendar C06 begins with Calendar Item 1443. That's 1443.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar C06.

BISHOP FANNIN: This is before us. Any questions? If you would approve, press 1; if you would not approve, press 2, when the light appears. You have supported this by a vote of [*Yes, 848; No, 22*].

REIST: I have two corrections to report to you on the consent calendars printed in this mornings DCA, so that you are aware of them and do not need to go to the effort of trying to remove them from the calendar. Special Consent Calendar A93 begins in today's DCA on p. 2310. The item to be removed from that calendar is on p. 2311. P. 2311. Calendar Item 1180 was placed on the calendar in error. That's Calendar Item 1180 was placed on the calendar in error. On the very next p. 2312, Special Consent Calendar C93, C93 Calendar

Item 1550, 1550 was placed on the consent calendar in error. That concludes my report, thank you.

*Agenda Committee
Introduced to Conference*

MASSEY: Bishop Fannin and delegates, this is our final agenda report. We can get through our business today if you will be prudent and succinct with your comments. I would be remiss if I did not recognize our wonderful agenda committee that are standing down front and thank them for all of their efforts. They have been with us every morning at 7:00 and all of the legislative committee chairpersons as well as the presiding bishops.

In addition, we want to give thanks for Jay Voorhees, who is the production manger and all of his staff who have allowed the petitions to be on the screen and for Gere Reist, who has brought us the consent calendar items. Would you thank them now please. (*Applause*)

BISHOP FANNIN: I was in the Civic Center this morning about 6:50, and the committee was already here working hard, so we greatly appreciate all of the hard work of your committee Mary Alice and all of those who participated in making our business run smooth. I am Bob Fannin from North Alabama—they have an interpreter if you need it—but I'm glad to be with you today and have two wonderful people assisting me, Bishop Joe Yeakel and Bishop Charlene Kammerer from the Western North Carolina Conference. So I am just grateful for their presence. They will be whispering in my ear. Now we have a matter of elections to go to. Is this a point of order? Green card go to mike 4.

DONALD R. AVERY (Louisiana): Shouldn't we have voted on the consent calendars that were just presented.

BISHOP FANNIN: They are coming this afternoon. and you will have the opportunity at that time. All right. Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention. One of the things that I wanted to challenge you with on this day is that we do need to move ahead. I think our primary purpose for being together is to build the kingdom of God. to present to people the presence, the spirit, the love of Jesus Christ. So if you at any time see the chair holding back the building of the kingdom of God, just yell, "point of order." However, if your statement is not going to build the kingdom of God you might want to

think about it twice. (*Applause*). So I just say that. In no way do I want to hold up procedure or do anything improperly, but we will be moving rapidly through our business. And I give God the praise and thanksgiving for your support.

*Board of Global Ministries Bishops
Approved*

Any, OK, I draw your attention to p. 1747, 1747, which are the bishops for the General Board of Global Ministries. The daily edition Volume 4, #3. P. 1747. These will not be number votes. They will be yes or no votes. If you have questions then you need to of course draw it to my attention. Is this a question concerning the election? OK, shortly after the election I'll recognize you. All right, the procedure will be then, we will take that group, the General Board of Global Ministries bishops and take one vote unless there is a question. And if you would approve the list as printed. Properly before you, any questions? If none then would you elect on p. 1747 the names listed. If so, press 1 yes; if no, press 2, when the light appears. OK, [*Yes, 871; No, 23*]. It has been suggested that we could go through all of these in one motion. If you would like to consider these in one motion press yes when the light appears, 1, and no 2. OK. [*Yes, 863; No, 24*] I will read these rapidly to you. You have approved 1747 pages 1747 and 8.

The General Council on Finance and Administration, bishops, members at large, 2 Central Conference John Guillera, replaces excuse me 1, John Guillera replaces Cyprien Ntungwanayo and the Jurisdictions, Patricia Bryant Harris replaces Noah Reid. In the Southeast Connie Mitchell replaces Al Guinn.

BISHOP FANNIN: On 17, page 1748, the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits members. Page 1748, General Commission on Archives and History members. Page 1751, the Commission on General Conference and there are additional nominations listed on page 2278.

*Old John Street United Methodist Church
Trustee Nominations*

ROLAND SHORIST: In addition to these, we have the Old John Street United Methodist Church trustee nominations, for 2000-2004. These were not in your *Daily Christian Advocate*. I apologize for that. We all apologize; however, they were left out. I will read these nominees: James Cardwell, James H.

Howenstien, Wilma J. Roberts, Rayna Rogers, Steven K. Rose, Allen Tapler, Connie Takamine, William T. Staubach Jr. and the bishop of the New York area of The United Methodist Church. Old John Street United Methodist Church, trustee nominations. Are there any questions about any of these nominations? If not, then we will approve all the nominations that I've referred to in one vote. If you approve these nominations would you press one when the light appears and two if you do not. You have approved of the vote of [*Yes, 883; No, 14*]. Thank you, that was very, very helpful. We are ready to move ahead now and let's keep our spirit in mind and our need to watch the clock. I call on Charles Courtoy for Conferences.

CHARLES W. COURTOY (Florida): Thank you, Bishop Fannin:

BISHOP FANNIN: I should say in the beginning here, Dr. Courtoy, that we are dealing with items that have financial implications first. These persons will come back with their other petitions but we are dealing with financial implications first. Thank you.

Petition to Establish Evangelical Missionary Conference in Western Jurisdiction

COURTOY: You want to turn in your DCA to page 2154, 2154. It will be very helpful to you, I suspect, if you'll turn in your *Advance DCA* to page 1341. We'll be dealing with Calendar Item No. 1351 found on page 2154. We are dealing with Petition 31279. It is entitled, "Establish an Evangelical Missionary Conference in Western Jurisdiction." The committee voted nonconcurrence. The rationale: The committee listened with great empathy to the expression of disenfranchisement that the representatives from evangelical churches in the Western Jurisdiction feel. The committee was moved to nonconcurrence based on what has happened among our Korean United Methodists, who in 1996 General Conference attempted to establish a missionary conference and were turned down. We heard here at this General Conference from them that they have affected reconciliation and we pray that the same will happen with those who brought the petition.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, this is before you. I notice a yellow card all the way in the back. Move to mike 8 please.

MENNO E. GOOD (Eastern Pennsylvania): And I move referral if that is in order.

BISHOP FANNIN: It is in order.

Motion to Reform Evangelical Missionary Conference to GCOM Debated and Defeated

GOOD: I move referral of Petition 31279 and its rationale to the General Council on Ministries to study along with other studies already referred to them in order to assess the needs for a non-geographic missionary conference in consultation with the original petitioners and others and report to the General Conference of 2004.

BISHOP FANNIN: Do I hear a second? I have a second. Would you like to speak to it? Your motion, mike 8.

GOOD: I have a speech, yes, but in the interest of time I simply offer this as a facilitating motion that we might move forward in the same way in which the Korean initiative did in the last four years. It seems to me that the General Council on Ministries is the correct place for this.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we will have speeches for and against referral. All right, the green card over here, come to mike 4.

HARRY L. WOOD (California-Nevada, clergy): I want to speak against referral. To postpone this for another four years will exacerbate the feelings that have led to this proposal and so I urge you to deal with this now.

BISHOP ROBERT FANNIN: All right, sir. We've had one for and one against. A yellow card all the way in the back, mike 8. (*Pause*)

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Bishop, our legislative committee gave careful consideration to this. We were convinced that we're going down a slippery road if we begin to divide the church according to theology and theological divisions. I would urge us to vote against referral and not permit this kind of legislation. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. We have one for referral, one speech left. Yes, the pink card here. Mike 4.

ROGER A. KINDSCHI (Wisconsin): I speak in favor of referral. I was on the subcommittee where we learned about the situation and felt like it was a worthy situation to really look into and to deal with. We feel there are issues that need to be dealt with. We have heard of times where there has been persecution of pastors, and churches, and lay people. And for this to be studied fairly, I would encourage. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you. That fulfills our two on each side. Dr. Courtoy?

COURTOY: Just remind the body that the Committee recommends non-concurrence.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. We're voting on referral at this point. To refer or not to refer. If you would refer this matter you would vote "yes," if you would not refer it you would vote "no." Vote when the light appears. (*Pause*) You have defeated of the referral with [*Yes, 358; No, 557*]. We're back to the main motion and this is non-concurrence. Do you have anything to say? All right, we're ready to do that. Yes, over here, green card, mike 4.

WOOD: I want to thank my colleagues on the delegation here. I'm expressing a viewpoint that is not shared in the majority of our delegation and I appreciate being able to be here. The creation of an Evangelical Missionary Conference in the Western Jurisdiction will provide the following benefits to our mission to know Christ and to make Christ known. It will free vital energy; it will empower a grassroots movement; and it will encourage congregations and pastors. It will free vital energy, which has been spent in debate over theological and moral issues, and release it for doing the work of evangelism and building up the church. It will empower a grassroots movement that wants to be United Methodist and we want to be evangelical. It will encourage congregations and pastors in the Western Jurisdiction who've been excluded from leadership positions in their annual conference. For example, in my conference, no district superintendent representing the evangelical perspective has been appointed in more than forty years. It will accommodate diversity of ecclesiology and theological perspective within our denomination in much the same way that that has been accomplished through the orders of the Roman Catholic Church. That Church is enriched by Jesuits and Franciscans, and others that come under one aegis. It will help stem the tide of loss of members, clergy and churches. Since 1967, the California-Nevada Annual Conference has declined in membership from 125,000 to 93,000. This occurred during a time when the state population doubled.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

WOOD: Finally, creation of an Evangelical Missionary Conference will boost morale and give incentive to church growth. In an area where we have floundered and failed, it offers hope and I ask that you vote against the committee and give us that hope.

BISHOP FANNIN: Speech against. All right. I noticed the yellow card . . . What color is that, orange or yellow way back in the back? Mike 6.

CHEOL H. KWAK (California-Pacific Annual Conference): I want to speak for the committee's decision because when we talked about the action in 1996 for a Korean Missional Conference it was strictly because of language and culture. It is not about theology. Now, if we are beginning to create new conferences based upon theology, I believe because of what happened yesterday, we are going to have a lot of different conferences all over the place because of their different theological interpretations. So I strongly urge this body to support the committee's decision.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. A representative for all the orange cards in the back. All right. Mike 8.

JAMES T. SEYMOUR (Peninsula-Delaware): Bishop, I rise to speak for the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence if that's okay.

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes.

SEYMOUR: Bishop, we continue to wrestle with issues of unity and diversity. I would urge the body to affirm the legislative committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. To begin with, the petition is incomplete in terms of estimates of the costs involved. And the petition has other aspects that may require clarification. My main concern, however, is that the proposal to establish such a missionary conference seems to represent the step that diminishes, rather than strengthens, a sense of connection. It separates rather than brings people together. I feel that wherever possible, we should work to where it's maintaining a unity that transcends our differences. I urge that we support the committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Thank you. We can have one more "against." Way in the back, if you would stand up I can recognize you rather than just an orange card. This one right here near mike 6. Yes. (I see an orange card.)

Substitute Motion Calls for Dialogue Between Cal/Nevada Conference and Western Jurisdiction College of Bishops

DAVID V. W. OWEN: I rise to provide a substitute. I move to substitute the following wording in Petition 31279. We recognize and acknowledge the pain represented in Petition 31279. There is a troubling circumstance in a portion of our connection that must be addressed with deep prayer, compassion, and our best discernment of God's will. We believe we are a redeemed people, reconciled to God in Christ. As such, we are called to demonstrate our reconciliation in our relationship with each other. Petition 31279 begs us to exhaust every effort to seek reconciliation if our Christian witness to the world is to have integrity.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

OWEN: Okay. This effort requires the highest commitment of pastoral care and leadership of the church. Therefore, I recommend that General Conference, as a body, instruct and bind the leadership, both clergy and lay of the California Nevada Annual Conference to enter into a direct process of reconciliation, under the direction of the College of Bishops of the Western Jurisdiction. This process must enable clear and direct dialogue to identify the key issues of disagreement, seek to restore the covenant and/or provide an orderly restoration of the relationships of ministry between episcopacy, clergy and laity of the annual conference. I so move.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well now, that sounds more like a speech against. Do want to make that a substitute?

OWEN: I'd like to make it a substitute.

BISHOP FANNIN: We'll have to have that information brought to the front, it seems.

OWEN :All right.

BISHOP FANNIN: Is there a second? There is a second. All right, the substitute is before us. I think we'll have to have that read again. Give us the exact, mike 8. Can you give us the exact wording of your substitute?

OWEN: This is . . . We recommend that General Conference, as a body, instruct and bind the leadership, both clergy and lay, of the California-Nevada Annual Conference to enter into a direct process of reconciliation under

the direction of the College of Bishops of the Western Jurisdiction. This process must enable clear and direct dialogue to identify the key issues of disagreement, seek to restore the covenant and/or provide an orderly restoration of the relationship of ministry between episcopacy, clergy and laity of the Annual Conference. I am David Owen.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you, David. I'm a little confused because that sounds like part of our job description already as episcopal leaders. Do you feel that it's important that we mandate this?

OWEN: It seems to me that the people I've talked with who are engaged in both sides of the conflict, that something has broken down and I believe we as a General Conference, need to say, "Friends, brothers and sisters in Christ, we're going to sit at the table, look at one another, and work it out as a witness to Jesus Christ to the world."

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. That's a speech for the substitute. Yes, on my left over here, the green. Mike 4

MARIELLEN SAWADA (California-Nevada): Mariellen Sawada, California-Nevada Annual Conference, of which you speak in that particular part of the petition, but that has taken me quite by surprise because what that makes me think is that the person, the maker of this, does not know what we are doing in the California-Nevada conference, whether we are sitting down at the table or not; maybe doesn't give us the credit that we *are* sitting at the table; that district superintendents have been asked. Maybe that person has not talked with us to see what we are or are not doing. So I certainly would ask that we vote against these particular words. And please know that we . . . I would be one who is looking at unity, and anything that provides that kind of unity, we are for. I come from a tradition of provisional conference, the Japanese Provisional Conference, and we know the need for unity and the need to sit at the table.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

SAWADA: So we appreciate the words but probably don't appreciate that part that says "binding" and "you must do this" when these things are already in process.

BISHOP FANNIN: Is the house ready to vote on this matter?

SEVERAL VOICES RESPOND: Yes.

Substitute Dialogue Motion Fails

BISHOP FANNIN: Is it okay if we test that? All right, if you, then, would approve the substitute, vote yes; if not, vote 2 when the light appears. [Yes, 300; No, 606] All right, you have defeated the substitute. Now we've got one more speech against nonconcurrency that's coming from the committee. Do I have a speech against the committee—nonconcurrency. Orange, over at mike 7.

WILLIAM C. SMALLWOOD (Mississippi): Would it be all right to yield to my fellow delegate from Mississippi, Leon Collier? Were you trying to get to mike 2, Leon?

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, do it, but—don't get hostile.

SMALLWOOD: If it—if it's not all right, I'd like to make this speech.

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes sir, go ahead.

SMALLWOOD: We have a number of missionary conferences already. We have conferences that overlap conference lines. That's true of the Rio Grande Conference. Those of us that heard debate yesterday would have to feel a deep sympathy for our evangelical brothers when we hear that 90 people joined together to find the law of the church and they're out there trying to give ministry. I think this would add vitality to our church. I've served on global ministries, and I've supported every initiative that I thought would bring new people into the table and widen our connection and strengthen our connection, and I think this would do just that.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you. Now that's two for and two against. I can only recognize anybody point of order or question. All right, Dr. Courtoy?

COURTOY: I think we're ready to vote, Bishop.

*Evangelical Missionary Conference
Vote Fails*

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, you have a motion from the, recommendation from the committee for nonconcurrency. If you agree with the committee, press 1; if you do not, press 2 when the light appears. [Yes, 615; No, 312] You have supported the committee. Thank you.

All right. We call now upon Financial Administration, Stan Sager. Just a minute, Stan. I . . . the gentleman down here raised his hand a moment ago and I did

not recognize him. You, sir—do you still need to speak? All right, go to mike 2. We were in the middle of something, and I asked you wait, and I apologize.

KALIMA MUTOMBO (North-West Katanga): (*Interpretation from Swahili*): It is regarding what happened about the calendar. There is one mistake on page 2346. This is regarding what happened yesterday. The name that has been put there is not the correct name; I am the person who said those things. If you look on that page, you'll see that it is on the last paragraph.

BISHOP FANNIN: Sir, I think that could be taken care of by editorial corrections. If you would give the message to the secretary, the Conference secretary. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right, Stan?

MUTOMBO: Thank you very much.

BISHOP FANNIN: Microphone on the stage, please.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): If you would turn to p. 2156 in the DCA you will find there Calendar Item 1364. It refers to p. 1299 of the *Advance DCA*, and that is Vol. 2, Section 3, a small, brochure-type of folder, not the big blue one, and there is Petition 31305. This petition relates to amendment and re-statement of the CPP. The committee vote was 73 for concurrence, 1 against, and I would place that before you, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. 1364 is before us—nonconcurrency.

SAGER: No, concurrence.

BISHOP FANNIN: Concurrence, all right. I appreciate the correction. Concurrence. All right.

SAGER: That was CPP, Bishop, not CPT, as I think I may have said.

BISHOP FANNIN: CPP . . . CPP . . . Concurrence. (*Laughter*) Thank you for that correction too, Stan. All right, it's before us. All right, if you approve concurrence, vote yes; if not, no, when the light appears. [Yes, 838; No, 26]

SAGER: Thank you Bishop

Global Ministries . . . Christine Keels. Is a point of order back there? The orange card on the left, mike 8.

*Conference Suspends Rules In Order
to Consider All Financial Implications
in Present Session*

CASHAR W. EVANS (North Carolina): I move to suspend the rules in order to have all petitions with finan-

cial implications considered before the lunch break.

BISHOP FANNIN: That is our intent, Cashar, at this particular moment. We're trying to walk through, but we have some more—you're saying "all."

EVANS: Yes sir. If I'll get a second, I'll explain it to you.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, sir. It has been seconded.

EVANS: This action would enable GCFA to take all necessary actions in order to consider the GCFA reports after lunch.

BISHOP FANNIN: It's understandable. Any discussion? I see an orange card on the left. Now, first of all, we have to suspend the rules to open the discussion on this matter. All right, if you would suspend the rules, press 1; if you would not, press 2 when the light appears. [Yes, 701; No, 176] You have suspended the rules by a vote of 701, yes; no, 176. All right, card on the left, mike 7.

LAVON J. WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop, I have one from the Higher, Higher Education legislative committee. But, however, it's in today's *Daily Christian Advocate*, and I was informed it could not come in until this afternoon. The people have to review it. Please give me directions on this.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, I thank you for that. That's my understanding too. However, I think this takes priority. I'm going to call on Mary Massey to clarify this matter for us—chair of the Agenda Committee.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): It is my understanding that that is the intent of the suspension of the rules, to allow these to occur this morning so that they can take them up there. There are three of them, I believe.

BISHOP FANNIN: Right. All right. And you agree with that, Ms. Massey? OK. All right. Are we ready to vote on this—that we handle these financial matters before lunch if at all humanly possible? All right. If you would agree, vote yes. If not, 2 when the light appears. [Yes, 841; No, 37] You have approved. All right. Do we want to go back to Financial Administration since they have one of these items? Is Stan still here? All right. We'll move ahead then and come back and make sure that all of them are being handled properly. Global Ministries—Ms. Christine Keels.

CHRISTINE DEAN KEELS (Baltimore-Washington): Good morning, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: Good morning.

KEELS: A week ago the Global Ministries Committee leadership team made the decision to choose a parliamentary. We chose Gary Ward of the North Alabama Conference to be our parliamentarian.

BISHOP FANNIN: That's excellent.

KEELS: Gary monitored and guided the committee through the use of the General Conference Rules of Order. Gary organized the pages and the marshals in maintaining the integrity of the bar and the voting process. I'm very proud to present Gary Ward. He will refer to p. 2089.

GARY T. WARD (North Alabama): Bishop, members of the conference, turn to p. 2089, Petition 625, 625, the Petition 30863. This petition is found also on p.1822 in your *Advance DCA*—or in your *DCA*—and p. 876 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. We added one language group in the Philippines. And the rationale is, this is a continuation of a mandate from the 1996 General Conference. I so move, Bishop, that we—this is a referral to GCFA.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, properly before you. Any questions? All right. If you would refer to GCFA, would you vote yes when the light appears; if not, no. You have referred it, [Yes, 832; No, 35].

KEELS: Bishop, I'd like to introduce Charlene Black. Charlene was the chair, subcommittee chairperson for Health and Relief. She will now present some more referrals.

Church And Community Worker's Program Adopted and Referred to GCFA

CHARLENE R. BLACK (South Georgia): Thank you. If you would turn with me in the *DCA* to p. 2093, p. 2093, Item 1199. 2093, Item 1199 refers to Resolution 30230, which also appears in the *Advance DCA* on p. 49. This is a motion that continues to support the Church and Community Workers' Program and continues to deploy them. The committee recommends reference to GCFA because we certainly affirm the work of our Church and Community Workers and believe that this needs to be continued. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you very much. Properly before us. Did you

straighten out the terminology? When we refer, we really should say, "adoption and referral," "to adopt and refer." All right. If you agree, would you vote yes when the light appears; if not, no. It is adopted and referred by a vote of [Yes, 837; No, 28]. I'm not going through—you've been here so long now, you know that 1 is yes and no is 2?—so I'm not repeating that every time like we have in the past, so if there is a disagreement, let me know.

Restorative Justice Program Referred to GCFA

KEELS: Bishop, we're continuing on p. 2093. The presenter is Marilyn Outslay. Marilyn was the chair of the Women, Children, and Other Committee. Don't let the word *other* throw you. All the issues were important.

MARILYN J. OUTSLAY (Oregon-Idaho): Bishop, we are on the same page, p. 2093. The Calendar Item is 1196, Petition 30870, and the report for this is found on p. 899 of the *Advance DCA*. This is a petition that would allow us to continue restorative justice ministries. This was a program created by the 1966 General Conference. As you can see, it was voted on unanimously, but we bring it to you because of financial implications. So we would move concurrence with the referral.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. We have adoption and referral before us. All right. Vote when the light appears. Yes, 1; no, 2. [Yes, 823; No, 48] You have adopted and referred.

KEELS: Bishop, this concludes all of the money referrals for our committee.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Appreciate that. I want—Cashar Evans' motion has changed our agenda, which we understand fully. And we will move for the committee chairs so that they might be aware. We will now move to the afternoon schedule, the first part of the afternoon schedule, to handle these matters, so they might be aware of their order to be on stage. Right now, in a great southern tradition—you know, we've been talking, you know, the food in Cleveland's been wonderful, but I've missed the greens and the grits and all those delicacies, you know.

(Laughter—Applause)

But I can be sustained for a long time on a cup of coffee, and Bishop McClesky from South Carolina said he would bring me a cup of coffee during the break. Let's take a 15-minute break.

(Recess)

(Song)

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you. Praise God. We will be recognizing the legislative committees in this order: Faith and Order, Independent Commissions, Higher Education, and Financial Administration. And then we will ask the other legislative committee chairs if they have any legislation with financial implications. Faith and Order, Independent Commissions, Higher Education, and Financial Administration. Robert Hayes, Faith and Order.

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Thank you, Bishop. Members of the General Conference, we are going to present to you the first of two petitions that deal with the subject of abortion. The very first can be found on p. 2149 of your *DCA*, 2149. I'm going to ask that Delegate Sally Dick come on up. She'll be on the next one, but the first one does not have a minority report. It is p. 2149, Calendar Item 1295, in the *Advance DCA*, its Petition 30008. That's the first of many petitions under this particular calendar item. And the committee recommends nonconcurrence. Most of these petitions that are listed under this calendar item are suggesting that we change some of the wording that is found in 65J. However, the committee recommends nonconcurrence because the wording which is currently there is more suitable in favor—we've done this in favor of the wording that's already there as opposed to those that have been suggested to us.

BISHOP FANNIN: Mr. Hayes, does this have financial implications?

HAYES: That's why I was—that's why I was wondering—

BISHOP FANNIN: We need only yours that have financial implication.

HAYES: I have none.

BISHOP FANNIN: OK, this afternoon later we'll do these. Stan? Mike 2.

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): Bishop, could I ask for a little bit of clarification? The matters that Financial Administration has with financial implications now, they're directly on GCFA reports, and we have no problem presenting

them this morning. And perhaps it makes sense to get them out here before the reports are submitted, so that if they effect the change in the budget it could be done. But I want to assure myself that they will be considered before the GCFA reports are, are considered because it is conceivable that action could be taken that would be contrary to GCFA recommendations.

BISHOP FANNIN: I appreciate that caution and I think that's our understanding. They just need to know where we are as a conference.

SAGER: So we'll prepare, be prepared this morning, in a few minutes, to present those.

BISHOP FANNIN: That's correct.

SAGER: Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: We're going down the list now.

HAYES: Bishop, it must have been an error in what you received because we have no financial—

BISHOP FANNIN: All right.

HAYES: —considerations for this afternoon.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right.

HAYES: So I'll bring this back at another time.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you very much. You were on our list, but the list was wrong. Independent Commissions. Independent Commissions, Harold Batiste. All right, Higher Education, Ms. La Von Wilson. If Mr. Batiste could be ready. OK. All right. Is that a point of order? Back here, the pink card? Go to mike 4 please, sir.

THOMAS O. GARNHART (Wisconsin): I would like to move to suspend the rules for the purpose of amending our rules in a way that, I believe, will help us increase our trust in each other in this process of working together, to clarify a matter that we've had a lot of confusion around.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, what is that matter?

GARNHART: Would you like to hear what I would intend to present?

BISHOP FANNIN: I think they, they would like to hear at least a—

GARNHART: Well, the matter—

BISHOP FANNIN: a little bit before they begin to vote.

GARNHART: The matter is around the confusion over whether we are voting on what we see before us, or rather

we are voting on an original position, petition that has not been seen by the delegates.

BISHOP FANNIN: We dealt with that for quite a while last night.

GARNHART: And it was clarified last night that we do not have any written rule that covers that matter but is done by a rule that is known by some but not in print in any form.

BISHOP FANNIN: So you want to set aside the agenda to present a clearer understanding of that process?

GARNHART: Yes, to amend the rules in a way that would clarify it in one direction or another, and if, I'm more interested in clarifying it than getting my particular perspective voted on.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, if you would set aside the rules, press one; if not, two. [*Yes, 244; No, 484*] It is not supported. Thank you, sir. Ms. Wilson?

Motion to Create Task Force on Immigration/Naturalization Approved

LAVON J. WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): If you would turn in your *DCA*'s to p. 2242, Calendar Item 1560, in *Advance DCA* is 1025, Petition 30597. This relates to create a taskforce on immigration/naturalization issues related to clergy appointments. Our committee recommends concurrence. Our vote was 74 and none against and one not voting. Our rationale for this was that the committee recognizes the growing need to speak with constituencies regarding the issue of immigration and naturalization related to clergy appointments and staff positions. A taskforce formed as recommended in this petition would be able to research, consult, and advise all of the involved agencies and entities of our church. And there are no new monies requested for this taskforce as explained in the final paragraph. And the committee recommends with concurrence.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, this matter is properly before us. I see no cards. We'll vote when the light appears. 1, yes, 2 no. concurrence. All right, you have supported the committee. [*Yes, 671; No, 72*].

WILSON: Thank you Bishop, that's the only one we have.

BISHOP FANNIN: Is Harold here? Harold Batiste here now? Nothing with financial implications, they're saying. OK, thank you very much. I apologize, you're on the list. OK, Stan Sager, Fi-

nancial Administration. On the platform, the mike on the platform.

SAGER: These will be directed at GCFA reports, and I want to assure that those who are presenting minorities reports on those will be here as we go through these, Bishop. And that would be Chuck Lanier, Jeff Sitts, Eddie Fox, and Warner Brown.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, will these persons come forward please and be ready to respond?

SAGER: Let me begin with p. 2090 of the *DCA*. Calendar no. 1163, *Advance DCA*, p. 331. The Petition 30702, this is the report on GCFA, by GCFA on the Black colleges. We have voted to concur.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. There's no minority report with these.

SAGER: No minority report.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, this is properly before you. They have concurrence coming from the committee. See no cards. If you support the committee on concurrence vote yes, if not, no, when the light appears. You have supported the committee with a vote of [*Yes, 743; No, 16*].

SAGER: On p. 2090 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1162 refers to p. 334 in the *Advance DCA*, Petition 30704. This is the report of the Episcopal Fund. We have voted to concur.

BISHOP FANNIN: Excuse us just a moment. Excuse me just a moment, what the problem is Stan, if I could just interrupt for a moment. We've just received-the general secretary of GCFA-feels that there's a misunderstanding about us setting aside the rules to handle these items prior to this afternoon. Could you give permission to Sandra Lackore to speak on the floor to clarify this matter? All right, I hear no one disagreeing. Sandra, are you here in the back? Sandra? We were told that she was here to . . . she may be in the office. We're going to proceed right now. What . . . Cashar Evans, are you here? Mike 8. Sandra Lackore has challenges on this matter. Can you help explain? Mike 8.

CASHAR W. EVANS (North Carolina): Bishop Fannin I think I'm in as much of a quandary as you. It was my understanding that Sandra wanted all of these things done before lunch if possible. And that was the reason that I moved to have that done.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, thank you.

EVANS: I'll go get her if you want me to.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, we may have a clarification with the secretary. I turn to the conference secretary.

Secretary Clarifies Process for GCFA Report on Financial Implications

MARSHALL: A word of explanation. Sandra Lackore was on her way here and would be very willing to share with us, except she has just fallen, and cannot get here right this moment. She just called again, and wanted to remind the body that according to our rules, all of the items which fall within the budget as set by GCFA require that GCFA bring the reports and which they will do this afternoon and then any amendments on what we would consider at this moment minority reports. Anything that would be an adjustment to that be brought then after the report has been presented. The budget has been presented by GCFA. And so the request was that we postpone receiving these reports and action on them until after GCFA reports this afternoon. Bishop Fannin, that's the essence of the conversation.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we seem to have some confusion. We're going to ask two questions. One is do any of the committees have legislation that have new money that has not already been in the hands of the GCFA? Any of the chairs have request for new money? We're getting a no. They're all saying no. Then in that case then, Mr. Evans, if it's alright with the body, I'm going to move back to the general reporting of the committees, and move away from this, because there seems to be a lot of questions surrounding it, we might have to rehandle it, if we go ahead. So, yes pink card. All right Sandra Lackore is just here. Maybe she can clarify this matter for us. I have a speaker now on mike 1, if you would come here.

JULIUS A. ARCHIBALD, Jr. (Troy): And this is more of a request for clarification. Yesterday afternoon Calendar Item 336 was lifted because it had financial implications and referred to GCF&A by this body. In looking report no. 17, see p. 2362 this morning in which a number of these items were identified with recommendations from GCFA, I did not see any reference to Calendar Item 336. I just want to be sure that it doesn't get lost.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we'll make sure that the right look at that and make sure it's available. A while ago you gave permission for Sandra Lackore, the general secretary of General Council on Finance and Administration to speak, and I think that's still in order. Mike 2. Mike 2.

General Secretary of GCFA Clarifies Process for Referrals

SANDRA LACKORE: (General Secretary G.C.F.A.) Thank you Bishop, I apologize for not being on the floor, but I fell this morning, and I've been trying to keep my leg from swelling so that I could walk up this afternoon. But in any case, Bishop, we had requested as Carolyn Marshall indicated, that matters with financial implications be before you so that we could deal with them at noontime. Our understanding of the presentation of the reports—and in fact with when we present our reports, we've come into consensus with several of the minority reports already and we will be presenting those minority reports as part of our report. And so I think what you're doing is duplicating what will happen this afternoon. So, all we need before you right now are things that we would have to deal with at noontime.

BISHOP FANNIN: In other words, new money.

LACKORE: Just new money.

BISHOP FANNIN: OK, then we've asked the chairs about that. They've said that there are no new money requests.

LACKORE: Then that's fine, then we'll deal with everything else this afternoon when GCFA brings it report. The reports of the legislative committee and then the reports, any minority reports that have not already been incorporated into our recommendations to the General Conference.

BISHOP FANNIN: I think there was a misunderstanding, Mr. Evans, Cashar Evans thought you wanted that done before lunch.

LACORE: I'm sorry for that, if there's been any confusion Bishop. But we'll hold steady as Bishop Solomon told us, and we'll get it done.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you very much, green card on my left. Mike 2. Alert the legislative committee chairs to be ready to continue on the non-financial implication information as we previously planned. Yes.

CAROLYN BRISCOE (South Carolina): Thank you Bishop Fannin, I'm sure that Ms. Wilson was right, but in the Higher Education and Ministry Committee we had a resolution regarding Africa University, is that considered an increase or is that considered new money because the resolution we passed was for an increase to 20 million dollars rather than the 10.

BISHOP FANNIN: OK, that's in the hands of GCFA. We're OK.

BRISCOE: Thank you very much.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, now we are ready to continue with the reports. We apologize for this, it seems to be miscommunication. We call upon General and Judicial Administration, Chris Harman.

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Thank you Bishop Fannin, this morning we will be presenting 3 items at this time. And leading us through that process will be Kathi Austin Mahle, chair of one of our sub-committees. Kathi?

Petition to Add to Constitution Article Four Because of Judicial Council Ruling on Baptism

KATHI AUSTIN MAHLE (Minnesota): Bishop Fannin, I would like to refer you to p. 2158, item no. 1380. This is Petition 30313. It's found on p. 705 of the *Advance DCA*. Bishop this is a constitutional amendment to Article 4 of the Constitution, which is presented in order to have *The Discipline* reflect the action taken by the 1996 General Conference with regards to the document "By Water and the Spirit." After 8 years of study and revision, "By Water and the Spirit" was passed nearly unanimously by the 1996 General Conference as the official interpretive document for the church. Legislation was passed by the 1996 General Conference enacting the theological understandings of this document and placed in the *Book of Discipline*. In October of 1997, the Judicial Council ruled that this legislation was in violation of paragraph 4 of the Constitution. This was decision no. 811. This ruling came as a surprise to the General Board of Discipleship because the intention of paragraph 4 is to stipulate who can be a member not how membership is defined. The General Board of Discipleship is now proposing this amendment to paragraph 4 in order for new legislation to be brought to the 2004 General Conference. Baptism is the sacrament through which God incorporates and initiates all persons into

the church. All persons no matter at what age they are baptized must ultimately profess their faith in Christ. If one is baptized as an infant, one is nurtured and formed in a local church and empowered to profess the Christian faith when one reaches an age of moral accountability. When confirmation occurs, a person professes faith and becomes a professing member. Only professing members are to be counted for the purpose of church statistics. At this point I would move to suspend the rules to allow Gail Felton, author of "By Water and the Spirit" to be able to speak to any questions that may arise from the discussion.

BISHOP FANNIN: Do I hear a second? All right, it is before us to set aside the rules so that the author might speak. If you approve press 1, if you do not 2 when the light appears. You support by [Yes, 734; No, 99].

MAHLE: She will be available to answer any questions, the motion is before you.

BISHOP FANNIN: Does she want to speak.

MAHLE: She can answer questions.

BISHOP FANNIN: She can answer any questions, cause that's what we gave her approval for, for the author to answer questions. All right it is before us, pink card on my right, mike 5. That's you, yes sir. Mike 5.

Meaning of "Membership" Debated

MAXIE DUNNAM (Kentucky): Our church, the entire United Methodist church, and our General Conference had an enriching experience perfecting and studying the baptismal paper "By Water and the Spirit." That study was responsible in keeping the vital balance of the sacramental and evangelical traditions of our Methodist movement. We made it clear that baptism did not guarantee salvation. Baptism is a means of grace, but in our unique Methodist understanding prevenient grace. I speak against changing the present constitutional position. Our present position makes it clear that we're justified by faith in Jesus Christ and on the public profession of our faith we become full members of the church. This has been a part of the tradition in the Methodist movement in America from the beginning, which has been an evangelical movement. In infant baptism we initiate the child into the family of the Christian faith and he or she becomes as in previous language a preparatory

member. One of the great problems in the church is that we don't make church membership distinctive enough. There is not enough discipline. This constitutional change further erodes the meaning of church membership and weakens the vitality of United Methodist congregations. I speak against change in the constitution.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. That's one against. All right let's turn to this side, the green card on my left, mike 4. Green card.

THOMAS A. (ANDY) LANGFORD, III (Western North Carolina): Bishop I speak in favor of the constitutional amendment. This amendment is consistent with our Wesleyan and evangelical and catholic theology. The committee that studied and worked on this studied this exceptionally well. My father, now deceased, was a member of that, a Wesleyan theological systematic theologian. This statement is consistent with who we have always been. I encourage delegates to read John Wesley's sermon on baptism, which would reconfirm what this committee is doing. I urge your approval, your acceptance of the constitutional amendment.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Now that is 1 for and 1 against, the pink card here. No, I recognize the gentleman there. Mike 5.

JOE P. PEABODY (North Georgia): It's difficult for me to understand why it is valuable for us to use the term *member* in two contradictory ways. What we're asked for in this legislation is the opportunity to call baptized persons "baptized members," which in the parlance of everyday, plain language means . . . "members." Whereas a term like, preparatory members indicates that there is some sense in which it is necessary for that membership to be completed as we do in our professing situation.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

PEABODY: I would encourage this General Conference to give the message back home to our folks, that a member of the church is that somebody who has professed his or her faith in Jesus Christ, although we welcome and we lay claim to those babies whom we baptize, but not confuse everybody by using the same term.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we've had two against the committee, one for. Do we have a one for? I have not recog-

nized . . . in the back? That's—yes, sir. Microphone—6 or 8? Six. Mike 6. No, I think, the gentleman in the coat.

DUANE V. SARAZIN (Minnesota): Thank you, Bishop Fannin. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment. When we bring a child home from the hospital or from the place where we receive a child for adoption into our families, we do not leave them out in the yard or in the garage, we bring them into our household. We introduce them as members of the family. And by the same token, in keeping with our Wesleyan theology, our Christian heritage, we need to acknowledge that baptized people are fully members of the family—just in a different way. And as they grow in God's grace, regardless of their age at Baptism, that one day they shall be led to profess Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. I speak in favor of the amendment. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, that completes your process of two for and two against. I could—you have a question? Mike 5. Mike 5. Question?

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): Bishop, can we address a question to Dr. Felton?

BISHOP FANNIN: Could you identify yourself?

MESSER: Don Messer, Rocky Mountain Conference. Can we ask Dr. Felton a question?

BISHOP FANNIN: Doctor, we're going to give the chair an opportunity and the summation to allow Dr. Felton to speak, if they so choose. And then I would have to test the body for questions, this has not been part of our procedure. Do you want Dr. Felton to make the summation, or you?

MAHLE: There have been several questions raised in the course of our discussion, and as part of the summation, I would invite Dr. Felton to respond to those questions. We support bringing the *Discipline* and Constitution in line with action that we've already taken in terms of ritual and theology.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we have set aside the rules. Dr. Felton? Welcome.

*By Water and Spirit Author
Addresses Baptism Questions*

GAYLE FELTON: I agree with almost everything that has been said about our theology and practice of Baptism. And I really feel that we are dealing with

some misunderstandings. The present situation that we are in is quite a confusing—and, I would argue, untenable—one for the church. We have a baptismal ritual and an official interpretive document, *By Water and the Spirit*, that talk about baptism in one way, and we have a *Discipline* that talks about Baptism in another way. They use different categories. And this cannot allow us to effectively teach what it means to be a member of the Christian church. When a person is baptized, that person is initiated . . . incorporated; this is the classic meaning of Baptism within Christianity. It is initiation into the church. But certainly, as this amendment makes abundantly clear, in our practice, baptized members are only beginning the process of growth toward salvation that Wesley called regeneration, justification, and sanctification.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up, Doctor, thank you.

FELTON: Yes. They are to be nurtured in home and in church, so that as soon as they are able to speak with moral accountability for themselves . . . Yes, indeed, they must confess their faith in Jesus Christ and profess that before the church, in the service we now call confirmation. Both sides of the heritage of United Methodism are balanced and well represented here, we believe.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, does that satisfy everyone? I only have room for questions and point of order. Yes, pink card on my right here, mike 1.

GAIL E. MURPHY-GEISS (Yellowstone): Bishop, may I offer an amendment?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes.

MURPHY-GEISS: I would move to add in two places, after the list of race, color, national origin, and status, the following: "sex, age, disability." If I have second I'll speak to it. (*It is seconded.*) These are commitments that we already have, and I think it would be important for them to be in this foundational document, our Constitution. And I think their omission here is quite glaring, so I would move their addition. Thanks.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, the amendment's before us now. Yellow card in the back, mike 5. Yes, we had a second, I heard a second. Is that correct? Okay.

Motion Made to Divide Into Issues of Inclusiveness and Vows of Membership

MARK C. TROTTER (California Pacific): There are really two issues in this paragraph because of what the Judicial Council ruled about the vows of membership. There is the issue of inclusiveness in the church. There is the issue of vows for membership. I wonder if it's possible to split those two issues in this debate, since they are really, at this point, not related. Would that be in order, Bishop?

BISHOP FANNIN: I think that would be up to the house to do that, we're now talking about the amendment, and I—

TROTTER: Excuse me, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: Go ahead.

TROTTER: The amendment refers to that part of the paragraph that deals with the inclusiveness in the church, who may be in the church; the legislative committee's report deals with how you become a member of the church. What I would move is that we would split the two issues so that we may deal with each one separately.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, I think that—what is, what is the chair . . . ?

MAHLE: In the course of our discussion in the legislative committee, we were . . . we dealt with this together. However, we do realize the importance of both the inclusion issues and the importance of the Baptism issue. Our concern in the legislative committee was to make sure that the Baptism issue was cared for. I would support a division.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, now let me . . . the maker of the amendment, mike 1, I think, the person who made the amendment—who made the amendment? Would you be willing—come to mike 1, please. You would be willing to accept that? So you withdraw your amendment? She withdraws her amendment, okay. She is waving her hands "no," and I'm taking it one way, and . . .

MURPHY-GEISS: I'd be in favor of splitting it, if the house so desires.

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, that's my point.

MURPHY-GEISS: Yes.

BISHOP FANNIN: If we could do away with your amendment, then we can—

MURPHY-GEISS: Bring it . . . ?

BISHOP FANNIN: —have a motion to split.

MURPHY-GEISS: And I'll bring it back later. After you've split.

BISHOP FANNIN: Okay.

MURPHY-GEISS: Okay.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Is that okay with the house? Just wait a while before we deal with that part.

All right, do I hear a motion to divide? That was all we've been waiting on. A motion to divide? Mark Trotter, back here in the back, did you make that motion, Mark?. He is indicating he made that motion. Is there a second? We have a second. All right, please vote when the light appears if you would divide this issue. Vote 1 if you would divide, 2 if you would not. When the light appears.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, you have decided to divide, [*Yes, 616; No, 266*]. Now what is before us?

Issue of Baptism and Professing Members Debated

MAHLE: I believe that what is before us is the sentences that have to do with baptism and professing members.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, baptism and professing members. That issue is before us. Now we've had two for and two against on the whole issue. I think we're ready to vote unless there's a question.

MAHLE: And I would urge your support of this amendment.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, it there a point of order or question? All right, way in the back.

WILLIAM B. MORGAN (North Alabama): Would it be in order to offer an amendment to the main amendment?

BISHOP FANNIN: We're indicating here that we're already in the voting process. The summation has been made and that would be out of order.

MORGAN: Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: Point of order or question. Green card on my left. I think the gentleman in the dark coat. Mike 4.

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): I have a question for the committee or Dr. Felton. What is the status of a person who is baptized but never takes the vows to become a professing member? Do they remain a member of the church in perpetuity?

FELTON: They would remain a baptized member of the church. Because

baptism, in our understanding, is a sacrament and a sacrament is an act of God. In baptism of a person of any age, God claims that person as one's own. God's grace has to be accepted by that person when he or she is of an age to be able to do so. But that does not render the fact of God's claim, God's gift of grace, that came in the original baptism. So, yes, the person would remain a baptized member of the church. We do not claim that we can undo what God has done.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, I think we're ready to vote. If there's a point of order. That's all I can take now is a point of order. Is that a point of order? Pink card here, Mike 4.

MAC BRANTLEY (North Georgia): The point of order is exactly what are we voting on? What sentences are we voting on?

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, I think that's in order. I allowed that moment awhile ago. That was really further debate and I apologize, but trying to make it clear for the body. If the chair would tell us exactly the sentences, the part we're voting on.

MAHLE: Bishop, I understand that what we are voting on are the words that are before us in the amendment. However, part of this amendment, part of Article 4, includes words around "inclusion" and "exclusion" and my understanding of the Trotter motion to divide was that those issues around "inclusion" and "exclusion" would be debated following this vote.

BISHOP FANNIN: I hate to drag this out but I think what they hear is down to a certain sentence. Is that what you're asking for? And then where we made the division.

MAHLE: What we'll be voting on is the words that would be included "all persons shall be eligible to attend" and following down to the word "connection."

BISHOP FANNIN: All right.

MAHLE: Do you want me to read the whole thing?

*Conference Votes to Amend
Constitution Article 4*

BISHOP FANNIN: No I don't think we need to hear the whole matter. All right, it's properly before us. We followed our procedures. Only point of order. Are the yellow cards in the back a point of order? No more questions at this point. Only point of order. Thank

you. We're ready to vote. Recommendation from . . . we have divided the issue and the recommendation on the part mentioned by the chair that you have concurrence with that. You're recommending concurrence with an inclusion of the new wording. All right, if you . . . this is a constitutional matter. It will take two thirds vote. If you're ready to vote. When the light appears, if you concur with the committee 1, if you do not 2. All right you've concurred with the committee with a vote of [*Yes, 675; No, 248*].

MAHLE: I believe we need now to deal with the other part of this.

BISHOP FANNIN: The amendment is before us. All right. Would the maker of the amendment repeat the three words. They're just advising me that we need a little clarity on that. Mike 1.

MURPHY-GEISS (Yellowstone): To add the phrase in two places, the phrase is "sex, age, disability" after the word "status" in sentences 1 and 2. The first sentence and the last sentence of paragraph 4.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Do I hear a second—oh we had second to that already, so we're okay. Now the amendment is before us. We've divided the issue and we're dealing with the other part of the issue. Yes, right here, pink card, mike 2.

*Motion to Substitute "All Persons"
for Membership Eligibility List*

SHAWN HARTMAN (Central Pennsylvania): I apologize, but I'd like to offer a substitute amendment, please. With the listing of categories, I'd like to strike all the listing of categories so it would just read "all persons." If I have a second I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, you have a second.

HARTMAN: I believe that this wording is not inclusive of all persons and that if we simply say "all persons" we mean "all persons." This list is not conclusive and not extensive enough to cover what it is we're trying to say. This substitute will allow us to affirm what we have decided, saying "all persons" are eligible.

BISHOP FANNIN: Okay, thank you. All right, the substitute is before us to remove the listing. Green card on my left, mike 4. Mike 4.

EDWARD A. KAIL (Iowa): Thank you, Bishop. I speak against the amend-

ment to replace the list with a term "persons."

BISHOP FANNIN: The substitute.

KAIL: The substitute.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right.

KAIL: This was an action that we took at one point last time in Denver. It was just a week later that I was reading some of the primary sources printed by a group called The Phineas Priesthood. This is a branch of extremist racist hate groups whose sole purpose is to kill, murder interracial couples. Their basis for doing that is to define all people of color as something other than persons. Usually I would agree with the logic of this move as being more inclusive.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

KAIL: However, I find there are some persons in this world who would take this laundry list as precisely those who are not persons and who do not deserve to live. I would rather have them named as included rather than be summarily dismissed.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, that's a statement against the substitute. All the way in the back, the yellow card all the way in the back, mike 8. We have 1 for and 1 against, now.

ULISES TORRES (New England): Bishop, thank you for recognizing me. I have a question. What does it mean "without regard," etc. Could somebody answer that?

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, turn to the chair.

MAHLE: I think the words "without regard" refer to any of these historic categories of exclusion. So when we affirmed this as a committee we wanted to continue to affirm what our church has stated in the past in terms of including people.

*"Without Regard"
Becomes Painful Language*

TORRES: In that case, may I offer a friendly amendment to the amendment that was a substitute amendment that was made recently. Because I feel that if somebody says without regard, that means that my race, my gender somehow is lesser than what may be called proper. And I'd like to offer this amendment. "Therefore all persons from all races, color, national origin, status etc."

BISHOP FANNIN: That was, that was, when we made the division, that was in the first part. Am I correct? That

was in the first part, so that is not properly before us. You could make a motion of reconsideration later. We are in the middle of this substitute at this moment.

TORRES: If you allow me to do this Bishop later, I'd like to be recognized.

BISHOP FANNIN: I hope to be able to recognize you. I can't promise you of course, but I hope to. All right, now we have 1 for and 1 against. I believe this gentlemen right here, pink, mike 2. This is on the substitute.

Question Whether Addition of "Sex" to List Permits Ordination of Homosexual Persons

JOEL S. GARRET (Western Pennsylvania): I need to ask a question, and depending on your answer, may request a further division of this question. In the last part of this amendment here "in The United Methodist Church no conference or other organizational unit of the church shall be structured so as to exclude any member or any constituent body of the church because of race, color national origin, status," the language that has been inserted there. My question is when we talk about an annual conference, an organizational unit of the church, are we talking about Order of Elder, Order of Deacon, Board of Ordained Ministry, any type of committee in the church. My concern is if we approve the amendment with the inclusion of these does that then nullify what we did yesterday in terms of the homosexual issue and by approving this constitutional amendment, the action of this body yesterday in regards to sexual orientation, does that then make that action that we made yesterday unconstitutional?

MAHLE: I'm not a bishop of the church. I would think that if we took this action and if it became part of the Constitution that might be the case.

GARRET: I would like to request then that

BISHOP FANNIN: I would think that, I would just add to that, that it does not say sexual orientation, I did not believe.

GARRET: I thought that she said, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

BISHOP FANNIN: No, sex.

GARRET: OK thank you very much.

BISHOP FANNIN: Am I correct.

MAHLE: However, I believe the substitute motion was to change to remove

the list from both places and to not have any kind of listing.

BISHOP FANNIN: That's correct, that's correct. The substitute is before us.

MAHLE: ..so that if ... that becomes a problem.

BISHOP FANNIN: OK mike 2.

GARRET: In light of the substitute I would request that we divide the question for that reason.

BISHOP FANNIN: And where would you like to divide.

GARRET: That we divide the question where we vote on the substitute on the first part in terms of all persons without regard to race, color, national origin, status, age, disability or sex, economic condition, that that be, that the amendment to the amendment be voted on, on that part and then we vote on it separately on the second part.

BISHOP FANNIN: You are saying you are willing to remove that list. The substitute said remove all the list.

GARRET: That's right, he's asking that we vote on just all persons. That all persons, that would be inclusive of everybody. Because of the impact that that amendment to the amendment might have, on the second part of this concerning the organization of our conferences and our church structure that we vote on that separately.

BISHOP FANNIN: I think that's in the first part. Let me check. I was correct, that is in the first part that you are talking about. We already clarified that and voted on it. What we have now is the amendment that is included, 3 statuses or whatever, sex, age, and disability. That's what we're talking about. The substitute would say persons there, rather than those, all persons, other than the three listed. That's where we are. All of this we have been talking about here is been reconsideration. We split the issue down to a certain point and what you're speaking of is in what we have already voted on. We're voting on the "all persons" in the second part. That's what the substitute does. All right, right here, pink card, right here, yes. Mike 1. Is that clear to the body. That's great. I've already recognized. A point of order. Mike 4, excuse me, just a second please. We divided the question, you must know exactly where we made the division, we clarified that and voted, now the second part is before us, yes.

RANDALL FLANAGAN (West Virginia): Bishop, I would ask that you would rule the substitute out of order because it was intended to be in a part that has already been approved by this body and the wording of all persons makes no sense if you look at the sentence. I would ask that you rule the substitute out of order.

BISHOP FANNIN: Certainly it is out of order if it is referring to the first part. It is not out of order if it is referring to the second part. Maker of the motion, what were you referring to. Make the substitute. Yes, what you have to do is clarify for us by putting a period in and restating, you know, to make it sound correct.

SHAWN HARTMAN: My understanding was what we were doing was considering actually, the second sentence of the amendment that says "all persons" and that list, right there, striking that list, not the latter list that is listed at the bottom.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. We've already voted on that first list you're referring to.

HARTMAN: No, I though we separated out those two lists. That was my understanding as we separate out the lists to consider those separately.

BISHOP FANNIN: We separated it out to a particular point, which went down to connect it, I think.

MAHLE: Bishop, if I could read what we just approved, I think this would help us.

BISHOP FANNIN: You were very clear, yes.

MAHLE: We approved: "all persons shall be eligible to attend its worship services, participate in its programs, receive the sacraments. Upon Baptism, be admitted as baptized members and upon taking vows, declaring the Christian faith, become professing members in any local church in the connection." We did not take action on the first list nor the second list.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, the piece out of the middle, you're saying?

MAHLE: Right. Beginning with the words, "without regard to," we did not vote on.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Well, that really splits it. You have the first part then, is what they're saying, and then we took a section out, and then we have the second part. All right. The substitute then, is in order. That's the un-

derstanding of what the committee presented in the first motion. Mike 2.

HARTMAN: With the concerns raised, I will accept as a friendly to remove the first list and leave in the second list.

BISHOP FANNIN: The amended list?

HARTMAN: Correct.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, he's accepted to remove and add "all persons"—is that correct?—in the first list and keep the second list in the amendment.

MAHLE: I believe, if I could, I'm going to say "no" to what he wants to do, but if I could just clarify what he wants to do. He really needs to move to delete the words "without."

BISHOP FANNIN: That's correct, delete. Right, correct. All right, now, we're not going to, you know, we need to vote on this matter. We've got to go back to mike 1. But I just want to make it clear that what the substitute has accepted, now, it really isn't your privilege to change that first substitute motion. That belongs to the house once we start. So you have basically said both lists would indicate "all persons" rather than any listing. All right. Now that's where we are and that's the first substitute, that is in order according to the chair of the committee and I believe it is in order. Mike 1. We're now talking about the substitute.

BYRD L. BONNER (Southwest Texas): Thank you, Bishop. I chaired the subcommittee on constitution, and we spent a good bit of time in legislative committee on this specific issue. Not only in the constitution subcommittee but in the legislative committee on the whole. Shawn, I appreciate the spirit of your substitute. And there are many in our legislative committee who appreciated that spirit. If only we were to the place where we could not have a list. I think it's important, especially in our Constitution, for us to acknowledge, and to realize that we have not behaved ourselves in a way, or lived out the Gospel, in such a way as to allow us to be at the place where we can do away with the lists and just say, "all persons." The lists are necessary; especially in the second, in the last sentence, are necessary for legal reasons that have come before the Judicial Council and before our church . . .

BISHOP FANNIN: Sum up.

BONNER: . . . that speak to the way that we structure ourselves. Again, I

think its important for us to search all that we've been about here, these two weeks, and for us to understand and to acknowledge that we are not to that point and that our Constitution, above all, must overtly state that we will not exclude these persons. So I speak against the substitute.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we have one for and one against.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Point of order!

BISHOP FANNIN: Point of order. 1 for, 2 against, they've informed me. Mike 4, point of order.

GARNHART: Bishop, I do believe that there was someone who had the floor previously who was ruled out of order but with the corrected understanding, I believe that that person was in order and it was one of those persons who is directly affected by these categories. And I would wish to have that person honored. Unfortunately, I do not remember his name but he will.

BISHOP FANNIN: I remember. Thank you. He's standing there now. Could you come to mike 8. Thank you for that important remembrance.

ULISES TORRES (New England): Thank you, Bishop. My profound concern with the word "without regard" is that we will continue to perpetrate the notion that people from other races, cultures, colors, etc., are lesser than what we may consider the norm. And I feel left out with this kind of language. I do not have at this moment, because of the action taken, an appropriate way to say how to include it. But we continue to do the same thing. Darker races are lesser. That's . . . we need to say, without regard. It's a very paternalistic way of looking at all persons.

BISHOP FANNIN: Now, are you saying that you're in favor of the substitute? To list all, to say "all persons" rather than the list?

TORRES: I am in favor of doing something more positive. There are no basis for sameness in the whole of creation and I would like to say, "All persons from all races, colors, national origin, etc," because we need all of us.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Thank you. I'm going to recognize that as a courtesy from the chair, cause we had asked him to be seated. I have room for one more for the substitute. Back in the back, orange card. No. At mike 7. We have someone coming to mike 7.

MARK FENSTERMACHER (North Indiana): Let our yes be yes. Let our no be no. "All persons" should mean all persons. There is no list that we can devise that will not leave out some group or persons. And so I speak on behalf of the amendment . . . substitute.

BISHOP FANNIN: Ready to vote? Yes. I think we're ready to vote and this is a point of order question. All right, point of order, pink card here, mike 4.

JOY J. MOORE (West Michigan): I'm going to need some help here, Bishop—but I think I heard the courtesy that you were just lending saying that he needed a way to offer the words to get what he was trying to get at. I don't know if you can . . . I don't think we can add another substitute. So what I want to do is offer those words. It is support . . . I think it would be support of the amendment, but it would be another sentence that would allow the list to be there clearly and answer what his concern is. I don't know if I need to ask for an extension of the rules to be able to read this, but I think that this would answer what his concern is.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. We are in agreement up here that what you would do, you would want to perfect the amendment, if that's the case, when we finish with the substitute, but the substitute could become the amendment. So I need you to keep that in mind, but we must deal with the substitute. If you are ready to vote, if you would stay near mike 4 if that happens, and is that a point of order in the back? All right. Mike 8, and we need to move ahead. We knew that this would be an extended discussion. This is very important. Mike 8.

DANIEL IVEY-SOTO (New Mexico): I don't want to belabor this or extend this much more, but I'm a little confused and I need a little clarity before we vote. As the substitute currently stands, are we voting on taking out both lists?

BISHOP FANNIN: That is correct.

IVEY-SOTO: And in light that understanding there was a delegate a few minutes ago who made a motion to divide the question between the first list which some of us will be willing to support, and the second list which seems to be dealt with yesterday. And because we weren't sure which list we were dealing with, that delegate was told that there was no question to be divided. It seems to me that there is a question to divide, and I would ask the

chair before we vote on the whole thing if first we could put the question on division before the first list and the second to the body. Because I think there is a substantial difference between the impact of the first and the second.

BISHOP FANNIN: And I appreciate what you are saying. However, the maker of the motion to divide said we would divide it so these inclusive issues might be separated from what we've already passed. So the list from the very beginning . . . We excluded . . . It was my understanding to begin that we divided it in the middle, but however, we took out a section and both lists of inclusiveness were left in, and very clear, in the motion to divide. OK, if one more point. Mike 8, and then we'll have to move on.

FENSTERMACHER: And, Bishop, excuse me but there was a second person who got up about two minutes ago and tried to make another motion to divide, and that's the one that I am referring to divide out between the first and the second list.

*Conference Votes to Keep
Lists of Membership Eligibility
in Constitution*

BISHOP FANNIN: I understand, and I appreciate that. The point I am trying to make . . . You need to vote up or down the substitute and then we can move on to any further division or working to perfect the amendment. Is the house in agreement? All right. Let's vote. That would be the substitute which removes listings and includes all persons in both of the areas where there is a list. Is that correct? All right. Vote when the light appears. 1 if you agree with the substitute; 2 if you disagree. The substitute is defeated. [Yes, 358; No, 558]. Now we're back on the amendment which includes "sex, age, and disability." Is that correct? OK. All right, we're ready to perfect or have our speeches. Mike 4.

*Motion Made to Use Positive, Inclusive
Language*

MOORE: Again, I may need some help in clarifying these words. I don't know if it should be one sentence or two, but it would be a sentence that states what we feel. So I would amend, "The United Methodist recognizes humanity as created in the image of God, inclusive of all persons from any race, color, national origin, status, sex, age,

disability, or economic condition." Can I have a second?

BISHOP FANNIN: We have a second.

MOORE: I believe that would give the list we made. Obviously, in our culture, we may need to add others, but it is the list that we have been presently working with with the additions asked for. But it changes the words from "with regard" "with no regard" to "from" and it says a statement for how we as a church are feeling, rather than simply saying, "We do this" or "We don't do this." We are saying why: because we recognize all persons as human beings created in the image of God.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Before you leave the mike that is a substitute amendment, and what you need to do for the amendment . . . what you need to do is repeat that one more time and make sure we have a copy.

MOORE: OK. We're getting the copy. "The United Methodist Church recognizes humanity as created in the image of God, inclusive of all persons from any race, color, national origin, status, sex, age, disability, or economic condition."

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Thank you. That is properly before us, substitute for the amendment. Green card on my left, and then if the person with the yellow in the back would move toward the mike. Mike 4.

WILLIAM HINES (West Ohio): Bishop, are we at the basis talking about baptized or professing member of any constituent body of the church.

BISHOP FANNIN: Madame Chair.

MAHLE: I believe we are talking about all people.

BISHOP FANNIN: I guess that's inclusive of both. All right. Mike 8.

LUCILLE VANZANT (Oklahoma): I am glad to see that this General Conference is coming out of the area of making everybody generic. My name is Lucille. I have been called Annie, sister, hey that fat, black woman. Let's be specific in using the words of the people we need. Get out of the generic area of what God wants, and let us name people by people.

BISHOP FANNIN: So that's one for. Pink card on my right. Pink card on my right. That was for the substitute. Mike 1.

*Motion to Add "Sex, Age, Disability" to
Eligibility List for Membership*

GAIL MURPHY-GEISS (Yellowstone): I speak for this new wording. I offer a friendly amendment because we are missing some words here. After "economic condition", I think we also need to add "all of whom." So that it would say, "national origin, status, sex, da da da . . . economic condition all of whom shall be eligible to attend," etc.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Is that a friendly amendment? Yes, that has been accepted. That's OK with the house. All right. I'll recognize the green card here on my left. And would the maker of the amendment—are you friendly enough to accept the substitute? OK. We'll talk about that in a minute. Mike 2.

JAMES A. HARNISH (Florida): Bishop, would a motion be in order to suspend the rules to move the previous question on all that's before us?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes, that would be in order.

HARNISH: Yes. I move that we suspend the rules in order to move the previous question on all that's before us. We've got more fish than this to fry.

(Laughter)

BISHOP FANNIN: That's good. I'd like some of that fish right now.

(Laughter)

HARNISH: That's not in order?

BISHOP FANNIN: That's in order. Do you need to speak to it? No. It's non-debatable. All right, the question's been called, and that would be the substitute amendment, which you've heard now, and the friendly acceptance of the addition. Are we ready to vote? First, on to suspend the rules—to call the question, excuse me. All right, if you would suspend the rules for the purpose of calling the question, would you vote yes 1, no 2. [Yes, 850; No, 49]. Now, if you'll call the question, vote yes; if not, 2.

MAHLE: Bishop, do I have an opportunity to speak?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes. Just a minute. I'm going to call the question. If you call the question, vote 1; if you do not, 2. [Yes, 858; No, 32] All right, you have called the question. I call on the chair.

MAHLE: Bishop, as you and General Conference delegates, as you have heard from Mr. Bonner, we spent many

hours both in subcommittee and in our legislative committee discussing this issue. And we voted to affirm the historic position of the Constitution.

BISHOP FANNIN: OK. All right. What they're requesting now, here, that we hear what has been finalized in this last amendment. Now, we're looking at the amendment to the amendment. So, do we have the wording, Ms. Marshall?

CAROLYN MARSHALL: All right. "The United Methodist Church recognizes humanity as created in the image of God, inclusive of all persons from any race, color, national origin, status, sex, disability, or economic condition, all of whom shall be eligible to attend its worship services," etc.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, that's what they have up front here as the official . . . Point of order. Mike 2.

JOEL S. GARRETT (Western Pennsylvania): I would just like to hear, how will Paragraph 4 sound? How's it going to sound the whole way through?

BISHOP FANNIN: You want the whole paragraph read?

GARRETT: How will the whole paragraph sound? I'd like to hear that before we vote.

BISHOP FANNIN: That was—we've already approved, and, this amendment to the amendment. Is that right? Is the body not clear on this? I think we need to vote. All right, I think we need to vote. You're voting on the amendment to the amendment, which would include . . . Point of order, mike 7.

DARLINE D. BALM-DEMME (Iowa): I didn't hear the word *age* included when the secretary read the motion, which was read on the floor.

MARSHALL: It is in the motion, and unless I skipped over it, it's here, it reads—

BISHOP FANNIN: It is—we have that in the motion. All right. Point of order? All right, mike 4. I'm going to take a vote. Get ready.

ULF RICKARSSON (Sweden) I'm not clear what this amendment would replace. If we accept this amendment, does that mean that we then delete the first sentence, "The United Methodist Church acknowledges that all persons are of sacred worth"?

BISHOP FANNIN: We'll turn to the chair to clarify that.

MAHLE: My understanding of that amendment from Joy Moore was that

the sentence—sentences—would be replaced. Is that right?

BISHOP FANNIN: I think, I think to clarify this most important matter, could . . . we're going to read this Paragraph 4 in its entirety.

MAHLE: And I believe that the Secretary has that information.

BISHOP FANNIN: That's correct. Can we have Paragraph 4, including the amendment to the amendment? Listen carefully.

MARSHALL: All right. We're going to try it. We may have to listen to verbatim transcription when we get to the end of this, but let's try. "The United Methodist Church acknowledges that all persons are of sacred worth." Now . . .

BISHOP FANNIN: They're, they're questioning about starting from the very—how it would sound from the very beginning.

MARSHALL: From where?

BISHOP FANNIN: Paragraph 4.

(Pause)

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes, just a moment. Just, wait a minute because we're researching that we have it clear as well. Hang tight. We've got some very important things coming next. I think the maker of the motion—would you go to mike 4 please and take us through the *Discipline*, from the very top, on ¶4, how your amendment to the amendment would read in the context of the *Discipline*. The whole thing.

MOORE: I know you believe you understand what you think I said, but I'm not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.

(Laughter)

BISHOP FANNIN: I think you just summed everything up for us.

(Laughter)

MOORE: Now I need to find the exact paragraph. There. Nope.

MAHLE: It's on p. 22.

BISHOP FANNIN: Page 22, they're saying.

MOORE: All right. The, therefore, therefore, "Therefore all persons without regard." Okay, that's not what it said in mine. The sentence that you just read "The United Methodist Church recognizes all persons as of sacred worth." Then I said, "The United Methodist Church recognizes" again and if

the house would allow it, I would say, "The body of Christ recognizes humanity" or "We recognize humanity."

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, we have to say what you say. "The body of Christ recognizes—"

MOORE: "The body of Christ recognizes humanity as created in the image of God, inclusive of all persons from any race, color, national origin, status, sex, age, disability, or economic condition, all whom..," whatever the friendly amendment said.

MAHLE: Bishop, we did not have the first sentence of the article before us.

Constitution Amendment Referred Back to Legislative Committee

MOORE: Exactly, exactly, and that was, that is why both sentences begin "The United Methodist Church recognizes." And so what we need to do is not start two sentences with the same word. That's editorial. I don't think that that disturbs what we're doing here.

BISHOP FANNIN: I believe that . . . wait just a minute. This is extremely important legislation. It's at the very heart of who we are. It's constitutional in nature. I would, as a Chair, entertain a motion to refer this back to the legislative committee and then let them bring to us, in consultation with these persons that are making the amendments, the wording because apparently we're on two different tracks here.

JIM EHRMAN (East Ohio): Bishop? Bishop?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes, I've got a hand back there in the back. Orange card, mike 7.

EHRMAN: Bishop, I move that we refer this matter back to the committee. We have now suffered through living proof of why a constitution should not be amended from the floor without careful study. And so I move that we refer this back to the committee.

(Applause)

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Do I hear a second? All right. All right. If you would refer, would you vote yes, if not, no, when the light appears? You have referred—[*Yes, 792; No, 96*] Thank you. We realize this would be a very important discussion.

MAHLE: I'm going to try another one. This is found on p. 2240, Item 1546. This refers to Petition 30808 in the *Advance DCA*, p. 706. The committee voted concurrence on this petition, which

would add a new Article 5 after the Article 4 that we've been currently working on, and then renumbering the rest of the articles. You will note that there is an error in the original printing on p. 706 in line 7. After the word *and* please add the word *marginalization*. This was added in the errata page that we received in the original DCA. The committee affirms the statement made in this petition, especially in light of the worship service and the discussions that we have had on this floor. I move concurrence.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, it's properly before us. All right, seeing no cards, if you would approve concurrence with the committee, vote yes; if not, no, when the light appears. This is two-thirds because it's constitutional. All right, you have approved—[*Yes, 831; No, 45*] We have an order of the day. I appreciate it and we'll pick up here this afternoon.

MAHLE: I'm going to speak for Chris and I guess our legislative committee needs to reconvene at noon.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, the legislative committee in your room at noon. Do you want any of the persons that made the amendments to be there for consultation? Madame Chair, do you want anybody there for consultation?

HARMAN: Bishop, I think that we could probably handle that with the executive team and with the leader of the subcommittee and with Joy Moore. Any other persons are certainly invited, but I think that is the critical group of individuals that need to be a part of this.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, thank you. We're just trying to move our work along. Thank you very much for that report. I don't want you to get carried away with this next item. I mean no screaming, yelling, and saying "Thank the Lord," and all of that, but we're going to recognize a very special group of people. My colleagues over the past eight years and part of a wonderful group of caring, loving, dynamic Christian leaders. I call on Sharon Rader, Bishop Rader, to come forward as the secretary of the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church.

Task of Superintending Resides with Bishops and District Superintendents

BISHOP SHARON RADER (Wisconsin): Dear friends: In Chapter 3 of *The Book of Discipline*, which is called "The Superintendency," paragraph 401 says

in part, "The task of superintending in The United Methodist Church resides in the office of bishop and extends to the district superintendents, with each possessing distinct and collegial responsibilities. The mission of the Church is to make disciples of Jesus Christ. From apostolic times, certain ordained persons have been entrusted with the particular tasks of superintending. The purpose of superintending is to equip the Church in its disciple-making ministry. Those who superintend carry primary responsibility for ordering the life of the Church. It is their task to enable the gathered Church to worship and to evangelize faithfully.

"It is also their task to facilitate the initiation of structures and strategies for the equipping of Christian people for service in the Church and in the world in the name of Jesus Christ and to help extend the service in mission. It is their task, as well, to see that all matters, temporal and spiritual, are administered in a manner that acknowledges the ways and the insights of the world critically and with understanding while remaining cognizant of and faithful to the mandate of the Church. The formal leadership in The United Methodist Church, located in the superintending offices, is an integral part of the system of an itinerant ministry."

Retiring Bishops Recognized

Each quadrennium we come to a moment when we must acknowledge that some members of the Council of Bishops are either reaching mandatory retirement or are seeking voluntary retirement. And it is our privilege this day to recognize and to acknowledge those persons who will be retiring. I'm going to introduce them to you and ask that they come and stand before you at this General Conference.

I'm going to begin with our Elders and introduce them by classes in which they were introduced. First of all from the class of 1980: Melvin George Talbert, (*applause*) George Willis Bashore (*applause*). Let's hold the applause and I'll read them all and then you can give our applause for all of them. Emerito Nacpil, Arthur F. Kulah. From the class of 1984: J. Woodrow Hearn; Roy I. Sano; Robert C. Morgan; Judith Craig. From the class of 1988: Richard Carl Looney; Dan E. Solomon; Moisés Domingos Fernandes was retired in 1999. From the class of 1992: Joe Allen Wilson; Raymond Harold Owen;

Donald Arthur Ott; Marshall Leroy Meadors, Jr; Charles Wesley Jordan. From the class of 1996: Daniel Castillo Arichea, Jr. And there is one other bishop who is actually elected in the class of 1968—and who was pressed back into service during this last quadrennium— Paul L.A. Granadosin, he is retiring yet again. These are the bishops of the church who intend to retire with this Jurisdictional or Central Conference time. Let us greet them.

(*Sustained applause*)

BISHOP FANNIN: Well, I tried not to let him retire but he says he must. So there is one other that needs to join the group, and that is Bishop Emilio J. M. de Carvalho. (*Applause*) I would remind you of just one other thing, and I would remind my colleagues, that a retired bishop is a bishop of the Church, according to our *Discipline*, in every respect and continues to function as a member of the Council of Bishops, in accordance with the Constitution and with other provisions of the *Discipline*. They do not cease to be bishops because they are retired. They continue to work with us on the Council of Bishops and to that we are very grateful. They will continue to lead the Church. Thank you. Bishop de Carvalho would like to introduce, would like to speak to you as the longest serving bishop in his class.

BISHOP EMILIO J.M. DE CARVALHO (Western Angola Area): Thank you Bishop Fannin, delegates to the General Conference. I am supposed to be the longest active serving bishop in the United Methodist Church in the world. *In the world.* (*Applause*) I was elected in 1972, 1972, serving this Church for the last 28 years, myself and my wife Marilena, who is sitting over there, please. (*applause*) As you can see we are not going back to the shelf. We'll continue to serve this church as long as we live. Thank you very much for your support, for your prayers and I speak on behalf of my colleagues who are also retiring this year that we will continue to be at your disposal, at disposal of the Church of Jesus Christ. Thank you very much. (*applause*)

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, would you please be seated? Bishop Raymond Owen from the San Antonio Area had to leave early, personal matters, but Bishop Owen is also retiring at the end of this quadrennium. (*Applause*) We have two matters that must be dealt with and so I quickly call to the podium Bishop Bolleter for report on the Cen-

tral Conferences. Two items to consider.

Commission on Central Conference Affairs Celebrates Thirtieth Anniversary

BISHOP HEINRICH BOLLETER (Central and Southern Europe Area): Thank you Bishop. First of all, I would like to invite the Chair of the Conference to celebrate, with the Commission on Central Conference Affairs on the 30th anniversary of this commission. For those who are not familiar with the history, this commission came out of a process of the so-called Cosmos (Commission on the Structure of Methodism Overseas) and since the commission was the instrument to make the voices of the Central Conferences heard and to make the Church more global.

BISHOP FANNIN: We celebrate with you. That's a great, great anniversary.

(Applause)

Bishop Calls for General Conference Assistance in Congolese War

BISHOP HEINRICH BOLLETER: The vice chair of the committee is Bishop Omena Fama from Congo, and the secretary Marilyn Outslay from the Oregon-Idaho Annual Conference.

The first Calendar Item we have to deal with is Calendar Item 461, on p. 1978, it is petition 31205. The page in the *Advance DCA* is 1150. *(Pause)* This resolution is asking the General Conference to give lead in finding solutions to stop the war and aide financially to the Congo United Methodist Church. To care for the refugees and also that the secretary of the General Conference send two petitions, very short petitions, to the mentioned authorities. We have amended this petition and I want to remind you that the text is almost parallel to the resolutions we had on the floor yesterday, here. So, we move, from the committee, referral to the General Board of Global Ministries for further reflection and action and also to the General Board of Church Society.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, this is a motion of referral.

BISHOP BOLLETER: The referral as amended.

Petition on Congo Referred to GBCS

BISHOP FANNIN: As amended, 461. All right, any questions? All right, vote when the light appears. One if you refer, two if you do not. *(Pause)* All right,

the matter has been referred, *[Yes, 814; No, 11]*

Request Made for Three Additional Philippine Episcopal Areas

BISHOP BOLLETER: The second item is Item 1280 on p. 2147, it is petition 31991, on p. 1886. The title of the petition, is a little bit misleading. Three new episcopal areas added to the Philippines is the request, but they are asking for at least one. In the context of former daily deliberations they mentioned the three, but they are asking momentarily for at least one. The committee recommends referral back to the College of Bishops in the Philippines and the respective Central Conference. We had no basic information about the issue in the committee, that was one thing, and the second thing is that the sender of the resolution is not the Central Conference, but one of the organizational bodies of the Central Conference and its not clear if the Central Conference has taken a new decision about that and I..we thought it cannot be only relied on the formerly-taken decision in the Central Conference there. So, we voted referral back to the College of Bishops in the Philippines and the respective Central Conference.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, it's probably before referral to the College of Bishops in the Philippines. We got a card on the back, mike 5. This is a matter of referral.

MAXIMINO T. MAREGMEN (Visayas-Philippines): Is it improper Bishop, to make a motion to amend by substitution this time? For this matter?

BISHOP FANNIN: We're referring this matter for consideration. I think that you would have to speak to "referral" or "not to refer."

MAREGMEN: So, we're going..we cannot make a need to amend by substitution?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes, nice try. Yes.

MAREGMEN: Okay, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: Is there a second to..well, let's hear your substitute first.

MAREGMEN: I move to amend the recommendation that instead of three, only one bishop is being requested and she is last, he will be assigned in the Visayan Islands where United Methodist Church work is growing and need to be supervised and therefore its financial implications to GCFA. If there is a second, I would like to speak on it.

Substitute Motion for One New Philippine Missionary Bishop and Referral to GCFA

BISHOP FANNIN: So you're saying not to refer this matter, but to substitute it with one new episcopal area and also refer to GCFA for financial consideration?

MAREGMEN: Yes, I would like to speak, Bishop.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, do we have a second? We have a second. All right.

MAREGMEN: Visayas Philippines is barely four years old: it has three districts, 44 local churches, 42 are new, small and under 10 years old. 47 clergy members with 9 elders. In 1984, there is only one United Methodist Church in the area. Visayas Islands are located in the central part of the Philippines. There are over 14 million people. The task is huge and great. Therefore, the United Methodist Church work in the Visayas is missionary and it needs to grow and be supervised. A missionary bishop assigned there would be a ..a missionary bishop assigned there would hasten the church growth. Please give us another bishop to shepherd us. Thank you.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we have a substitute before us to form a new area in the area described. There any discussion around the substitute? All right, a green card over here, mike 4. No, I'm sorry the gentleman in the back. Yes, yes, you.

BENONI R. SILVA-NETTO (California-Nevada): Bishop and members of the Conference, we are all for support here for the growth of Methodism in the Philippines but the question right now is the proper procedure to go about it. Do we know that the Central Conference and the Philippines are supportive of this, and what are the financial implications of all of this if you approve it? So, I'm for referral.

BISHOP FANNIN: You're for a referral. All right. With that one and one, do we have any further discussion? Oh, excuse me, question, mike 2. Mike 2.

DEBORAH L. PRITTS (North Central New York): I have a question Bishop Fannin. I have been looking at the Constitution, specifically Article 4, paragraph 15, which refers to the duties of the General Conference. I'm having difficulty finding there any language that would help us to understand that the

General Conference has the ability to deal with this matter under consideration. Would someone be able to help us with a ruling on whether this is properly before us?

BISHOP FANNIN: Yes that's correct. What we're saying here is that it went through the proper channels, the Central Conferences, they came forward with a motion to refer. The General Conference now has taken ownership of that and has an amendment before it. So we followed the procedures, we're just not following the recommendations, if you vote for the amendment. All right, now we have one for and one against. All the way in the back, the yellow card in the back, mike 8.

GERARDO SAMSON (Bulacan Philippines): Bishop, my name is Gerardo Samson.

BISHOP FANNIN: Are you for or against the substitute?

SAMSON: I would just want to make it clear that what the resolution, the motion, was asking for was not for an Episcopal Area, but merely to ask for a missionary bishop for Visayas Island, which is not an Episcopal Area, so I am against the referral.

BISHOP FANNIN: You're against the substitute? All right, we need one for the substitute. The yellow card back here has been standing a long time, right. Mike 8. What happened to my speaker. Mike 6.

NOE VALDERAMA (North-West Mindanao, Philippines): I am speaking for the amendment. Bishop, the two Filipinos who spoke beforehand do not belong to the Davao Episcopal area. And the one who made the amendment, and I myself, have been serving in Davao Episcopal area which contains two main islands in the whole Philippines. In the Luzon we have two bishops, but in Davao Episcopal area which consists of Mindanao and Cebu, which is a large area to travel, to visit, to administer. In the previous experience bishops have a hard time to do these tasks. And besides this new missionary area of the Davao Episcopal area which calls for a leader who would really concentrate on the huge task in missioning the Visayas area.

BISHOP FANNIN: You need to sum up.

VALDERAMA: And as such bishop, I support the amendment to the motion.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we need to vote now. You understand the com-

mission has suggested referral to the College of Bishops. We have a substitute to that that says a particular area, and you've heard the testimonies to that area. You ready to vote? I know the Chair speaks, but are we having a point of order? Point of order, mike 1.

JULIUS ARCHIBALD, JR. (Troy): I have a question, Bishop. If we refer this, does that mean that they cannot establish a new episcopal area for four more years?

BISHOP FANNIN: The question is does this delay the formation of a new area for four years if we refer?

BISHOP BOLLETER: Basically, yes.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we have it. The answer to that question. Ready to vote. If you support the substitute which names a particular area... You want to speak to it further? You have another chance to speak from the commission from referral.

BISHOP BOLLETER: We think that the question came not in a properly way before us and it was sent by the Central Conference Coordinating Council and we had no word from the Episcopal College about it. We are not sure if the Central Conference today, the last decision was made in 1992 of the Central Conference, if the Central Conference of the Philippines is today willing to agree with this proposal, so we sent it back to get a very clear proposal through the proper channels to the Commission on Central Conference Affairs.

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, let us vote. If you support the substitute, which names a particular area, vote 1; if you do not, vote 2. The substitute fails. [Yes, 351; No, 497]. Now the motion for referral is before us. Are we ready to vote? Is that a point of order? All right, mike 5, point of order.

BENER B. AGTARAP (Philippines): I rise for a point of order. That is clarify and correct the statement made by the chairperson of the committee. Specifically, statement no. 2. I would like to correct the second reason stated by the chairperson of the reason why the committee decided to refer this petition to the Philippines Central Conference. I would like to say that this petition was acted officially by the Coordinating Council of the Philippines Central Conference and that the Coordinating Council is the interim body of the Philippines Central Conference while the Philippines Central Conference is not

in session. In other words, this petition is the official position of the Philippines Central Conference.

*New Philippines Episcopal Area
Referred to Philippines College of Bishops*

BISHOP FANNIN: All right, we have that information. If you would refer this matter to the College of Bishops in the Philippines, you would vote yes; if you would not, you vote no. All right, it has been referred by [Yes, 666; No, 196].

BISHOP BOLLETER: This concludes our business.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you very much. We have two quick items. I know our time is up. 12:15 was our adjournment time. I want to call on Carolyn Marshall, the secretary of General Conference, to recognize the wonderful staff that she has working with her. Ms. Marshall has done a tremendous job. Tremendous!

(applause)

Introduction of Secretary's Staff

CAROLYN MARSHALL: There are two arenas in which appreciation should be expressed. The first one is to all of you because you have been more than willing to forgive mistakes when they happened in the very beginning. And you have been very kind and gracious in the ways in which you have related to all of us, and for that we are deeply appreciative. Any appreciation which you have expressed to the general conference secretary, in reality should go to the staff because they're the ones that make things happen.

And so it is with gratitude to each one of them that I introduce them to you.

John Ross Thompson has been on the laptop at my immediate right and has a wonderful calming way of keeping me straight. John. *(applause)* Millie Hilts-Kowen is our office manager. This probably the first time that she has seen the arena, except on TV, down in the office. *(applause)* You have met Gerry Reist daily, sometimes more than once a day, as the coordinator of calendar. *(applause)* John Brawn is the brain behind the PETS system and all of our petitions, and we're grateful to him. *(applause)* Working with him on that staff is Gary Graves. *(applause)* Early on in General Conference we made mention of the fact that Preston Price, who is a member of the staff and who was working on some coordination on the computers here, was called away from

the conference because of the death of his father. And when one says yes to Christian service, one never knows where one is going to be called. Quinn O'Bannon came here from Louisiana as a page; he ended up full-time on our staff. *(applause)* And in the process of our debriefing the other evening, Gary made mention of the fact that this was *déjà vu*, because that's how he got here a couple of conferences ago. Dalilah Cruz is also a member of our staff, has done wonderful work downstairs and then also this week, and particularly after Preston had to leave, has worked on the stage with the computers here. *(applause)* Mim Porterfield accompanied her spouse as a member of the delegation of which I'm a member, South Indiana, but she didn't get to sit and watch. We have put her to work for the second General Conference, and we're grateful to Mim for so doing. Lindy Loresco has done everything and everything. That's not duplication; that's said intentionally. Lindy's been wonderful. *(applause)* And if some of you think that we pay no attention to those attendance sheets that you fill out, and that it's just so much paper that gets recycled you hope, let me say to you that that's one of the responsibilities of the staff and Lindy and Mim have worked very hard with those. We appreciate the ways in which you have responded and have kept track of the rules and have followed them. Two other persons are really here as far as working with UCom, but they're in some ways adjunct members of the secretarial staff. They have done a lot of work as far as the web is concerned and with our computer concerns. And that's Susan Brumbaugh and her husband Randall Partin. *(applause)*

A little earlier today, you attempted to introduce and express appreciation to Jay Voorhees and he was someplace else in this building at that time, but he is here now and we said he belongs to all of us so let's make him a part of the secretarial staff.

(Applause)

*Rich Peck, DCA Editor,
Honored as He Retires*

Rich, would you come here, please. Many of you know Rich Peck, whether you know him to see him or whether you know him by that which he has done, across the years in the printed word. It has been my privilege to work with Rich across the several years that I

have had this responsibility. There's no one who is any more caring or any more concerned or any more dedicated or who gives more hours and will work around the clock if that's what it takes and he's had a few of those times, probably, for every General Conference but certainly, above and beyond for this one. We just recognized bishops who are retiring. Rich Peck is retiring and I have said to him, "I hate to think of a General Conference without Rich Peck on the DCA." But that time comes for all of us.

And so we want, Rich, to express appreciation to you and to let me read this to you so that all of us can affirm the service which you have given, and you're not quite through yet. "Presented to J. Richard Peck, on behalf of the General Conference of the people called United Methodist, we express our respect for your tireless and impressive work, our admiration for your spirit of cooperation and our thanksgiving for your commitment to the mission of the Church in producing the *Daily Christian Advocate*, 1988, 1992, 1996 and 2000." Signed William B. Oden, President of the Council of Bishops, Carolyn Ann Marshall, Secretary of the General Conference, Neil M. Alexander, President and Publisher, the United Methodist Publishing House.

(Applause)

And with your applause for Rich and for all the staff, let me say again, a word of our appreciation to each of you. We affirm you for who you are and the ways in which you express your commitment. My appreciation personally to the staff and all of our appreciation to all of you.

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you, thank you, deeply. I want to personally thank all of you for being supportive of the chair today. I appreciate you being supportive of the chair. They're still talking to me in one ear or the other. You might want to be seated just a second. It won't be long. You heard that before? Well, you're lucky, I didn't tell any of my stories out of compassion for all of you. No applause necessary.

All right, I'm going to turn to Carolyn Marshall for some items and then I'm going to call upon Bishop John Hopkins of the Minnesota area. You may think bishops are kind of, you know, stick-in-the-mud or whatever you want to say. But John Hopkins has just formed a Rock and Roll Hall of Fame

band from the Council of Bishops. It sounds like a good Salvation Army band but it's working out real well. So, I call on John Hopkins at the end of this time together. Carolyn?

MARSHALL: Bishop Fannin, would it be possible for Gary Bowen to introduce the business manager's staff prior to the announcements?

BISHOP FANNIN: All right. Gary?

*Conference Business Manager's Staff
Introduced*

GARY BOWEN (Conference Business Manager): I will be brief. Not because the staff didn't do a good job and worked hard but because it's near lunch and I understand. I'll call your names, and then if you'll come out. First, I have Steve Zekoff, who is the assistant business manager which means that he gets everything that's really tough to do and he's done a great job. Russell Ellenz Many of you that have had travel problems or hotel problems, Russell made certain that you got here and that you had a roof over your head. Gail McDougall I can't describe what she does. She's on the local committee. She volunteers. She does transportation. She helped in the technical area. She's helped get vendors. She's done everything and has done a wonderful job. Gail? If you just want to hold your applause to the end that'll make this go even faster. Merle Gleason, who's my assistant. Those of you who were in my office, perhaps met her. We gave her early release for good behavior. She's back in Evanston by now. Mark and Laura Wharff who are in charge of our pages and marshals, bring a wonderful spirit to it and have done it a number of times, kept me out of hot water lots of times. Mark and Laura? Jay, you don't have to come up here again. But he's also part of the business manager's. Come on Jay. Walk is good for him. Once again, I would not have survived without Jay. He has enormous knowledge of the General Conference and knows more than I'll ever know about producing this thing and he did, I mean to him goes the credit. And then John. I'm sorry, Peknik I just call him John, never really got that. John Peknik who is also on Gail's technical staff and he's done a tremendous job in the booth back there. So John, thank you. I'm just looking to see if there's anybody waiting and if I forgot anybody. I don't think I did. Thank you.

(Applause)

BISHOP FANNIN: Thank you for standing. We are still feeling that in two hours we could be back here at 2:30. Ms. Massey, is that agreeable? Do you think we'll be back here? All right, then the first announcement, we'll be back at 2:30. Now Ms. Marshall has some additional announcements. Ms. Secretary.

MARSHALL: The first one is that a letter was received that was passed to courtesies but it was after the time for introduction of those, from the president of the Republic of Macedonia. We simply want to acknowledge that greetings were received and a response will be sent from the General Conference.

This announcement will be made now and it will be made again and will be made again tonight. That is the announcement as far as the translation. This evening is the last session of the General Conference. Please remember to bring to the interpreter's booth your portable, individual headsets. Each unit costs \$500 and can only be used inside this plenary room. Please do not forget to return your headsets before you leave.

The full General Council on Finance and Administration will meet during the lunch recess in room R232 to deal with referrals that have been made since the publication of the reports in the DCA. No lunch will be served. You will have an opportunity to get your lunch after the meeting is completed.

(Laughter)

The comment up here was "good luck."

A reminder that the Korean Choir which we all appreciated so much this morning will be performing again this noon in the food court during the lunch hour and you'll probably want to avail yourselves of that opportunity.

And then Bishop Hopkins, as you bring our closing prayer, perhaps this prayer request might be incorporated and be a part of our thinking. Word has come from the Iowa delegation that several tornadoes have touched down in northeast Iowa, Waterloo, Cedar Falls and Black Hawk County. That completes the reading of the announcements.

BISHOP FANNIN: Am I correct that Cokesbury closes at 1:00 today? Some of you may have some items there or

something. My good friend, Bishop Hopkins.

BISHOP JOHN L. HOPKINS (Minnesota Area): Personal privilege before I bring the benediction is that as you elect your bishops during your jurisdictional conferences, the episcopal band could use a saxophone player.

(Laughter)

BISHOP FANNIN: They could use more than that, but not....

(Laughter)

BISHOP HOPKINS: When we came here we said that Christian conferencing was a means of grace and if you look around it certainly has. We're going to miss this gathering when we leave, believe it or not. We're also been reconciled to God through Jesus Christ and there's some reconciling that perhaps need to take place among us before we leave. We have two breaks for a meal. So as I give the closing benediction, I would like you to look around and think, is there anyone here I need to be reconciled with before I leave this place? And use the time that we have remaining that we might deal with that personal inner commitment that we have to follow Jesus Christ and be reconciled to one another. Let us pray.

O God, you have been so good to us. Your blessings have flowed to us before we arrived, during this place and will continue to go with us and we give you thanks for the means of grace and which as we come together as your people, your Spirit flows among us. We're mindful this day are those who have suffered great destruction where they live from natural disasters or from warfare. We ask your blessings and prayers upon the people of Iowa who are recovering this day from the tornado disaster. Refresh us during this mealtime. Let this be an opportunity to be reconciled with one another that we might reflect your love for us. And may that deep peace of God in Jesus Christ go with us. Amen.

BISHOP FANNIN: You are adjourned till 2:30.

Friday Afternoon May 12, 2000

(Bishop Woodrow J Hearn, presiding)

(Music, Singing, led by Cynthia Wilson; Hymn 698, "God of the Ages"; "Masiti Amen," from Global Praise I)

BISHOP J. WOODROW HEARN (Houston): I want to recognize Mollie Stewart, who is with the Commission on General Conference. Mollie, where are you? Thank you. Chair of the commission. Mollie?

MOLLIE STEWART (North Alabama): Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Podium microphone, please.

STEWART: Thank you, Bishop, to the Conference. It is my great honor and pleasure to introduce to you now, from the East Ohio Conference and the Host Committee, the Reverend Dr. Ken Chalker, who will now introduce his team.

(Applause)

*East Ohio Conference Host Committee
Recognized*

KENNETH CHALKER (East Ohio): Thank you, conference delegates, it has been a great privilege to be the chair of the Host Committee, and we are coming to the close, thank goodness, of a seven-year effort. I am deeply indebted to Bishop Boulton and Bishop Keaton for allowing me the opportunity to have this privilege and certainly also to extend my great appreciation to our Cleveland district superintendent, Julius Trimble.

This effort that we have been putting before you for the past two weeks could not have been possible without a tremendous amount of effort and enthusiastic volunteering. And I—we created in East Ohio a 27-division Host Committee that carried forth everything from transportation issues to hosting first-aid here in this hall, to all kinds of concerns relative to the bishops' reception and the wonderful evening we had at Severance Hall. And I would like to ask if the division chairpersons of my Host Committee would stand . . . those that are here.

(Applause)

Many of the persons that have been involved in this effort have, like Elvis, left the building, and had responsibilities for earlier parts of the program in the time together, and I am so deeply indebted to all of them. None of this

would have been possible also without the wonderful support of the Commission of General Conference, and certainly the super leadership of Mollie Stewart and Gary Bowen. It also would not have been possible without many, many thousands of East Ohio volunteers, that among other things prepared for all of us over one-quarter million cookies.

(Applause)

And present with us today is the Youngstown District that's hosting us and many of the volunteers that are in the room, who represent the literally thousands and thousands of people in East Ohio who have prepared for your coming, all of our coming, and I would like for all of my great volunteers to stand and be recognized.

(Applause, Cheers)

We had a number of goals as a Host Committee, one of which was that you would know something of the generous and wonderful support of East Ohio hospitality. And I am so grateful to all of these folks who have made that possible. We also very much wanted you to have a, for many of you, a different opinion of Cleveland, Ohio. And many of you have that now, and I am grateful.

(Applause)

And finally, I know that many of you have expressed—today, particularly—that it is indeed your deep desire to go home. And we would like to do all that we can to facilitate your desire.

(Applause)

BISHOP HEARN: Dr. Chalker, I think that the response of this Conference has indicated to you and to all of those who have worked with you our deep appreciation for the hospitality that we have received here, and all of us will remember fondly our experience of having the opportunity to have the General Conference in the year 2000 in Cleveland.

This morning when you adopted the calendar for today, you indicated by your action that this afternoon's session would first be devoted to the report of the General Council on Finance the Administration. This is according to Rule No. 5 in the Organization of the Conference. This council makes the report directly to the session of the General Conference. This afternoon I'm, I'm so amazed, I'm actually in awe myself, be-

cause for twenty-two years of his career, my father was the treasurer of the Louisiana Annual Conference. And so our house had a lot of inner involvement with the councils on finance and administration. All of the fifty years of my ministry, I've had council on finance and administration connections in our family and in my work. I think, this afternoon, that I'm feeling a presence. I think my daddy has gotten together a bunch of his saint buddies up in the heavenly places and said to them this afternoon, "My son's going to preside over the session of the General Conference considering the GCFA report." Now, I want to ask you to be as helpful to this bishop in the chair as you can so that this afternoon when we are finished, my daddy will turn to his saintly buddies and say, "Ol' boy did pretty good, didn't he?" So you help me, okay?

(Laughter, Applause)

So I'm appealing to you to help me in that spirit.

I'm going to turn now to the report that is to be given, but before I do that, let me make a few observations. First of all, the General Council on Finance and Administration is going to present its report in total, so that we have all of the information about the report before us. This will prevent us from asking questions about "how does this part add up to that part"; until we have the whole process before us, we'll not be able to answer those questions anyway. So their report will be presented to us in total.

Then we are aware that some of you, in your legislative committees, have taken action and are making recommendations to the General Conference that certain things be done that are different in a financial way from what is contained in the report of the General Council on Finance and Administration. I am asking that the legislative committee chairs be available to present to us any item that your committee has taken that affects the GCFA report at the time that we will be taking action upon this report. And the action of your legislative committee will be handled as an amendment to the GCFA report. I'm aware too that in some cases there are minority reports that are coming out of the legislative committees that also relate to the GCFA report. If the legislative chairperson will be sensitive as we are moving along and inform me at a proper point when we are in the ac-

tion process that there is a minority report that the house needs to hear, we will hear it at that time as an amendment to the report which is being brought to us by the Council on Finance and Administration.

What this means of course is, that we will use the Finance and Administration's report as the backbone of the foundation upon which we will do our discussion and decision making this afternoon, amending it wherever it seems appropriate to do so, and we will move forward in that fashion. I want to tell also the house that this is the item which you, by your own action, have established as the subject for this afternoon's business, and we will not do any other business until we have moved through the report for the GCFA.

I'm going to call now on Bishop Looney who is the president of the GCFA to make introduction of this report and to present those other people who will assist in presenting it to the Conference. Bishop Looney, welcome.

BISHOP RICHARD C. LOONEY (South Georgia): We ask first for suspension of the rules in order to distribute one sheet of paper that was necessitated by your action, just before lunch.

BISHOP HEARN: If you will suspend the rules for this distribution being made, vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 791; No, 8]* I'm going to interpret that as a vote to suspend the rules and also to authorize the distribution of the material.

GCFA Gives Final Report

BISHOP LOONEY: It's a joy to bring to you this report this afternoon. I would like to begin by thanking you for your marvelous response to a rather risky action we took four years ago. In responding to the plea of annual conferences for some breathing room so they could do a better job on paying the apportionments you have increased the percentage of payments in each year of this quadrennium and it looks like you're on the way to doing it in the fourth. This has made available to the agencies of the general church, several million dollars that was not anticipated. So we thank you for that good work.

Now I might add, that we have tried to follow something of the same philosophy in this year. You have been excited about many ministries and you have complicated that work. But we

think our staff and directors have worked, I've started to say, a minor miracle but, I will say, a major miracle, in bringing you a budget that incorporates a good bit of what you have been enthusiastic about and at the same time some care in the percentage of increase. You may want to look on page 325 in the *Advance DCA*. You will find a copy there of the budget originally presented and then there are adjustments to the 2000 budget on page 324 as explained. There's some shift from prior claims on ratio funding for the General Council on Ministries and more on the Council on Finance and Administration.

I would also like to thank the General Council on Ministries and the agencies for the marvelous cooperation we have had in the whole budget-setting process and that has continued here as we have sought to negotiate a reasonable budget and some wonderful exciting dreams. All of us have found it difficult to deal with items that come from the floor. We have tried to provide guidelines for many things that were coming and we were grateful to those who provided that, that gives us some sense of accountability in the process.

I'd like to introduce now the council members who will be making reports. We will just do that in sequence without introducing people each time. Cashar Evans, lay delegate from the North Carolina Conference, and if you all will either just stand or wave. Dr. Aaron Black Sr., clergy delegate from the Nebraska Conference; Rev. Dr. Eugene Matthews, clergy delegate from the Baltimore Washington Conference; Marilyn Lloyd, lay delegate from the Little Rock Conference; Tracy Merrick, a reserve lay delegate from the Western Pennsylvania Conference; Patricia Hinker, district superintendent from the Minnesota Conference; Gayle Scott, conference treasurer in the Wyoming Conference; and Bishop Don Ott from the Michigan area. Four of these persons are not delegates to this General Conference and therefore, Bishop Hearn, I ask permission of this body, for these persons to be granted the privilege of appearing on the platform. Merrick, Hinker, Scott, Bishop Ott, and possibly Bishop Norris if we go too long.

BISHOP HEARN: Any objections in the house these persons participating in the presentations? I hear none; they are welcome.

BISHOP LOONEY: As has been mentioned, we have requested the privilege of going through the first seven reports and then report 17, (see p. 2362) so you can get the larger picture. To quote a famous American of whom the director of the General Council on Finance and Administration will be familiar, "This is a beautiful glass mosaic and you need to see the whole picture before you start picking it apart," and you will certainly have the privilege of doing that. But we hope you know that as you pick one part you need to prop up the other. So we will do this in a cooperative and consultative spirit. Thank you for your attention and thank you for all you have done and will do for The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Bishop Looney. Cashar Evans, I believe, is to be the next presenter.

Presentation of Revised Budget Summary

CASHAR W. EVANS (North Carolina): Bishop Hearn and fellow delegates, the original World Service Fund report is found on pages 326 to 329 of the red *Advance DCA*. The revised budget summary is a table found on page 2290 of this morning's daily *DCA*. Please note the following: World Service is God's people reaching out in love and compassion in the name of Christ. It represents a call and a challenge to each United Methodist. The United States has experienced a period of economic growth and prosperity rivaling any in our history. Christian stewardship calls us to share our personal success in works of mission and ministry to those in need in our own country and throughout the world. World Service is a way for each of us to extend our acts of ministry beyond the confines of our local communities through our connectional church. GCFA is committed to raising more dollars for mission and ministry. We've heard the messages from the local churches and annual conferences about the desire to close the gap between apportionments and actual receipts. The past four years have seen an increasing number of conferences paying their apportionments in full, thereby causing the actual level of receipts to rise. When we last met in 1996, six annual conferences were paying 100% of their apportionments. Today, 17 annual conferences are paying 100%.

(Applause)

I would also call your attention to last Monday's daily *DCA* on pages 1946 and 1947. Receipts to date, this year, for the apportioned funds are up \$1,000,000 over 1999. And 47 annual conferences have experienced increased receipts to date this year as compared to last year. In addition, the collection rate on the World Service Fund over the past quadrennium has increased from 89% in 1997 to 91% in 1999. One of the most exciting examples of this commitment to supporting mission and ministry is the United Methodist Church Foundation started by GCFA this quadrennium. If I might digress just a moment, the Presbyterian Church Foundation is now approaching \$1.5 billion in assets and they fund almost 50% of their mission work from that foundation. I request a moment of personal privilege to ask for a suspension of the rules for the purpose of distributing a brochure on the United Methodist Church Foundation at the next break.

BISHOP HEARN: The house is informing us that you already have the brochure. Shame on those that passed it out before you told them to. I believe they already have it, Cashar. Does everyone have that brochure? Some do not have it. I don't believe there's any objection in house for it to be passed out to the other delegates, is there? All right.

Growth in Agency Reserve Funds Discussed

EVANS: Thank you. GCFA and the several agencies have also begun the process of analyzing how the growth in reserve levels, due to the buoyant stock market, can be used in funding some of their program needs. Please note, that there was a change in accounting standards in 1996 that caused assets to be shown at market value, rather than original or book value leading to a significant increase in the magnitude in the numbers on the statement of financial position. This budget continues the pattern adopted in 1996 of controlling the growth of the budget in the belief that local churches and annual conferences will continue to strive to pay their apportionments in full as they are able. This report summarizes the areas of mission and ministry directly supported by the World Service budget. The general agencies have each detailed their work elsewhere in the *Ad-*

vance DCA in their individual reports given to you, the General Conference. This budget was developed by a consultative process involving representatives of the General Council on Ministries and GCFA, along with agency presidents, general secretaries, and some members of all the general agencies. By sharing their visions at this common table, visions that they feel they were called to pursue, we were able collectively to seek a balance between the total resources likely to be available and the overall work that could be accomplished. There may be always more work than resources can do, but this budget represents a reasonable attempt at using well what we do have. There was one significant new aspect to this budget as originally presented. It contained a line item for innovative and emerging ministries. This money was set aside as a starting point in funding the many unfunded proposals that were offered for consideration at this General Conference outside the budgets of the general agencies. GCFA developed guidelines and procedures for each of those proposals to be considered with a comparable set of financial and programmatic information. This information has aided GCFA as it considered how to fund those items that the General Conference has decided should be included in the work of The United Methodist Church this quadrennium. The report on all those items is number 17 that was distributed to you earlier this morning and will be presented to you shortly. We believe this budget represents a good and reasonable goal for our church to pursue during the next years. It will allow The United Methodist Church to continue its long history of mission and ministry to the world. I present it to you for your heartfelt and prayerful consideration and for your approval. Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Cashar. We will now turn to, I believe Aaron Black is the next person. If those of you who are presenters if you would just come on forward. When one is finished, we'll save a little time. Dr. Black?

Report of Ministerial Education Fund

AARON D. BLACK, SR (Nebraska): Thank you, Bishop Hearn. Members of the General Conference. GCFA Report No. 2, the Ministerial Education Fund, is found on pp. 330 and 331 in your red *Advance DCA*. The Ministerial Education Fund was established by action of

the 1968 General Conference as a means of engaging the total membership of our Church in the recruitment, enlistment, training and equipping of clergy and lay persons for ministry. The fund supports undergraduate and seminary education. It supports local pastor courses of study, continuing education, and other programs that strengthen the ministry of our Church at every level.

Realizing the declining number of persons coming into annual conference membership who are United Methodist seminary graduates, the declining support in other means and in other ways, that have led to a reduced support of United Methodist seminary budgets, and the corresponding increase in student indebtedness, the need for this fund becomes greater and greater. The reality is, that in order for this fund to render its best support to the process of educating our church leadership, the church must move toward the payment of 100 percent of this fund. If we continue to demand nothing but the highest quality of leadership in our church, we then must be willing to share in that cost. With these thoughts in mind, this report, along with all of its recommendations, is being brought to you for your prayerful consideration and support.

Report of Black College Fund

Report No. 3, the Black College Fund, follows on pp. 331 and 332 in the *Advance DCA*. Before I begin this report, allow me a bit of personal testimony, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Yes.

BLACK: I am a proud graduate of Huston-Tillotson College, one of the institutions supported by the Black College Fund. I proudly display that degree among my other degrees on the wall in my office. In fact, my other degrees are clustered around my Huston-Tillotson degree because H-T, as we so fondly refer to it, was where it all started for me. And there are thousands of other proud graduates of United Methodist-related Black colleges who have been enabled by their experiences in those institutions who are making significant contributions to both our church and our world. The Black College Fund was established by the 1972 General Conference to marshal financial support for institutions of higher education, which are related to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist

Church and which have historically served the educational needs of not only African-American students but others as well. I am happy to report that, as a result of discussions coming out of the funding task force that I chair, a recommendation was made to the GBHEM Board to establish an endowment for these institutions. In this regard, a resolution submitted jointly by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the General Council on Finance and Administration, entitled Resolution on Endowment Fund for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities of the United Methodist Church will be brought before you for approval at a later time.

And finally, Report No. 4, Africa University, follows on pp. 333 and 334 of your red *Advance DCA*.

Report on African University

Let me say that I had an opportunity to visit Africa University this past March, and I came away from that experience with a greater appreciation of our world-wide connection than ever before. To see where that university has come since its approval by the 1988 General Conference, makes me even more proud to be a United Methodist. (*Applause*) In my opinion, Africa University, if not the most profound, is certainly one of the most profound achievements of United Methodism in the last one hundred years. It is a real jewel in the history of our Church.

May I refer you, now, to the printed report and suggest that we need to take a serious look at what our next steps ought to be regarding this institution. The initial \$10 million allocated as start-up money for Africa University has been well spent. In fact, the University is currently debt-free. However, operating in an economy with a 72 percent inflation rate, a 50 percent unemployment rate, has put tremendous burden on the University budget. Hence, I bring this report and all of its recommendations before you, asking you for your continued support in order that we can take this institution to the next level. The dollars we have allocated to this point offer a deposit on the future of higher education on the African continent. I don't know about you, but I surely can attest to the fact that what has happened at Africa University is just the beginning. For that great institution, my friends, with our continued support, the best is yet to come.

(Applause)

In closing, let me urge that in all three of these reports, you consider not so much the dollars involved, but the level and the amount of work that these reports represent. They all represent significant segments of who we are as a people called United Methodists. I commend them to you now for your prayerful consideration, your support and your caring. Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Dr. Black. (Applause) Mr. Eugene Matthews.

Episcopal Fund Report

EUGENE MATTHEWS (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop Hearn and fellow delegates, I bring to you the Episcopal Fund Report which is Report No. 5 found on pp. 335 through 340 of the red *Advance DCA* and in today's *DCA*, you find the budget item on 2289. As you may very well know, the bishops' expenses are not a part of the annual conference budget, and Report No. 5 outlines of support of bishops provided by the Episcopal Fund. There are several important changes that are being recommended for the new quadrennium. I would like to start to say to you as a result of our actions here, the last several days, there have been at least three other items that have been added to the budget. Number one has been the increase in the CPP, which has about doubled with figures around 60,000 to 80,000 and also the effective date of the compensation for bishops, which we talked about last evening, would amount to close to 200 additional thousand dollars in budget [sic. 200,00], and also for the continuance, or to make sure that there is the tenth episcopal area in the northeastern jurisdiction, bishop to be elected, which adds \$1 million to the budget.

First, I would like to say, in order to support the increasing workload of our episcopal leaders for the coming quadrennium, we propose a \$1,000 yearly increase in office budget to bring the annual budget to \$56,000 in 2001.

Secondly, we are simplifying the procedure for the purchase of office equipment. Each episcopal office will have \$12,000 over the full quadrennium for replacing office equipment as needed.

Thirdly, we are raising the maximum amount paid for maintenance of the episcopal residence to \$20,000 each year during the quadrennium.

Fourthly, as we become more and more a global church, one of the largest increases is the expense of international travel, which is very much needed and essential for our continued ministry.

In consideration of the stewardship of the church's dollars, and to help the bishops, an extra day's expenses for layover or for rest at the end of the trip will be reimbursed. Air travel will be reimbursed at economy class rates. This change brings about the episcopal policy in uniformity with the travel policies of the general agency. Lastly, I would like to say that in order to address the financial needs of surviving spouses of our bishops, we are pleased to propose an increase of pension for surviving spouses from 70% to 75% of bishops' pension rate for the pre-1982 service years. This reflects the trend in annual conferences for pastors' surviving spouses' pensions. Bishop, these are the highlights of changes in Report No. 5 for the next quadrennium and I commend this report to the conference for their support.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you very much.

Report of General Administration Fund

MARILYNN LOYD (Little Rock): Bishop Hearn and fellow delegates to the 2000 General Conference. Pages 341 and 342 of the red *Advance DCA* contain the original report and recommendations of the General Council on Finance and Administration in regard to the General Administration Fund. But on p. 2291 of this morning's daily *DCA*, you will find a revised summary table that reflects changes as a result of several actions of this General Conference. An additional revision of this morning's table was distributed to you earlier to reflect GCFA's recommendations on several items that were referred to us subsequent to last night's deadline for the *DCA*. As the most recent revision shows, the General Conference section of the General Administration Fund budget would be increased by \$700,000 for translation of the *Advance DCA*. The significant changes over the prior quadrennium are described in the footnotes to the table. And, as you will note in footnote No. 5, two items of an ecumenical order and/or a programmatic nature were moved to funds that were more consistent with their nature. The significant increase in the budget for GCFA is primarily a result of the change from fixed administrative charges on the Ministe-

rial Education, Black College, and Africa University funds to on-ratio funding in this fund. GCFA has also added staff for its internal audit function, and that was created as a result of directions from the 1996 General Conference. The other major increase in the General Administration Fund budget is for the cost of General Conference, including several changes that are related to additional translation costs that you approved this week. Not only are the actual costs increasing, but the reserves from the prior years have been exhausted in funding this conference.

I would like to continue, Bishop Hearn, with the presentation of the Interdenominational Cooperation Fund, and that report and recommendation from GCFA appears on pages 342-344 in the red *Advance DCA*.

And then I also have a revised summary table that appears on p. 2292 of this morning's daily *DCA*. As you can see from this report, this fund provides the basic support for ecumenical and inter-religious organizations participated in by The United Methodist Church. Funding for the World Methodist Council was moved here from the General Administration Fund because the General Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-religious Concerns disciplinary responsibilities in regard to The United Methodist Church relationship and funding of this ecumenical organization. The ever-changing face of the worldwide ecumenical movement has resulted in some changes to the categories of this budget. Those changes in this budget, in conjunction with disciplinary changes relating to the responsibilities of the Council of Bishops and GCCUIC in evaluating the appropriate ecumenical inter-religious venues, will provide the flexibility to adapt to any new developments that come about in this area. This budget provides for a continuation of the United Methodist historic strong support and presence in the ecumenical movement.

Now, the original budget amounts were developed by the Christian Unity Commission, in consultation with the Council of Bishops for your review and consideration by GCFA. But subsequently a minority report was prepared in the Financial Administration Legislative Committee after that committee reported concurrence with the original report. The revised table that you see before you on p. 2292 represents an agreement reached between the mak-

ers of the minority report and the ecumenical officer of the Council of Bishops and representatives of GCCUIC on revisions to the original report. This is my report.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you very much. Bishop Looney.

*List of Referrals to GCFA
by General Conferences*

BISHOP LOONEY: You can now understand why it's such a joy to work with such splendid sisters and brothers on GCFA. If you would turn now to 2295 in your today's *DCA* you will find here listed, including the extra sheet passed out, 23 referrals to GCFA. As I have mentioned earlier, one of our difficulties is in having some standard way to deal with items that we knew were coming but had not yet been approved by the General Conference. And this first column and a good bit of the second column is just some reporting of our understanding about how the way these need to be attached to general agencies. And you will see how that spells out in the 23 items. Let me just read a couple of sentences. "This year's total value of these proposals was \$70 million over 13% of the total of all the apportioned funds. GCFA asked that the adoption of this report serve as the confirmation from the General Conference that all programs, projects, and initiatives that are being recommended for continuation beyond the current quadrennium shall be included within the budgets of the general agencies which have provided support, funding, and encouragement during the current quadrennium. The evaluation and review of these programs, projects, and initiatives will be conducted within the disciplinary requirements for the development of the World Service Fund budget." This gives us an orderly way, and hopefully will reduce the number of referral during the weeks of General Conference. What I propose to do would just have you look at each of these—you can see what has been proposed and you can see GCFA's recommendation. The first has to do with the Iglesia Metodista de Puerto Rico and the recommendation is an annual allocation of \$300,000 in 2001, \$200,000 in 2002, and \$100,000 in 2003, with the understanding that the church still has access to funding from some general agencies.

Item 2 is to continue the Initiative on "Strengthening the Black Church for the 21st Century." You see the petition,

and here is the recommendation. The funding in the amount of \$2,080,000 will be allocated as shown in the revised Report No. 1 on the World Service Fund, an increase of \$770,000 over the 1997–2000 quadrennium.

The National Plan for Hispanic Ministry, we recommend \$50,000 be allocated to the General Board of Church and Society, \$110,000 to the General Board of Higher Education, and \$630,000 to the General Board of Global Ministries as shown in the revised Report. These amounts are in addition to the following amounts previously included in the agency budget lines in Report No.1 in the *Advance DCA*, and I won't read those. The total for this proposal, \$3,200,000.

Continuation of the Native American Comprehensive Plan, we recommend that \$65,000 be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries line, that the amount is in addition to the \$1,075,000 already included in Report No. 1. in the *Advance DCA*.

The Asian-American Language Ministry Study, we recommend that \$1,638,000 be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries line in the revised Report No.1 on the World Service Fund.

Advancing Korean-American Ministries, we recommend that \$2,885,000 be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries line in the revised Report No.1.

Shared Ministry [*sic*, Mission] Focus on Young People, we recommend that \$3,036,000 be allocated to the General Board of Discipleship in the revised Report No.1 for the World Service Fund.

Number 8, Communities of Shalom, we recommend that \$295,000 be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries line. This is in addition to the \$800,000 included in the GBGM line in the *Advance DCA*.

Number 9, Comprehensive Plan for Older Adult Ministries, recommends that \$450,000 be allocated to the General Board of Discipleship line in the revised Report No. 1 on the World Service Fund.

I hope you understand that several of these simply mean that the additional funds in the initiative are being reallocated and that amount increased in the World Service lines.

Program on Substance Abuse and Related Violence, we recommend \$1,332,000 be allocated to the General

Board of Global Ministries line in revised Report No.1. This is in addition to the \$1,836,000 already included.

The National Committee on Deaf Ministry, we recommend that \$100,000 be allocated to the General Board of Global Ministries, as shown, and an increase of \$49,000 over the amount budgeted in the 1997–2000 quadrennium.

Theological Education in Europe, we recommend that \$1,000,000 be allocated to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministries as shown in the revised Report No.1, this in addition to the \$2,000,000 included for this program in the GBHEM budget line in the World Service Fund.

Number 13, Recycling and the Use of Recycled Products, we recommend that efforts in this regard continue to be pursued where economically feasible without a specific timeline, and that there's a report of what's being done at this point.

Fourteen, Igniting Ministry Media Campaign, GCFA recommends that funding of \$20,000,000 be provided as shown in the revised Report No.1 of the World Service Fund as a sub-line entitled, titled "Other Ministries, United Methodist Communications, Igniting Ministries."

Fifteen, National United Methodist Native American Center, we recommend that funding of \$500,000 be provided as shown in the revised Report No. 1 on the World Service Fund.

Translation for 2004 General Conference, we recommend an additional \$580,000 be added to the General Conference line item as shown in the General Administration Fund budget.

Change Number Formula for General Conference Delegates to Restore Fairness and Balance, we recommend that \$60,000 be added to the General Conference line item in the General Administration Fund budget in the revised Report No.6.

Pay Equity in the General Agencies, we recommend that funding of up to \$800,000 be provided for the implementation of the Pay Equity recommendation. An amount of \$300,000 has been added to the General Administration Fund budget, and the remaining \$500,000 will come from GCFA's on-ratio allocations.

The Make Africa University a Priority, we recommend that the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry continue to seek funding as a World

Service Special Gift under provisions of [Paragraph] 813 of the *Book of Discipline*, with a goal of \$10,000,000 for the quadrennium to be used for the permanent endowment funds.

The Report No. 4, as you previously heard, includes \$10,110,000 in the recommended budget.

This, and MEF, and—what was the third item?—will be increased, simply because they're out of on-ratio—they're off-ratio items now.

Number 20, Increase Commission Membership by 14, GCFA determined this amended petition require funding of \$64,000 and recommends that this amount be provided from funds already provided in the revised [World] Service Fund Report No. 1.

And now, if you'll go to the additional sheet you received, Number 21 was dealing with raising money for the Russian Seminary and Church Growth. GCFA recommends that a \$12,000,000 goal be set for a General Advance Special rather than the \$10,000,000 and \$2,000,000 apportionment, as suggested.

Number 22, Continue Restorative Justice Ministries, we recommend that this be referred to the Board of Global Ministries for funding within the amount established in the revised World Service Fund.

And Resolution 23 has to do with Translation and Distribution of Materials for Delegates of the Central Conferences, and we recommend the total of \$700,000 be added to the General Conference line item in the revised General Administration Fund Budget Report No. 6.

If you'd like to look, just passed, on page 2300, this gives you a sort of running report of all that I've read, and my apologies for that, but I thought you deserved the courtesy of having an explanation of what was being recommended. Let me simply say that it was not possible within the constraints we felt the church had placed upon us on to fund everything at full request. But I personally feel that in light of all that's before us, the staff of GCFA and the directors have done a remarkable job in bringing a budget that's just over 6% increased. That means four times the amount for 2000, and that should come out to less than 2% a year. So with this general overview, we will now go back to look over these in sequence, and we'll hear from legislative

committees and deal with the minority reports and so forth. Thank you, Bishop Hearn.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Bishop Looney

(Applause)

I'm also aware of the fact that these few pages in the material that we've looked at represents mission and ministry in thousands of different ways in many places in the world. And for that we rejoice that God is calling and using The United Methodist Church to be in service and ministry in so many different ways to so many people.

Now, if the committee would give me some help as to how they would like for us to begin to process the GCFA report we will start moving through it. Stan?

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): Bishop, I am prepared to lay before you the recommendations of the Financial Administration committee on the reports which you've just heard.

BISHOP HEARN: Very good, if you would give it to us item by item, and after Stan has made a description of this, I'll ask for some representative of the General Council on Finance and Administration to point out to us how this networks into the recommendations of the council. Stan?

SAGER: With respect to Report No. 1, World Service, the committee has recommended concurrence. There is, however, a minority report, which I understand is going to be presented by Don Underwood . . . who is right here. Don?

Minority Report on GCFA Budget Report

DON W. UNDERWOOD (North Texas): Thank you, Stan, and thank you, Bishop. The minority report written by those of us on the committee was actually in response to a vote by the committee to approve the original—

BISHOP HEARN: Is this in the DCA?

UNDERWOOD: Yes, DCA Petition No. 30700, page 2155, Item No. 1361.

BISHOP HEARN: All right.

UNDERWOOD: I mentioned our minority report was written in response to the original GCFA budget, which was adopted by the financial legislative committee, and not the one that has been amended by GCFA this morning, so the material that you have just had presented to you is new to us as well.

Our minority report reads like this: In the World Service Fund budget, *Advance DCA* page 329, increase the line item allotted to Innovative and Emerging Ministries by \$10,000,000, to a total of \$26,330,000 by directing the Council on Finance and Administration to reallocate at their discretion the amounts allotted to other line items, thus producing the same bottom-line total. We offer this legislation as an attempt at compromise between those who wanted to be aggressive in funding new and emerging ministries and those who wanted to keep a fiscally conservative budget.

Let me take the delegates to a couple of pieces of information. If you will find the GCFA report, volume 3 . . .

BISHOP HEARN: Don, before you do that, for the clarification of the house, I'd like for you to stipulate what your motion for action is going to be, so that we'll all have that before us, since you've indicated that this does not exactly fit in with what has been presented by GCFA.

UNDERWOOD: Yes sir, well, our motion was to, our minority report was in response to the Financial Administration's committee report, which was prior to the report which was presented, has been presented today.

BISHOP HEARN: And what I'm pushing you to do is to give us your action of what you would like to do to modify the GCFA report as it has now been presented, and not as it was originally.

UNDERWOOD: Be glad to. My report, what we asked to do is to provide another \$10,000,000 for new and emerging ministries, which would have expanded new and emerging ministries considerably, and to be aggressive in using fund balances to do that. If I understand the World Service budget as it has been presented today, GCFA is actually being—we felt like our proposal was modest—and if I understand the proposal, GCFA has been aggressive, much more aggressive than we were, and has found \$28 million in, actually reallocated \$28 million rather than the \$10 million. We would like to accept that part of the work of the GCFA, but in a compromise to enable us to maintain a fiscally conservative budget, the original budget, we would like to maintain the 0-0-1-2 bottom-line total originally offered by the Council on Finance and Administration.

BISHOP HEARN: I do not hear you moving to amend any particular part of what has been presented by the GCFA. Don, if you wish to do that, we'd be glad to hear it, otherwise, you have not presented anything that this house is going to be able to deal with.

*Minority Report Seeks to Keep
0-0-1-2 Budget*

UNDERWOOD: Bishop, if you think I am out of order, I'll be glad to go take my seat. I think that we are offering an amendment to what has been offered. In other words, the \$28 million found by GCFA for new and emerging ministries of—we accept that, but we wanted the body to have a opportunity to vote on a more conservative budget, 0-0-1-2, that would require GCFA to go back and reallocate. And if it's the will of the body to live with the 6% increase, the 6.1% increase, I personally would find that OK.

BISHOP HEARN: I hear you making a speech concerning the presentation of GCFA rather than making a motion, so at this point you would be out of order, Don, thank you.

UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: I'll turn back now to Dan Sager. I mean to Stan Sager. Stan.

STAN SAGER: Regarding Report Number 2 from the General Council on Finance and Administration. The committee has concurrence referred to on p.2090 DCA, Calendar Item 1165. There is a Minority Report with respect to that also. It will be presented by Bill Couch.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, Bill Couch. Please come forward. Page 2090. I understand the item we're dealing with is 1165.

SAGER: Bishop, I think that Bill Couch has explained that his Minority Report does not apply here. Let me move on if I may.

BISHOP HEARN: Please do.

SAGER: The Black College Fund, we concurred with that, actually, this morning in undue haste. And that was voted on as concurrence, I believe. I would be glad to lay it before you, just to be sure that it has been addressed. It's referred to on p. 2090. DCA Calendar Item 1163. Committee has voted concurrence.

BISHOP HEARN: Is there any difference with this as what is being presented by GCFA?

*Proposed Change in Ministerial Education
Fund Formula*

SAGER: We resolved the difficulty that I had here with Dr. Couch. The committee voted concurrence with the MEF, p. 2090 DCA, Calendar Item 1165. However, there was a petition which bore directly on that. It is reported on p. 155 of DCA, Calendar Item 1357. There was non-concurrence with that. The effect of that petition, Bishop, would be to revise the MEF formula. And it is my understanding that that should be addressed at this time, because the bottom line effect would be to revise MEF and to treat the view of Mr. Couch's group as directed at Report Number 2, MEF.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, if you will direct us to where this is found in the DCA, so that all of us can have it before us.

BILL COUCH (Northwest Texas): The page number is 2155. Calendar Item 1357. That's 2155, Calendar Item 1357. You can see at the bottom of the paragraph there, that the committee recommends non-concurrence with the minority submitting a report, and you can best see the changes, I believe, in this by turning in your *Advance DCA* to p. 445, petition no. 30110. Page 445, petition no. 30110. With regard to petition 30110, I move that the Minority Report be substituted for the committee report as amended as follows. You see in the amending of paragraph 832.1 and 2 of the total money raised in each annual conference for the Ministerial Education Fund, 25 has been stricken, now strike 50 and replace that with 40 percent. And in no. 2, of the total money raised in each annual conference for the Ministerial Education Fund, you see 75 has been stricken, now strike 50, and replace that with 60. What this does is change the percentage that is paid to the seminaries at 60 percent and kept in the annual conferences at 40 percent, for the Ministerial Education Fund. I move the substitution of this motion.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, we will use this, we will deal with this as an amendment to the report, so that we can have clarity. You understand that the difference here is that the GCFA is using one formula. This is an amendment to the GCFA report to use a different formula. It is now before us. All right I'll start down here.

ROBERTO GOMEZ (Rio Grande): I wish to speak against the Minority Report, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: All right.

GOMEZ: I support the present formula, MEF formula for 75-25 percent. The MEF supports the Conference Course of Study schools where local pastors are trained. The biggest single line item for program in the Division of Ordained Ministry for the Course of Study schools. The majority of pastors in the Rio Grande conference and the Oklahoma Indian Missionary Conference are trained in Conference Course of Study schools. A significant number of Hispanic pastors in other conferences are also trained in the Conference Course of Study schools. A growing number of second-career persons are also trained in the CCOS. Change in the MEF formula will demand additional tuition on the part of local pastors. Most students in the CCOS are the least able to pay the cost of the religious training required by the *Book of Discipline*. Please keep the present MEF formula of 75-25 percent.

BISHOP HEARN: Yes, I saw a yellow card almost in the back, back there. Towards the middle of the...well it's gone now. So, I'll move over here. There's a pink card almost in the back, back there. Yeah, you stand up. That's good. Mike no. 7.

*Funding Level for Gammon Theological
Seminary Discussed*

PHIL GRANGER (North Indiana): I'd like to propose an amendment to the Minority Report. I'd like to propose the addition of a new paragraph, 821.2C. The wording would be: "because of the United Methodist commitment to strengthening the Black church, and due to our long standing commitment to leadership development within the Black church, Gammon Theological Seminary is to retain at least its current level of funding, and also receive a percentage increase in funding each year equivalent to that provided for the other United Methodist seminaries." If I have a second, I would like to speak to that.

BISHOP HEARN: Is there a second?

GRANGER: Many of us have a special concern...

BISHOP HEARN: Was there a second in the house?

HOUSE: Yes.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, thank you.

GRANGER: Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: Go ahead.

GRANGER: Many of us have a special concern for leadership development within the ethnic church, and the close relationship between leadership development and the strengthening of the Black church. Because of this, this amendment provides for support of Gammon Theological Seminary at the present dollar amount, to be adjusted upward by the same percentage as other United Methodist Seminaries in succeeding years. Special allowance should be given in this case because of the special place that Gammon has in providing leadership resources to our denomination and in the strengthening of our ethnic church.

BISHOP HEARN: Secretary needs your name again for the record, if you would please give it to us at mike 7.

GRANGER: Phil Granger, North Indiana.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Phil.

SAGER: Bishop?

BISHOP HEARN: Yes?

SAGER: We'll accept that as a friendly amendment.

BISHOP HEARN: The committee would like to accept it as a friendly amendment, but actually that's not parliamentary correct to do. So we won't do it. The green card, right over here? Green card. Mike 4.

WILLIAM HINES (West Ohio): Bishop and members of the conference, Bishop, is it in order to rise in support of the minority report?

BISHOP HEARN: No. The amendment is before us which has to do with Gammon Theological Seminary.

HINES: Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: The yellow card way in the back almost on the aisle. Go to Mike 8, please. The amendment that is before us is the one which would merit special specific information concerning Gammon, the Granger amendment.

LUCILLE VANZANT (Oklahoma): Thank you, Bishop Hearn. I would like for this conference to stand with me for it is because of their efforts and their concern that "Strengthen the Black Church" has been as successful as it is. Gammon has been a leader in strengthening the Black church. Some day I hope to have a granddaughter who might be a minister and who could look back on these times, and say "Because of the concern of General Conference in 2000, I'm able to become a minister and

to be able to serve God's people in all walks of life." Will the General Conference stand with me, please?

BISHOP HEARN: We'll see in just a minute, Lucille, when we take the vote. We had two speeches which have been for it. If any one wishes to speak against it, I'll recognize you. All right. Back here. This needs to be a speech against the Granger Amendment.

FREDERICK G. OUTLAW (Alabama-West Florida): Graduate of Gammon Theological Seminary, President of the Gammon Alumni Association. I come with somewhat of a heavy heart in hearing this amendment and this minority report, and rise to speak in opposition to the amendment as well as the minority report. Yes, Gammon Theological Seminary has been in the forefront of theological education for all United Methodists. Since 1881, Gammon Theological Seminary has had an open policy. In 1893, the first white graduate, Paul Shillings, received his education there. We are one of 13 United Methodist seminaries within the United Methodist Church, and we would want the continuation of the present formula. To set Gammon out apart at this point in the life of this church is unnecessary and possibly may be unchristian. We think or we appreciate the concern coming from the minority report, but we believe that if we continue the present formula, this will be in the best interests of all the seminaries. Most of these seminaries if we move this formula with the amendment, will receive a two-third reduction in their budget. Seventy eight percent of Gammon's budget, yes, does come from the Ministerial Education Fund. That would be some \$860,000 lost. But to now set Gammon out apart is something that we are not comfortable with. I would urge defeat of the amendment and the minority report, and the support of the committee's report. Thank you very much.

*Amendment on Minority Report
on Ministerial Education Fund Defeated*

BISHOP HEARN: All right. The amendment is the item that is before us. Are you ready to vote? If you would express your opinion concerning the Granger Amendment, you vote when the light appears. It has been defeated. [Yes, 170, No, 170]. We are back now on the report which is contained in the advance DCA changing the formula figures from 40 to 40 and 60 in the two categories. OK. The back of this house is more active than

the front of this house. I'm going to go to the orange one over here closer to the number of mike 8. Mike 8.

CARL SCHENCK (Missouri East): I was a member of the Financial Administration Legislative Committee, and I speak against the minority report. We heard a good deal of argument and I suspect we will hear on the floor, but this redistribution of the formula would assist the indebtedness of clergy coming out of seminary because conferences would have more money to give in scholarships. This whole line of argument completely misunderstands the primary purpose of the Ministerial Education Fund which is the development and the strengthening of a system of the finest seminaries in the land, and to take away significant funding from our seminaries not only reduces the quality of United Methodist graduates that we would have because their training would be weakened, but it also cuts the heart out of things like the Course of Study School, research, curriculum development, and a host of other services for the church which the seminaries provide. This minority report is, in effect, an attack upon our seminary system, and we should reject it.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. That is a speech against it. Let's see now. I'm going to come here to the pink. Right in here.

GERALD THURMAN (North Georgia): Bishop and fellow delegates, I'm here to speak in favor of this motion. Let me explain a little bit that this particular motion will not cut the heart out of the work of the division.

BISHOP HEARN: Excuse me. We need your name for the record.

THURMAN: Indeed, these funds would be remaining with the division; those funds necessary for their functioning. All those excess funds would then be directly redistributed to the various 13 seminaries as they are presently. What this would do, however, it would strengthen the connection between seminarians and their respective annual conferences. It would afford them greater direct grants from the annual conference MEF Funds and it would also even out the injustices in the way the fund is presently administered. Just to illustrate my point, in 1997 these figures have, by John Harnish they have been verified. He says they are accurate, but in 1997... For instance, Boston...

BISHOP HEARN: You need to start summing up, please.

THURMAN: Boston had 46% United Methodist students in their M.Div. program. Iliff 49%, Claremont 48%. For instance, Iliff with 92 students received that year from the MEF Fund right at \$1,000,000—\$990,000. Candler, with 266 United Methodists students in the M.Div. program, received only a million and a half. Terrible inequities are present in the system that we are using. I would encourage you to approve the minority report so that the funds would follow the students.

BISHOP HEARN: OK. Thank you. All right, we can have one more speech that is against the...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In favor.

BISHOP HEARN: That is against. Thank you. Let's see. We'll go back here. All right. Judge, it better be a good one. This is my neighbor from Houston, the reason I'm talking to him.

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): Bishop, I believe that the first speech against the minority report was given by Roberto Garcia and then we had a second speech against. I believe we've already had two speeches.

BISHOP HEARN: Ewing, no one in the house is more willing for vote than I am, so I'll go on to the vote. The matter that is before us, no, we've had. I'm sorry. I'm being advised back here that you are correct. He'll never let me forget that. So we can take one more for. We'll go back here, one more for the minority report. Back there – let's see, he sat down. Over here to the green. Mike 4.

SCOTT JONES (North Texas): Bishop, I move referral to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the whole matter.

BISHOP HEARN: An item for referral would be in order, except I need to ask a question about this. Where does that then leave the item that we will eventually be voting on with the GCFA report. I want the house to be clear about what we are voting on in referral. You'll need to clarify that a little bit, Scott.

JONES: If this matter is referred, the *Discipline* remains as it is and all the questions regarding this can be studied by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

BISHOP HEARN: I think that adding all of that to it, it makes an item not proper to refer. Since we have a budget

to adopt, I do not think that that will either help the church or GCFA or the budget. So I am informed that we need one speech for it and then we are going to put the vote. Okay, we'll come down here. A green card, mike 4.

HINES: I rise in support of the minority report. I'm a graduate of Garrett Evangelical. I have a son serving a United Methodist Church who graduated from United. I have a daughter who serves as a children's education coordinator in a church in Arizona. She served several years as a missionary under the Board of Global Ministries. She attended METHESCO or the Methodist School in Ohio. I have another son who is a youth pastor, was a youth pastor in a United Methodist Church. He moved to Florida. He has now become a Nazarene. I have two men on my present staff who are graduates of METHESCO. I had women on my staff who graduated from other seminaries, United Methodist seminaries mostly. There have been forty-plus people who've entered the ministry from churches my wife and I've served. They graduated from a variety of seminaries across the United States. I think to a person, they have confirmed what I've seen and experienced. Anyone who has a strong basic understanding of the Christian faith can survive in our seminaries. But, they seldom survive without serious effort and they regularly feel they must compromise their faith in order to please certain professors. Often they are marginalized or criticized if they do not fit in – they cave in.

BISHOP HEARN: You'll need to start summing up please.

HINES: So I support the changing of the formula slightly for the distribution of the Ministerial Education Fund. After all, this is our money and we should have some expectation as to how it will be used. Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, the matter that is before you is the amendment to amend the GCFA Report. The GCFA Report would leave the matter as it is currently with 25% going to be retained by the Annual Conference and 75% being submitted to the conference treasurer. The amendment changes the 25 to 40, 75 to 60.

COUCH: According to paragraph 821 in the *Discipline*, the stated purpose of the Ministerial Education Fund is to provide financial support for the recruitment and education of ordained ministers and to equip the annual conferences

to meet increased demands in this area. Under the current procedure the annual conferences send 75% of the monies collected for the Ministerial Education Fund to the General Church for use by United Methodist seminaries and retains just 25% for use by the annual conferences in direct support of their seminary students. The original petition had recommended that the total money raised be split 50/50. Under the amended petition it is 60/40. The problem, of course, is that many graduates of our United Methodist seminaries finish school with \$10,000 to \$30,000 in debt. Our main concern is the debt of young pastors coming out to small churches with very little assistance during their seminary education. While it's true that we have an obligation to give our seminaries institutional support, the overarching purpose of ministerial giving is to produce trained pastors regardless of where they chose to attend seminary. What we are proposing is that we allow the annual conferences to keep an additional 15% of the monies so that the funds can follow our seminary students and help them stay out of debt.

BISHOP HEARN: GCFA would like to have a word.

BISHOP ALFRED NORRIS: This is pretty awkward since the gentleman who is presenting the minority report is a member of one my annual conferences. But I'm speaking now for GCFA and would simply urge the conference to support what GCFA is proposing and I'm going to do that without any, without being argumentative. But, we do believe that this is the best scenario for the Ministerial Education Fund.

40/60 Split in Ministerial Education Fund is Defeated

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you. The amendment is now before us which would change the recommendation to 40/60 from 25/75. If you support or do not support, be prepared to vote when the light appears. [Yes, 343; No, 550] This is defeated. Stan, you have another item?

SAGER: I have another item if we've disposed of that one.

BISHOP HEARN. We will take the other side of that when we get the whole report from GCFA before us for a vote.

SAGER: The next report was report number 4 from GCFA. The response of the Committee on Financial Adminis-

tration was to concur. It is reported on page 2155 of the *DCA* as Calendar Item 1360. There is a minority report. The minority report will be presented by Jeff Sitts, a member of the committee.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, Jeff?

JEFF SITTS (Minnesota): Thank you, Bishop Hearn. If you would turn to p. 2155 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1360, Petition No. 30703. Minority Report calls for the increase of the Africa University fund for the 2001 to 2004 quadrennium to increase to \$20 million which will be broken down as follows: No. 1, implement new facility of health sciences for approximately \$2 million; No. 2, place in the new library a state of the art learning program and communication center and establish satellite campuses; No. 3, a new major academic facility will be built; No. 4, day-to-day operational funding. It is also further requested that \$20 million also be budgeted for the 2005 to 2009 quadrennium to support the operations and development of Africa University. The Minority Report.

BISHOP HEARN: The Chair would like to observe, I believe it is correct, that one General Conference does bind an additional General Conference and so the last paragraph I would move to be out of order for consideration.

SITTS: Bishop, may I speak on this, then?

BISHOP HEARN: Yes, you may.

SITTS: What started off as a project in 1988 by the General Conference has now, today, become 23 completed buildings of Africa University. Five additional buildings including three dorms, one library and one staff house are nearing completion. All of these in a country despite 70% inflation and 50% unemployment. But a university is not only the buildings that are on the campus. African University has 240 graduates in action. Some have returned home as agricultural heads, teachers, or heads of theological study. Others have gone on to the United States and Europe to pursue masters and doctorate degrees with the intent to return home upon conclusion of their studies. Graduates in action, just as John Wesley called all of us to do over 250 years ago. At its inception, Africa University was not thought to be an apportioned item forever. Africa University will be independent, but the time is not yet here. Constant growth experienced by it helps to show the need for continued support. The word on Finance and Ad-

ministrations Committee, which I'm a member of, has been accountability. Amidst all of this present growth, Africa University is debt-free. They have obtained a balanced budget and they pay 100 percent of their apportionments. That's accountability. Africa University opened its doors in 1992 with 40 students. Today, eight short years later, there are 847 students in five colleges. But the dollars that are apportioned by The United Methodist Church has remained the same since its inception. The time is here to make the next step. I'd now like to yield to Dr. Aubry K. Lucas, member of the Mississippi Annual Conference and Treasurer of Africa University.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, we will hear from him. I will judge this to be a speech in favor of the amendment.

AUBRY K. LUCAS (Mississippi): Bishop and other friends of the conference, there are many reasons why I am optimistic about our appeal to you today. First of all, we've heard this absolutely wonderful news from Cashar Evans that United Methodists will respond generously when they have opportunity to support good causes, and we have a good one for you today. Secondly, at noon the Dow Jones and all of the other indices were up, so the stock market is trending well. We have great wealth in this country. Thirdly, have you ever noticed how much Bishop Looney looks like the billionaire, Warren Buffet? (*Laughter*) I'm hoping he's a Buffet-in-Methodist-clothing and will generate capital as well as his look-alike. Now, you have heard that it has been recommended that only \$10.1 million be made available to Africa University during this next quadrennium from apportionments. This amount is only \$100,000 more than we received last quadrennium, which means that the buying power of our money is far less because of the inflation about which you've heard. \$20 million was requested and is urgently needed. We United Methodists have started a new and great thing in Africa. Our University there is bringing opportunity and hope to a people who need it and who want it. We have in place a first-class leader in Vice Chancellor Rudy Murapa, who is a native of Zimbabwe, yet has a distinguished record at the United Nations and in universities here and in this country. You've heard about the need. You've heard that our operating budgets are inadequate. Our technology at the University

is woeful. Our apportionments that we're considering here now, these apportionments are the basis of that operating budget. You've also heard about the crippling inflation. We need to establish this faculty of health sciences to meet the overwhelming health needs of sisters and brothers in that country. We need additional buildings, but we need to maintain those that we have. Financial aid to students is an imperative. So we invite each one of you to join the Honorary Alumni Association, to become an alumnus for only \$50 a year, \$500 for a life-time membership. Surely we United Methodists can come up with just 59 cents per member each year for our university in Africa. We can do it. Let's do it. Let's continue with faithfulness what we have started there. Let's support the Minority Report. Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Deciding on 2155, 1360 outside of the last paragraph, which I have ruled to be out of order, is now before us. Okay, we're going to go back here to the orange. The second one in from the middle aisle. Would you go to Mike 8, please. Second one in, yes, you. If you'll hurry on the Mike 8, please.

JACK CRAMER-HEUERMAN (Illinois-Great Rivers): I come here to speak on behalf of one of the great leaders of Africa University, a person from our annual conference who always addressed this issue, Richard Reeves. Many of you knew Dick. He was a member of the Board of Directors. He was the person who chaired the Buildings and Grounds Committee, and that wonderful report about the buildings and the facilities that are there are a part of Dick's commitment and accomplishment. Dick often said in this General Conference that the impact isn't just now. It's for the continent of Africa, for the people of the global United Methodist Church in the centuries to come, when we support Africa University. To accomplish great things, we must not only act, we must also dream. \$20 million is about accomplishing the dream. We always put the package together to say that we will have \$20 million in support, but the World Service Special Gifts part of that do not come up to make the \$20 million. Some annual conferences support at 2%, 7%, 47%.

BISHOP HEARN: You'll need to start summing up, please.

CRAMER-HEUERMAN: I will. Sixty-seven percent of their total in the

World Service Special Gifts. We do not get the \$20 million in the quadrennium to support Africa University. When we put it in the World Service dollars, we will. Fifty-nine cents is about a cup of coffee, a hamburger on sale. We can give 10 times, 100 times that much. We can give, we can make a difference in the lives of the people of Africa in The United Methodist Church around the world. I support the Minority Report.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. No more speeches in favor are in order. Only speeches that would be against the report that's before us now. Okay. Down here.

TSHIBANG KASAP (North-West Katanga): [Speaking French without an interpreter]

BISHOP HEARN: Translation please and I'd like for the translator to indicate to the speaker that this speech must be against the amendment or it is out of order.

KASAP: [Speaking French]

BISHOP HEARN: We're not hearing the translation.

KASAP: [translator for Dr. Kasap] Oh, I'm sorry. I'm one of the professors who visited Africa University for four months in 1997. I ask the delegates to please listen carefully to what I have to say. On the eve of African independence the Catholic church began universities two or three years before the independence of African countries. The Protestant church has hesitated because they said that the creation of universities is very expensive. Africa University was just born in 1992, and we thank the church very much for this gesture of love, because Methodist students find a field for studies and for science. However during my stay at Africa University I discovered something. I discovered that they lacked lodging for married students. Imagine a married student who comes from Congo or Nigeria and who leaves his wife behind for four or five years.

BISHOP HEARN: I need to ask the translator to inform the delegate that the time is up. Will the translator please inform the delegate that the time has expired for the speech? [Translator informs speaker of the time]

KASAP: I support the Africa University request for tomorrow.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Because of the difficulty in language, you understand that I allowed this speech to continue, although it was not really in

order at the house at the time. Now we have had four speeches now that have been in favor of it, I think. We've had no speeches against it. So only if you're speaking against it will you be in order. I'll go back to the back there in the yellow one that's in the middle.

CHARLES BOAYUE, JR: (Detroit) Bishop, I'm speaking neither for nor against, although I know how I'm going to vote. I have a question. Can GCFA inform the house as to whether support for Africa University has increased since its establishment? And also how much the inflation rate in Zimbabwe is.

BISHOP HEARN: This is an inquiry that we'll ask GCFA to respond to. Bishop Norris?

BISHOP NORRIS: Bishop Hearn, I think we would have to refer that question to the treasurer of Africa University. He's in a much better position to answer that question than I'll be.

BISHOP HEARN: OK, if you will give us that information.

AUBREY LUCUS (Mississippi): I'm the new treasurer.

(Laughter)

I, I think that I can safely say that the church has increased its generosity through the years. It's not been dramatic, but I think it has been steady.

BOAYUE: I like, Bishop, can the treasurer indicate—my understanding is that we've been giving \$10,000,000 each quadrennium till now. So if that's not the case, can you indicate the amount of change and which quadrennium it happened. Also what is the inflation rate in Zimbabwe. Because I think this has great bearing on the actual value of what we are doing to Africa University.

LUCAS: The inflation rate somewhere in the 70%; I'm not sure specifically. And the apportionment has been, I think, \$10,000,000 for two quadrennia. Am I right on that? No.

BOAYUE: If that's the case, there's been no increase in the dollar value this far in over 70% inflation rate. Although my speech is not in favor or against.

(Applause—Laughter)

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, we'll come down—let's go over here on this side. If you'll go to mike no. one. Yes, please. I want to remind you that the only speech that is in order is against the amendment that has been made.

JAY BRIMM (Southwest Texas): Bishop, I rise reluctantly to speak against the minority report but in favor of Africa University. I'm a member of the Higher Education funding task force for GCFA, and we spent a lot of time talking about the wonderful progress we've made at this university. The difficulty we face as members of General Conference is to balance all of the mission opportunities we have as a church. I want to remind the delegates that we've already passed \$19,000,000 over the budget that's been offered by GCFA, and we'll be talking about how we're going to cover that \$19,000,000 if we add another \$10,000,000 in with this very worthwhile request. We will be adding another 50% above what we're already talking about in additional funding. Friends, we've made great progress over these last four years in building the apportionment payments from our local churches. Let's continue that progress by sticking to our budget. And let's talk to our friends and our local churches about supporting this university through additional special payments over and above apportionments. I ask you to defeat the minority report but work for Africa University.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay. We can take one more against and then we'll need to go on to vote. I'll take the orange card that is close to the aisle in the back. Right in the middle, close to mike six. What is your question?

PE DZISAI KANGARA (Zimbabwe): Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Are you going to speak against the amendment that's on the floor?

KANGARA: I have a question, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: All right.

KANGARA: Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: What's your question?

KANGARA: Is there any plan for a second university in Africa? Knowing the population growth rate, knowing the economic problems of Africa, knowing the disadvantages which have been there for I don't know how many centuries, because that may give us an idea that at least {Unintelligible} will come.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. I appreciate your question. It is not on the subject that's before the house right now. I would like to ask some of the people from Higher Education to personally

talk to you to give you an answer to that question so that you might have information. Are you ready to vote?

DELEGATES: Yes.

BISHOP HEARN: I believe you're ready to vote. The item that is before us is Item 1360. I'm going to ask now if the mover of that wants to make a comment, and then we'll have a person from GCFA also make a comment. Yes?

SITTS: Thank you, Bishop. In 1988, the committee recommendation was asking for \$5,000,000 annually for a total of \$20,000,000 for the quadrennium. Following the budget approval of 1988 that amount was cut in half to the current \$10,000,000. Concept was new and unproven. There wasn't a way of knowing that this idea would work, must less, strive. But now Africa University has succeeded. Included in that is an expansion of at least three campuses. If it is proven accountability, as Dr. Aaron Black stated, the future looks sweet, but I would add one thing. The future is here, let this process finish what it started to do. I urge support for the minority report.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay. We'll hear now from representatives of the General Council on Financing and Administration.

BISHOP LOONEY: After these stirring speeches and enthusiasm I feel about as safe as Daniel in the lion's den. There is no one here who would like to say a word against Africa University, certainly not I. But I would like to say a word of encouragement to you to know that churches have responded this quadrennium because they felt like we had a reasonable balanced bottom line. I would remind you also that Africa University is being increased, a modest amount certainly \$100,000 plus \$76,000 from prior claim. The university has its own provision for endowment at this point. And I would simply say that with the enthusiasm exhibited here, if we would go back to our annual conferences we could raise the other \$10 million in World Service Specials and I would encourage you to do that rather than continuing to increase the percentage of the budget before us.

*Minority Report Budget
for African University Defeated*

BISHOP HEARN: All right, this amendment to the GCFA report is before you. You will vote when the light appears. It is defeated [Yes, 304; No,

589]. Stan Sager, do you have some other matters?

SAGER: Yes, I do.

BISHOP HEARN: Here's another one.

Episcopal Fund Budget Approved

SAGER: Yes, I have some more, Bishop. On p. 2090 of DCA you will find Calendar Item 1162. It refers to Report No. 5 from GCFA, the Episcopal Fund, which is Petition 30704 which you heard earlier. The committee votes to concur. There was no more minority report.

BISHOP HEARN: Then this report does not differ from the GCFA report.

SAGER: It concurs in the GCFA report, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: I'm not sure we even need to vote on this, but if you will concur with the committee, you will vote yes. If you disagree, you vote no. Vote when the light appears. You have approved this [Yes, 816; No, 53]. The reason why I was raising a question about whether or not we really needed to vote on it is because when we vote on the GCFA report, we're going to vote on exactly the same material. So I wonder if the house would have that same understanding so we don't have to go through all of this twice. With that understanding then, Stan, if you could give us only those items where there is a difference from the Legislative Committee from the GCFA report.

SAGER: All right, that would take us to jump to Report No. 7 from GCFA. That appears at p. 2239, Calendar Item 1542. There is a minority report but, Bishop, I have good news with respect to that. In the spirit of love, openness, and cooperation that so characterizes the people that work with the finances of the church, the minority report has been subsumed into the report given by GCFA and so it no longer needs to be considered and can be stricken in whatever way the persons that handle this work out.

BISHOP HEARN: I tell you my dad has been busy this afternoon with those saints in heaven to get all this together for us. Thank ya, Papa!

SAGER: And with respect to the reports that have been given this afternoon, we have no other matters that did not involve concurrence.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, we'll turn back, then, to the report from GCFA. And just for the record let me state

again, that we are operating under the principle that those matters that went through the legislative committee on finance that concurred so that there is no disagreement with the GCFA report, will be taken care of technically by our approval of the GCFA report. Just for the record. GCFA have another word for us? You ready to move on for our action on the report?

CASHAR EVANS (North Carolina): Are you ready to move acceptance of Report No. 1?

BISHOP HEARN: Yes I am.

EVANS: I urge you to accept the Report No. 1.

GCFA Reports 1-4 Approved

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you. Report No. 1 is now before us. If you will approve Report No. 1, you will do so by voting 1; if you disapprove, you will number 2 when the light appears. You have accepted Report No. 1, by a vote of [Yes, 837; No, 46]. Bishop Norris.

BISHOP ALFRED NORRIS: Bishop Hearn, I urge the approval of Report No. 2.

BISHOP HEARN: Report No. 2 is now before you from the GCFA. You will make your decision about Report No. 2 when the light appears. It passes by a vote of [Yes, 802; No, 53].

BISHOP NORRIS: Bishop Hearn and members of the General Conference, I urge support of Report No. 3.

BISHOP HEARN: GCFA Report No. 3 is now before the house. You will vote on Report No. 3 when the light appears. It passes [Yes, 833; No, 36].

BISHOP NORRIS: Bishop Hearn and members of the General Conference, I move support for Report No. 4.

BISHOP HEARN: GCFA Report No. 4 is now before the house. You will vote this report when the light appears. It passes [Yes, 824; No, 47].

EUGENE W. MATTHEWS (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop Hearn and members of the conference, I move Report No. 5.

BISHOP HEARN: GCFA Report No. 5 is now before the house. Yes. Microphone number 2.

DEBORAH L. PRITTS (North Central New York): Thank you for allowing this question Bishop Hearn. I may be totally confused and that would be a wonderful thing. The conference's legislative committee removed Calendar Item 336 from the consent calendar yes-

terday because it was our understanding that it had financial implications. It dealt with changes to the formula that considered the number of bishops applicable in a jurisdiction. We were instructed that it was necessary to place that calendar item before the entire house because it had financial implications. The understanding that we had was that by the General Conference concurring with calendar item 336, we were making it possible for the Northeastern Jurisdiction to retain its current number of episcopal areas, rather than experiencing a reduction in one episcopal area as would have been mandated by the 1996 *Book of Discipline*. So my question is, the GCFA report that is now before us, does it include adequate provision for the action that we took yesterday that includes a tenth episcopal area in the northeast?

BISHOP HEARN: We'll ask GCFA to respond to this inquiry.

MATTHEWS: Yes it is. I'm sure...I apologize for that not being clear in presentation but the matter is on the budget.

GCFA Reports 5-7 Approved

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you. The matter has been properly taken care of. GCFA Report No. 5 is now before us. You will vote on No. 5 when the light appears. It passes. [*Yes, 842; No, 50*]

MARILYNN LOYD (Little Rock): Bishop and delegates, I move the acceptance of Report No. 6.

BISHOP HEARN: Report No. 6 is now before the house. You will vote on Report No. 6 when the light appears. It passes. [*Yes, 826; No, 36*] Marilyn.

LOYD: Bishop and delegates, I move the acceptance of Report No. 7 and it is amended, so with amendment.

BISHOP HEARN: Report No. 7 as it was amended is now before the house. You'll vote on Report No. 7 when the light appears. It passes. [*Yes, 821; No, 52*]

BISHOP LOONEY: Bishop Hearn, I'd like to thank the presenters and the house. All the items on 17 were for information and were included in the matters on which you've now voted. So this concludes the budget presentation. There are several other reports that will be fairly simple to deal with. We'll turn to number 8 now. To be clear, they're saying maybe we should move 17 so there is no confusion. Because I think all

the items there were included in the first seven reports.

BISHOP HEARN: And so you are moving for adoption Report No. 17, see page 2362 because the information in that was included in the reports that you have made.

BISHOP LOONEY: Right.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. GCFA is moving Report No. 17, see page 2362. Wait just a minute. Wait just a minute. Oh, excuse me, it's the extra sheet.

BISHOP LOONEY: It's 2295 is where it begins in today's DCA.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, this is before us on page 2295. Somebody had a question. Okay, up here, green card. Mike 2.

TIM BAGWELL (South Georgia): Bishop Looney, a question. Under item number 22, it reads, "General Council on Finance and Administration recommends that this be referred to the General Board of Global Ministries for funding within the amount established in revised World Service Fund report number 1." Is this directive, or is it a request?

BISHOP LOONEY: My assumption is it's directive.

BAGWELL: It is directive?

BISHOP LOONEY: I better make sure.

BISHOP HEARN: General Secretary Sandy Lackore.

SANDY LACKORE: The General Board of Global Ministries has agreed ahead of time to fund that.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, next question. Okay, way in the back, back there there some hand moving. Yes, you. Mike 8.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): Africa University Coordinator. I wish to make an amendment to item 19 for clarity. Our conference is the last conference to endow a scholarship at Africa University, wondering why 55 other conferences around this table have not done so with 304 votes against proposal. But one of the problems we had while working on that . . .

BISHOP HEARN: Excuse me, you said you wanted to make an amendment. It will help if you make your amendment first and then speak to it.

Motion Approved for GBHEM and GBGM to Combine Africa University Scholarship Efforts

GOODWIN: Sorry, Bishop, not the first time I get out of line. At the bottom it reads "GCFA recommends that the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry continue to seek funding as a World Service special gift under provision, blah blah blah for a goal of \$10,000,000." The amendment I want to make is that it should also maybe read that "the General Board of Higher Education with cooperation of the Global Board of Ministries," and I will explain why I believe that's so.

BISHOP HEARN: Is there a second? All right, it's before us.

GOODWIN: In our efforts to endow the scholarship of Peninsula-Delaware Conference we tried to enroll the United Methodist Women in the capacity to help us. There was a disagreement between the United Methodist Women over their ability to help because the Advance Special no. 030188 is under the Board of Higher Ed and thus, ineligible for support according to the United Methodist Women. If it is a number that is jointly sponsored by the Global Board and Higher Education, I think this disagreement or misunderstanding would be eliminated. So I would amend the proposal to include both of those boards so there would be greater cooperation between our agencies.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, if you, before you leave the mike, if you'll indicate exactly where you want those words put in to the sentence.

GOODWIN: I would say after it says, "General Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the Global Board of Ministries working in cooperation..."

BISHOP HEARN: You're talking about the General Board of Global Ministries?

GOODWIN: Yes. My boss.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Okay, this amendment is before us. I do not see anyone wishing to speak for it so if you would adopt this amendment or not adopt the amendment be prepared to vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 599; No, 248*] The amendment is adopted. Back there close to mike 6. I see a hand with...

*General Conference Directing Activity of
a Following General Conference
Questioned*

GREGORY PALMER (East Ohio): I have a question on Report No. 17, see page 2362. Beginning on page 2295, the right hand column, approximately line 10 from the top with the sentence that begins, "GCFA asks that the adoption of this report serve as confirmation from this General Conference that all programs, projects and initiatives that are being recommended for continuation beyond the current quadrennium shall be included within the budgets of the general agencies which have provided support," etc., etc.—my question is, is this wise, and secondly, in light of the chair's ruling on p. 2255 that deleted language from a minority report as being inappropriate and out of order about one General Conference binding what the next General Conference can do—how appropriate is this wording in the narrative portion of this report?

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, would someone from GCFA like to respond to Dr. Palmer's question?

LACKORE: Bishop and members of the General Conference, this language was only intended to implement the already disciplinary responsibility of the General Council on Ministries in assisting the general agencies of the church and evaluating the ministries that you assign to them.

BISHOP HEARN: This then would be within their disciplinary responsibilities and would be no more binding to them than any other provision in the *Discipline*. It would be within their normal assigned work task. All right, over here next to the wall, behind mike 5.

*Additional Amendment Proposed for
European Ministerial Education Fund*

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): I would like to amend on p. 2297, Item 12 on that page under "Theological Education in Europe." My amendment would be in the second paragraph to read "recommends that \$2 million be allocated to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry." If I have a second I would like to speak to it.

BISHOP HEARN: Is there a second? Here's a second. Go ahead, Don.

MESSER: We've had much discussion in this General Conference about the need for reaching out to Eastern Europe. The Higher Education and Ministry board has set aside \$2 million of

which they ask this conference to give \$2 million, to give the first apportioned funding ever to those schools. By cutting it by 50%, we have made a major action, which will be very damaging to the efforts to help those 5 institutions, Estonia, Russia, Graz, Czech, Poland. This is almost like the widow's mite in the light of all that was recommended in this report for increases. If I understood it right, GCFA brought in nearly \$45 million more, but only \$1 million for this important work at this time. Furthermore, there's an erroneous point in the paper handed out to us on No. 21. I'm sure it's just simple confusion and not intentional. Item 21 should be "Church Growth and Congregational Develop in Europe." None of that money was voted on or recommended for the Russian Seminary. So the title is wrong, and, of course, as you can see in that particular petition, all that money for apportionments was eliminated and placed in Advance funds. So, in light of all this, I recommend that you support a small increase of \$1 million which goes back to the original intention of the legislative committee, which we have overwhelmingly adopted with \$2 million proportion to be matched from funds from the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry for those theological schools in Europe.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. The amendment is that the Item 12 be amended to change the \$1 million dollars in the first line of the bold paragraph to \$2 million. That's what's before you. All right. Let's see. Go right back here in the middle, and the yellow one way in the back there. Would you go the mike either 6 or 5? Which ever one. Going to mike 5.

FRANK DORSEY (Kansas-East): I want to speak in favor of the Messer amendment, and I want to do so because I have never seen a body find it so hard to seize upon the opportunity of a *kairos* moment. It is before us, friends. We must give some apportioned money to guarantee some money to put together the ways that we can leverage the support we need to make a witness to Jesus Christ through Eastern Europe, and in Russia, and the CIS. It is a *kairos* moment. I hope you will support it.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. What is your point of order?

SHAWN HARTMAN (Central Pennsylvania): My understanding as we've already acted on the first recommendation, the first report which is the World

Service Fund where this is at. So will we not have to reconsider the entire World Service Fund Budget to make this change.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. I'll ask for a response, first of all, from GCFA.

LACKORE: The reason the GCFA placed Report 17 before the General Conference was because there were a couple of references to us that did not involve budgetary matters such as the recycling issue that is on the sheet. Our understanding is that you have acted on the budgetary issues around Report 17 when you passed the World Service Fund.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. I want, first of all, I'd like for GCFA to point out to us the items that we've not acted on in Report No. 17, see page 2362 and then I am going to rule that we have already acted, as the point of order indicated, on the items that are contained in Report No. 17, see page 2362 and I would require us to reconsider if we were going to do anything else with that. What are the two items that we've not actually talked about in terms of funding?

Recycling and Use of Recycled Products

LACKORE: On p. 2297, Item 13, "Recycling and Use of Recycled Products," Bishop, was a referral for reference back to the 2004 General Conference. That is the only item that is before you.

BISHOP HEARN: That we have not acted on. OK. Yes. The chair is going to then say that the only item that is before us in Report No. 17, see page 2362 which was put before us by Bishop Looney. The only item that is before us is No. 13 which is simply a reference that comes back. And if you would like to adopt this . . . All right. What's your point of order? Mike 5.

MESSER: Bishop Hearn, Bishop Looney made a motion to approve the described report on 17. He re-opened that. Now you are closing after you have opened it and made amendments in various parts of the report. I appeal to the chair that the report was opened by a valid motion by the GCFA, and that the motion that I have made is before us. If it requires later opening World Service to add this \$1 million for Russia then we'll have to do so, but it was brought forth by your very body and allowed on the floor.

BISHOP HEARN: OK. In this regard, you can blame the Chair if you wish to

do so, but the Chair's ruling is that we have acted upon those items once. In order for them to be acted upon again this House will have to vote reconsideration of them. Now I am informed that the one part of Report No. 17, see page 2362 that has not been acted upon is No.13. So the chair is putting item No.13 before you at this time. If you would like to indicate your decision concerning item No. 13, you'll vote when the light appears. It is accepted [Yes, 719; No, 97]. Does this complete all the action that we need to take, Tracy?

TRACY R. MERRICK (West Pennsylvania): Bishop Hearn and delegates, if you would turn with me to Report No. 8, the Apportionment Formula, it's found on pages 344 and 345 of the red *Advance DCA*. This should be very brief because we have been to describe the work of the Connectional Ministries Funding Patterns Task Force, and you approved that report earlier, but I do need to make a couple of comments. In the Recommendation Section of this particular report on p. 345, there is a reference to the word of the Connectional Ministries Funding Patterns Task Force and the apportionment formula which was in Report 16, which you adopted the other day. When you hear from Stan Sutton, [sic. Sager] you'll realize that there was an amendment to this section of the Report 8 by the Legislative Committee. One other comment that I need to share with you, and that is that if you would look in Recommendation No. 2 you will see a P factor that's reflected there, and it's 3.619284%—certainly a percent that all of us are going to re-memorize before we go home, right? You will realize fairly quickly that that percent was one that was established based on the budget that was originally proposed by GCFA and the formula that was originally in Report 16. So that percentage will need to be recalculated at the end of the General Conference given the fact that we have changed the amount of the budget, the apportionment formula which changed in Report 16 when it was adopted the other day. That is the information that I need to share with you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Are you saying then that the material that's in Report 8 has already been adopted by the Conference?

MERRRICK: What I am saying is that Recommendation 1 does not need to be adjusted as it was adjusted in the Legislative Committee because that content

was already adopted by the General Conference under Report 16.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Let me ask the question the other way around. Do we need to adopt Report No. 8? I'm being informed now that we need to Report #8. If you will vote your conviction when the light appears. [Yes, 779; No, 64]

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): Yes, Report No. 8. The vote has already been taken. Perhaps all I can do..What I needed to do was confirm what was said with respect to the committee, and we voted a minority report, but the amendment was made and subsumed into Report 16. So we're in agreement.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Material from the legislative committee was absorbed in this report so it's all the same and it passed by the vote that you saw on the board.

BISHOP LOONEY: Just so the chair and the house will know, that we have Report No. 9, "Sundays with General Church Offerings"; No. 10, "The Condition of the Agencies of the Church—Internal Control Audit"; then [No. 11] "Directives for the Administration of the General Funds"; 13, "References from the 1999 [sic, 1996] General Conference"; 14, the "Budget of the General Council on Ministry"; "Reports Presented from Other [General] Agencies." All those should be brief, but just to let the house know, there are several other reports coming.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, if you will move as expeditiously as you can in putting those before us. Is Report No. 9 next?

Special Sundays Offerings

PATRICIA HINKER (Member, GCFA): Bishop Hearn and delegates of the General Conference, I'd refer you to pages 345 in your red *DCA, Advance*, for the Report No. 9 on Sundays with General Offerings. The 1996 *Book of Discipline* gives to the General Council on Finance and Administration the responsibility to recommend to the General Conference the Special Sundays with offering. And it gives to the General Council on Ministries the responsibility for recommending Special Sundays without offerings. A joint task force of these two councils has traditionally cared for this work. The joint task force had several meetings with the general agencies responsible for administering the ministries that benefit from the Special Sundays. We also ex-

amined the focus group research done in the last quadrennium by United Methodist Communications. We gathered information regarding the number of churches actually participating in the offerings and examined the promotion costs in relation to the dollars raised. I want to emphasize that the task force agreed that all of the ministries supported by these Special Sundays offerings were valid and worthy ministries. But we questioned in some instances whether or not a Special Sunday offering was the most effective way of raising the funds. We learned that the number of churches who participated in a special offering ranged from a low of 18.67 % for Peace with Justice Sunday to a high of 39.36 % for One Great Hour of Sharing. In 1998 the costs of raising the funds ranged from a low of 9.3 % for One Great Hour of Sharing to a high of 22.1 % for Peace with Justice Sunday. Due to the low participation by local churches in many annual conferences, the actual net proceeds from some of these offerings did not appear to be an effective means of raising funds. A better alternative would seem to be for the agency to include the program costs in their regular World Service budget.

Our recommendation to reduce the number of Special Sundays from six to four was made to GCFA and GCOM at their joint meeting in November. We recommended retaining One Great Hour of Sharing, World Communion Sunday, incorporating the scholarships from the Student Sunday, Native American Ministries Sunday, and combined Peace with Justice Sunday and Human Relations Day into a new Sunday; Justice, Love, and Mercy Sunday. The recommendation comes to you with the affirmation of both the General Council on Finance and Administration and the General Council on Ministries. Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you. Report No. 9 is before us, and I believe that the legislative committee on financial matters has some amendments. Stan, we turn to you.

SAGER (New Mexico): Bishop, while the committee concurred with that report, there is a companion petition that appears at page 2038, Calendar Item 671, ADCA page 441, Petition No. 31176. It is also my understanding that there were two or three petitions that were acted on within other committees, as I've been told by the chairs of those committees, that would also have the

affect of amending the report on Special Sundays. The minority-type report that was produced in my committee—that is, the committee on financial matters—is to be presented by Warner Brown, delegate from West Michigan.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, we'll hear that amendment. Would you give us the page and the calendar number again, please?

WARNER H. BROWN (California-Nevada): Bishop, members of the Conference, I call your attention—

BISHOP HEARN: Excuse me, give us the page and the calendar number again, please.

BROWN: That's, that's what I'm about to do, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, thank you.

BROWN: I call your attention to page 2155 of the DCA.

BISHOP HEARN: Could I interrupt you just a minute? If there is another chair of a legislative committee that has something that relates to this item, you'll need to make your way up here to the platform.

BROWN: This will be found under Calendar No. 1358. Calendar No. 1358. I move to substitute the language in the minority report for the action of the section on this matter. The purpose of—let me move that, Bishop, and then I'll speak to it.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. It's coming from a committee. You're in order to speak.

BROWN: The purpose of this motion is to give local churches the opportunity to receive these offerings without making them mandatory. Language has been shifted to make some of these offerings permissive rather than required. The Special Sundays provide excellent opportunities to inform churches about ministries across the church and allow choice in the benevolences we support. It is recognized that some churches do not observe these offerings, while others fully avail themselves of these opportunities to give support to ministries beyond the local church. I've looked at the Giving Patterns Report for these offerings, and it is true, across the church, a number of churches do not support this offering. However, across the church, a minimum of one out of every five churches receives each of these offerings. In several of our jurisdictions, almost 25 % of the churches receive all of the offerings.

The change presented in the majority report is likely to result in a reduced funding in effective ministries, such as United Methodist scholarships. I stand before you as a Crusade scholar, and to say that to attempt to reduce from two offerings to one to receive scholarship money is likely to result in a loss. Based on the 1997 giving patterns, in order to see an increase in any of these funds, we must assume that there is going to be a 40 % increase in giving to these offerings. In addition, when we look at the cost of promotion, when we shift from six to four the per-offering cost increases, it does not come down. In addition, as we look at the efficiency of collecting these offerings, it's been reported to you that our cost ranges from 6.6 % for One Great Hour of Sharing to a high of a little over 26 % for Peace with Justice.

BISHOP HEARN: If you'd sum up as soon as you can, please.

BROWN: Yes, Bishop, with these last two comments. When we compare a report from the Better Business Bureau, it recommends that promotional costs for nonprofits should not exceed 35 percent. We are doing far better than that. Let me ask you this practical question. If you and your local church take special offerings at different times during the year and you reduce the number you take across the year from six to four, will you receive more money? I think not.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, the amendment is before us. The intent is, as you see on 2155, to keep Paragraph 816 as it is with some adjustments there, instead of Report No. 9, which has been presented to us. Amendment is now before us. I'll go over here to the green card, close—come down to microphone 4.

DONALD AVERY (Louisiana): Bishop, I'd like to offer an amendment. My amendment would be to retain the language "shall" instead of "should." If I could get a second, I'd like to speak to it very quickly.

BISHOP HEARN: It's seconded

AVERY: I remember Bishop Kenneth Shandlin and one of the statements that he used to make. He used to tell us that we as preachers don't need to protect our people's pocketbook. They'll do a good enough job protecting their own.

(Applause)

While I'm on the floor, let me get it all out, because I probably won't get back again. I think that we should maintain the six days. We should encourage our preachers to put it before their people and give them an opportunity to give. We should not be, at this point, knocking down to people complaining about the number of special days and the number of different causes. I have learned, over a period of time, that people do what they want to do. They can always find money for whatever they want to find money for. And we need to be faithful and to put the causes of the church before people and give them an opportunity to give.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. This is an amendment to the amendment now that we have before us. Okay, right down here, please. Yes, sir.

DON WILLIAMS (West Michigan): Bishop, we have already taken action on this item and I'm wondering if it would be helpful if we heard from the chairperson of the legislative committee standing on the stage so that as we go through we can see how these mesh. I...

BISHOP HEARN: That's enough. Okay, what he's referring to is, that has already been mentioned, there is another legislative committee that has an item that relates to this. It's been my experience in parliamentary houses that usually, if you take one path and work it all the way through to the end, it works best. But, I would like for the house to be informed about this other one that is about to come, so Chris, are you prepared to do that? Danny Soliz going to do that? Danny, if you would just inform the house about the substance of the matter that you're going to put before them. He is not putting this before you now. We have two amendments before us and we will trail that out and finish them. But, we'll give you this for the information of something that will be coming next.

DANNY SOLIZ (Rio Grande): Thank you, Bishop. Bishop, the house has approved Consent Calendar Item no. 1231 which is located on page 2136. This was a resolution, a petition that was perfected by the Legislative Committee on General and Judicial Administration, which calls for the retention of the six special Sundays as well as an addition of Organ and Donor Tissue Sunday to the church-wide observance of special

Sundays, and then the addition of another church-wide observance of Disability Awareness Sunday. And then also amended Native American Awareness Sunday to Native American Ministry Sunday. So, this would have, is in opposition to what is presented in the minority report and that is, would retain the six special Sundays as they are now.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, that matter will be before us next. Right now, we have an amendment to the amendment on item number 1358 which will change the "should" to the "shall." All right, we'll go on this side of the house, right down here. Mike 2.

JUNE MCCULLOUGH (Southern New Jersey): Bishop, I speak in support of the amendment to the amendment, because it puts the language back where we have it in paragraph 266.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Are you ready to vote on this matter? We have the amendment, which would change the word "should" to "shall" in 1358. You'll vote when the light appears. [Yes, 502; No, 325] That amendment passes, which brings us back to item number 1358. All right, way in the back I see an orange card. Mike 8.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): This time I'm wearing my Conference Mission Secretary hat. In preparation for General Conference I did the numbers and then and I'm unfortunately going to have to disagree with my fellow Methodist from California, that his numbers are not correct. The cost of running Peace with Justice Sunday is 42% and he stated anything over 35 he would not donate to, which is one of the reasons. Now, one of the reasons also stated is their concern for a lack of funds. If you understand that the cost comes out of what the National gets, rolling it into Human Relations Sunday, assuming no increase in giving whatsoever, the Peace with Justice Sunday at the national level goes from \$18,000 to \$77,637. It's increasing five-fold if we do nothing. The money that's kept at the annual conference level goes from 118,000 up to 175,000. So the annual conferences will increase their money that they get to keep by 50%. Now, I do have to agree with him on the student loan side. On the student loan side it is about a 10% cost under the merged plan, but I don't think that's a big deal, because if you look in paragraph 2694, annual conferences are allowed to have their own special

Sundays with offerings. So if any annual conference finds it absolutely necessary to run their own Peace with Justice Sunday or Student Sunday, they can do so and it's according to the *Book of Discipline*. Thank you.

BISHOP HEARN: You'll need to sum up. Thank you. All right, over here the yellow card in the

BISHOP HEARN: Mike 5.

MYRON MCCOY (Northern Illinois): As one who has personally benefited from the Crusade Scholarship and United Methodist student loans, I rise and speak in favor of the amendment. What's being proposed in the main motion defies logic when you really think about it. Would we ever have one offering to help fund a multitude of causes at an annual conference or even at a general conference? During the three offerings raised during our time together during these last two weeks, would we have raised the same amount of money if we only had one offering? We would not close the wallets of our people in those situations and neither should we close the wallets of our people during this General Conference and in the next quadrennium. We don't need less money; we need more. Finally, whenever there is a high ratio of interpretation administrative cost relative to receipts, we explore and implement more cost-effective methods of promotion. If it doesn't work, we fix it. I strongly encourage us to approve the amendment.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. I am going to turn to the people who did the presentation now. Any of GCFA would be prepared to respond?

WARNER BROWN (California-Nevada): Thank you, Bishop. There's always a danger when you begin to talk about numbers and whose numbers are right. I would just share that the numbers that I use are quoted from the Consultation on Special Sundays that were prepared by the United Methodist Communications Division of Program, Benevolence and Interpretation. And it reports information that was shared at a meeting on August 25, 1998, Irving, Texas. That included task force members, representatives of boards of Church and Society, Global Ministries, Higher Education, Communications, various initiatives including Communications and GCFA staff. I would hope that we can count on our general agencies for this information being accurate. I also say that my projections were

based on actual 1997 receipts as reported and projection scenarios developed from those. If I am incorrect it's because the information that I received that was represented to be from these sources was incorrect.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, GCFA.

PATRICIA HINKER: I don't want to comment on the calculations. I didn't bring my calculator. But I can share with you that by moving from six Sundays to four Sundays there would be \$91,000 saved in promotion costs. Also, to answer the question about a more effective way of promoting. UMC has done a good bit of research around this question and in fact, a "World of Difference in Six Sundays" is a result of coordinating that promotion to make it more cost-effective and also to make it more meaningful to the giver. Bishop, would you like me to sum up at this point as well? Or do you want more questions?

BISHOP HEARN: No, we are going to a vote.

(Laughter)

HINKER: I just want to say on behalf of the joint task force, we appreciate this discussion today. It mirrors the discussion that we had over a period of about 18 months. We too struggled with these very same issues. But the reality is we felt that this is not an effective way of raising money for some of these causes. The special Sundays have become, in a way, institutional giving in that they have continued to perform at about the same levels and they also have continued to fund the same ministries since their inception. We want to also affirm the speech that indicated that the annual conferences can choose to have a Peace with Justice Sunday if, particularly in their conference, these monies are used for meaningful projects. And so that way the annual conferences where the Peace with Justice Sunday, for instance, is successful, would be those annual conferences that would receive that offering. And so, Bishop and delegates, I would urge you to support the GCFA report.

BISHOP HEARN: The amendment is before us, which would basically keep paragraph number 816 as it is in the current *Discipline*. If you will vote your convictions when the light appears. [Yes, 534; No, 301] So the amendment passes. Now, I'm going to turn back to Danny Soliz because another legislative group that dealt with the same mat-

ter has a slightly different twist on this. So, I'm going to put this before the house and then we're going to see where we are. Danny, would you come and share with us that information, please. The next General Conference, we can't tell them what to do, but we do want to tell them, get all these petitions together in the same box next time.

DANNY SOLIZ (Rio Grande): Bishop, the item is found on page 2136. It's Calendar Item 1231.

BISHOP HEARN: OK.

SOLIZ: We felt that it was important to maintain the six special Sundays in particular because of our desire to see United Methodist Student Day and Peace with Justice Sunday continue. We felt like they had been a benefit to the church and we want to make sure that they are preserved. This calendar item maintains six Special Sundays with offering. As I said earlier, it amends Native American Awareness Sunday to Native American Ministries Sunday. And it increases from two to three the number of special Sundays without offering and we would now observe Organ and Donor Tissue Sunday and would increase from three to four the number of church-wide awareness Sundays, adding Disability Awareness Sunday, excuse me.

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, Danny. You were here when we just passed the action that we just took which would basically leave that paragraph the same as it is. What are the differences between what you're proposing and what the house just accepted?

SOLIZ: It would add a new special Sunday without offering, Bishop, which would be Organ and Donor Tissue Sunday. And a church-wide observance of Disability Awareness Sunday. With the option of annual conferences to collect an offering.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Then these are the two matters that would be before us in this amendment, and would you tell the house again those two differences that are between this and the action which the house just took. So everybody will know. Listen carefully because this will be the amendment that is before us now. What are the two differences that you articulated?

SOLIZ: It would increase from two to three, the number of special Sundays we would collect without offering, and that would include Organ and Donor

Tissue Sunday; and from three to four the number of church-wide observances without offering, with the opportunity for annual conferences to collect an offering, that would be Disability Awareness Sunday.

BISHOP HEARN: All right. Yes, green card.

RICHARD EDWARDS (Northwest Texas): Does this also include the change of name for the special offering that's currently in place?

BISHOP HEARN: Danny, would you respond to that, please.

SOLIZ: I'm sorry, I'm not sure I understood the question.

BISHOP HEARN: Could you repeat the question?

EDWARDS: I understood you also recommended a change in Native American Ministries. Does that also include the name change?

SOLIZ: Yes, it would.

BISHOP HEARN: Way in the back.

PORTER WOMELDORFF (Illinois Great Rivers): This item, as the speaker said, was included and passed on Consent Agenda A05 yesterday. What is the effect of that on our proposed current action?

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, I'll have to ask the persons that put it on the calendar. If it was on the consent calendar it ought not be coming back now. So can we have some clarification to that? Okay, Stan? See if you can help us.

SAGER: Bishop, on page 1705 of the DCA, in the middle column, there is a rule under the small letter "b" which discusses it, that may be helpful. It talks about, if matters approved on a consent calendar are in conflict with parts of another calendar item discussed and voted upon at a plenary session, the item discussed and voted upon shall prevail. So if there are differences, my point would be that whatever is done here would prevail over the consent calendar.

BISHOP HEARN: All right, the chair's going to rule that we have taken care of this matter and that we go back to the fact that we have passed an amendment to Report No. 9, that is before us. Number 9 has been amended by the action that we took a few moments ago to keep the paragraph the same as it is in the current *Discipline*, except to change the word *shall* to *should*, and you have already acted upon that item. So these items have been acted

upon. Does GCFA have anything else they need to bring before us?

(Pause)

GAIL SCOTT (GCFA Member): Bishop Hearn, delegates, guests. It is my pleasure to present to you Report No. 10. You'll find—

BISHOP HEARN: I want to ask you, if you would, to present this just as succinctly as possible. The material has been in the hands of the delegates, and I don't think that they're in need of a speech, a long speech, at this time. Thank you.

SCOTT: Yes, sir.

(Unidentified Person Speaks, Inaudible)

BISHOP HEARN: Okay, what is your point of order? (Pause) I missed both the *should* and the *shall*, didn't I? Okay. It'll come out in the editing. Thanks, friend. Okay, if you'll proceed with Report No. 10.

Internal Audit Department and Committee on Audit and Review

SCOTT: Report No. 10 is found on page 348 of the *Advance* edition "red book." It tells you of the work of the Internal Audit Department and the Committee on Audit and Review. Four years ago at the 1996 General Conference there was established an Internal Audit function for application to the agencies. I encourage you to read that report since it is a brand new initiative. A number of recommendations in the report, including that we continue the work of the Internal Audit Department because it is very important work. So Bishop, I move the adoption of Report No. 10.

BISHOP HEARN: No. 10 is before you. You'll vote when the light appears. [Yes, 769, No, 23]. We appreciate the work that GCFA is doing in this important field and hope that all of you will become familiar with that work. Bishop Ott.

GCFA Budget Approved

BISHOP DONALDOTT: Conference, I am Bishop Ott, vice-president of GCFA. I bring to you Report No. 14, the "Budget of the General Council on Finance and Administration." It has been before you for a number of weeks in the *Advance DCA*, pages 361–362, was before you in a revision in this morning's *DCA*, pages 2293–2294. The revisions are modest, they're driven by actions that you have taken, And I put it before you.

BISHOP HEARN: This budget is before you. You will vote when the light appears. [Yes, 794; No, 34]. Bishop Looney?

BISHOP LOONEY: The Report No. 11 is on Page 350 to 352 in the *Advance DCA*.

BISHOP HEARN: What's your point of order? As soon as we clear this matter we're going to Report No. 11, is that correct, Bishop Looney?

BISHOP LOONEY: Yes.

BISHOP HEARN: All right.

STEPHEN MOTT (New England): Bishop, did we ever vote on Report No. 9 after it was amended?

BISHOP HEARN: What we did was to adopt the substitute, which was in the form of an amendment to it. Just to be sure that it is in the record, we'll come back now and put the amendment as the main motion on No. 9. If you will vote on that when the light appears. [Yes, 753; No, 64] It is adopted. Bishop Looney, we turn to you.

BISHOP LOONEY: Yes, I move the report, the adoption of Report No. 11.

BISHOP HEARN: No. 11, which is on page 350. If you will make your decision on Report No. 11, vote when the light appears. [Yes, 784; No, 15] It is adopted.

References from 1996 General Conference Approved

BISHOP LOONEY: Report No. 13, found on pages 358 to 360 in the *Advance DCA*, having to do with "References from the 1996 General Conference." I move its adoption.

BISHOP HEARN: Report No. 13 is before you. You will vote when the light appears. [Yes, 817; No, 13] You have adopted it.

BISHOP LOONEY: And the final word from the mouth of any preacher, "finally," Report No. 15, pages 362 to 363. These are the "Reports Presented with Other General Agencies," and I move its adoption.

BISHOP HEARN: Report No. 15 is now before you. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 835; No, 9] It's adopted.

BISHOP LOONEY: This finishes our reports, and then we thank you and all the agencies who've worked in the negotiation. Thank you very much.

BISHOP HEARN: Let's express our appreciation of these people.

(Applause)

We have a special communication that needs to be shared with the Conference. I'm going to call on the Conference secretary, Carolyn Marshall, to make that communication known to us.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: We have received a letter from president of Macedonia, a person who has been a delegate to this General Conference the last three and, because of responsibilities there, could not share it with us. Because of our relationship with Macedonia and this individual's relationship in the country with the people there, at the church there, we are asking that a part of this letter be shared with you. We're asking Jim Shaw, who chaired the Commission or the Committee on Courtesies, to bring that to us at this time.

JIM SHAW (South Indiana): Thank you, Carolyn. Bishop?

BISHOP HEARN: Yes?

SHAW: While our committee has not appeared before the body until this time during the conference, our committee has been working and I'd like to, if you will permit, to recognize just the members of the committee.

BISHOP HEARN: All right.

*Letter from the President of
The Republic of Macedonia*

SHAW: Would the committee members please stand where you are? Betty Suzuki has been serving as our secretary,

(Applause)

and may the other members please also stand? The letter from the president of the Republic of Macedonia reads as follows: "Dear brothers and sisters in Christ, I bring you greetings from Macedonia where God has been working in a powerful way. My country of Macedonia has just gone through a crisis of immense proportions, testing the very fabric of our society. The Kosovo crisis of last year brought almost 300,000 refugees into Macedonia. And yet the citizens of Macedonia stood together, united, and overcame our problems when many said we could not. I credit our God in keeping Macedonia together during these dark days, and I know that you and countless others around the world were praying for us. I can tell you that the prayers of the saints were heard. Today

God is allowing me to serve my country as president. I am both humbled and honored to serve, knowing full well that God has put me in this position so that His name may be glorified and so that others might have the opportunity to know Him. I appreciate your continued prayers and support. While you are at General Conference, may you remain focused on the one issue which binds all of us together: the transforming love of Jesus Christ and eternal light with him and the believers. We're all called to be fishers of men by our Father throughout our lives, no matter what our position is. As a former delegate I know that it is easy to get tied down in rules, regulations, and procedures, especially within organizations. But we must remain mindful of our purpose in life here on earth: to glorify our Father. Let me close by quoting the prophet Micah, who said: 'He has shown you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you? To act justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God.' Let us go forward now and carry out God's commandments to us with the final goal of glorifying his name and sharing the good news of Jesus Christ with the world. In Christ's name and love. Boris Chagosgi." Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP HEARN: We appreciate the information—

(Applause)

we've gotten from this former delegate who is now the president of the country that has such a biblical sounding name. Our rule, our adoption this morning of the agenda calls for us to adjourn at 5:30. We've just about come to that hour, but I'm going to turn to the secretary to see if there are matters that need to be shared in terms of announcements.

*Judicial Council Rules that
General Conference Has Authority to
Plan for Support of Bishops*

MARSHALL: Yes, Bishop, there are. First one is a ruling from the Judicial Council regarding the petition from the 2000 General Conference regarding the constitutionality of Petition 30958 fa823d adopted on May 11, 2000, which provides that a salary of a newly-elected bishop begins at the time of consecration as a bishop. On May 11, 2000, a delegate from the North Georgia Annual Conference moved that Petition 30958 fa823d be referred to the Judicial Council to determine whether it is con-

stitutional. The Judicial Council has jurisdiction under ¶2609 of the 1996 *Discipline*. The question of when the salary of a bishop begins has been before the Judicial Council previously. In Decision 781, the Judicial Council stated "As set forth in the 1992 *Discipline*, ¶923, bishops are paid from the Episcopal Fund, and the General Council on Finance and Administration recommends to the General Conference the budget for the Episcopal Fund. In adopting the recommendation of the General Council on Finance and Administration, the General Conference makes plans for their support as required by ¶15 and ¶25. It is clearly the responsibility of the General Conference to make these plans." Decision 781 was made pursuant to the 1992 *Discipline*. There were no changes in the relevant paragraphs in the 1996 *Discipline* to negate Decision 781. It remains the responsibility of the General Council on Finance and Administration to recommend the budget for the Episcopal Fund. Further, it remains the responsibility of the General Conference to adopt a plan to the support of bishops. The concluding digest; "Petition 30958 fa823d, adopted by the General Conference on May 11, 2000, is constitutional as it follows in the direction Article 4 of the Constitution, ¶15, of the 1996 *Discipline* that the General Conference adopt a plan for the support of the bishops of the church."

BISHOP HEARN: Thank you, Carolyn. Do you have other announcements that need to be made to the house?

MARSHALL: I do. One, these are some housekeeping things of which we should be aware. One, is that the food court in Hall A will not be serving food tonight. A reminder to be sure to check around your seat as you leave either tonight for dinner or as we conclude this a little later, and take all of your materials with you. Everything that is left on the tables tonight after the session will be discarded. The photographic and video sales now in the registration area will close soon after the break for the dinner hour. The audio tape sales in the registration area will close at 9:00 p.m. And then once again our reminder as far as the translation headsets are concerned, it is very, very important that those be turned in. They will be of no use to you after you leave here. So please leave them and turn them in upon your leaving the final time today. And then, Bishop, just a final word for our information now, and that is the fact that I'm

sure the conference would want us to send greetings to Bishop Boulton. Bishop Boulton was the bishop of the area here at the time the decision was made and the invitation issued to come to Cleveland for General Conference, and I'm sure that this conference would want to greet him.

BISHOP HEARN: If you would ask the secretary to be certain that that greeting is sent to Bishop Boulton, you'll lift the hand. Thank you. Those opposed down, and the greetings will be sent to Bishop Boulton. Are there any other announcements, Carolyn?

MARHSALL: I think that completes it for now.

BISHOP HEARN: I want to express appreciation to Bishops Huie and Solomon who have been sitting with me this afternoon. We decided that we would keep together the team that spent the day together yesterday and for this afternoon session. So I express my appreciation to them for sitting with me during this session this afternoon.

(Applause)

Now to close this session of the conference, I'd like to say a great word of appreciation to you for the help that you've given to take care of a tremendous amount of business that related to the fiscal affairs of our church. And those affairs, of course, relate directly to the mission and ministry that our church does in so many places. So we should all feel a sense of excitement about what has been done in terms of making these funds available as well as give thanksgiving to United Methodist people across the connection who make these funds available for mission and ministry in all these places.

(Applause)

I have asked Bishop David Lawson to come and to give the prayer for the close of this session. Before he does, I want to indicate to you that the two of us have shared something during this experience of this General Conference in that we both have tried to set a new tone of style.

(Laughter and Applause)

We actually were in a stomping contest together, and we both lost. Bishop Lawson, it's a wonderful thing to have you come now and to close this session with a word of prayer.

Bishop Lawson Prays Afternoon Session into Closure

BISHOP LAWSON: If you'd be willing and if you are able to do so would you stand so that we might have prayer together? Our very presence in this place, O God, is, is our testimony that we belong to you—no one else, nothing else, you. We're very tired. It would be very easy for us to ease out of here without acknowledging that simple, profound fact. But we do acknowledge it, everyone of us in the quietness of our mind, heart, just now, quietly admitting the One to whom we belong. We're grateful to you, God, for Woody Hearn and for those who back him up in this experience of guiding this house in its decisions. And just now in this moment of prayer if you will help us, our minds will range across the congregations of this denomination around the planet Earth. We've listened to them speak in a multitude of languages, we hear their song, we see them dance. We have organs and drums and pianos and guitars. And we watch in our memories as they, in a moment of worship, receive into their hands an offering plate and commit themselves to you once again in very tangible forms, and thus allow us to be here to make decisions. We're grateful for those people and their loyalty and their faithfulness. And now we go out of here looking for nourishment. We have work to do still. And will you guide us toward that nourishment—some of it food and some of it fellowship and some of it a breath of fresh air? And send us back soon, bright and fresh, in order that once again we can counsel together wondering what it might be that you would have us to do in the life of the church. We ask this in Christ's name. Amen.

Friday Evening May 12, 2000

(Bishop Melvin G. Talbert, presiding)

BISHOP MELVIN G. TALBERT: Amen. Amen. Give Cynthia and her music team a well-deserved hand. Thank you, Cynthia. Thank you. Thank you.

(Applause)

All right, if you would take your places, and let's settle down for . . . in a spirit of prayer. Take your places, and I want to begin with a brief word of prayer. Let's take your places. The dele-

gates . . . delegates, please take your seats. And let us be in an attitude of prayer. Please take your seats, let's be in an attitude of prayer.

All right, let us pray. Most holy and gracious God, we come to this last day in another General Conference. We come to this moment out of a history of struggle and pain. But even as we have experienced all of these emotions in our lives, we know that you have been with us. And so we come now to acknowledge that you will not leave us alone here this night. You will be with us. We pray that we will open ourselves to the guidance of your Spirit; and as we continue our work here together, we will be mindful of who we are: your people, called to serve through your church. Help us to open ourselves, this night and always, to doing and discerning this one thing: seeking and discerning your will. Nothing more. Nothing less. Nothing else. In the name and in the Spirit of Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

All right, friends. We have before us now whatever it takes to wrap us up, and I'm going to begin by recognizing the Agenda chair and see if she has anything for us as we get going. All right.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I believe what we have is the consent calendar.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's get the mikes on up front here. *(Pause)* All right, I think we are ready.

MASSEY: What we have for you tonight are the consent calendars. Gere?

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

FITZGERALD REIST: Good evening. I am Fitzgerald Reist, of Central Pennsylvania Conference, Coordinator of the Calendar.

(Applause)

Consent Calendars A07, A93, C07, C92, and C93, Approved

Please turn in your *Daily Christian Advocate* for today, Friday, May 12th, 2000, Volume 4, No. 9 [*sic*, 10], to page 2310. That's page 2310. The 7th Consent Calendar begins there. On page 2310, Special Consent Calendar C92 begins with Calendar Item 1149. That's Calendar Item 1149.

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

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 693; *No*, 11] You have approved it.

REIST: On page 2310, the same page, Special Consent Calendar A93, A93, consists of Calendar Item 1352. On page 2311, . . . I'm sorry, *begins* with Calendar Item 1352. On page 2311, Calendar Item 1180 has been removed; Calendar Item 1180 has been removed.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar A93, with the exception noted.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 734; *No*, 8] You have confirmed it.

REIST: On page 2311, page 2311, Special Consent Calendar B93 begins with Calendar Item 1353.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Special Consent Calendar B93.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 732; *No*, 15] You have adopted it.

REIST: On page 2312, the next page, Special Consent Calendar C93 begins with Calendar Item 1366. On page 2312, Calendar Item 1550, has been removed.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar C93, with the exception noted.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 750; *No*, 13] You have approved Calendar Item C93.

REIST: On page 2313, that's page 2313, Consent Calendar A07 begins with Calendar Item 1563.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar A07.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 752; *No*, 14] You have approved the calendar.

REIST: On page 2313, the same page, Consent Calendar C07 begins with Calendar Item 1565.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar C07.

BISHOP TALBERT: C07 is before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes*, 767; *No*, 18] You have approved it.

MASSEY: Guess what, folks? We're through!

REIST: *With the consent calendars.* Thank you!

(Applause)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, as we now move to finish the reports of the committees, friends, let me just say, I want to test this with the body, I don't want to get bogged down in special

courtesy reports and special privileges. We are going to finish the business of the Conference, and then we'll get into some of this. Mike number 8; you're waving your card back there, what is it?

KURT GLASSCO (Oklahoma): Yes, sir. Question for the Committee on Agenda and Calendar.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Listen, Committee on Agenda and Calendar.

GLASSCO: On page 2283 there's a resolution printed in the DCA that I presented on May 9. Will it appear later for approval?

BISHOP TALBERT: Can you just look at that and tell me where we can put it in the calendar? If it was brought before this conference, and you put it before the conference and it was to be printed and brought back for action, is that right?

GLASSCO: It is my understanding to submit it to the committee, which we did to perfect it. And now they have published it.

BISHOP MELVIN G. TALBERT: All right. Then you might just look at that and take a little time to think about it and let me know, whoever. All right.

GLASSCO: Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: If you could do that.

REIST: It was the decision of the Committee on Agenda and Calendar, that we would turn to these items when we complete the business of the conference if we complete on time.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, thank you. We'll take it in that order then. Now as we get ready for the reports from the committee members, let me take this moment simply to acknowledge that I have assisting me tonight two persons. First of all, Bishop Alfred Norris. He's a good buddy of mine. I've known him for years. In fact, he was my best man April 1.

(Applause)

He saw me through that and I think he can see me through tonight. So thank you, Alfred, for being here with me tonight. And the other one is my colleague bishop from the Phoenix area, Bill Dew. So they will be riding shotgun with me and I hope we can see it through tonight.

(Applause)

Let's move now to the report of the Committee on General Judicial Administration, Chris Harmon.

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Thank you, Bishop. Maybe we can bring this home tonight. First I must—before we bring our regular items, I must direct you to something that we need to get clarified with the conference. If you would turn in your DCAs to page 2225. And direct your attention to Calendar Item 1401. That's page 2225, item 1401. This item has already been voted and cleared by this General Conference. However, it has been brought to our attention that there may have been some confusion with that. When the legislative committee was debating this issue and discussing it, we talked about the possibility of whether or not there were financial implications. Through our discussion our conclusion was that there were not; that the budgets of the general agency should be able to accommodate the request that was coming in this amended petition. However, when we brought the petition forth we did not include a statement of our assumption and understanding that the current budgets of those general agencies could care for this item. Now, if the body was not operating under that assumption, then I need to bring a motion to reconsider in order to make a recommendation for referral to GCFA. So—

BISHOP TALBERT: I think what you need to do is state to the body what your assumption is and then I'll test that with the body.

HARMON: The assumption was that the existing and operating budgets of the general boards and agencies would be able to accommodate the amendment that was made into this petition and is printed in your DCA.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I see a hand over here and we're going to have the body test this. Let me see what you have. Mike 6.

*Pan Methodist Participation
in Boards and Agencies*

BILL LUX (Iowa): I'm wondering if the members of the Pan Methodist Committee have been consulted as to whether they would agree to sending a person to be on each board and agency. As you know, most of those members are bishops of AME, CME and AME Zion churches. I wonder if they're will-

ing to take the time to spend. That needs to be connected with them before we ask them or maybe we could extend the invitation.

BISHOP TALBERT: I think that's the issue. It'll be extended. Let's test the body and see if you agree with the assumption that the chair stated. If you agree with the assumption you'll vote with one, if you do not, vote two. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 694; No, 93] All right. They agree with your assumption. Let's move ahead.

HARMON: Thank you very much. We'll return now to our discussion of constitutional items with Kathi Austin Mahle who chaired the subcommittee on this area.

KATHI AUSTIN MAHLE: Thank you, Chris. Bishop...

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes.

MAHLE: I'm hoping that we can move through this fairly expeditiously. If I could have the first slide. What we have prepared is the recommendation of the committee with the information that we have already approved. The first sentence that you see there, "The United Methodist Church is part of the church universal, which is one body in Christ," is currently in the *Discipline*. We did not do anything with that sentence.

BISHOP TALBERT: Now let me just test, are you with her—do you know what this is? You're clear?

MAHLE: Yes, I'm sorry, paragraph 4, page 258, Calendar Item 1380.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

MAHLE: This morning we took action with The United Meth. I had assum. .2158. The slide that I thought was being prepared does not reflect the action that we took this morning. As you read this next sentence, "The United Methodist Church acknowledges that all persons are of sacred worth." This is part of what we are amending. In the next sentence, beginning with "all persons without regard to race, color, national origin, status or economic condition shall be eligible to attend its worship services, participate in its program, receive the Sacraments; upon Baptism be admitted as baptized members and upon taking vows declaring their Christian faith become professing members in any local church. Beginning with "all persons" and moving to "shall be" following is what we voted this morning, that is, has currently been approved. Our next sen-

tence, if we could have slide 2 and then slide 3. It's always interesting when you deal with technology. This is what we approved this morning. Now, if we could go to slide 3. This is what the committee recommends. "In the United Methodist Church no conference or other organizational unit of the church shall be structured so as to exclude any member or constituent body of the church because of race, color, national origin, status or economic condition."

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

MAHLE: Now, you referred to a group of us to work on a substitute motion by amendment and Joy Moore has that to present. I believe

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's recognize you, Joy. Go to mike 4.

*Special Committee Returns with
Amendment on Membership Eligibility*

JOY MOORE (West Michigan): In consultation with the members of the General Judicial Legislative Committee I present this perfected substitution. I believe it will be on the screen and I will read the entire constitutional paragraph and I suggest that we all breathe before I finish the third sentence.

"The United Methodist Church is a part of the church universal, which is one body in Christ. The United Methodist Church acknowledges all persons are of sacred worth and created in the image of God. All persons, inclusive of every race, color, national origin, status, sex, age, disability, or economic condition," shall be eligible to attend its worship services, participate in its programs, receive the sacraments, upon baptism be admitted as baptized members, and upon taking vows declaring the Christian faith become professing members in any local church in the connection. In The United Methodist Church no conference or other organizational unit of the church shall be structured so as to exclude any member or any constituent body of the church because of race, color, national origin, status, sex, disability, or economic condition. You will notice that during the second listing, age was not in the list. This is because of specific age-related stipulations already built into current structures regarding categories of youth—ages 12 through 17, young adult—17 through 30, and mandatory retirement at age 70.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Now, is this what you have before us, then, are these items, these words in color?

MAHLE: Except for in the first sentence, the additional words “and created in the image of God” has not been highlighted. That is not in the original motion.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I think the best thing for us to do then is to treat these additional words as an amendment coming from this small group, and we’ll put that before you then as, as what’s being debated now. All right. I see this green card over here. Mike, mike 4.

BILL HINES (West Ohio): With a question again. Are you talking about baptized members or professing members? And if this is not the case that we’re talking about baptized members, any person can be a baptized member whether they’re a baby or whoever it may be. If it’s a professing member, then we, I can understand. But in that last sentence, will this become part of our constitution and negate everything we did yesterday?

MAHLE: I believe that if you’re referring to the second list, we are talking about structures of the church.

HINES: But you’re only using the word *members*.

MAHLE: Right.

HINES: Yes, that’s right. That’s what I mean.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I think, I think—all right. The card behind you back here. Mike 6 or 8.

JASON PAULSMEYER (Missouri East): Bishop, I would like to offer an amendment to the amendment before us.

BISHOP TALBERT: You’re in order.

PAULSMEYER: I would like to strike the word *age* where it appears in the first paragraph as was highlighted on the screen. And if I have a second, I will speak to it.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is there a second? It’s seconded.

PAULSMEYER: As a young adult, I recognize the absolute importance of age inclusiveness in our church. But as a youth director in a local church, I realize the tradition that many local churches have of discriminating according to age, and I feel legitimately so in when we allow people to become professing members of our church or go through what’s, what we commonly refer to as confirmation. If we would include age in this paragraph as presented, anyone of any age, a two- or

three-year-old, could legitimately request and would have to be recognized and allowed to become a professing member of the church. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is there someone against this amendment? Do I see a hand against it? I see none. Anything from you? Did I see a hand? All right, yes. All right. Mike 4.

MOORE: I’ve not known a two-year-old to be able to make a profession of Christian faith, and so I would speak against the amendment, particularly by the example that he has used. The word in the, in the first paragraph is separated by saying “the list.” And then it says “and upon taking vows declaring Christian faith.” And that would distinguish someone who is able to make that kind of vow.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This amendment is before us. Yes. Mike 4.

ANDY LANGFORD (Western North Carolina): Bishop. I speak against the amendment. I appreciate what Joy has been trying to do. I think she’s trying to be sensitive and inclusive in her language. I believe this is beginning to take us down a road we don’t want to go down. I think the way the committee has proposed it by what Kathi has presented ought to be accepted by this group. I think otherwise, again, we’re opening up some cans of worms that we don’t want to play with if we do that.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

LANGFORD: So anyway I move that. But also, Bishop, congratulations on your marriage.

(Laughter)

BISHOP TALBERT: Thank you. What’s before us now is this motion that was made at mike 6 striking “age.” I’m going to put that motion—If you are—

MAHLE: Bishop,

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes?

MAHLE: Can I speak to that? I would support—

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes.

MAHLE: I would support Delegate Langford’s comments. The committee worked hard on the language that we submitted to you, and the language that we submitted to you has been reviewed by the GCFA general council. And I would suggest on behalf of the committee that you vote nonconcurrency to the amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. If you will strike that, if you will choose to strike “age” vote 1, if you are against striking “age,” vote 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 287; No, 559] You have voted not to strike “age” and the amendment fails. What’s before us now is the amendment brought in from this special group. Yes. Mike 2.

ARNOLD RHODES (Western Pennsylvania): I would like to make an amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

RHODES: And my amendment is that on the line, the line that says “In The United Methodist Church, no conference or other organizational unit of the church shall be structured as to exclude any.” And my amendment is add the word *professing member*.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is that seconded? I think I hear it. That is a second. You want to say something about it?

RHODES: Yes, just the word that I think there was concerns between baptized and, which would be much and the relationship with professing. And I believe we’re talking and understanding that a person who is a professing member, who has taken vows, would be open to be included into the life of the organizations that are of The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This motion is before us. Yes, back here, mike 5.

MARK TROTTER (California-Pacific): Bishop, if this is approved I will be making a motion that will clarify the issue of language. But the fact of the matter is because of Judicial Council decisions, we cannot use language that was put in the ‘96 *Discipline*. We have to go back to the ‘92 *Discipline*. It’s in the ‘96 *Discipline* that the language of “professing member” appears. So I will, and we can’t use that until this amendment, this amendment to the Constitution is ratified by all, all of the conferences, and then we’ll come back in 2004 and deal with the language of “professing member” and “baptized member.” So that’s why it has to remain “member” here so the Constitution can be in effect during that four-year period, and we will be back, I’ll be back, I should say, I hope—if you recognize me—to clarify that with a resolution.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. In the far rear, back here, the yellow. Mike 8.

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Bishop, I think we know where we are and where we are headed. I move the suspension of the rules in order that we might vote on all that is before us.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is that seconded? If you vote for the, for suspension of the rules in order to do this—you're ready to do that now, vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 810; No, 52*] Takes two-thirds, 93%, 94%. It was ready for all that is before us. Nothing but questions now or—yes? Questions or point of order. Mike 1.

JIM WELCH (Texas): Bishop, one question. Does the inclusion of the word *disability* in the second part of that paragraph, does that mean that boards of ordained ministry, depending on how one defines disability—

BISHOP TALBERT: Sir? What is your question?

WELCH: Would we be required as boards of ordained ministry to accept every disability, whether it would be something that would lead to ineffectiveness in ministry if we adopted this? Is there some legal definition that we would be bound to?

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes, I, I think that this is something that each annual conference will have to struggle with. All right, this matter is before us. Anything from the chair?

MAHLE: The first item that we'll be voting on is the addition of the word *professing*. I would encourage you to vote against the addition of that word at this time.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. What's before us now is the amendment inserting the word *profession*. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 294; No, 651*] All right. You have not added that word. The amendment adding *professing* is defeated. What's before us now is—

MAHLE: Is the substitute—

BISHOP TALBERT: —the substitute—

MAHLE: —motion.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

MAHLE: —as amended.

BISHOP TALBERT: —the substitute motion as amended. That's before you.

MAHLE: And, and I—

BISHOP TALBERT: Go ahead.

MAHLE: And I again, would encourage the body, as much as we want to have an inclusive church, to understand that we are operating with the

Constitution. We have worked long and hard to be able to work on the issue of baptism. The language that is before you has been reviewed by counsel and at this point is affirmed. So I would invite you to vote nonconcurrency with this amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: Let me make sure. What is that amendment you are asking the body to vote nonconcurrency?

MAHLE: This would be the substitute motion. This would be adding the words "and created in the image of God" also the words, "sex, age, and disability" in the list of inclusion on the first line, inclusion list and *sex* and *disability* in the last line of the amended article.

BISHOP TALBERT: So you are saying you want this body to vote against what was worked out in, in consultation.

MAHLE: Right.

BISHOP TALBERT: You understand that? Any questions? All right. If you would, whatever your choice, for or against, vote when the light appears. All right, it's not included. [Vote count not recorded] All right, what's before us now?

MAHLE: Before us then is the—

BISHOP TALBERT: Let me just state it for the record, it was 69% against, so the amendment failed.

MAHLE: What is before you is what is found on p. 2158, 1380, Calendar Item 1380. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. It's before us. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 700; No, 170*] All right. You have sustained the committee 80%. What's the point of order? Mike 3.

FRANK H. FURMAN (Florida): I'm just trying to understand the presiding officer's interpretation. It seemed to me on those two no votes whatever we were voted on prevailed. I understood you to say just the opposite. Perhaps I've been here too long, but help me understand just where we are, sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: Well, you, those amendments were adding things in and you refused to do it.

FURMAN: OK, so in effect they were out.

BISHOP TALBERT: They're out.

FURMAN: All right.

BISHOP TALBERT: You didn't, you didn't put them in.

FURMAN: All right.

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes.

FURMAN: That's what I wanted to clarify.

BISHOP TALBERT: That's right. All right, mike 5.

TROTTER: Bishop, would an enabling motion for the Committee on Correlation be in order now?

BISHOP TALBERT: Is it relating to the item on which we just voted?

TROTTER: Yes

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes, now would be the time to do that.

TROTTER: OK. Because of the—

BISHOP TALBERT: Did you identify yourself?

TROTTER: I did.

BISHOP TALBERT: OK. Thank you.

Motion for Correlation and Editorial Revision Committee to Fix Discipline According to Judicial Council Ruling

TROTTER: Because of Judicial Council decisions, one of which was issued here at the site of the conference, some language that uses the term *professing member* was considered unconstitutional and others were not. To remove what would be inevitable confusion in the 2000 *Discipline* I have this motion which would delete this language until proposals can come back in 2004. And this is the motion. "In response to the Judicial Council decisions 811 and 884, I move that the Correlation and Editorial Revision Committee be directed to correct the language concerning membership that has not been changed by legislation of the 2000 General Conference in the following ways." And then I list about ten categories dealing with baptized or professing members to replace them with the old language of the '92 *Discipline*. And I'll read those if I can.

BISHOP TALBERT: I think you better go ahead. This is a very important thing.

TROTTER: All right. Number one, delete *baptized* or *professing member* and replace with *member* or *members*. Delete *baptized* or *professing member* or the plural, *memberships*, (or the plural) and replace with *membership*. Delete *professing member* (or the plural) or *professing membership* and replace with *members* or *membership*. Delete of *baptized members* in ¶227.3. Delete *role of professing* and replace with *role of full*. And delete *role of baptized* and replace with *role of prepa-*

ratory. And these changes would affect, but not be limited to, language in the following paragraphs in the '96 *Discipline*. Paragraph 214, 216, 226, 227, 228, [2]29, 231, 243, 244, 531, 710, 1206, 1207, 2627. This would apply both to the '96 *Discipline*, and any new legislation enacted by the 2000 General Conference with the exception to the Constitutional amendments.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is that seconded? All right, it's before us.

TROTTER: This would simply allow the Committee of Correlation to have consistent language in the *Discipline*.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This matter, I think, is very important, and the person at the mike is Mark Trotter, who has been working with this matter all along. But I think this body needs to know what it will be authorizing the Correlation Committee to do. All right. The mike right here. Mike 1.

CHRISTY YENTZER (Central Pennsylvania): Hi! I'm really confused about the vote that we just took. And I need help, because I don't know how to do things properly. But I sat in on that committee that worked on it this afternoon, and we spent a lot of time working out all those additions and wording it correctly. And, as I understand, that was approved by all the groups that it was presented to, and they supported it, and this body just voted it down. And I don't know that we're all aware of what we just voted down.

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes, what we did is sent this committee out to do this work to bring back a possible amendment for this body to adopt. This body heard that, talked about it here, but when it came to the vote, the body said, "Thank you for your hard work, but we don't want to add it. And we didn't."

YENTZER: OK

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. The motion before us is the motion from Mark Trotter. All right.

(Applause)

All right. Mike 4.

THOMAS O. GARNHART (WISCONSIN): I do speak in favor of the motion that is on the floor before us because I do believe that it's correct. But I would like an interpretation from the chair, who presented the most recent motion, who urged our rejecting what was worked out in voting for the original because language was correct—which was the primary rationale

given to us for why. There's some conflicting information.

BISHOP TALBERT: What's before us is the Mark Trotter amendment, I mean motion. That's what—back here, I'm going to recognize the card in the rear, and we'll hopefully get back to you. Yes. Mike 7.

BERNARD KEELS (Baltimore-Washington): My question is this—

BISHOP TALBERT: Identify yourself please.

KEELS: Mark Trotter indeed is a premier authority on baptism, but it was such a long motion and will have such tremendous consequence in the life of the church. I would feel comfortable if he could simplify it so that we would be able to go home and say what it applies to and why it applies. If you remember, in '96 we changed all the language. Now we'll be going back to '92, and I'm afraid the people in the pews don't have the kind of preparation that's necessary to really digest all this. And this is a critical point in the 21st century for The United Methodist Church on the issue of baptism and inclusiveness. Mark, I would just ask you, is there any way to simplify what we just heard? Because I listened with all my heart and soul, and I got lost halfway through it.

*Presiding Bishop Explains
Proceedings on Baptism*

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Let's see if we can get this now so we can get the other work. We've got a lot of work to do tonight. All right. Mike 5.

TROTTER: The language in the resolution was written for the benefit of the Committee on Correlation. The situation is that the Board of Discipleship, on the basis of the action taken by the '96 General Conference, sought to implement the action of the '96 General Conference with language of *baptized member* and *professing member*. The Judicial Council declared that we could not use the term *baptized member* because of ¶4 in the Constitution. And we'd have to change the Constitution. So we removed, originally during this last quadrennium, language dealing with *baptized member*, kept in language of *professing member*, submitted it to you. Here at the site of the General Conference, the Judicial Council issued another ruling. This one was numbered 884, which questioned whether it was constitutional for us to use that language of *professing member*, because we were using paragraphs out of the '96

Discipline, rather than the '92 *Discipline*. And they said we had to use '92. At that point we decided that it had gotten too complex, too complicated. And the best thing to do would be simply to pass a constitutional amendment empowering the next General Conference to change the language and to pull out all of the language dealing with *professing member* so that there would not be the kind of confusion in the local church over language that you have indicated would be there. And I agree.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Are we ready to do this one, friends? All right. Right here. Mike 2.

SYDNEY SADIO (Southern New Jersey): It's my assumption that what we have just passed, 1380—

BISHOP MELVIN TALBERT: Is this on the Mark Trotter motion?

SADIO: Yes, it is.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

SADIO: That what we've just passed—1380—is going to go to the annual conferences for ratification, then to come back to the General Conference in 2004.

BISHOP MELVIN TALBERT: No.

SADIO: No?

BISHOP TALBERT: When you put a constitution out there it gets ratified, and once it's ratified, it's in effect then.

SADIO: Right, but in the meantime, though, what goes in 2000 *Discipline*—

BISHOP TALBERT: Right.

SADIO: —will be what is in the 1992 *Discipline*.

BISHOP TALBERT: Right.

SADIO: Right. So it seems to me that we should vote against that amendment, because that's not helping us.

BISHOP TALBERT: Well, you, I take that as a speech against.

SADIO: Okay.

BISHOP TALBERT: Back here.

PEGGY SEWELL (Rocky Mountain): I have no voice. There it is. OK.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

SEWELL: I have also been working with the editorial committee related to this and this is what we have been instructed that we must do in order to clear, clean the language up in the 2000 *Discipline* so that we do not have to deal with more Judicial Council ruling requests. It simply brings all of the language into alignment with the action that this General Conference has taken.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this matter's before us. If you support the Mark Trotter motion, you vote one; if you're against it, vote two. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 671; No, 184] All right. You support the motion 78.5 %. All right. Next agenda item.

Petitions to Allow Constitutional Changes to Become Effective in Single General Conference

MAHLE: Yes, I'd like you to turn to p. 2240, Item No. 1548. The Petition is 31212, and it's found on p. 709 of the *Advantage DCA*. This is changing ¶58 of the Constitution. The change in this article would amend the Constitution so that legislation to amend the Constitution may be enacted at the same session of General Conference in which it is approved. This legislation has been crafted out of the legislative process from the General Council and Ministries to address the concerns raised by several Judicial Council decisions, which have delayed the restructuring plans for many annual conferences. Before this amendment was finalized, it also was reviewed by GCFA legal counsel and several bishops knowledgeable in constitutional matters. Bishop, I recommend concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before us. Yes, mike 5.

JACK RYDER: (Northern Illinois) I have an amendment to offer.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

RYDER: The amendment is to add either a second paragraph or sentence that would read: "In the same manner an annual conference may approve legislation prior to the effective date of an amendment to the constitution and/or a change to the *Book of Discipline* with an effective date after the effective date of the constitutional change and/or *Book of Discipline* change."

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is that seconded? Is that seconded? Okay, I hear a second.

RYDER: The lady at the podium just spoke to this when she mentioned the annual conferences getting in trouble. But the petition as it's presented without the amendment does not allow, does not effect annual conferences. It only affects the General Conference. This amendment will restore the spirit and some of the language from Petition 31047. It is on the top left of p. 709, of the *DCA*, which is the same page as the petition that we're amending here. And I

fully support the petition for a constitutional change brought to you from General Council on Ministries. But while their perspective for writing and submitting the document is good, it is different than that of an annual conference. As you're all aware, we have already passed several constitutional amendments at this General Conference. It will be four years before we can enact changes to the *Discipline* that will implement the will of this body.

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up.

RYDER: This amendment, if it were in effect today, would allow annual conferences to pass legislation at their sessions in May or June of 2001. That would take effect around the first of September 2001. Rather than having to wait until May or June of 2002.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This amendment is before us. Anyone speaking against the amendment? Is there anyone speaking against it? Yes. Mike five.

MEL R. BOWDAN: (Kentucky): Bishop, this change, or this prospect of change, concerns me. The Constitution, as we all realize, is a very important document. And I think it is important that any change in that Constitution also be looked at by the aggregate members of our church and be given time to look at that. I realize we are representative of that church, but even in our own government, when a constitutional change occurs, it takes two-thirds of all the states to rule on that constitutional change. The congress cannot do it by itself. And I think we're setting a precedent that could be very destructive in terms of rushing at something and changing the Constitution. And I believe it needs to go back to the annual conferences. I'm opposed to the petition.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is someone speaking for them? All right. I see none. You want to say something from the chair up here, or are we going to quit?

MAHLE: Yes, Bishop. Our legislative committee did not deal with this as the speaker—who was just speaking—mentioned. This is a very important situation and item before us. I would request nonconcurrence with this amendment until we have an opportunity to research this and bring it back in 2004.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. The amendment is before us. If you support the amendment, vote one; if you're against it, vote two. Vote when the light appears [Yes, 152; No, 712] The amendment fails. What's before us now is the motion. Are you ready? Back here, mike 8.

SWEET: I wish that an attorney who had been part of our legislative committee were still present, because he could speak to this much more eloquently than I. As an attorney, he talked about the importance of the foundational document of any constitution as a foundational document. And that constitutions are, by design, created to take a long time to change. If we pass this legislation, it gives the mood of any annual conference the possibility of creating a constitutional change. It seems to me that we should not risk speeding up the entire process.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I think, according to my record, we have two and two, and we need to now put the motion in. We are ready. If you are. This is a constitutional amendment and it takes two-thirds vote. Nothing but a question. All right. If you're ready, vote when the light appears [Yes, 344; No, 521]. You voted no. The Constitution is not changed. The motion failed.

MAHLE: Thank you, Bishop. This concludes the work of this part of the General and Judicial Administration Committee.

BISHOP TALBERT: Is that all of your work?

MAHLE: No, that's just the constitution.

CHARLES W. COURTOY (Florida) Bishop, I have three.

BISHOP TALBERT: This is the Committee on Conferences, right?

Committee on Conference Legislation to Correlate Constitutional Language

COURTOY: This is the Committee on Conferences, sir. There are three constitutional amendments that hopefully has been already settled: the issue about "professing" and constitutional amendment 4. We've been waiting until that was settled, and these simply clear up the language in the other parts of the Constitution. So I direct you to page 1846, Calendar Item 143 Petition 30315. We're dealing with Paragraph 30 of the Constitution. Page 162 in the *Advantage DCA*, top, right-hand corner. The amendment is to add the word *profess-*

ing to clarify membership of lay election to General Conference. "Professing lay members" is the addition. The committee moves concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this matter is before us. Any discussion? Yes, what's the point of order?

M. DIANE NUNNELEE (Missouri West) Did we not, by voting Mr. Trotter's amendment, null-and-void all of these considerations, because we will not be including *professing*? So aren't all of those considerations now null and void?

COURTOY: I think Mr. Trotter can speak to that. I did not hear the Constitution being eliminated, but let's let him tell us.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's, let's get a word from Mark. Mike 5.

TROTTER: The last sentence in the resolution reads, "This would apply both to the '96 *Discipline* and any new legislation enacted by the 2000 General Conference, with the exception of the constitutional amendments."

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. So he's in order. This is before us. Yes. Mike 4.

JOY J. MOORE (Michigan): I apologize, Bishop, I'm very confused right now. I thought that when Judicial and Jurisdictional brought the first amendment, we removed *professing*, and so I'm confused as to why we're trying to match by adding *professing* at this time.

BISHOP TALBERT: Can you say a word about that?

COURTOY: Bishop, I understood that they identified what "professing member" was in that constitutional amendment in the first part that was dealt with today. Is that right? . . . They say yes.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Mike 5. We've got to try to leave here tonight at 10:30, and I'm gonna give you just a few more minutes. We're gonna have to roll, here. All right, mike 5. OK.

PEGGY SEWELL (Rocky Mountain): If I could, I would speak to all three of the constitutional amendments, because the same question will probably come up for all three of them. The reason that *professing* needs to be added in these three constitutional amendments, as it was added in Paragraph 42, constitutional amendment a couple of nights ago, is that that helps us to identify to use later in the *Discipline* specific areas where only professing members can be

elected or serve. Such as, in charge conferences, it is the only place, the professing member is the only one that will be able to vote. It is only professing members who can be elected to annual conferences, to General and jurisdictional delegations, and whatever the other one is here. But, it is important that it be in the Constitution so that we know and have stated it is only "professing" who can be in those particular places of leadership in the church.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I think we're ready, friends. If you support this, the addition of the word *professing*, you vote no; if you're against it vote yes and if you're against it, vote no. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 702; No, 168] All right, you have approved it, 80%, it's more than enough to make it constitutional. Next?

COURTOY: All right, same page, Calendar Item 144, Petition 30316, dealing with Paragraph 34 of the Constitution, found on p. 164 in the *Advance DCA*. The committee moves concurrence. The wording would be, add the word "professing" to clarify election of lay delegates to General, jurisdictional and central conferences.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 791; No, 71] You have approved it.

COURTOY: And Bishop, I need to move that we take from the table the, p. 1846 in the *DCA*, Calendar Item 142. We tabled that the first day that we began to deal with petitions.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, if you would take it from the table, you will now vote when the light appears. [Yes, 809; No, 34] All right, you have taken it from the table. What is your motion?

COURTOY: The title of this petition is "Using 'Professing' to Clarify Membership Calculation Numbers for General Conference Delegates."

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, is that your motion, that you do want concurrence on this one?

COURTOY: Yes sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it's before you. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 813; No, 57] You have adopted it.

COURTOY: And then, Bishop, we had two petitions, and it's my understanding if we don't act on them, they die—and they should die, if I've understood Mark Trotter's motion—and that would put "professing" in Paragraph 602 and 603, which is in the body of the

Discipline. I believe that's what Mark Trotter—even though he did identify those paragraphs—is suggesting, that we not add the word *professing* in the body of the *Discipline*.

BISHOP TALBERT: So, what do you want this body to do?

COURTOY: Well, I guess I'm asking the ruling of the chair that we just leave it alone and not do anything with it, and let it die a natural death.

BISHOP TALBERT: Are you saying you're not bringing it to us?

COURTOY: I'll not bring it, Bishop.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. That's your problem. (Laughter) Next item.

COURTOY: That deals with the constitutional items. We have three items that we can bring from our secretary. Are we ready?

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, whatever, let's . . .

COURTOY: Our secretary, Deborah Pritts.

Petition on Mandatory Youth Delegates to General Conference

DEBORAH L. PRITTS (North Central New York): Thank you, Bishop. We are on page 1842 in the *DCA*. We are looking at Calendar Item 98. It refers to Petition 31508, the full text of which can be found on page 167 in the *Advance DCA*. Calendar Item 98 is before us because it was lifted from the consent calendar by persons within our body. The recommendation of the legislative committee relative to Calendar Item 98 is nonconcurrence. And let me say a word to you about why we voted nonconcurrence. I think it's fair to say that many, if not most, of the members of our legislative committee were initially disposed to vote concurrence on this particular item, which called for every annual conference to elect at least one youth delegate to the General Conference. We certainly have tried to do all that we can to encourage the participation of youth and young adults at all levels of the life of our church. However, as we discussed the possibility of concurrence on this matter, we were reminded of Paragraph 34, which is a part of our Constitution, Article 5. And that paragraph states as follows: "The lay delegates to the General and jurisdictional or central conferences shall be elected by the lay members of the annual conference or provisional annual conference without regard to age . . ." We felt that the Constitution was very clear on

this matter, and so, with reluctance, we recommend nonconcurrency relative to this petition.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. I recognize a card in the rear.

BISHOP TALBERT: Mike 8.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Penninsula-Delaware): There's an even better reason than what the lady suggested. If you look at who comes to annual conference, there are 54 conferences that send one lay delegate. Are we going to now disenfranchise everybody who is a lay delegate over 18 from those 54 conferences? Passing this amendment would do that.

BISHOP TALBERT: So you are against this?

GOODWIN: You betcha. (*Laughter*)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Over here. (*Pause*) Mike 4. All right, I recognize the young lady right there. Yeah. OK, sorry. Mike 4.

JOANNE HACKETT (Pacific Northwest): I would like to propose a substitute amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. You're in order.

HACKETT: And this is how it would read: "It is strongly recommended that at least 20 percent of annual conference delegates to General Conference shall be under the age of 30. In the event that 20 percent of the delegation is more than one person, it is encouraged that at least one of the delegates be between the ages of twelve and eighteen, and at least one be between the ages of 18 and 30." And if I may have a second, I will speak to that.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's seconded.

HACKETT: OK We are a church that claims to care for the needs of its young people. A few days ago we confirmed the Shared Mission Focus on Young People. By approving this amendment, we will further affirm our dedication to the young people of the church. It will allow the General Conference to hear the voice of the youth and young adults, so that we may respond based on what our dreams are, rather than on what people think the dreams of young people in the church are. People under the age of 30 are grossly underrepresented at General Conference. The survey taken of General Conference delegates that was given to everyone stated this: "Inclusiveness and representation of various age

groups is not an area where the General Conference is doing very well."

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up.

HACKETT: I present to you the fact that there are currently, at our General Conference (not counting the Central Conference delegates, because they were not included in the survey), under 7 percent of youth and young adults. This is not at all taking into account our membership within the Church, and by adopting this substitute amendment, we will be affirming our commitment to youth and young adults.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it is before us. Someone against this? All right over here. (*Pause*) Mike 5.

LAURA SIMMONS (West Virginia): I wasn't planning to speak on this, but as a youth who is here as a delegate, I oppose this amendment. I feel that we are all lay here or clergy, and if you think about it, clergy would have say five—older people, there's not a lot of young adults who are ministers. (*Laughter*) So therefore, if there were five lay members, and two of them were under the age of 30, this would kind of have an unfair advantage to those who are older. And it does say in our Constitution that it should not be based on age. I feel better about being here.

BISHOP TALBERT: Sum it up.

SIMMONS: Because I was voted on from my entire annual conference, and I think that that's more respectable than having a token position. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, your rule says no applause, no applause. Mike 1.

HENRY FREE (Troy Conference): I speak in favor of this substitute. And speaking with some youth that are here and also out of my own thoughts, I feel that this substitute is an improvement over the original petition for two reasons. First of all, it addresses concerns raised by the smaller annual conferences by its language "to encourage" rather than to "require" this. It assures these smaller conferences of their ability to nominate and elect members fully of their choice. Secondly, it addresses the desires and need of youth to be recognized, without being tokenized. Youth want to be elected to and participate as full delegates to General Conference, not because they must be, but

because they are valued as equal members of their annual conferences, and of General Conference. They want to be included knowing they have earned the respect and trust of other members of their conference to represent them. I serve by invitation of our youth.

BISHOP TALBERT: Sum it up.

FREE: The youth love the Lord, they love the church, they have the heart, and mind and soul and strength to help shape the church, not just for today, not just for tomorrow, but for today and they want one thing more, a voice and a vote to do that.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Only one against. Somebody against over here. Mike 4.

BLANE DAVIS (Alabama—West Florida): Speaking as a youth and after being here for two weeks, I would not wish this on any of my friends. (*Laughter, applause*) I can tell you that I had to work to get here. That this is not a position that we should just hand out. It should be something that a youth delegate should have to work to be able to be here, and to be able to understand all the issues that we face. So I would oppose this.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, by your vote we are ready now to move. Anything from the chair? Let the conference be in order. All right.

DEBORAH PRITTS: Our delegation to this General Conference includes amongst its five lay delegates two young adults. I believe that the body understands that we have not recommended nonconcurrency because of any reluctance to support the full inclusion of youth in our midst. And I think we've also had some discussion about the constitutional issues that are raised, so we trust the decision of the body.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Are you ready? Vote when the light appears? (*Voices yelling*) What is this back here? Mike 6. Mike 6.

ANA KELSEY-POWELL (Northern Illinois): Point of clarification. Did the substitute amendment start with "shall" or "strongly recommended"?

BISHOP TALBERT: You want to hear what it says? Let's hear. Let the body know what it says. Secretary, do you have a copy of it? Secretary, mike.

CAROLYN MARSHAL: Excuse me. "It is strongly recommended that 20 percent of annual conference delegates to General Conference shall be under

the age of 30 and in the event that 20 percent of the delegation is more than one person, it is encouraged that at least one of the delegates be between the ages of 12 and 18, and at least one be between the ages of 18 and 30."

KELSEY-POWELL: Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* Substitute fails. *[Yes, 179; No, 694]* What is before us now is Item Number 98. Over here. *(Pause)* All right, mike 4.

JOSH ELLIOT (West Ohio): Bishop, I would like to make an amendment by substitution, if this is in order.

BISHOP TALBERT: Go ahead.

ELLIOT: Thank you. I move to amend by substitution, so that the following language be placed in the *Discipline* in paragraph 502.3 as new "item X." "Each annual conference that has at least ten lay delegates is encouraged to elect at least one youth or young adult delegate to General Conference. If I can get a second, I'd like to speak to that.

BISHOP TALBERT: You have a second. It is seconded.

ELLIOT: As a young adult, of course I support the idea of better representation of youth at General Conference. However, I am concerned about trying to remedy this deficit in youth representation by placing strict regulations on the election process of annual conference delegates. If we place this proposed condition on the election process, then how many more conditions must we place to insure inclusiveness? Again, I agree that General Conference should have better youth representation and by using the word "encouraging the election of a youth or young adult." This would be in order with the Constitution.

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum it up.

ELLIOT: Thank you. I am against the original proposed method of obtaining this representation, because I believe this kind of regulation of the election process will prove to be too problematic. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Someone speaking against it? Right here.

BISHOP TALBERT: Mike 2.

ADAM HAMILTON (Missouri West): I wonder if it's possible to make a substitute for that amendment?

BISHOP TALBERT: That's a substitute for a substitute.

HAMILTON: All right. The substitute that I'd like to make is that annual conferences are encouraged to elect a youth or young adult as a reserve delegate in addition to the other reserve delegates and at the annual conference pay the expenses related to the youth reserve delegate coming to General Conference. In addition, the delegation be encouraged to allow the youth delegates to experience the legislative process on the floor.

BISHOP TALBERT: Is this seconded. Is it seconded? It's seconded. All right.

HAMILTON: All right, I'd like to speak to that for just a moment. I think it is very important that we have youth who have a chance and young adults to experience this process. To see what it's like and so that we encourage future leaders in the church. As a reserve delegate who's had a chance to float in and out of the conference delegation, it's been a great experience to have a chance to do that, to watch the experience and also to have a chance to be on the floor. At the same time many of our annual conferences only have a handful of delegates to General Conference and this would allow them to bring an additional youth delegate without having to forego any of the delegates they have. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this substitute for the substitute. I recognize this card – yes. Not you, sir; the lady. No, she's coming. Mike 4.

ERIN DUNNING (California-Nevada): I move to suspend the rules and call the question on all that is before us.

BISHOP TALBERT: You support that motion, all right; against it, vote when the light appears. All right, you are ready to vote. The substitute for the substitute is before us. Do you need to have it clarified again? You know what that is? Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 102; No, 757]* Substitute for the substitute fails. Now the substitute motion is before us. You need it clarified; you're ready? Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 222; No, 659]* Substitute failed Item 98 before us. Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 734; No, 122]* You have voted yes. It means you supported the committee for nonconcurrency. Next item.

Petition to Add Youth Delegate From Every District to Annual Conference

DEBORAH PRITTS: Bishop, the next item is found on p. 2088 in the *DCA*. It is Calendar Item 1148. The Petition is

31211, the full text of which can be found on page 162 in the *Advance DCA*. This petition deals with the topic of adding a young person from each district as a member of the annual conference. It comes to you because it is a constitutional amendment. It comes to you with the recommendation of concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it is before you. If you will support this or are against it, vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 686; No, 157]* You have voted in the affirmative, 81%, more than the two-thirds needed.

Petition for General Conference to Meet Every Fifth Year

PRITTS: The next calendar item is found on page 2063, Calendar Item 857. References Petition 31325, which is found on page 161 in the *Advance DCA*. The subject of this petition is that we gather as a General Conference once every 5 years. This would require an amendment to our constitution. I must admit it's a little more tempting tonight than it was last week. But the committee does recommend nonconcurrency.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. I think you decide whether you want it four or five. What's over here? Mike 5.

DALE JONES (Kentucky): Bishop, I wish to make a motion for referral and then if it's seconded to speak for it very briefly.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the motion for referral is in order.

DALE JONES: Move that Calendar Item 857 be referred to GCFA, which in consultation with other church agencies is to assess the financial and other implications of increasing the interval between General Conferences, and to report to the church no later than General Conference 2004.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, someone speaking against that?

JONES: I'd like to speak for it.

BISHOP TALBERT: I thought you just did. All right, go ahead.

JONES: We have budgeted for the next quadrennium \$6.2 million for General Conference. That would be about five times what was originally asked for the communities of Shalom proposal for the next quadrennium. Like the committee and others of you I'm not in favor of making a change like this right now. But it came to us from the Hispanic Caucus with some very thoughtful rationale about not only cost

savings, but time that it takes to fully implement some of our initiatives and I think it would be worth having someone look at it, give us some information and bring it back to the church so that we could if there are merits in this item. If you feel the same way would urge you to vote for referral. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. If you vote referral or not referral, vote when the light appears.

BISHOP TALBERT: You did not refer it. [Yes, 392; No, 490] What's before us now is nonconcurrence. If you are ready, if you support the committee, vote 1; if you do not, vote no. Vote when the light appears. You have supported the committee [Yes, 769; No, 113]. Next.

DEBORAH PRITTS (North Central New York): Dr. Courtoy has one additional item.

CHARLES COURTOY (Florida): Page 1841 of the DCA—Calendar Item 85, p. 182, Petition 30098. The committee voted nonconcurrence, placed it on the Consent Calendar. But this petition was removed from the Consent Calendar because when the committee voted on it, we mistakenly believed that the Judicial Council decision referred to in the petition footnotes has declared the contents of this petition to be unconstitutional. We have since learned that it is not the case. The committee had another chance on Saturday afternoon to reconsider it and chose not to reconsider it. But there were members of the committee who felt like this ought to be brought in fairness to this body, and so it's here with the recommendation of non-concurrence from the committee.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee [Yes, 779; No, 94]. Next.

COURTOY: Bishop, this completes the petitions of the Committee on Conferences. (Applause)

BISHOP TALBERT: Yes. Mike 4.

DON WILLIAMS (West Michigan): I move, Bishop, to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering a motion of reference to care for the likelihood that we might have unfinished business . . .

BISHOP TALBERT: Sir, I'm not going to take that one now. We're going to do the work as long as we can. Next item.

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Thank you, sir. To present our next items, which were lifted from the Consent Calendar, I would ask Mary Council-

Austin to join us. She is a clergy member of the Wisconsin Conference delegation and Mary chaired the team on trial procedures. That group labored through 77 drafts of trial procedures to deliver the documents which appeared on the Consent Calendar, and I commend their work to you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

Petitions Concerning Church Trials

MARY COUNCIL-AUSTIN (Wisconsin): Bishop Talbert, sisters and brothers, it's been my privilege, and also challenge, to facilitate the work of the subcommittee on trial procedures. We were blessed to have inclusive in that committee two circuit judges, 11 lawyers, two prosecutors, (laughter) district superintendents, lay and clergy and youth delegates. We were able, as a result, I believe, to fashion our work. And instead of presenting to you 77 petitions, we presented for concurrence eight primary petitions, thus the long list of nonconcurrences. I would direct your attention to p. 2304 in the DCA, Calendar Item 1397, Petition 30544, and the fuller text can be found in ADCA p. 767.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I think you have.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: Page 2309 carries the correction.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: It was originally on 2224, but now 2309. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: The legislative committee recommends concurrence. The committee on appeal may have legal counsel present who isn't conference chancellor, and I would ask Jim Allen from the South Carolina delegation to speak to this matter.

JAMES ALLEN (South Carolina): Thank you. Paragraph 2328 is the section in the *Discipline* that governs appeals from trial court decisions in church trials. Section J specifically refers to appeals from the Committee on Investigation. It was declared unconstitutional by the Judicial Council in a decision last year because the appeal went from the trial process over to the annual conference, which violated the separation of powers doctrine. So the correction, or the revision, of that section is found in the middle column on p. 2309. And it provides for appeals to the Jurisdictional Court of Appeals to correct

that problem which the Judicial Council pointed out. There's also some clarification as to who pays for counsel for the Committee on Investigation in an appeal.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

ALLEN: The committee would recommend concurrence as amended as printed beginning on p. 2309.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before us. All right; I see no card. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee recommendation 98%. [Yes, 865; No, 10] Next item.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: Bishop, the next petition can be found on DCA p. 2224, Calendar Item 1394, Petition 30546, ADCA 739. The legislative committee recommends concurrence as amended. Once again, I turn to attorney Jim Allen, a member of the subcommittee, to speak a word of rationale.

ALLEN: One of the goals of the subcommittee in this integrated document on trials and appeals procedure was to make the whole process simpler and cheaper for the church and for the respondent. We had some, I thought, novel ideas to put things in chronological order and group things together that were similar. A little unusual for the *Discipline*. (Laughter) There were two, I think, non-substantive changes that are in bold print at the bottom, which have to do with clarifying when the statute of limitations takes effect, and when the time of offense is considered, and also to bring them into alignment with Judicial Council decisions concerning the statute of limitations. The committee would recommend concurrence as amended as printed on p. 2224.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before us. The card over here. I recognize the party over here. Mike 3.

Debate on What Is a Chargeable Offense

CHRIS E. STEINER (West Ohio): I rise to move an amendment to restore Item 1B, which has been deleted by the committee's action. In other words, I want to reinsert "practices declared by The United Methodist Church to be incompatible with Christian teachings" as a chargeable offense in section 2624 of the *Book of Discipline*. If I have a second, I would like to speak to the motion.

BISHOP MELVIN G. TALBERT: It is seconded.

STEINER: Based upon the actions of this Conference yesterday, we have cre-

ated a situation that if the committee's recommendation is passed without the benefit of this amendment, we have a situation where we will have prohibited certain conduct, but we may not have a means of enforcement when violations of the prohibited conduct occur. Some delegates may assert that this amendment is unnecessary because charges which could have been brought under this provision could still be brought under one of the other provisions, such as immorality or disobedience to the order and *Discipline* of The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up.

STEINER: This creates a great deal of ambiguity because there are those who would propose that the practice of homosexuality is not immoral, nor does it violate the order and *Discipline* of The United Methodist Church. Therefore, without this amendment, the prohibited conduct may not constitute a chargeable offense under section 2624 of the *Book of Discipline*. I urge you to provide a means of enforcing the prohibited conduct, which this Conference affirmed in its actions yesterday.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Someone against this? Are we . . . Microphone 5.

RHONDA VANDYKE COLBY (Virginia): Before coming to Cleveland, I prayed that God would help me not have my mind so made up that I wouldn't be ready to learn something while I was here, and I began to learn a lot in the subcommittee that dealt with trial procedures. I thought, when I came here, that "incompatible with Christian teaching" was a broad, umbrella chargeable offense; I thought *anything* incompatible with Christian teaching. So I began to ask questions about where the lines are. I asked, for example, if one of my colleagues was seen buying a lottery ticket, would that be a chargeable offense, because gambling is by disciplinary language deadly to the moral interest. I was told by folks who are legally sophisticated delegates and staff that that would not be the case, because in fact the language was more narrow. The *Discipline* would have to prohibit actual practices that are called in the *Discipline* "incompatible." That language only appears, as I can find it, around homosexuality and war. No matter how we feel about the actions of yesterday, I think that is an unfortunate yoking of offenses. What became clear

to me is that 1B is not a defining of principle or standard; instead, it is code language for a particular offense. This body has spoken with clarity yesterday. Everything that this body by its action yesterday wished to remain a chargeable offense in this regard—that is, homosexual practices or same-sex unions—continues to be chargeable under 1E, which is disobedience to the order and *Discipline* of The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up. You need to sum up.

COLBY: Yes sir. The action of the committee doesn't negate anything we did yesterday. It removes the code language so we can be clear and thorough without being redundant in language and excessive in spirit.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Someone speaking for the amendment? All right.

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): This particular petition, I noticed, came from the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. It is titled in our *Advance DCA*, "Statue of limitations regarding certain offenses." The presentation that the committee has made has focused upon these matters, and I think the body will have no problem in supporting that petition. However, somewhere along the line in the committee, this deletion of this line B, "practices declared by The United Methodist Church to be incompatible with Christian teachings," came up and now has been brought to us as an amendment that did not come from the general board and is not germane to the basic subject or the title of this proposed petition.

BISHOP TALBERT: Are you for the amendment or against it?

WERLEIN: I am for the amendment to delete the strikethrough in "B" and support the amendment that this language, which presently *is* in the *Discipline*, should *remain* in the *Discipline*. And therefore Bishop, and delegates, I support the amendment to delete the strikethrough of "B" and leave in the *Discipline* language that is there so that in light of what we have decided yesterday, there will not be ambiguity and confusion about the position of the church.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Over here? Yes. One against. Are you against this?

ELAINE J.W. STANOVSKY (Pacific Northwest): You can count it against,

Bishop. I am here to "say uncle" to the 250 of you who voted together so consistently yesterday. I have given up hope of influencing the vote on this matter. But I am not going to take it sitting down or silent. I am called to bear witness to the faith given me. It's time to testify today in our conferences, in our churches, among our church members, and in the lives of unchurched people seeking faith, homosexual United Methodist pastors are ministering faithfully to the gospel of Jesus Christ. They are praying with people in hospitals, teaching children, they are on a Friday evening probably preparing for worship on Sunday. I ask myself, are these pastors called by God? And the answer comes, "Yes." Are they blessed and formed by God? Yes.

BISHOP TALBERT: Sum up.

STANOVSKY: Are they ordained and powered by the Holy Spirit? Yes. Are they serving God, even under circumstances of risk and persecution? Yes. Does their ministry bear the fruits of the spirit? Yes. The Holy Spirit bears witness with my spirit that sometimes God calls, blesses, forms, ordains, and sustains homosexuals—practicing homosexuals—for ministry in The United Methodist Church. The Holy Spirit bears witness with my spirit that The United Methodist Church is prohibition of homosexual clergy is contrary to the will and the work of God among us. Therefore, the church is divided and the gospel corrupted. This is my testimony, God being my witness.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it's before you. Anything from the chair?

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: In the words of Rhonda VanDyke Colby from the Virginia Annual Conference and a member of our subcommittee, we did have a great deal of discussion, and as a committee, as a subcommittee, and also presented in our legislative committee, we felt that "B" was redundant, that in variety of ways it is very clear to us, the position of the church, but we felt the language redundant. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. The amendment is before us. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 463; No, 418] All right, you have substituted the amendment. The report of the committee is before us as has been amended. All right. . . Mike 2.

JUNE MCCULLOUGH (Southern New Jersey): Bishop, according to my reading there is a slight omission in the

petition as it is printed. It goes from small letter—in number 1, it goes from small letter “f” to “h”; “g” is missing and should read: “Racial Harrassment.”

BISHOP TALBERT: Is that correct?

MCCULLOUGH: That is correct, and we will accept that as an editorial . . .

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, then, this is an editorial matter, and the correlators will pick that up. Are we ready? The petition is before us as has been amended. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 724; No, 174] All right, you have sustained this and adopted. Next item.

COUNCIL-AUSTIN: And Bishop, that concludes our work with trial procedures.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Petitions from Committee on General and Judicial Administration

JANET FORBES (Rocky Mountain): Bishop, I served as secretary for General and Judicial Administration. I have four items to present.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

FORBES: Page 2226, Calendar Item 1407, Petition 31251 on p. 728 of the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before us. I see no cards. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have sustained the recommendation of the Committee, [Yes, 626; No, 220]. Next item.

FORBES: Page 2240, Calendar Item 1551, Petition 31241 on p. 719 of the *Advance DCA*. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. I recognize the card in the rear. Mike 8.

Debate on Youth and Young Adults Serving on All Boards and Agencies

DAVID WILSON (Little Rock): I speak against concurring. Presently on the Board of Pensions we have 32 members. That would mean that if we would adopt this, 6 of those would be youth and young adults. GCFA has 40 members, 8 of those would be youth or young adults. And I submit that these two agencies, and others, deal with very complicated matters that most of us adults can't even understand.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is there someone on the other side of this issue? Is that where you are, the young man right here? All right. Mike 1.

GERALD (JAY) WILLIAMS (Western New York): I guess that, in response to what was just said, if those six members were on the board, what's wrong with that? I'm 19 years old. I'm a freshman at Harvard University. I was elected the first lay delegate to the annual conference from Western New York, on the first ballot. I think I'm well capable of being here and serving on any agency in the church. And I affirm that all that the youth are doing. And I hope you support the recommendation of GCOM.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Now the . . . Are you against? Someone against? All right. Right here, yes. Mike 4.

MARY ANN GALLOWAY (West Ohio): My concern with this is the fact that these agencies meet during the day, meet during the times when these youth and young adults are in school. And many find it difficult to come there.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. In the far rear, over here with the pink sheet. Are you against?

JEFF SITTS (Minnesota): No, for.

BISHOP TALBERT: You're for. All right.

SITTS: I offer a challenge to the gentleman that raised the question of youth and young adults understanding these complex formulas. I'm a grad student at the University of Michigan going for a Ph.D. in nuclear engineering. I'd be willing to ask if he could understand what I study. (Laughter) Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This matter's before us. And we hear now from the Chair. By your own rules, no applause. All right.

FORBES: This reflects a commitment of the committee to leadership of youth and young adults across the general church. It says it is recommended that wherever possible 20 percent of general agencies be youth and young adults. We recommend concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) The conference did not sustain you. [Yes, 435; No, 450]. It is therefore, nonconcurrent. Next item.

FORBES: Continuing on p. 2240, Calendar Item 1550, Petition 30375, p.719

of the *Advance DCA*, regarding that general agency membership should include years of church membership, the committee recommended non-concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 733; No, 100] Next.

FORBES: Page 2241, Calendar Item 1556, Petition 31878, and p. 1335 in the *Advance DCA*, Section 3. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have sustained the recommendation, [Yes, 813; No, 53]. Next.

SAM WYNN (North Carolina): I call your attention to p. 2060, Calendar Item 838, Petition 31552, *DCA*, p. 781. The committee recommends concurrence as amended. The amendments are there and the rationale being in light of our earlier action on Calendar Item 836, Petition 31967. Living into the future, we move concurrence with this as amended.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 792; No, 90] You have sustained the committee's recommendation. Next item.

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Bishop, that concludes the work of the Legislative Committee on General and Judicial Administration with a gratitude for service.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's go with the next committee. According to mine, it is Higher Education and Ministry, is that right? Yes. Will you move with some precious moments, let's; item number four. Mike 4.

Report of Committee on Higher Education and Ministry

JOE KILPATRICK (North Georgia): Bishop, just a point of inquiry. On p. 2241 is Calendar Item 1552, adding young adults between the ages of 17 and 27 from the North Central, South Central, and Southeast jurisdictions of GCOM. We just passed a resolution that added members from other jurisdictions to GCOM. What's the condition of this calendar item? What's the status of it?

BISHOP TALBERT: Identify it again, what page is it?

KILPATRICK: Page 2241, Calendar Item 1552. Is it on the Consent Calendar or is that the reason we're not acting on it?

BISHOP TALBERT: Can someone, the committee chair, identify where that item is? Is it on the Consent Calendar? He said it's on the Consent Calendar. All right. Let's proceed.

LAVON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop, Katherine Lehman will bring the first four petitions.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

*Evangelism as Requirement
for Candidates*

KATHERINE LEHMAN (North Indiana): Bishop and General Conference, our first item is found on p. 2094. Calendar Item 1202. You will see the title as, "Evangelism as Undergraduate Requirement for Candidates." That title is error and the word undergraduate should be struck so that the title reads, "Evangelism as Requirement for Candidates" and Al Gwinn will speak to that.

BISHOP TALBERT: Before we get into this, I have been informed that there are United Methodist delegates here who are sitting next to a vacant machine and when it comes time to vote, rather than voting your machine only, you're reaching over and voting on another machine. Need I remind you that that's an immoral act in this process of legislation. And I hope delegates who are observing that will call that to my attention so that we can invalidate that kind of voting here in this General Conference. Let us proceed.

AL GWINN (Kentucky): Thank you, Bishop. On item 1202, the committee recommends concurrence. Our rationale is this would help our future leaders become better equipped in assisting our congregations to fulfill our calling to make disciples.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. Yes, number 5.

TRACI WEST (New York): I'd like to amend this to move the word "evangelism" into the sentence so that it reads "Evangelism/Mission of the Church in the World." If I have a second, I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is seconded.

WEST: I think that for many of us it's been a long since we've been in seminary and I just want to remind us of some of the consequences of these actions. The seminary students have a lot of requirements to fill right now and complain about being able to do so within a three-year period. By taking this action of adding an additional re-

quirement, in some cases it will force students to go a fourth year and to incur even more debt. The number of requirements are not simply that they have to meet or not simply the requirements that we lift here, but also many that seminaries add. For example, preaching is not on our list; or, for example, pastoral counseling is not on our list. And so, I would urge you not to add yet another requirement for our seminary students to meet. In addition, evangelism is something that is very important and could—in fact one of the members of our legislative session suggested—be a cornerstone of work that students do as probationers. Now that that process is extended, the seminaries are working with probationers in that process so at that point they will be located in a community where they have a commitment to that community and they can work on evangelism in that context.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right the amendment is before us. Are you against? All right, I recognize you. Mike 4. The amendment is before us now.

GARY EXMAN (West Ohio): I've sat here for two weeks and we've said very little about evangelism. The more we can emphasize it the better. Our denomination—we're not going to be here too many general conferences if we continue to lose membership as we are. We need to evangelize and empower people with Jesus Christ. Let's get busy with it. Don't take evangelism out of this.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, is there someone for this amendment? All right, over here. Mike 4.

WARNER BROWN (California-Nevada): Evangelism is very important and I wholeheartedly support it. But I feel the placement of the word in this paragraph is better placed in the amendment than in the initial legislation. So I would encourage us to put evangelism in, but make it a part as stated in the amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, someone is against it. I recognize the hand in the far rear back here to my right. The orange card, yes, yes.

BISHOP TALBERT: Mike 8.

MARK DICKENS (South Indiana): I am just completing eight years on the Section on Evangelism for our annual conference. One of the things I have learned is that many of my clergy col-

leagues had no exposure to evangelism in seminary. It is a needed subject, and I am sure that our official seminaries, who want so much to be responsive in preparing appropriate pastoral leadership for our denomination, can make this requirement fit.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. The amendment is before us. Any word from the chair?

AL GWINN (Kentucky): Yes, Bishop, thank you. I remind you that paragraph 315 in our *Discipline* refers to qualifications for probationary members in our annual conference. The petition addresses the subject of evangelism and adds it to the 24 semester hours of graduate theological studies in Christian faith. It does not add to the overall program of a seminary graduate. We do feel that our calling to make disciples is significantly important and needs to be clarified at that very point in the *Discipline*.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the amendment is before us. If you support the amendment, vote yes. Vote when the light appears. All right the amendment is not supported. [Yes, 360; No, 507] The item is before us, vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee, [Yes, 710; No, 171]. Next item.

*Charge Conference Responsibility
for Paying Pastor's Salary*

LEHMAN: The next item is found on p. 2158. It is item no. 1381. "Responsibility for paying pastor's salary rests with the charge conference." It's Petition 31270 and it's found in the ADCA on p. 967. The committee recommends nonconcurrence, because the committee understood that the original disciplinary language affirms that clergy are members of the annual conference, with claim, perhaps, on the equitable compensation fund for minimum compensation. Therefore, we recommend nonconcurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee, [Yes, 793; No, 75]. Next item.

LEHMAN: The next item is on the same p. 1382. It is Petition 31271, found on p. 967 of the ADCA. And this is to clarify grounds for seeking subsidy grant from the equitable compensation fund. It is linked with the item we just did. There is a correction here. The committee is recommending nonconcurrence. It's printed incorrectly in your

DCA. The subcommittee recommended concurrence, which failed, and so the voting report is for nonconcurrence. The reason for that is that the effects of this language that is proposed in this action really are unclear and the committee was divided, as the vote shows. And therefore we recommend nonconcurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. Remember it's nonconcurrence. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee [*Yes, 847; No, 32*].

Board of Ordained Ministry Membership

LEHMAN: The next item is found on the same page, item 1386. There are two corrections here. The first is in the title, rather than BOD, it should be BOM referring to Board of Ministry or Board of Ordained Ministry members. And then, there was an omission in the amendment—and I will try to be as clear as I can. If you look please at the sixth line of the amendment, at the very end of that line, it begins with the end of the word *elders* “and deacons in full connection and,” after *and* insert the words “when possible.” And then it continues with the words “at least two associate members.” And if you are clear, then I will go on. The committee affirms the need to have local pastors and associate members represented on the BOM, but in no place in our life together do they vote on matters of ordination and character. And therefore, it is appropriate to have them on the board, but without vote, since that's the work the BOM does. So the committee does recommend concurrence with this amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee, [*Yes, 745; No, 135*].

LEHMAN: Thank you, I turn to our chair, LaVon Wilson.

BISHOP MELVIN TALBERT: Yes. Mike 4.

ROGER A. KINDSCHI (Wisconsin): On Tuesday night, when this legislative committee was meeting, I tried to amend one of the concurred items, and it was recognized, and I haven't been able to do that until this time. I would like to be able to present an amendment that affects our seminary students and seminary students to be.

BISHOP TALBERT: Which calendar item are you on?

KINDSCHI: I am referring to Calendar Item 640.

BISHOP TALBERT: Well, that's not before us now. We have this committee report coming.

KINDSCHI: OK, would it be regarding reconsideration of this, sir?

BISHOP TALBERT: You want to reconsider an item?

KINDSCHI: Yes, sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Identify it again.

KINDSCHI: It's on Petition 1994, Calendar Item 640. And this was one of the items that we had that we voted in two parts.

BISHOP TALBERT: How did you vote on that item?

KINDSCHI: I voted concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

KINDSCHI: And if I could get a second, sir, I would like to explain.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Let's see you want to ask this body to reconsider that?

KINDSCHI: Yes, sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. If you would consider—what's the point of order? Number 8?

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Bishop, I thought I understood you at the beginning of this session to say that you would not entertain any other actions until all committee reports had completed. Did I misunderstand?

BISHOP TALBERT: I think you're right. Let's hold this, sir, until we get this down the road further. All right, go ahead.

Petition Regarding Membership on University Senate

J. LA VON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): If you would turn in your DCA to p. 2081, Calendar Item 1064 in your *Advance DCA*, p. 1010, Petition 30960. This particular one was lifted off the consent agenda regarding membership in the University Senate. Our rationale is that we support the current membership ratio that follows the principles of academia peer evaluation and the evaluation, criteria used by the senate has a strong religious life and instructional component. Our committee recommended nonconcurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 823; No, 56*] All right, you've sustained the committee nonconcurrence. Next item.

Appointment of Retired Clergy

WILSON: The next item is found on p. 2242, Calendar Item 1559, *Advance DCA* 1659, Petition 31962. And this petition has a minority report. This is “The Church in Solidarity.” I'm sorry, that's the wrong one. “Retired Clergy May Be Appointed One Year at a Time if Bishop Decides it in It's Annual Conference Best Interest.” The membership voted 72 for and 23 against and 2 not voting. And the committee recommended concurrences with the amendment as follows. In place of petition's words remove from ¶355.6, “but not the same appointment from which he or she has been retired.” And to that point we have a minority report that Carol Woods will bring at this time, Bishop.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Let's hear from the minority report.

Appointment of Ethnic Minority Retired Clergy

CAROL WOODS (North Texas): Bishop and conference, this report comes from our subcommittee. Because of the pressure of time, the whole legislative committee did not have a chance to process the issue fully, so our subcommittee, after careful consideration, brings this issue to you now. We supported it by a vote of 15 to 0, and the only way to bring it to the floor was as a minority report. We support the main motion and we want to make it clear that our minority report includes the language of the majority report. We simply want to add these words. In addition to the minority report, majority report added the following to the end of 355.1: “be retired, except that in lieu of retirement the bishop of an annual conference may initiate the appointment for ethnic minorities, language, and specialized mission situations of a person who has reached mandatory retirement age to an appointment for one year at a time, subject to an annual re-evaluation if the bishop determines such an appointment or reappointment to be in the best interests of the annual conference.”

BISHOP TALBERT: Now—

WOODS: The rationale of the subcommittee is this: We considered 14 petitions on this issue, and centered around the issue of mandatory retirement. There are cases of appointments involving ethnic minority churches, language churches, and specialized mission situations where it is critical for

pastors to continue to be appointed in the active conference relationship in order to be culturally credible and viable in their setting. When such ethnic, language, or missional pastors reach the mandatory retirement age of 70, they cannot continue in the active relationship. This minority report would allow for the bishop to initiate the exception to this retirement age for missional reasons one year at a time and subject to annual review. We need to allow these vital and effective ministries in ethnic, language, and missional situations to continue where specialized leadership is needed and the subcommittee voted unanimously to support this exception. We respectfully request that you support the minority report.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I'm not going to treat this as a minority report. I'm going to let you handle it as an amendment. So the amendment is before us. All right. Someone against it? Are you against it at mike 4? All right.

DENNY WHITE (Western North Carolina): With great reluctance, I find that I must speak in opposition to the position stated by my friend from North Texas. We're often fond, in this body, of talking about a slippery slope down which we do not want to go, and I suggest to you that this is one of them. According to our historical tradition as Methodist people, the membership of the clergy in the church is in the clergy session of the annual conference. It is the clergy session what elect, which elects us to membership in the conference. It is the clergy session which votes to ordain us into the ministry of the church. It is through the actions of the clergy session that our relationship to the annual conference is determined—whether that be active service or a leave of some kind or in the most relevant case, retirement. What the person who has been representer of the minority is proposing here affects mandatory retirement, and we have a lot of views about that. But in our negotiated arrangement that you find represented in the report of the minority, we believe we've met the concerns of the North Texas delegation in regard to allowing a minister to stay in an appointment past retirement. But for us, as a General Conference, to place into the polity of our church a means by which a bishop, who is not a member of the clergy session, can, in effect, determine whether or not a clergy member retires is a practice that I view as against our historic tradition and—

BISHOP TALBERT: Sum it up.

WHITE: —in the point of those slippery slopes down which we do not want to go.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Is there someone for this amendment? Yes.

BISHOP TALBERT: Mike 5.

GRANT HAGIYA (California-Pacific): I come from culture that values age, but is very hierarchical in it's order—it's social order. And whereas, we honor retirement, it also is a lessening of the authoritative role of the pastor once that happens. In many of our cultures, sub-cultures of Asian, Korean, Southeast Asian, Chinese, the pastor once retired, no longer has the authority with which to carry office. And what we are asking for is the maximum amount of flexibility that a bishop can have to initiate the deployment of personnel in these specialized situations. So this is why we are asking for this particular rationale on this Minority Report and I would support it.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, is there someone against it. In the rear back here, the yellow card. Yes. Mike 8.

CHARLES BOAYUE, JR. (Detroit): I rise in opposition to this amendment to the Majority Report, on the grounds that this may undermine the recruitment which ought to be a planned activity of the church for new clergy, when we begin to legislate dependence upon on those who have reached mandatory retirement. And until we can remove mandatory retirement, we should respect it, and so I urge you to defeat this amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, we have the two for, two against. Any final word from you? And then we'll get a word from the chair.

CAROL WOODS: Yes, I would just say we need to allow for flexibility in these ethnic language and mission situations. We need to recognize the cases where such ministers who are in their 70's who can still be seen as active, important, and culturally credible in the mission and ministry of the church. I remind you that our Minority Report also includes the language of the Majority, and I urge you to support both by voting for the Minority Report. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, any word from the Chair of the Committee?

LAVON WILSON: The *Discipline* states that retired clergy are already eligible for appointment in a retired rela-

tionship, and bishops may call for this special circumstances with the provision that is already in the discipline.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the amendment is before us. Vote when the light appears. You do not support the amendment. It failed [*Yes, 300; No, 558*]. All right, the report of the committee's before us. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee [*Yes, 714; No, 133*]. Next item.

WILSON: Bishop, I would like to say, I would like to thank my sub-committee members of Martha Orphe and Robert Schnase and David Penalva and Allen Norris, along with my committee who has helped us to go through 416 petitions. We thank you, and we are complete.

BISHOP TALBERT: Thank you very much. Next. All right, I understand the General and Judicial chair needs to make a motion regarding some actions. I recognize you.

Changes in Membership Requirements of General Agencies Effective at End of General Conference

CHRISTINE HARMON: Thank you Bishop. I need to make an enabling motion to bring into effect some of the action that you just voted in the report on the Committee on General and Judicial Administration. I move that all actions of the General Conference which have made changes in the membership requirements of General Agencies shall be effective immediately upon adjournment of this General Conference.

BISHOP TALBERT: I think you understand that. Any question? Yes. Mike 1.

GIL HANKE: (Texas): What does this do to the cap that we have on numbers of persons who can serve on a General Agency, on all the General Agencies combined? We passed the thing where we were going to add persons from pan-Methodists, and I need to know what that does to the relationship to that cap.

HARMON: What this does is not just the caps, but the membership requirements especially around age and who participates, all that. What this does is enable the actions that you have already taken to go into effect at the July nominations at jurisdictional conferences.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. If you vote support this motion, vote yes; if you do not, vote no.

Vote when the light appears. You've sustained this motion [Yes, 777; No, 62]. Next item. All right, Faith and Order.

Partial Birth Abortion Debated

ROBERT HAYES (Texas): Yes, is delegate Sally Dyck in the house? She needs to present a Minority Report. Bishop, the first item that I have for us tonight is found on p. 2157 of your DCA and p. 487 of the ADCA. It is Calendar Item 1378 on the bottom right-hand corner. It will be also helpful if you have your *Book of Discipline* with you. Page 90, paragraph 65j. I'll give you just a moment to find that. Petition 30045. This petition deals with abortion and includes the term "partial birth abortion." The committee looked at over 40 petitions that dealt with abortion and the majority of the committee felt strongly about using much of what is there, but also including the term, this term "partial birth abortion" in our discipline. It recommends concurrence as amended. And our rationale is that the current language, although good and somewhat thorough, does not go far enough to include this relatively modern medical procedure. We do have a Minority Report at this time.

SALLY DYCK (East Ohio): And the minority report is the addition of just a couple of words in two places in the language of what the majority report had. It adds "sometimes called partial birth abortion." So we would add the two words *sometimes called*. And the reason for this is that *partial birth abortion* is a term that the media has brought to our attention and awareness. And in many respects, it's jargon; it is not technical or medical terminology, and we wanted to make sure that we had those extra words in that regard. And the other part of the minority report is to add the two words *and health* after the language of the majority report, so that it would read "except when the physical life *and health* of the mother is in danger." And we would continue on agreeing with the rest of the majority report when there are no other medical procedures available or in the case of severe fetal anomalies incompatible with life. So we would simply add those two words, *and health*. We believe that it's important to make sure that the health of the mother—the woman—is added in there, because many times in these severe tragic cases, which are the conditions of the majority report, it's important that the woman with her family and her physician be able to

make some very difficult choices and to have some options for those choices. Many times in these kinds of situations, we recognize that there's no positive outcome when you look at the conditions in the majority report. And so, when a woman and her family and her physician have some options, it helps to be able to go forward in a way that can be as healthy for the woman physically as possible. So we would encourage the addition of these words, *sometimes called partial birth*, and to add *the physical life and health of the mother*.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, with the permission of this body I'm going to treat this as an amendment and just move immediately to the amendment. What's before us is the amendment. All right, I recognize the lady's card in the pink, yes you. All right, number six.

JANET STEPHENSON (Iowa): I would like to remind the group that at the Iowa Methodist Medical Center a couple years ago, septuplets were born to the McCoy family. The obstetrician, Dr. Paula Mahon, as each baby was born said, "God is good." This same woman has lobbied the Iowa legislature, who was attempting to pass the ban on partial birth abortions, saying that there are some cases when it is medically necessary. For us to sit here secure in the comfort and knowledge that we will probably never have to face such an agonizing decision is not only presumptuous, it is arrogant. I would wish that we could know that we do not have the medical competence to know what is the right thing to do in every situation. If the conditions are bad enough, there needs to be the option of this procedure, as hard to think of as it is. Sometimes I think when I hear folks talking about this—

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up.

STEPHENSON:—they would prefer to have two deaths instead of one.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let me just be clear. What's before us now is the amendment which is adding these words, *sometimes called* and *health*. So that's what's before us. Over here. Yes, not you, not you in front, behind you back here. Mike 7.

STEVE FURR (Alabama-West Florida): Thank you, Bishop Talbert. I'd rise to speak against the amendment. Although this sounds very good, they say we don't have the medical knowledge to make this decision. This is a

statement from the American Medical Association.

BISHOP TALBERT: Are you on the amendment, sir?

FURR: Yes, speaking against it.

BISHOP TALBERT: This is the, what is sometimes called an [unintelligible] adding those words.

FURR: Correct.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

FURR: The American Medical Association says, "According to the scientific literature there does not appear to be any identified situation in which intact dilatation extraction is the only appropriate procedure to induce abortion and ethical concerns have been raised. The Christian American Dental Society makes the same statement. There are always other options. We're talking about late second and third trimester pregnancies, which can also be delivered vaginally and also by cesarean. This situation in this procedure is where the intra-cranial contents of the baby are evacuated. There's no indication, medical indication, where that is ever necessary. This is just a gaping hole to allow a procedure that should not go on in a humane society. It's not about abortion; it doesn't matter whether you're pro-abortion or anti-abortion, pro-life or pro-choice. This is about a procedure that should not go on in a humane society. I ask that you vote against this amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I recognize the woman right here. Are you for or against the amendment to the report? And let me know. All right. Mike 3.

MARLA FORD (Nebraska): I'm against the amendment.

BISHOP TALBERT: We've had two already. I'm sorry. Is this it? All right, I'm sorry. E. O, you're it. Go ahead. One more. OK.

FORD: I agree with what was just said that the partial birth abortion, according to the medical community, is not necessary at any time for the health of the mother. Also, I would question the word *health* and what your definition of health is. Part of what is happening today with as far as health is, we're adding and thinking about the emotional well-being of the mother at that time. Anytime any mother would be going through this type of a decision, she is going to be rather emotional about it. Just because she is considering what

her options are as far as being able to have a life that, you know, she wants to as far as the health of the mother—

BISHOP TALBERT: Sum it up.

FORD:—we need to think about what health actually means, and the emotional part of a woman at that particular time should not be taking into consideration a partial birth abortion. So consider what health means today; it's just not the physical well-being of a woman. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, we have two and two, so we need to now hear from you.

BISHOP TALBERT: Point, what's the point of order? *(Pause)* No. 3.

DAVID BAKER (Western North Carolina): I'm not sure I understand the intent of the Minority Report. By definition, a woman whose life is in danger, her health is in danger.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, sir, you're out of order. This is debate. You're out of order.

BAKER: May I ask a question?

BISHOP TALBERT: Ask your question.

BAKER: Would you please explain your rationale? A woman, whose life is in danger, by definition, her health is in danger. Do you mean a mother's life or health? Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

DYCK: The wording is, "and health." And the understanding is that, in terms of health, it could be even the health of a woman to be able to conceive and bring to full term in the future. I want to remind you that we are adding those words with the conditions of the Majority Report, which mean that in the case of severe fetal anomalies incompatible with life. And so this would mean that it would potentially be a pregnancy where perhaps there was no brain or heart and death was inevitable. And so, the health of the mother may mean, not life and death for her, but maybe even the possibility of pregnancy to full term in the future.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Any word from the chair?

HAYES: We just simply urge you to defeat the amendment and concur with the majority, who voted concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the amendment is before us. Vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* All right, the amendment is defeated, [*Yes, 396; No,*

489]. The recommendation of the committee is before us. All right, back here. That's right. Mike 6.

*Partial Birth Abortion Referral to GBCS
Defeated*

BETH CAPEN (New York): Bishop, I would move to refer the amendment of the *Discipline* to the General Board of Church and Society.

BISHOP TALBERT: You're moving to refer this action to the Board of Church and Society. Is that seconded? All right. It's seconded. That's what's before us now, the motion of reference. Anyone wanting to speak to that? If you would refer this matter to the General Board of . . . yes? Mike 8.

KERMIT BRASWELL (North Carolina): I would urge us to defeat that because I believe that we, as a collective body, have the judgment and understanding to make a decision on what is right, and we do not need to refer this to the Board of Church and Society.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, that's a motion against. Anyone else? Yes, back here. A speech against, I mean. Mike 5.

FRANK DORSEY (Kansas East): I believe that the statements made do not understand the meaning of health . . .

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is on the motion of reference?

DORSEY: Yes, it is. I'm for the motion of reference.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

DORSEY: And I do that because of the inability to understand health in a holistic way, and as I understand some of this procedure, it is necessary in some cases. As a pastor, I have gone through that with family in some of the most painful thing I've ever gone through. And a very noted obstetrician said that in this case it was necessary and we have continued to deal with that. So, I have to stand for reference.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the reference is before us. Mike 4.

WARREN LATHAM (North Georgia): I'd like to speak against the reference.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

LATHAM: I would rather trust this body to make this decision than the Board of Church and Society. *(Laughter)*

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Anyone else? All right, let's vote when the light appears. If you want to reference, vote yes. If you do not, vote no. *(Pause)*

You do not refer it. [*Yes, 297; No, 613*] What is before us now is this item. Anything further? All right, yes. Mike 2.

NANCY DENARDO (Western Pennsylvania): Thank you, Bishop. As a registered nurse, I would say that we do not know enough about severe fetal anomalies incompatible with life at the time of birth. And given the advancements in technology that have saved infants that they never thought would survive, I would say that we are going to be in trouble if we approve this, because my God is still a God of miracles.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I can only take one more for it. Is there someone for this? Is that you, back there? All right.

DAVID CRANE (South Indiana): Thank you, Bishop. I rise to speak for this, to concur with the committee report. You know, we need not be naïve about the purpose of this, and the main driving purpose behind this type of abortion. Even though there are extreme cases where it might be the only way to save a mother's life, the procedure could also be done in another way. These cases extreme cases are very few and far apart. They pale in comparison with the facts supporting the notion that this procedure is done basically and primarily for financial reasons. One of the main driving forces behind partial birth abortions is the harvesting of body parts for research and transplantation. That's right, harvesting of body parts. They're using these babies in lieu of guinea pigs and mice. I've heard that parts such as the spinal cords and hearts, and so forth, sell for several thousand dollars on the market. There are reported cases of abortion clinics . . .

BISHOP TALBERT: You need to sum up, sir.

CRANE: Yes, sir. There are reported cases of abortion clinics encouraging and paying young mothers, or young women, to carry their babies to late term, so the body parts will be more mature, and worth more on the market. I urge you to support this committee recommendation.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. That's all I can take now. All that is before us is *(laughter)* . . . that is true. All right.

HAYES: We urge you also to support the recommendation of the majority of this committee.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, the recommendation is before you. Vote when

the light appears. (Pause) All right, you've supported the committee and sustained its report, [Yes, 622; No, 275]. Next.

Petition to Address Suicide in Discipline

HAYES: We ask you to turn now to p. 2092 of your DCA. It is found on p. 504 of the ADCA, p. 2092, p. 504 of the ADCA. It is Calendar Item 1180, Petition 30550. It was placed on the Consent Calendar in error and then removed and it is a petition that we must address at this time and the subject is suicide. At this particular time our *Book of Discipline* has no provision in it dealing with suicide. And this particular petition would add a section beginning after 65L, making it 65M, that deals compassionately as possible with suicide. The committee attempted to take a very serious and emotional subject and treat it with some measure of dignity and integrity and respect. And there you see the committee recommends concurrence with this particular petition and has the amended sentences contained.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This matter is before us. All right, vote when the light appears. All right. You have sustained the committee's recommendation. [Yes, 776; No, 89], no. Next.

HAYES: I would now ask you to turn to p. 1181 in your *Daily Christian Advocate*; 1181. I mean Calendar Item 1181 found on p. 2133. I'm sorry, 2133. Page 520 of the ADCA, p. 2133 of the DCA. It is Calendar Item 1181 and this particular petition was 31606 handed out in a legislative sub-committee and I would like to bring Greg Stover, who was the chair of that sub-committee, to take us through this particular petition. There is a minority report.

Rationale for Mission

GREG STOVER (West Ohio): Bishop and members of the conference, you can see the majority report with the petition and the language that it adds to the section on our rationale for mission, in Section 200 of the *Discipline*. There has been considerable discussion in our section, subsection section and since then about this petition. And we believe that we have worked out a way as we've talked about principle people involved to come to a compromise between the majority and the minority report and that that will save us time. And I'll allow Linda Campbell Marshall, who is presenting the minority report, to say more about that to you.

LINDA CAMPBELL MARSHALL: Bishop, by common consent we believe it is possible to save ourselves some time this evening. A modification which Bill Hinson is ready to present if the body will allow.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Let's try it. All right, mike 1.

BILL HINSON (Texas): I propose as we said by common consent these words as a substitute for majority and minority reports. The UMC affirms that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Savior of the world and the Lord of all. We respect persons of all religious faiths and we defend religious freedom for all persons. If I have a second, I'll say just a word.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I'm going to let you treat this then as a substitute for both of these. Is that agreed?

HINSON: Yes, sir

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

HINSON: All of us felt that this took away the redundancy of the original petitioner and said these words succinctly, simply, and clearly and we believe we can all affirm it.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. This is before us. Any discussion? Far rear, over here. Number 8.

PORTER WOMELDORFF (Illinois Great Rivers): I'm a little bit confused, Bishop. Does this eliminate the phrase "the mission of the church is to make disciples"?

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Can you tell us where this would be inserted and what would be taken out? Number 1, mike 1.

HINSON: This would be at the beginning of the paragraph. It would not take out any words. It would precede, coming, fitting there under the rationale for missions.

BISHOP TALBERT: And, in other words, before it says "the mission of the church," it would go, would it go at some point in that paragraph?

HINSON: You have the book there, Linda, help me.

MARSHALL: I can clarify that.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

MARSHALL: The text says, it presently reads, begins, "The mission of the church is to make disciples of Jesus Christ by proclaiming the good news of God's grace." That would remain down through the phrase, "the vision Scripture holds before us." Then would

come the sentence, "The United Methodist Church affirms..." that Mr. Hinson has brought to us.

BISHOP TALBERT: So you would be substituting his words for this bold type here? Is that right?

MARSHALL: Yes. We would, we would simply delete some sections, the paragraph would run as it is down through "Christ is the Son of God, the Savior of the world." And then the next section.

HINSON: And the Lord of all

MARSHALL: I'm sorry?

HINSON: And the Lord of all. The Son of God...

MARSHALL: And the lower part would be retained also. We respect when it comes to that first paragraph—

BISHOP TALBERT: And so you're only striking the words "one and only."

MARSHALL: Yes, that's correct.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Good. Okay. All right. Are we clear? All right.

MARSHALL: In that paragraph, that's correct.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I recognize the woman right here, Phyllis. Mike 4.

PHYLLIS FERGUSON (Pacific Northwest): I hope you don't think I'm being facetious, but I want to know what this church thinks about people who do not believe in Jesus Christ. There are Muslims and there are Buddhists and there are other religions.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I take that as a speech against. All right, right here, sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: Mike 4

GARY EXMAN (West Ohio): Thank God you're all beginning to talk about the things that I want to talk about. This is what we need to support. God wants us to win the world to Christ but we need to be careful. The greatest Methodist of the 20th century, in my opinion, was E. Stanley Jones. He traveled all over the world. He worked with Muslim, Hindu. He worked with Jews and he had a wonderful way about himself that even Mahatma Gandhi challenged him and he challenged Gandhi; they worked together. In my own church, there are families that are part Muslim; there are families that are part Jewish. They respect me for telling them what I believe the truth is and I listen to them and they wouldn't respect me if I didn't tell them what the Bible says. We need

to challenge people in a loving way about Jesus Christ.

BISHOP TALBERT: I have one for and one against. I recognize the gentlemen . . . Not you sir; the one behind you. You are right, the . . . Mike 8.

PAUL CHITNIS (North Carolina): This is true, where Jesus Christ is the only Lord and Savior, that very issue for which almost 104 years ago, a Hindu family of mine converted to Christianity. We had many, many gods. Finally, we found one true God. What I am saying is I was in India for 33 years, and worked in every home (*inaudible*). I met Hindu, Muslim and all other religious people and I was able to share my faith and nobody objected about it. We have to be truthful in our basic belief. Thank you, sir.

BISHOP TALBERT: Are you for this amendment or—for the Hinson motion or against it?

CHITNIS: I'm against it.

BISHOP TALBERT: You're against it; all right. I can only take one for. All right. Mike 7.

PHILIP WOGAMAN (Baltimore-Washington): The Bishop and friends of the conference, on the rare occasions when Dr. Hinson and I are in total agreement, the General Conference wants to seize that moment.

(Laughter)

BISHOP TALBERT: I remind you of your own rules.

WOGAMAN: I don't think there's a person in the Faith and Order Committee who disagrees with the centrality of Christ and the importance of Christ. My own feeling about the use of the "only" language in this part of our *Discipline* is that the statements that go into the meaning of Christ are better placed in the theological section, and when placed in the language of exclusivism in our statement of mission, I'm afraid the focus turns from Christ to the word "only." And I just as soon not to have to explain the word "only" when I'd rather witness to the word "Christ." For Christ is the center of our faith. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is before us. Any other word from the committee? If you're supporting this you were ready for this compromise. All right, the substitute is before us. Nothing but—We're ready now to vote. I've taken all I can take. (Laughter) Let's go.

(Laughter, applause)

BISHOP TALBERT: What, you have a question or something? All right, let's hear it. Six, mike 6.

ED KAIL (Iowa): Thank you, sir. I was a member of the Local Church Legislative Committee who worked on these paragraphs and we are rearranged some of the material in these sections. My question is, what happens to that work if that petition is passed?

BISHOP ALBERT: I understand that what we have before us is a substitute for the material that was in this bowl tight. And that what's before.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I clarify that matter?

BISHOP TALBERT: Sure.

SCOTT L. JONES: At the last General Conference the mission statement was passed by the local church to be in paragraph 100. Through the editorial process it was placed in paragraph 200. The action of the Local Church Committee that is passed on the Consent Calendar restores the whole mission statement intact to that place. It's my understanding that what we're doing now doesn't effect that but simply adds language to the mission statement as it has been moved to paragraph 100 and I trust the editorial committee will be guided by this statement as they do their work.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, is that clear? We are at the point of voting now. If you have any questions or anything, that's all. Mike 8.

CHARLES BOAYUE (Detroit): Bishop, just a point of clarification. I believe the substitute we are about to vote on is a replacement of the entire bold printing and not just the first paragraph of it. Could you clarify that for us?

BISHOP TALBERT: My understanding is, the substitute includes most of the bold print and it only deleted "one and only" and then it made an addition.

BOAYUE: Because it speaks, Bishop, to religious freedom, which is the subject of the second part. So let's get some clarification on that before we take a vote.

BISHOP TALBERT: Can the secretary read to us what the Hinson substitute is? We don't have it yet?

LINDA CAMPBELL-MARSHALL (New England): I could do that.

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: All right, you don't have it yet? All right—you can do that?

Let me read the entire revision. The paragraph would read, "The mission of the church is to make disciples of Jesus Christ by proclaiming the good news of grace," etc., down through "the vision scripture holds before us," all the same in between there. "The UMC affirms that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Savior of the world, and the Lord of all." New paragraph: "We respect the persons of all religious faiths. We defend and affirm the right of religious freedom."

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, that's before us. Vote when the light appears [*Yes, 752; No, 145*]. All right, the substitute has prevailed. It is now the main motion. If you voted as the main motion, vote when the light appears. You have confirmed that, that's the main motion. [*Yes, 795; No, 72*]. Next item.

STOVER: Bishop, the members of the conference, I would invite you to remain on DCA p. 2133 and just look to the next column to Calendar Item 1182. You would find this material in the *Advance DCA*, p. 535, Petition 30665. This particular resolution came to us prior to the work which we have just accomplished and we did not have time as a committee to go back and redo this work, however—and you will note that there is a minority report—however, in conversation with folks who prepared the minority report, we are in agreement that we would be happy just to let both the majority and the minority report go and vote nonconcurrency with both. Linda?

CAMPBELL-MARSHALL: In the interest of time, Bishop, I would affirm that.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right the motion is nonconcurrency on both. Is that what you're saying?

STOVER: Yes.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you then, as recommendation for nonconcurrency. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 824; No, 54*] You sustain the recommendation for nonconcurrency for item 1182.

HAYES: Our vice chair, Scott Jones will take us through the next two or three.

Military Service

JONES: We're making progress, y'all; let's keep it going. I call your attention to page 1965, Calendar Item 354. It refers to p. 513 in the *Advanced DCA*. The Petition 31649. The committee's recom-

mendation is for concurrence as amended. This refers to paragraph 68G in the Social Principles of the section titled "Military Service." The petition suggests that we delete the first sentence and the word "therefore" in the second sentence of the existing paragraph and substitute this language. The committee's rationale is that it's more balanced in acknowledging that, while we deplore war, we recognize that it is sometimes necessary. The examples cited are: cases of unchecked aggression, tyranny and genocide. We urge your concurrence as amended.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it's before us. I recognize the person with the—"yes, you"—yellow card. Mike 8.

TYSON FERGUSON (Detroit): It's my understanding we are nearing the order of the day if we are not already there. Therefore, I would move to suspend the rules to suspend the date on the remaining petitions allowing for chairpersons to provide the committee rationale and also to those who are going to provide the minority report if there is one. Then allow the Holy Spirit in this place to act so we can do God's work here in this holy place. For the remaining of the petitions or until 11 p.m.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, that's a motion for suspending the rules. If you would do that, vote when the light appears. [Yes, 695; No, 168] All right, the rules have been suspended. What you're saying is, you're suggesting that we continue working under this new rule until no later than 11.

FERGUSON: That is correct, unless somebody wants to move for later.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's go on to that. Chair.

JONES: Do we vote [audio not transcribed] petition, Bishop?

BISHOP TALBERT: That's what it says.

JONES: OK.

BISHOP TALBERT: This petition is before us. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You've supported concurrence with this petition. [Yes, 767, No, 90]

JONES: Same p. 1965, the next Petition is 355. ADCA is p. 1516, Petition is 31684. The committee's recommendation is for concurrence as amended. This adds the word "usual" to the first sentence. In paragraph 69C, it is concurrent with what we—the action we just spoke.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have sustained the committee. [Yes, 783; No, 79]

*Support of Religious Freedom
Through Separation of Church and State*

JONES: Thank you, Bishop, p. 2091, Calendar Item 1178—it refers to p. 514 in the ADCA, Petition 31677. If I'm moving too fast, I'll repeat just the page and calendar—that's p. 2091, 1178 is the Calendar Item. We recommend concurrence as amended. It refers to paragraph 68D in the Social Principles, by adding these words to the subparagraph on education. The rationale for this is that it is in support of religious freedom as allowed by the constitutional separation of church and state.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before us. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You've sustained the committee, [Yes, 736; No, 132]. Next item.

MARY-ELIZABETH MOORE (California-Pacific): Secretary, Faith and Order. I invite you to turn to p. 2157, Calendar Item 1375, *Advance DCA*, 533, Petition 30649. The committee recommends concurrence. This is a resolution for the United Methodist Church to be in ministry to all persons. The purpose is to offer an invitation in the *Book of Resolutions* to reach out, as a church, with hospitality and compassion to all persons, including persons of all sexual orientations. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have sustained the committee, [Yes, 83; No, 54]. Next item.

JONES: On the same page—that's 2157, Calendar Item 1377, in the right-hand column. It refers to p. 520 in the DCA, Petition 30301. The committee's recommendation is for nonconcurrency. The addition of words to paragraph 117 on inclusiveness—we believe these matters are cared for in other places of the *Discipline*.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) You have supported nonconcurrency for 1377. [Yes, 730; No, 140] Next item.

*"Doctrinal Standards"
Added to Social Principles*

JONES: The next petition is on p. 2239. The Calendar Item is 1543. That's at the bottom of the page, in the middle column. It continues on in the right-hand column in the middle of the

page there. It refers to p. 525 in the *Advance DCA*, Petition 30899. This refers to paragraph 304.1 on qualifications for ordination. The sentence there starts, "The church expects persons seeking ordination to ..." and then it has a long list of items. In item I, it would be amended, so that it says "be accountable to the United Methodist Church, accept its doctrinal standards and *Discipline* and authority." We're adding the words "doctrinal standards" there; the rationale should be clear.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before us. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) MOORE: Remain on the same page, please.

BISHOP MELVIN TALBERT: All right, it's sustained. [Yes, 733; No, 139]. Next item.

MOORE: On the same p. 2239, Calendar Item 1544, *Advance DCA*, 1816, Petition 30165. The committee recommends nonconcurrency. The primary rationale given was that some legal restrictions need to be placed on holy unions. This was passed with nonconcurrency in committee before the action of this body yesterday to move the holy unions legislation into paragraph 332 of the *Discipline*. For this we have a minority report and Gayle Murphy-Geiss is presenting that.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, your recommendation is nonconcurrency, right?

MOORE: The committee's recommendation is nonconcurrency.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's hear the minority report.

MURPHY-GEISS: The minority report simply adds words to affirm that the Social Principles are principles rather than law. The rationale was that historically the Social Principles have been a teaching document. And due to the inclusion of the same sex-union prohibition, they began to be treated like law. Our entire subcommittee, people on all sides of this issue, actually agreed to this statement in philosophy, but it came as a minority report, because they wanted to wait and make sure it got moved into the paragraph in the 330's on ministry. So now that it is there, I urge you to preserve the Social Principles as a teaching document and support the minority report.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. By your rules, you're to perfect the majority report. Since they are recommending nonconcurrency, I'm assuming there's

nothing to perfect. So, we now perfect the majority report. And by your rules, you've said that the only perfection you want now is to vote. Vote when the light appears.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tell them what they're voting on.

BISHOP TALBERT: What you're voting on is the minority report. You understand? So, that's what we are to perfect. And by your rules, you said the only perfection that you want to do is vote. So you now have to vote on the minority report. It's before you. Vote when the light appears. *(Pause)* [Yes, 467; No, 435] All right, the minority report prevails, it is now before you as the . . . and what you need to do now is make this the main motion, which means that you are concurring with this change. Vote when the light appears.

The Ministry of All Persons

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, this is . . . the minority report passed. [Yes, 528; No, 356]. You made it the main motion and so this addition has been made to the Social Principles. Next item.

JONES: I call your attention to p. 2092. The Calendar Item is 1179, the upper left-hand corner. It refers to p. 517 in the *Advance DCA*, Petition 30875. The committee's recommendation is for concurrence as amended. The petition as it originally came to us, with "amend paragraph 103," in the section titled, "The ministry of all Christians," in the third paragraph of 103,— it would delete the sentence. We are restoring part of that by saying, "We call all persons into discipleship" and then deleting the words "and for the reconciliation of all things," which were in the petition. So, our amended item here would retain the sentence. "We call persons into discipleship," add the word *all*, and then add the words, "under the Lordship of Jesus Christ." Our rationale is, that is better wording than the proposal in the petition.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it is before you. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee, [Yes, 753; No, 101]. Next item.

MOORE: The next two items have the same rationale and are on the same page. Please turn to p. 2074. Calendar Item 987, in your *Advance DCA*. One of these items is on p. 1279, Petition 30035. As you can see from the *DCA*, this is a long list of petitions and they deal with slightly different subjects. All of them were voted nonconcurrence by the

committee. They were taken off the consent calendar by a member of this body. The committee itself voted nonconcurrence because of actions taken in committee regarding the critical issues that we handled yesterday in this body. These issues dealt mostly with holy unions and ministry with gay, lesbian and ex-gay persons. You voted on these positions yesterday, the committee recommends nonconcurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you, vote when the light appears. You sustain the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrence for this item 987. [Yes, 788; No, 91]

MOORE: The second item on the same page, 2074, is Calendar Item 991, and the rationale is the same. I would like to add, however, that our committee was as deeply divided as this body.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, it is before you. Vote when the light appears. You sustained the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrence for item 991. [Yes, 723; No, 130]

MOORE: Please turn to p. 1905, Calendar Item 277, in your advance *DCA*. The page is 1286, the Petition is 31936. This one requires a small explanation because this was an early action on the part of the committee. The petition request the change of the word "youth" to "young people." When the committee voted on this, the rationale given for nonconcurrence was that it was not a necessary change. In the mean time the committee had discussions and recognized that it was an effort towards some kind of consistency in the *Discipline* that was at stake here. Therefore, on later petitions on other paragraphs, the committee did sustain these changes of youth to young people. I share this with you in the spirit of honesty. This petition is yours now, and you can decide rather to uphold the decision of the committee for nonconcurrence or otherwise. Was that sufficiently clear?

BISHOP TALBERT: Let's get clarity around this one. We may be talking about some actions that you've taken previously, is that what you're talking about?

MOORE: No, I'm sorry Bishop, I was trying to say it quickly, but let me—

BISHOP TALBERT: I think you better state it so that—go ahead, say it again.

Rights of Persons with Disabilities

MOORE: The Petition is 31936, the name of the petition is "Rights of per-

sons with disabilities." The committee recommends nonconcurrence. The explanation that I gave was to explain that many petitions have come before this body already requesting the same change in many other paragraphs of the *Discipline*. Our committee acted on this particular petition very early and recommended nonconcurrence on the basis that this change was not necessary.

BISHOP TALBERT: Does this impact—decision has been made?

MOORE: This—the particular change is a word change from "youth" to "young people." It has nothing to do with the rest of the content of that paragraph, regarding rights of persons with disabilities.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, any questions for clarifications—because we can't debate it. You have decided you're going to vote it up or down. You clear on it? Vote when the light appears. You sustain the committee of nonconcurrence, [Yes, 611; No, 222].

MOORE: Sorry for the confusion. These consistency matters become most confusing. Last item. Page 1905, the same page, the next item down, Calendar Item 278, *Advance DCA* 1285. Petition 31935. The committee recommends nonconcurrence because the opening sentence of that paragraph, which recognizes the youth orientation of our society, is giving an explanation for why elderly people often feel isolated. So the committee voted nonconcurrence with that petition.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you, vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee's recommendation on item 278. [Yes, 835; No, 34] Next item.

HAYES: Bishop, this concludes a nearly 500 petitions of Faith and Order. I want to thank my secretary and my vice chair. Thank you. *(Applause)* Thank you. Let's be in order. We got a little more to do yet. Thank you very much. Next committee, let's move.

TERRI RAE CHATTIN: Bishop, we have five petitions to bring too. We especially want to get in front of you the first one will be from our political committee. Gail Ford Smith will present that.

GAIL FORD SMITH: Page 2142, Calendar Item 1265. It's on p. 80 in the *ADCA*, Petition 30588. Calendar Item 1265. The committee recommends concurrence with the amendment in order to be sensitive to our sisters and broth-

ers around the globe. This statement calls us as United Methodist Christians to reaffirm our commitment to not tolerate acts against persons because of their national origin, religion, gender, age, race, or sexual orientation inside or outside of the church.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before us. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 833; No, 41*] You sustained the committee of concurrence for Item 1265. Next item.

CHATTIN: Page 2051, Calendar Item 793.

BISHOP TALBERT: What is the point of order? Mike 8.

KEVIN GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): As the one who pulled this off the calendar, wouldn't I be the committee for this now, and not the committee of the conference?

BISHOP TALBERT: No.

GOODWIN: Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: Let's go. Identify it again.

Women and Social Security

CHATTIN: Page 2051, Calendar Item 793, in the *Advance DCA* p. 65, Petition 30581. It's "Women and Social Security." We voted concurrence on this. Social Security is not only for retirement benefits, but also disability and survivor benefits. Women earn about 74% compared to men, or they're out of the work force—at least 15%—compared to men because of being caregivers. We just felt that this was important because it really helps older women not be at the poverty level, this Social Security. So we moved concurrence with this.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears [*Yes, 838; No, 35*] You've sustained the committee.

Conference Votes Against Privatization of Prisons and Jails

SMITH: Page 2154, Calendar Item 1354, Petition 30589. It's found on p. 81 in the *ADCA*. Our committee felt we needed a strong statement against the privatization of prisons and jails, which seems in direct opposition to restorative justice. I encourage you to vote concurrence against private prisons.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 734; No, 142*] You've sustained the committee.

Proposal for U.S. Secretary of Peace

CHATTIN: Our fourth petition, p. 2056, Calendar Item 804, p. 86 in the *Advance DCA*, Petition 30694, "To Enlarge the U.S. Presidential Cabinet to Include a Secretary of Peace." The committee moved concurrence unanimously.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 898; No, 238*] You've sustained concurrence from the committee for Item 804.

Oppose Privatization of Social Security

CHATTIN: Our final one is on p. 2090. This is Calendar Item 1159. It's on p. 45 in the *Advance DCA*, and it's Petition 30124, "Opposed Privatization of Social Security." The committee moved referral to the General Board of Church and Society.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 735; No, 128*] You've sustained the committee of reference.

CHATTIN: Bishop, that concludes the work of Church and Society.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP TALBERT: Before the amendment needs to be [Unintelligible] to the house, we got a couple more minutes. Can we do something? Let's try it.

CHRISTINE KEELS: Bishop, we have just a few more petitions to present. I'd like to bring now Paul Ervin, who will share with us petition from p. 2089.

International Day of Prayer for Persecuted Christians

PAUL ERVIN: Page 2089, Calendar Item 161, *Advance DCA*—originally in 1916. It was actually corrected and is in 1828, the correction. This is in concurrence by the committee to support an international day of prayer for persecuted Christians. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 780; No, 49*] You've sustained the recommendation of the committee. Next item.

KEELS: Bishop, the committee began on, I guess it was Saturday when we began our reporting, in a spirit of shared leadership. We continue that tonight as

we bring Arnold Rhodes and John Peterson to present from p. 2093.

JOHN PETERSON: I'd like to call your attention to Calendar Item 1198 on p. 2093 of the *DCA*. This calendar item deals with Petition 31281 on p. 901 in the *Advance DCA*.

To Free Political Prisoners

ARNOLD RHODES: This particular petition asks us to reaffirm the resolution that is found in the *Book of Resolution* on p. 533, entitled "To Free the Political Prisoners." And it includes a statement in the amendment in regards to the efforts needed to release further prisoners, Puerto Rican political prisoners.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 719; No, 143*] You've sustained concurrence on Calendar Item 1198. Next item. We're at 11 o'clock. What do you want to do? All right. Mike 2.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): I believe, according to my calculations, we have only—how many more do you have? Two? She has one, and I think we have two from Discipleship. If it is the will of the body, if we could extend it ten minutes or so, I believe we could finish.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. If you would extend this ten or minutes or so, vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 747; No, 184*] All right, you've done that. Let's do it. Go ahead.

KEELS: Bishop, in the spirit of shared leadership, we have one of our central conference delegates that I'm very honored to be presenting the next petition on p. 2061 with Kalima Mutombo, and the interpreters are ready to assist. Kalima?

BISHOP TALBERT: Let's go.

KALIMA MUTOMBO (North-West Katanga): [Through an interpreter] On the p. 2061 of the book of the *DCA* and the Calendar Item 846. It's on the p. 926 in our *DCA* book. Petition 30860. The committee worked together in concurrence, so he's going to let the sister continue.

(*Applause, laughter*)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

U.S./China Relations

KEELS: And the sister is happy to continue. The U.S.-China political relations. The committee, as you heard, voted concurrent and recommend con-

currence. This petition updates and affirms the present resolution on p. 683 of the *Book of Resolution*. The amendment seeks, takes into consideration the entities of the Republic of China, the people of the Republic of China and Taiwan. The focus of this resolution is to resolve the concerns between the people of these two entities. I should note for you that this was pulled and removed from the Consent Calendar, and you'll see that action on p. 2161. We recommend concurrence, Bishop.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 804; No, 54*] You've sustained the committee's recommendation of concurrence. Next item.

KEELS: This concludes the work of the Committee of Global Ministries.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP MELVIN TALBERT: All right, Financial Administration, I believe we have. Is that where we are?

Definition of Property

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): We have three petitions, Bishop. The first one is on p. 2156 of the *DCA*. It refers to, I'm sorry, yes on 2156 of the *DCA*. Calendar Item 1369. It refers to p. 449. The petition actually begins on the top of p. 450, as Petition 31188. This petition originated with the legal department of GCFA to clarify the meaning of the term "property" to include not only real property, but tangible and intangible personal property. The committee has voted concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears. You have sustained the committee of concurrence [*Yes, 779; No, 63*]. Next item.

SAGER: On the same p. 2156, Petition No., Calendar Item 1370. It refers to page 463 in the *Advance DCA*. Petition 31335. This is a petition that originated with the church in Marietta, Georgia, which went through considerable strife and difficulty. As a result they submitted a number of petitions, all of which were substantially the same. We changed the title and amended the petition that they submitted in order to do that because the title was not descriptive of the contents. We took the title off of one of the earlier ones. This simply urges the general agencies to examine the issue of reserves and surplus which is already underway in the agencies and we recommended concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears [*Yes, 818; No, 48*]. You've sustained concurrence with this item. Next item.

SAGER: The third item is p. 1896 of your *DCA*, Calendar Item 0196. It appears in p. 425 as Petition 30479. This somehow was removed from the Consent Calendar. It's simply changing a word, "committee," to a word, "commission," in reference to responsibilities with which in the annual conference pertaining to the communications issues.

BISHOP TALBERT: You vote, recommend concurrence?

SAGER: We recommended concurrence.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you. Vote when the light appears [*Yes, 822; No, 32*]. You've sustained concurrence.

SAGER: And except for thanking the hard-working committee, that concludes the work of Financial Administration.

(*Applause*)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, let's try the next.

HAROLD BATISTE (Southwest Texas): Bishop Talbert, the Independent Commissions Committee has only item. The house secretary, Margie Briggs, will make that presentation.

Churches and Solidarity with Women

MARGIE BRIGGS (Missouri West): Take a deep breath and turn to p. 2242 of the *DCA*, Calendar Item 1562, Petition 30307, and from the *Advance DCA*, p. 1381, "Churches and Solidarity with Women — From Solidarity to Accountability." And the committee recommends concurrence on the petition. There is a minority report. The rationale for our concurrence is, this petition is a resolution that draws attention to the barriers against women's participation in our churches worldwide. It serves as a statement of recommitment to move from being in solidarity with women to action and accountability.

DAVID BANKS (North Carolina): Bishop, there is a minority report. Let me quickly summarize the minority report for you and then Amanda Peterson will give the rationale. There are seven places where we would change the document. Two standardize the language. Two of those reflect the language of the 1996 *Book of Resolutions* with reference to theology including the addition of

the contributions being in accordance with United Methodist doctrinal standards. Two redirect the efforts of the agencies to instruct the churches in these matters. The last one puts the whole matter in the context of discipleship.

AMANDA PETERSON: The rationale for this minority report was when this came before our committee last Saturday, we had not seen copies of the U.N. Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Nor had we seen any documents from the Women In Beijing conference. Several members of our committee had a lot of trouble voting for this because of this reason. And also we were told by the General Commission that there was no way we could get it by the end of the conference. I am holding in my hands copies of both documents. One of them, the Women in Beijing, being 157 pages long. I have taken the time within the last week to read as much of these as I can and I have a lot of genuine concern for these two documents.

Number one, in neither one of them is religion really lifted up. It seems like the focus of the cause to eliminate discrimination has taken first step to our Christianity and our beliefs in our religion. Our religion has taken a back seat to the cause. Our minority report seeks to only lessen the effects of these petitions in the extent that they are not required by the churches to follow. In order for us to have a chance to read these for ourselves and decide for ourselves if these are really something that we as Christians and United Methodists want to lift up. Or if they are something that we feel like do not support our Christian beliefs strongly enough to be upheld.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. I think we need to have the last word from the chair of the committee and we are going to take first the minority report and have you vote on that. And then we are going to take the majority report.

BRIGGS: Do you want my final thing?

BISHOP TALBERT: Before we start voting I want the word from you. On this minority report. And yours as well.

BRIGGS: You want the minority report first?

BISHOP TALBERT: I want you to say your, whatever, is there a final word on the minority report? You just made it.

All right, then, do you have anything as the chair?

BRIGGS: This petition captures the importance in our history of women worldwide. The committee has grappled with many questions and we have reached agreement on presenting petitions to you. And this is not just the United Methodist thing. This is, we work with many different churches and we cannot expect that our United Methodist work in ministry will act with integrity when nurturing faith with many other religions and I would strongly urge you to support the majority in concurrence on this.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, we now have before us the minority report. Vote when the light occurs, appears. [Yes, 387; No, 502] The minority report fails. We now have before us the majority report on item 1562. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 661; No, 228] You sustained the majority report, 661 yes. I didn't get the no's, but that's all right. It's sustained.

BATISTE: This concludes our report, Bishop.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

(Applause)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right.

JEFF GREENWAY (Western Pennsylvania): Bishop Talbert and members of the General Conference, we have two items for your action tonight. You will be glad to know that these are the last two legislative items for General Conference in 2000. Rejoice and be glad for blessed are you. The first is found on DCA p. 665. This is Calendar Item 2037. I'm sorry, p. 2037, Calendar Item 665, Petition 33143. The full text is found in the *Advance DCA* 273. We're not going to vote on this because Judicial Council decision no. 890 which is found in today's DCA p. 2287 has ruled the wording of this petition out of order. Therefore, it's no longer before us. However, I believe it is in the spirit of the discussions of the Discipleship Legislative Committee to encourage the General Board of Discipleship and the General Board of Higher Education & Ministry to work together in the next quadrennium in an effort to address this issue that is continually expressed before the General Conference. The final item is found on DCA p. no. 2144. This is Calendar Item 1270, Petition 3040. The full text for the resolution, the original resolution, is found on page 300 of your *Advance DCA*.

*Adoption of a Provisional Ordinal
Is Approved*

GREENWAY: The recommendation of the committee is for concurrence. This petition calls for the adoption of a provisional Ordinal, which is found in its entirety on pgs. 239-277 with the changes that are referred to in the DCA on pgs. 2144-2146. There are four types of changes. One is to restore Trinitarian language in the prayer of ordination, the second was to restore two vows to each service from the 1992 *Book of Worship*, the third is to give more permissive selection of hymnody by local committees that are responsible for planning these services, and the last is slight edits of some of the prayers to reflect the partnership in ministry with laity. It also calls for the further revision of these services by the General Board of Discipleship during the next quadrennium and that the Ordinal be presented to the 2004 general conference for official adoption. Therefore, I move concurrence as amended.

BISHOP TALBERT: It is before you. Vote when the light appears, you have sustained the committee [Yes, 787; No, 74]. (Applause)

GREENWAY: Thank you very much.

BISHOP TALBERT: Thank you. I recognize Mary Alice Massey for a special motion.

MARIELLEN SAWADA (California-Nevada): Bishop Talbert, excuse me—

BISHOP TALBERT: Right here, mike 4.

SAWADA: Everyone here, those who are feeling weary or energetic, those feeling affirm, not affirmed, non-delegates, delegates, all of us here are following the closing worship on this late, very late night. Western jurisdiction delegates invite you to a brief service of healing and wholeness, if you are seeking healing, wholeness, join us and bring a hymnal. We invite you as the book of Hebrews leads, to go outside the gate, outside the boundaries of this room to our service of community and healing and we would just invite you after that service to go out these doors and to the left into the hallway.

BISHOP TALBERT: Thank you. All right, what is this, we need to wrap it up now, go ahead. No, I recognized this gentleman coming over here then we will see what you have. Mike 4

*Motion to Put Advanced DCA
on CD Disk Approved*

DONALD FADO (California-Nevada): This would be self-explanatory. I move that the Commission on General Conference be encouraged to look into having the *Advance DCA* on CD disc and allowing use of lap-top computers during 2004 General Conference sessions.

(Applause)

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, I think we are ready to entertain that. This is before us. If you support that motion vote one, use one; if not, two. Vote when the light appears. Is this a point of order? All right, then you have sustained that motion, it goes to the commission. All right, I recognize the gentleman with the pink card right here. Mike 4. I'm not going to have too many of these—yes.

ROGER KINDSCHI (Wisconsin): Bishop, this is very short. This is not for me, I would just like us to leaving not overtired, we want to go home, I've got to go to the bathroom.

But I would like to reconsider.

BISHOP TALBERT: You want to go before you do this?

KINDSCHI: No, no, this is going to be short. I'm going to make it fast. I just have a real concern for many of our seminary students who are currently in seminary and who are considering seminary, and I would just like to present what I think will be a friendly amendment. To an item that we talked about on Tuesday night that I think we can talk about very quickly. But means an awful lot to a lot of people.

BISHOP TALBERT: You have to move reconsideration and test this house right now.

KINDSCHI: Yes, I move a reconsideration.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's before you, if you reconsider one; if you do not, two. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 199; No, 595] Sorry. Vance? All right, number 4.

*Programs of Repentance
and Reconciliation to Be Reported
at General Conference 2004*

VANCE SUMMERS, JR. (West Ohio): Bishop, I move that the General Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-religious Concerns report to the 2004 General Conference on the pro-

grams of repentance and reconciliation implemented during 2001-2004 quadrennium with those who stayed and with those historic Black Methodist denominations. I think it's self-explanatory; we had a beautiful service last week. I only want them to report back the follow up.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, if you support that vote one; if you do not, two. Vote when the light appears. You sustain that motion, it is so ordered. [*Yes, 585; No, 166*] The calendar chair.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): There are two resolutions on p. 2283 in the *DCA*, that in good faith we must look at and vote up or down. I promised these people.

BISHOP TALBERT: Identify the page again.

MASSEY: Page 2283, one of them is regarding the men and women in our armed services and the other one is the sign language interpreters and they were not printed earlier, and they're in, and I promised these people that I would bring them to the house's attention before we adjourned.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right, do you have the page number? Is someone prepared for a motion on these?

MASSEY: I move approval on both resolutions, Bishop.

BISHOP TALBERT: It's seconded. It's before us. Vote when the light appears. You have approved them. [*Yes, 683; No, 85*] All right, anything further from calendar? All right, secretary.

(*Laughter—applause*)

I believe we're all ready for the final motion.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: You all will be interested in knowing what that call was about. It's quick, we've got to make a decision fast on the last bus. How soon you going to be out?

BISHOP TALBERT: As I understand it, the closing worship is going to be about 20-25 minutes.

MARSHALL: All right, I will take care of that. Let me just very quickly give you the announcements. We need a final reminder in turning in the headsets for those who have used them for interpretation. The announcement that you heard about the Western Jurisdiction healing and wholeness was much more vibrant than the secretary would have read it.

(*Laughter*)

And the last one. This is in a completely different vein, but one we want to be aware of as we come to our final service of closing the General Conference and remembering. The Western North Carolina Conference delegation asks for prayers for the Richard and Kyle Petty family on the car crash death of Adam Petty today during a practice lap. That concludes it, Bishop Talbert.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Are you prepared then, as secretary, to move rule no. 21 following the worship service: that the final adjournment will be *sine die* following the worship service? Is that your motion? It is before us.

MARSHALL: I so move.

BISHOP TALBERT: Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 619; No, 54*]

(*Laughter*)

All right, you stay, we'll go. Let me take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for sticking with me through these final moments. I'm honored to have had the privilege to do that.

(*Applause*)

PRESIDING BISHOP MELVIN G. TALBERT: The secretary, the secretary has one announcement, one more announcement.

MARSHALL: One final announcement, while you were expressing appreciation to Bishop Talbert, I got the call in, and the final bus will run at 12:15. Thank you.

BISHOP TALBERT: All right. Just to remind you, this is your much-maligned bishop of the California-Nevada Annual Conference, and I want you to know that we in the California-Nevada Annual Conference pride ourselves in being good United Methodists. And I would hope that we would use this as an opportunity to remind ourselves that when one is maligned, it would be courteous to at least have a conversation with that person before you make your final judgments. I am a proud bishop of this church. I have done my best to be faithful. I have upheld every law of the church. What I have refused to do is to allow my mind and my freedom to speak to be chained. I think that's the official position of our church. Thank you very much, and I pray God's blessings upon you as we continue to

live out our faith, in the name and in the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

My thanks to my two colleagues who sat with me in the saddle.

(*Applause*)

Closing Worship May 12, 2000

BISHOP JOE ALLEN WILSON: Will you be seated, please? Conference, let us begin our worship. I am Joe Wilson, the bishop of the Central Texas Conference of Forth Worth Area, and I'm happy to lead you in this final experience of worship of the 2000 General Conference. And let us now prepare our minds and center our minds and our hearts as we begin our closing worship.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

AUDIENCE RESPONSE: And also with you.

BISHOP WILSON: Let us pray. Gracious God, we pray for the holy catholic church. Fill it with all truth, and all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it. Where it is in error, direct it. Where in anything it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, strengthen it. Where it is in want, provide for it. Where it is divided, reunite it. For the sake of Jesus Christ your Son our Savior. Amen.

CYNTHIA WILSON: It has been my joy to serve as your director of music for this 2000 General Conference. You have expressed your love and appreciation to me, but I need you to know that without the help of two women who have been at my side at every turn, I could not have done it, and I want to say thank you again to Johnetta Johnson Page at the piano and Monya Logan at the organ.

(*Applause*)

As you remain resting on your feet, I recognize that it is appropriate that we sing all of the stanzas that tell the complete story. I invite you to sing stanza 1 and at your leisure read the rest of the stanzas. We will use the tune "St. Catherine."

(*Singing, Music*)

BISHOP WILSON: You may be seated. Hear again the words from Ephesians, words we have been living out during this General Conference and

words framed in Eugene Peterson's paraphrase:

We were all called to travel on the same road and in the same direction. So stay together, both outwardly and inwardly. You have one Maker, one faith, one baptism, one Lord and Father of all, who rules over all, works through all, and is present in all. Everything you are and think and do is permeated with Oneness. But that doesn't mean that you should all look and speak and act the same. Out of the generosity of Christ each of us is given his or her own gifts. He handed out gifts of apostle, prophet, evangelist, and pastor, teacher, to train Christians to skilled servant work, working within Christ's body, the church, until we're all moving in a rhythm, and easily with each other, efficient and graceful, in response to God's Son, fully mature adults, fully developed within and without, fully alive like Christ. We take our lead from Christ who is the Source of everything we do. He keeps us in step with each other. His very breath and blood flow through us, nourishing us so that we will grow up healthy in God, robust in love.

BISHOP WILLIAM B. ODEN: "We are all called to travel on the same road and in the same direction, so stay together, both inwardly and outwardly." Those words of the apostle to the Ephesians are very difficult words for us to follow. For according to Walker Percy, ours is an age of disconnectedness, an age when it is not simple to travel together. For we're disconnected, according to Percy, from our history, our institutions, and each other. We live in a time, he says, when collisions and conflicts abound, cluttering the space between persons and between institutions. Disagreement often verges on division.

Carl Sandberg says Abraham Lincoln lived in such a time and place. *Anguish, turmoil, conflict* were words swirling around his day. Rhinehold Nieber called Lincoln the most original of America's religious thinkers. Maybe he can help us as we search for ways we can stay together and walk the same direction in times of polarized community. We are not in a time of civil war, but James Davidson Hunter says that we're in a time of culture wars, when the clash of viewpoints, visions, and inflexible opinions divide us, fragment us. And so Lincoln, in his second Inaugural Address, reminds us that both

sides read the same Bible and pray to the same God. The prayers of both cannot be answered, and that of neither has been answered fully.

Lincoln named the agony and the experience of his day, of our day, and of this Conference. The connectional fabric that binds us together is in danger of being pulled apart and disconnecting. At the very least, it is fading and damaged by the storms within and without. Conflicts abound all within us and around us, throughout the church, over the authority of the Bible, social issues, the nature of discipleship, sexual morality. And all of us are in the war zone and are still almost numb from the battlefield of the last few days. Wounded are all around us, among us, within us. Hunter helps us understand that our church wars grow out of culture wars, for we have learned to echo public discourse, which has become polarized. And even an innocent Cuban boy and a remote Puerto Rican island becomes ropes in a cultural, political tug-of-war.

So we let the biblical witness anchor us, and give us meaning and direction. The theme throughout Ephesians is precise and focused: Walk the same road; stay together inwardly and outwardly. Church leaders, know that faith, unity, and mutual accountability cannot be separated, even when we are different kinds of people with different gifts and viewpoints. This is Wesleyan to the core, Wesleyan to the core. For it is precisely at those points of anguish and conflict and suffering where our affirmations of faith are tested, where our apostolicity is translated into leadership, and where the Holy Spirit is found to be working.

Dear friends, this is to say that in all the questions and concerns and crying out of this Conference, that the Holy Spirit is at work, is present in our pain, is permeating our suffering, is pushing us beyond our struggles, is helping us define our cruciform shape. Bishop Solomon used a phrase with me, as he reflected on yesterday, that I found most meaningful—that is, "unity in anguish."

So what is our calling? We're called to be bridge leaders in a disconnected connection. The late George Thomas was a British Methodist lay speaker as well as Speaker of the House of Commons. His coat of arms included a phrase in his native Welsh: *Bid bin, bid bont* [*written phonetically*], "Who would be a leader must be a bridge."

Our chasms grow deeper and wider through this General Conference. But the good news is, the Holy Spirit speaks many languages, and we are the translators and interpreters. As Augustine reminds us, this is our task, to channel the Holy Spirit. Without bridge leaders, there can be no connection, only advocates and adversaries; and advocates who turn adversaries into enemies burn their bridges.

Walter Wink says that the ultimate religious question of our day is, How can we find God's love in our enemies? We are called to be bridges to the world, especially to the dispossessed, both near and far; to the 1.2 billion people in the world whose income is less than one dollar per day; to those who live within the shadows of our wealth, the invisible poor—and those are our shadows; to the children in every place. A child born in Mongolia has a greater life-expectancy than one born in Washington, D.C. The issue is not the wealth and resources of United Methodism—we have seen that these two weeks. The issue is the will and resolve to reach out and bridge gaps, in order to tell the story of the saving grace of Jesus Christ.

We're called to be bridge leaders. We're also called to bind up the wounded. Look around. Casualties abound. They surround us. The wounds are within us: the burned out, the weary, the wasted. Culture wars have taken their toll on us. And the clergy on the front line are often those who fall first. No wonder that while our seminary enrollment is at an all-time high, the numbers of those being ordained are rapidly diminishing. And the five-year dropout rate among those completing seminary is alarmingly high. The laity on the front line often fall first also. For it's difficult for the laity to maintain the intensity of church wars while in a struggle with culture wars.

Nouwen's image of the Wounded Healer still holds for us at this moment. Remember it. Remember the image—the Messiah, the Liberator, sits among the poor by the city gate, covered with wounds. He unwraps and wraps his wounds one at a time, so he can be ready to respond to anyone who cries out in need. The wounded leaders are called to bind up the wounds of those around them. Cardinal Bernadine, one deeply wounded himself, called religious leaders "bridges to the very mystery of God and healers of

the soul." But our mission is not to bind up each other's wounds; no, our mission is to serve God's mission, and for that reason we bind each others' wounds.

We're also called to build up the body of Christ. We grow weary of debate, dialogue, often more interested in our own positions rather than listening to the other. But, it is precisely at the points of our conflict where the Spirit seeks to reach out and strengthen the body of Christ, I believe that. One would be a fool to predict what General Conference might do and what directions it might take. I wouldn't. I haven't. But when I was asked if I thought The United Methodist Church would divide over the issue of homosexuality, my response was, "I don't know. I hope not. I don't think so." For I have close episcopal colleagues on both sides of this issue, close clergy and lay friends on both sides. Close family members on both sides. They all love the church. And the reason I don't believe that we'll split is because I believe that when we move beyond this debate and open ourselves to the Holy Spirit, there's a possibility we can learn to listen to one another, to bridge, to bind, and to build up.

And that's the work of the Holy Spirit—bridging, binding, building. How tedious is this work, how tiresome, and turbulent. But this is precisely where the leaders of the church are called to be, leaders including every person here, leaders including the Council of Bishops. We are called by the Holy Spirit to be present and give visible leadership in the midst of our conflicts, our sufferings, our anguish. One part of the body cannot be built up at the expense of another part. As the old spiritual reminds us, "We're in the same boat, Sister; we're in the same boat, Brother; and when you rock one end, you're gonna reel the other."

Sean Sammon has done a study of the life-cycle of religious institutions that are renewalist, predominantly Roman Catholic. He has done this and reported it in a book entitled *In The Meantime*, edited by Paul Filbert. He says first is a foundation time, with a strong leader, whose vision forms the movement. The Wesleys come to mind.

Second is a time of expansion. Tremendous energy, evangelistic zeal. Father Asbury, the circuit riders, the westward expansion.

Third is the period of settled-downness, stabilization. The frontier is gone, a time of rules and regulations. And for Methodism and the EUB Church, this was a time of transition from movement to major American denomination. The rise of great general boards and agencies, moving from presiding elder to district superintendent, from quarterly conferences revival to charge conferences reporting. This is the post-World War II church, strong, and great status.

But then, Sammon says, fourth comes a period of the breakdown of long-established structures. The mechanisms appear not to be working. Systems have outlived their usefulness. Authority is questioned. And the times, they are a-changing.

Now, Sammon says at that point there comes three alternative futures. One, extinction, slow and painful. The movement drifts toward chaplaincy, care primarily for those within. Or, two, mutual survival, minimal survival. Because of internal conflict and a lack of communal vision, a settle-down institution seeks only maintenance leaders who will ground differences and conflicts, and for whom order is the primary objective. All conflict is swept under the rug. But then, he says, the third option is a time of re-founding, a time of painful visitation of the vision of the founders and reshaping that vision into today's world. He says that this is a time when conflict can be creative and help reshape, re-found this movement, to energize it for the future.

Sisters and brothers, even in our pain, might we be at the beginning of such a time? Are there not some signs that the Holy Spirit may be sending fresh breezes through our connection? The days of listening in so many annual conferences. The In Search of Unity dialogue. The conferencing that has taken place in California-Pacific Annual Conference. The renewal of laity through Disciple Bible study. The walk to Emmaus. VIM covenant discipleship groups. St. Luke Community Church in Dallas requires its leaders to go through Disciple before they can have an office. Five hundred a year go through that, over 3,000 in their congregation. And that church is vital, visionary, Wesleyan, and missional.

Fifth is the tremendous outpouring of financial resources in response to world disasters. And Shalom Zones, Holy Boldness, the ecumenical and interreli-

gious dialogues; and the children—always the children—they're leading the bishops, they're leading all of us; they are the face of pain, of hurt and hope around the world. They are the face that draws us to both suffering and hope.

So, go home to be re-founders and re-connectors of The United Methodist Church, heirs of the Wesleyan revival, carriers, translators of Wesleyan holiness, personal and social. Go home, you re-founders, you instruments of a church in need of healing, you wounded ones who will use your wounds to heal others. Go home, you re-founders, you proclaimers of an inclusive church, shake the dust of racism off your feet so you can march to Zion. Go home, you Elijahs! Get out of this cave. You have work to do. You've got to elect new bishops, new leaders of the church. Of all the leadership qualities we need, bishops who pray are at the top of the list. The African American church has a word for this kind of leader: elect us "prayer warriors." Go home, you Jairuses! The church is not dead; she's only sleeping. Wake her up. Teach her to make disciples, to bridge chasms, to bind up wounds, to build up the Body. Go home, you Marys! Quit tarrying by the tomb. He is not here, he is risen, and he goes forth before you to Galilee. Tell his disciples to meet him there, there where you live and where you work and where you worship and where you play. Go home to be bearers of grace. Go home to be bringers of good news to the whole church. And may the Spirit that reconciles all of us, the Holy Spirit of God in Jesus Christ, go with you.

Let us pray: *O God, let us, your servants, be open to your healing love. Melt our hearts. Mold our spirits. Mend our wounds. Make us know that we are one in the love of Christ. Amen.*

(Applause)

BISHOP JOE WILSON: The Lord is with you.

AUDIENCE RESPONSE: *And also with you.*

BISHOP WILSON: Let us confess our need and sin to God and to one another.

Lord Jesus Christ, you are the Way of Peace. Come into the brokenness of our lives and our church with your healing love. Help us to be willing to bow before you in true repentance and to bow to one another in real forgiveness. By the fire of your Holy Spirit, melt our hard hearts and consume the pride and

prejudice which separate us. Fill us, O Lord, with your perfect love which casts out our fear, and bind us together in that unity which you share with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Amen. Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive all your sins through our Lord Jesus Christ, strengthen you in all

goodness, and by the power of the Holy Spirit, keep you in eternal life. Amen.

(Hymn 432, "Jesu, Jesu")

BISHOP WILLIAM ODEN: And now let us be sent out with blessing. And may the love of God, the peace of our

Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit go with us all.

And now, I declare the year 2000 General Conference to be adjourned. Go in peace.

(Applause)

(Music)