

Proceedings of the 2000 General Conference of The United Methodist Church

Corrections

DCA, p. 2176, second column, first paragraph: *Thirteen* million Russians should be *35* million.

DCA, p. 2176, third column, third line: *Greek* Sanctus should be *Russian* Sanctus.

(Continued from page 2193)

Tuesday Evening May 9, 2000

(Bishop William W. Dew, Jr., presiding)

PRESIDING BISHOP WILLIAM W. DEW, JR. (Phoenix Area): Good evening. We are going to be beginning with the gathering music. If you would like to move to your places, the gathering music is going to begin.

(Singing, Hymn No. 478, "Jaya Ho," and Hymn No. 143, "On Eagle's Wings," led by Cynthia Wilson)

(Monya Logan, organ music)

Good evening. I want to call us to order, so I urge you to find your places.

(Applause)

My name is Bill Dew. I am the resident bishop of Phoenix, Arizona. Two colleagues from the Western Jurisdiction, Jack Tuell, retired bishop, and Melvin Talbert, the San Francisco Area bishop, are my colleagues to try to be sure I do not stumble as we work to gether this evening.

We want to take a quick moment to welcome the delegates from Nigeria.

(Applause)

One other announcement before I turn to the calendar chairperson. I know people like to take home souvenirs, and apparently the Advance has provided tote bags, and maybe somebody has more than one. If you have an extra tote bag from the Advance, and if you are willing to share your extra tote bag, in form one of the pages that you have an extra tote bag that you will give to them so that some one else may take home a tote bag. If you see those in the air, pages, pick them up, quickly, please.

I'm now going to turn to Mary Alice Massey to give us the calendar for this evening. Mike 2.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): Good evening, delegates.

The calendar is as listed in your agenda, with one exception. The Judicial reserves will be elected tonight, immediately following this report, and then we'll move into calendar items. For tomorrow—you might want to know that 1,400 items have been calendared so far. So, you might feel good about that. We've got a way to go, but that's good news. And let me say that at the end of tonight's session, which is to adjourn at 10:05, the committees of Higher Education, Faith and Order, and General and Judicial legislative committees will meet in their respective rooms. They will meet until 11:30, at which time they have to be out of the building, so . . .

BISHOP DEW: Are you also recommending that order of the day for GCOM? 9:35?

MASSEY: Yes. That—that remains the same, but I'm to present tomorrow's agenda, Bishop.

BISHOP DEW: All right, I'm sorry.

MASSEY: That's okay, because we've had so many changes today, I think it's good to review what we're doing, so, now . . .

BISHOP DEW: All right. Go ahead.

MASSEY: Now for tomorrow. We begin the day with an ecumenical worship service with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that will run until 9:15. And then we will recognize our ecumenical visitors. We will have the Committee on Calendar and Agenda Report.

Then calendar items, Bishop Craig will be presiding. In the afternoon we will again have calendar items, beginning at 2:30. Music begins at 2:20. The presiding bishop is Emilio de Carvalho, is that the way you . . .? And then, in the evening, we will have the report of the Committee on Agenda, and more calendar items, and since Bishop Nacpil did not get to pre side to day, he will be presiding tomorrow evening. And we project an adjournment at 10:30, but we will see about that, and the Conference may vote me down again, but we'll see how it goes. That's the report of the Agenda Committee.

BISHOP DEW: All right. This is the report of the Agenda Committee. If you will support the report. . . you will press 1 for

yes; press 2 for no. [Yes, 761; No, 14] All right. In the back left sections—yes sir, I'll recognize you, come to mike 8.

You did approve the calendar that was presented by the committee. No. 8.

KURT G. GLASSCO (Oklahoma): I would like to make a motion that the General Conference resolves—so that there's no misunderstanding in the media—that the General Conference of The United Methodist Church honors, supports, and upholds in our prayers those men and women who serve all of us in military service, and in addition, those men and women who are United Methodist clergy who serve in the Chaplaincy Corps of our armed services.

*Work of the Committee on
Agenda and Calendar*

BISHOP DEW: Is there a second. Yes. Whenever we have a calendar presented to us, and then another proposal is brought to the floor, you actually bring into the body another matter, and it really should be given to the Agenda and Calendar Committee. Let me read to you from our Plan of Organization: "Proposals, questions, communications, resolutions, and other matters not included in the regular business of the General Conference shall be referred to the Committee on Agenda and Calendar without motion or debate. That committee then shall determine whether or not the matter presented shall be considered by the General Conference." So when you bring matters before us, they should be referred to the Committee on Agenda and Calendar without motion or debate. And that's what I want to order that you give that to the Calendar Committee. Yes, Calendar Committee, mike 2.

MASSEY: What we presented was the adjusted agenda for tonight. The other presentation was the proposed agenda for tomorrow. We will be calling for that to be approved in the morning, so if this resolution comes to us, we will try to see if we can work that in under calendar items.

BISHOP DEW: All right. You heard from the chair of the Calendar Committee. Such matters should be taken to the Calendar Committee. They will then consider whether it can be brought before the body.

You still have questions? Mike 8.

BEN R. ALFORD (Tennessee): I have another matter, Bishop.

BISHOP DEW: Mike 8.

*Judicial Council Election Question
Referred to Judicial Council*

AL FORD: I am concerned, Bishop, that we may have worked our selves into a confusing situation in yesterday's—in the adoption of Calendar Item 623 on p. 1991 of the DCA. We removed the age 70 limit for Judicial Council members. By adopting that legislation, we remove that from the paragraph in the *Discipline* which placed that limit previously. We currently have a member of the Judicial Committee who is serving, and, were it not for that limitation, could continue to serve the remainder of his 4-year remaining term. And yet, we elected someone yesterday for a 4-year term. My recommendation is that we ask the Judicial Council to give us a declaratory opinion on the status of yesterday's election in the light of this matter.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Have you heard the presentation, and is there a second to his...? All right. It is before you. I'll recognize this gentleman. Yes, mike 4.

WILLARD H. DOUGLAS (Virginia): Chairman of the subcommittee on the Judicial Council. I would call the conference to the attention of the matter that was passed, which is 623, and so what was enacted was a deletion up to that point, and it made no reference to the effective date of that legislation. And according to Paragraph 508, the legislation adopted by this conference would only take effect unless noted to become effective sooner, and there is no notation that it would become effective this morning. Thank you.

BISHOP DEW: Matters that are approved by General Conference become effective January 1, in the next year, which would be 2001. So he has clarified that there is no urgency on this matter because it is dealing with something that would be in effect next January. The motion is still before the house. You've had a clarification that there is no urgency, but I still am obligated to call for the vote. Yes, sir, mike 4. Is your speech in favor or against?

VANCE SUMMERS, JR. (West Ohio): Clarification, Bishop. I think if you read the petition, it would indicate that it is effective immediately upon adoption, if we were to read it.

BISHOP DEW: You are questioning the clarification given by the chair of the committee?

SUMMERS: Yes, I am. I'm questioning the previous speaker as well.

BISHOP DEW: Would you help the delegates by telling them where to look so they could read it with you?

SUMMERS: I don't have the... p. 733, Petition 31789. (I'm getting a lot of help here.) Thank you.

BISHOP DEW: Let's state it again: What page?

SUMMERS: I can't do that. I'm sorry, Bishop. I got too much help. Let's try it again. OK, there it is on the screen.

BISHOP DEW: It's on p. 733 of the *Advance* edition. That's where we should find the matter. All right. We now know where this material is. You still want to clarify from the microphone?

SUMMERS: No, I have no other questions. I wanted to point it out, Bishop.

BISHOP DEW: All right. We're going to put the motion before you, to send this as a declaratory decision to the Judicial Council. It requires 20% vote for it to be sent... Simple majority. It requires a majority. All those in favor will vote 1 for Yes, 2 for No. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 603; No, 259] All right, the majority has voted that it will then be given to the Judicial Council.

*Bal loting for Judicial Council
Laity Alternate*

Let us then go to the election for alternates to the Judicial Council. (Pause) I would like to read to you the procedure for the election. You will be voting for six alternates in each category. We will vote for lay alternates first. You will be taking 6 ballots each time we vote. You will need to vote for a different person each time or else your vote will be counted as invalid. After each time you make your ballot you will wait a few seconds because the technicians reset the computer. Once we have completed all 6 ballots then they will tabulate the data and let us know when the results are ready. You have noted earlier, I believe, that once we have elected 5 with only 1 remaining, we are able to move to voting in what they call real time. That is, we can take one ballot one after another until the election of the final alternate has been completed.

We will be using the same numbers for the persons in each category that were used in the election to the Judicial Council of the members of the Judicial Council. We have also included the names of persons who withdrew so that the slate is inclusive of those persons for your consideration. All right, let's have the slate presented to the delegates. (Pause) Do I need to read these? If I need to read them for any one, raise your cards so I will read them. Okay—I do. They are in this order: 2-Lonnie D. Brooks; 3-Evelynn "Lynn" Caterson; 4-James Lamark Cox, Sr.; 6-Paul Ervin; 7-Daniel F. Evans Jr.; 8-Oscar R Ferrer; 9-Theophilous

Gambe; 10-Sally Geis; 11-Jon Gray; 12-Edward H. Hill; 14-Daniel A. Ivy-Soto; 15-Sтивен T. Lett; 16-Marc D. Loud; 17-Ann Alberty Saunkeah; 18-William L. "Ted" Todd, Jr.; 19-William White; 20-W. Clark Williams, Jr.

For some reason Cox is not listed on your... the screen. Can we get Cox on no. 4? I read James Lamar Cox. Be patient. (Pause) Okay. We have them before you. You vote for one. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) All right. (Pause) We vote for another one, and as I reminded you, I'll remind you again, if you vote for the same person again you will invalidate your ballot, so you vote for another person. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) All right, we are ready for the third ballot. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) All right. We are ready for the fourth ballot. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) Ready to cast a fifth ballot. Vote when the light appears. (Pause) And now, the final vote. And that will make 6, so vote when the light appears. (Pause)

I believe we are going to vote for the lay alternates until that election is completed. We could speed that up by consecutively doing that, rather than alternating back and forth. Then we will go to the clergy alternates. (Pause)

*Judicial Council Clergy Alternate
Election Delayed*

All right we are going to go to the clergy. Yes I'll recognize you right here. Yes, Mike 4.

B. WILEY STEPHENS (North Georgia): My question is, since we are waiting on a decision on the validity of the clergy ballot should we go ahead with this vote or wait till that's clear to see who the candidates might be.

BISHOP DEW: Well I think we need the election anyway and I—it's difficult for me to determine whether the results of that decision, how that would do anything. We can look at what we do with our election and perfect it at that time. Number 4.

STEPHENS: If we in turn elect someone differently than we elected because of eligibility of the person that was thought in eligible then our reserve list also might be different, since another name would be possible. Just thinking of saving time if that happened if it was tomorrow. I don't know how quick the decision would come.

BISHOP DEW: I think we're going to proceed. Yes, in the back here mike 5.

DON MESSER (Rocky Mountain): I move that we delay balloting because we would simply be unfair to the person who

was elected if they were eliminated from being considered.

BISHOP DEW: Is there a second?

MESSER: Bishop we are talking about an individual who is elected for a four year term. If she were to be eliminated by this ruling then she would not be eligible to be an alternate because we would have already taken action, and this would be contrary to the will of the body of last night, which acted in good faith. So, therefore, I urge us not to proceed in this election in such a way to jeopardize a duly elected person to the Judicial Council.

BISHOP DEW: Motion before the house is to delay the election of the alternates-for the clergy alternates, as I understand it. All right, if you would support the motion to delay the election of the alternates. If you support the motion press 1 for yes. If you do not support it press 2 for no. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 691; No, 224] All right, you have delayed the election then for the clergy alternates. We did have a calendar put before us.

We have the results of the lay ballots that you cast. I guess if we do get some glitches in the election process, the urgency we would have is to go ahead with the calendar items. So who ever is first on the calendar items, I would urge you to be present on the platform so we could turn to you if we run into problems on the electronic ballotting.

*Geis, Gray, and Ervin Elected
Judicial Council Alternates*

So let's have the results of the... here they are. I don't think it is 5004. Ballots 885. All right, yes you're right. 5004, valid ballots 885, needed to elect 418 this is for—in valid ballots 59. All right we have elected Sally Geis, Jon Gray, and Paul Ervin. (Applause) Yes, mike 7.

JAMES W. EHRMAN (East Ohio): I note that the number needed to elect was 418 which is less than half of the valid ballots cast. Now in each case, the three people who were elected received more than half of the valid ballots. But I would request that the conference secretary determine why we are having this mathematical error.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Since those elected were over half, I would like for us to go ahead and continue and we'll try to get an answer to the question. Can we go ahead then and... We have to elect three more and then when the slate comes on you'll know. Do you need those read do I need to read those? 2-Lonnie D. Brooks; 3-Evelynn "Lynn" Caterson; 4-James Lamark Cox, Sr.; 7-Daniel F. Evans, Jr.; 8-Oscar R. Ferrer; 9-Theophilous Gambe; 12-Edward

H. Hill; 14-Daniel Ivey-Soto; 15-Stephen T. Lett; 16-Marc D. Loud; 17-Ann Alberty Saunkeah; 18-William L. "Ted" Todd, Jr.; 19-William White; 20-W. Clark Williams. I'll recognize you yes. Delegate move to mike 7.

MARLENE S. CUMMINS (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop, we request that we see the vote one more time it was not on long enough for us to see the other votes.

BISHOP DEW: The request is to bring back to the screen the results of your first six votes. You can see them. Let's hold them there. Any one need to have them read? Are you satisfied that you know the results?

All right. Let's prepare to vote. You will vote for three—one at a time. All right. Vote when the light appears. All right, ready to cast another ballot. There is the list. Vote for the person you want to vote for when the light appears. All right, one more vote will be cast. Vote when the light appears. I believe we can switch to agenda items, and to present from Higher Education—yes, I recognize, yes, back in the back, the mike 8.

*Rules Suspended on DCA
24 Hour Petitions Publication*

STAN SAGER (New Mexico): Bishop Dew, I have a motion I would like to make with respect to the rules. The motion would be as follows: "That the rules be suspended for the remainder of the conference to permit GCFA and committees to submit petitions to the body on the afternoon or evening of their publication in DCA so that the body need not wait a full day for their consideration, and so that petitions with budget implications may be considered more promptly by GCFA." If there's a second, may I address that briefly?

BISHOP DEW: All right. It's a suspend-the-rules motion, and it can not be debated. He gave you the motion and the implications of it having to do with the financing of some of the reports. So it is before you for vote. If you would support the motion to suspend the rules, requires two-thirds, vote yes by pressing one; vote no by pressing two. [Yes, 737; No, 162] You have supported the motion to suspend the rules.

J. LaVon Wilson will present the legislative committee of Higher Education's next items for our action.

J. LAVON WILSON (Illinois Great Rivers): Bishop Dew, we will continue the items from this morning. If you will turn in your DCA to p. 1994, Calendar Item 637, Petition 30914, the Advance DCA is 974. This is on the extension course of study schools as an option for clergy to complete

their education requirements. The committee recommended nonconcurrency.

BISHOP DEW: All right. It is before you with the recommendation of nonconcurrency. If you support the committee, you vote 1 for yes; if you do not, you vote 2 for no. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 756; No, 146] You have supported the committee. Next item?

*Theological Education Funding
Amendment Approved*

WILSON: The next item is on the same page—1994. It is Calendar Item 638, Petition 30595; Advance DCA 1024 is the p. no. This is on theological education in Europe. The committee recommended concurrence with the amendment as follows, as you see in your book, to add a new paragraph after the last "Be it resolved: "Specific funding amounts will be determined by GBHEM/DOM, consultation with the bishops, seminary leadership and leaders of programs of theological education in Eastern Europe." And then you would go down to the ninth paragraph: "Therefore be it resolved... Funding for the following programs in Europe."... We are asking that delete dollar amount that is in the listing. And this has been sent through to GCFA.

BISHOP DEW: All right. This is the recommendation of the committee. Yes, way in the back. Mike eight. Mike 8, please.

H. EDDIE FOX (Holston): Thank you, Bishop. And we are in the back.

(Laughter)

We're so far back, the DCA gets here a day late!

(Laughter—Applause)

But I want to ask a question so that we're sure.

It says, it says that it deletes the dollar listings. In those listings are the individual seminaries. Also says "an annual \$1 million, and quadrennial total, \$4 million," That is followed by the paragraph "Be it further resolved that the General Conference provide \$2 million, and the General Board of Higher Education Ministry provide \$2 million for funds to be identified and redesignated for this purpose." I want to be sure that the \$4 million is in this resolution and that dollar amount has not been deleted.

BISHOP DEW: Can you clarify that?

WILSON: The bottom line figure stays.

FOX: So it's only real locating \$4 million dollars between the seminaries?

WILSON: Yes.

FOX: Thank you very much.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The recommendation is from the committee to concur as amended. If you vote yes, press 1; if you vote no, press 2. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 887; No, 49*] By 94.8, you have supported the committee's recommendation.

WILSON: The following petition is on 1994, Calendar Item 639, Petition 31209; in the *Advance DCA*, p. 1030. This is on the continuing funding of the Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico. The committee recommends concurrence.

BISHOP DEW: All right, the motion from the committee is for concurrence. Yes, in the back, there is—I'll recognize you, mike 8. They may be way in the back, but they're active! [*Laughter*] Mike 8.

No, I—I recognize the other gentleman, in the suit, I'm sorry. Yes, with the suit.

P. JACK EDWARDS (Holston): I believe we have had a procedural matter where we agreed that the rationale would be given for why committees voted concurrence or non concurrence.

BISHOP DEW: That is correct. (To Wilson) If you would add a sentence of support for your action, they would be helped.

(Pause)

WILSON: "It therefore be resolved that the 2000 General Conference of The United Methodist Church request the General Board of Global Ministries and the General Board of Higher Education and Ministries to consult with the Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico and consider the continuation of financial support . . . to that seminary through the year of 2004." It's to consider funding.

BISHOP DEW: The action is to consider funding, is what she is clarifying? All right. It is before you. If you support the concurrence of the committee, vote 1 as yes; vote 2 as no if you do not support it. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 826; No, 96*] You have voted the support of the committee's recommendation. Next item.

*Encouraging UM's to Attend
UM Seminaries Debated*

WILSON: The next item is on page 1994, Calendar Item 640, Petition 30736; the *Advance DCA* is page 947. This is on the "Candidates should be encouraged to attend a United Methodist school." The committee recommended concurrence as amended as follows: "At the end of paragraph 306.2(A). This paragraph shall be effective at the end of the 2000 General Conference."

BISHOP DEW: Would you give them a sentence of rationale?

WILSON: It's candidates for ministry. They do not have to be a member of the same United Methodist church. (Pause) "Shall have been a member in good standing of The United Methodist Church for at least two years."

BISHOP DEW: We're getting, I think, a bit confused. It's the—Item is 640, which refers to candidates encouraged to attend a United Methodist school.

(Pause)

WILSON: We basically, Bishop, wanted to support our own institutions.

BISHOP DEW: All right, it is—yes, I'll recognize you over here. Yes, come to mike 7.

RILEY B. CASE (North Indiana): I would like to speak against concurrence. I don't know of any candidates who have ever not been encouraged to attend United Methodist schools, but I believe that putting this in the *Discipline* is not in the spirit with our desire to be an ecumenical and broadminded church. There are two reasons why students choose non-United Methodist seminaries. One is convenience, which sometimes includes finances. The second is that they sometimes deliberately seek out a seminary that offers programs, emphases, and perspectives not found in our seminaries. One of these, for example, would be the evangelical perspective, which, in some instances, is not offered at all in our seminaries, and in other instances, offered only on a limited basis. Our church is impoverished when we cut off other alternatives, such as the evangelical perspective.

What we ought to be doing as a church is to encourage the best possible education, whether within or outside the denomination, one that best prepares students for ministry. And as a part of this we allow students to follow their own convictions about what schools best offer that kind of education. This restrictive legislation reflecting a kind of institutional defensiveness, parochialism, and inward-looking, is not becoming to us as a people.

(Applause)

BISHOP DEW: That was a speech against, no—no demonstration please. I recognize the woman, yes, standing, come to mike 4. Is this a speech in favor?

ARDITH ALLREAD (California-Nevada): I would direct the assembly to page 947, where the petition is there. I would support the committee's recommendation. The—to my mind, the significant point in this petition is at 2A, that the candidate "shall have been a member in good standing of The United Methodist Church for at least

two years." The problem is that we have candidates who are members of a United Methodist Church who move out of their area to attend seminary, transfer their membership to a United Methodist church in the community in which they're attending school, and then cannot meet our current requirement that they be two years in the same United Methodist church before they can become a certified candidate. This legislation would correct that, so that students would not be penalized in the ordination process as they continue toward candidacy and ordination.

BISHOP DEW: All right, is there a speech against? Yes, I'll recognize you. Mike 2. Are you speaking against?

JOEL S. GARRETT (Western Pennsylvania): I'd like to make a motion. Would it be in order to make a motion to divide the question? If I have a second, I'll speak to it—dividing it between one and two.

BISHOP DEW: It's seconded. Okay.

GARRETT: As I look at this piece of legislation, it seems that we're voting on two things. We're voting one, on encouraging students to attend a United Methodist seminary, and second, we're voting to change the two-year of the same—membership of the same church rule. I think those are things that we should vote on separately, not together.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The delegate has asked us to consider voting on what is stated as number one, "Inquiring candidates should be encouraged to pursue their education at one of the United Methodist seminaries," and 2A, "shall have been a member in good standing of The United Methodist Church for at least . . ." I can—I can separate that, if there is no objection. If there is no objection, we can vote on those separately. No objection? Let's take them, then, one at a time. Is there an objection in the back? Yes, are you objecting to my separating the two? That's what I want to hear, is whether you object or not to my separating the two. Mike 5?

JACK E. RYDER (Northern Illinois): It's more of a question. There's a third paragraph as well. And what—what happens to that one? 3C?

BISHOP DEW: Let me ask the maker of the separation suggestion. There is a 3C . . . Two and three can go together, was his suggestion, so we still divide the question, 1, 2A and 3C. All right. I'm going to put number one before you. If you support the recommendation of the committee for the paragraph numbered 1, if you support it, press yes; if you do not support it, press no. Vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 603; No,*

301] All right, you have supported the committee's recommendation for the one. Now we vote on 2A and 3C. If you support the recommendation of the committee, vote 1; if you do not support, vote 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 772; No, 160] You have supported the committee. Go on to another item.

*Clergy Fidelity in Marriage
and Celibacy in Singleness Affirmed*

LAVON WILSON: All right. If you will, turn in to page 1994, Calendar Item 641, Petition 31465; the [Advance] DCA page is 958. The committee, Bishop, voted concurrence with the amendment. I'm sorry, non-concurrence, and my vice-chair, Kate Lehman, is going to give the rationale.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Kate?

KATHARINE W. LEHMAN (North Indiana): Thank you, Bishop. The rationale is that the committee is recommending non-concurrence because the committee wanted to retain the present standards for our relationships in marriage and in singleness.

BISHOP DEW: All right. This is the committee's recommendation. It's before you. Yes, vote 1; no, vote 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 753; No, 153] You've supported the committee's recommendation. Next item please.

WILSON: The next one is on page 1994, Calendar Item 642, Petition 31471, Advance DCA 962. It is on the same subject—the committee recommended non-concurrence for the very same reason.

BISHOP DEW: All right. If you support the committee's recommendation, non-concurrence, vote yes, no. 1. If you do not support it, vote no, no. 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 787; No, 146] You have supported the committee's recommendation. Go on to the next.

*Local Student Pastors Given Voice
But No Vote*

WILSON: The next one is on the same page, Calendar Item 643, and that is Petition 30675, Advance DCA 970. The subject is on: "Local pastors can vote except about constitutional amendments, delegates to General Conference, and other matters." The committee recommended non-concurrence. And Al Gwinn will bring the rationale.

BISHOP DEW: Al?

AL W. GWINN (Kentucky): The committee voted non-concurrence on this petition because it's a student pastorate, local pastor, that we're speaking about. And those persons have the right of voice but not vote. And they can be members of their

home conference or members where they are presently serving. And the complication of that, we thought, made it far too difficult to allow vote as well as voice. So we recommended non-concurrence.

BISHOP DEW: The motion is for non-concurrence. Yes? Mike 1.

ROBERT L. CASADY (Missouri West): I stand urging you to vote non-concurrence with the committee, in all due respect. It is my understanding that just because someone is in seminary and goes back to their own conference, they do not necessarily have voting rights. But there are other reasons as well. It is very inconsistent for us, on the one hand, to grant voice and vote to every other licensed local pastor, full time and part time, and not allow it for student local pastors. It is not just on the one hand for us to congratulate churches who continuously serve as training ground for student pastors and deny them, year after year, pastoral voting representation at their own annual conference.

But there are other reasons. In the district where I serve as a superintendent, I have five student pastors. Valerie serves a congregation which has significant ministry to children mid-week in a displaced town that moved as a result of the '93 flood. Cindy has tripled the worship attendance in the congregation that she serves, in three years. Terry has brought healing to a very troubled congregation. Camille, upon graduation, plans to be going to Mozambique to join her husband in ministry there. Darren, like wise, has seen spiritual and numerical growth. I suspect that across the country there are hundreds of reasons why we should allow licensed student pastors the right to vote. This petition does not go too far. It does not overreach. They still have their voting rights restricted on matters of ordination, General Conference, and matters of the Constitution, and rightly so. All we're simply asking for them to do is to have the right to vote at their annual conference where they're serving as a student licensed pastor. I urge you to vote non-concurrence with the committee.

BISHOP DEW: That is a speech against. Is there a speech in favor of the committee's recommendation? The chair has a word to say?

GWINN: We certainly do understand the difficulty. In fact, the gentleman who just spoke has been a member of our subcommittee and our legislative committee. We have wrestled with this one, and it is a difficult issue. But it would be a very complicated thing to keep record of who is choosing to remain in their home conference and who is choosing to vote in their

conference where they are presently serving. The petition as is presently written does not clarify that, and this is a temporary kind of time period for these student pastors. And with all of those considerations we felt as a whole—on the whole as a legislative committee—it's best to allow voice but not vote, and we recommended non-concurrence.

BISHOP DEW: Calendar Item 643 the committee has placed before you. If you vote yes, press 1; if you vote non-concurrence, vote 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 523; No, 404] The committee is supported. Go on to the next item.

WILSON: On the same page, Calendar Item 644, Petition 31487, Advance DCA 970. Local pastors who are certified can dates for ordination can be appointed to extension ministries. The committee recommended non-concurrence, and Kate will bring the rationale.

LEHMAN: Appointment to extension ministries brings up issues of itineracy rather than the issues that are really the nature for local pastors. And so the committee recognized that the nature of local pastors may be changing, but for right now they are not part of the itinerant system and, therefore, are not to be appointed to extension ministries.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The committee's recommendation is non-concurrence. If you support the committee you will vote by pressing 1; if you do not, you will vote by pressing 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 784; No, 155] You supported the committee. We have another item.

WILSON: 1994 is the DCA page, and our Calendar Item is 645, Petition is 30014. AC, the Advance DCA, 972. This is on the voting rights for student local pastors. The committee recommended non-concurrence, and with the same rationale that was given before.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The committee recommends non-concurrence with the same rationale given. If you support the committee's recommendation, you will vote 1 for yes; two if you do not support the committee. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 577; No, 252] Point of order? What is point of order? Come to the mike if you have a point of order. You can interrupt the process with a point of order.

WILLIAM D. SCOTT (Mississippi): You had six flags raised. Been trying to get the floor, and you didn't recognize anybody.

BISHOP DEW: It's possible that I would see 50 flags waving, and I might not—

We were in the midst of the voting process is what I am trying to make clear. Yes, sir, I'll recognize you. Mike 4.

RICHARD EDWARDS (Northwest Texas): I, in fairness, did vote affirmative for that motion but would move to reconsider for the sake of voice for the persons who wanted to speak.

BISHOP DEW: Thank you. Thank you very much. If you would support the motion for reconsideration, press 1 for yes. If you do not support the motion for reconsideration, press 2 for no. [Yes, 712; No, 202] You reconsidered it, Calendar 645. Okay, now it is before you. Who wants to speak? Yes, I'll recognize you. Come to mike 6.

*Small and Rural Churches
Become Issue In Student Pastor Votes*

EDWARD A. KAIL (Iowa): Thank you, Bishop Dew. And thank you to the body for allowing this reconsideration. I was waiting for an opportunity to add a negative speech to the last one, but it was not called for. The petition that was just announced was sponsored by two of my students at St. Paul's School of Theology, both serving student local pastorates. And as we discussed their development of this petition we recognized two issues. One of them is the issue of clergy status. That is the one that tends to create opposition. But a second issue is the representation of our smaller rural churches and smaller urban churches who receive student local pastors. Bishop Mutti of Kansas shared with me the story of his being at a charge celebrating their 50th year—consecutive year—of, of having a student local pastor. That means that that church for 50 years only had a laity vote at an annual conference. There is an issue of fair representation here, in addition to the matters of clergy status and voting privileges. Myself, I see no harm whatsoever in allowing a few students to vote in a conference where they are offering effective ministry such as that Brother Casady gave testimony to.

BISHOP DEW: All right. That is a speech in opposition to the recommendation of the committee. Yes, I'll recognize you. Mike 7. If you speak in favor. . .

RON BARHAM (Mississippi): Mine is a question. I'm asking if this would mean that there would be in each conference a, an equalizing lay delegate for a vote. If there is, it has implications for all of us. If there is some one who could give us an answer to that question. . .

BISHOP DEW: We'll turn to the committee for the response to your question.

GWINN: Could we hear the question once again?

BISHOP DEW: Can we hear the question one more time? Speak up.

BARHAM: I'm wondering if there are implications in this that the—this would mean that there would be an equalizing delegate, lay delegate or lay member of an annual conference, for each of these additional persons we would be adding to the voting on the clergy side.

GWINN: If you want me to answer that. It's our understanding that in an annual conference setting there are always equal number of lay members and clergy members.

BARHAM: So are these declared "clergy," or are they "lay"? If they are clergy, my understanding is that each conference would then have to provide an equalizing lay member.

BISHOP DEW: Yes, I believe they would be listed in the clergymembers of the annual conference, there is a listing in that paragraph. Some one have a different opinion? Yes, standing in the back. . . mike 8?

JERRY H. MAYO (Tennessee): In the church where that student local pastor is appointed there is already a lay member to the annual conference. There would not be a need for equalization.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Yes? Mike 1.

JIMMY M. WELCH (Texas): We have in our annual conference students who are serving across the United States in student local pastorates because they are attending school outside of the state. If we—if we pass this, one of the things that will mean is that it will discourage those students from returning to their home conferences to participate in an annual conference, because they would be then expected to attend the annual conference where they were serving. Our expectation and encouragement is for student local pastors to return home for an annual conference. So, I would—I would recommend that we concur with the committee.

BISHOP DEW: All right, that's a speech in support, in the back? Yes? Is some one. . . yes, come to mike 8. Is that a speech against. . . ?

AMANDA B. PETERSON (Oklahoma): Against the recommendation of the committee.

BISHOP DEW: All right.

PETERSON: I'm Amanda Peterson, a lay delegate from Oklahoma, and also a future pastor. My concern with this is that in Oklahoma, we have a lot of small churches and a lot of students who want to be pastors. We need the pastors. Without the right to

vote, it's going to discourage them from even accepting their appointment if they feel that they need the opportunity to represent themselves and their conference in that delegation. Therefore, I speak against the recommendation of the committee for all seminary students who, like me, want to be pastors.

(Applause)

BISHOP DEW: All right, would some one like to—yes, I'll recognize you, mike 2. Are you speaking for the. . .

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I actually have a question for the committee. I'd like to ask, if I recall the discussion in committee, there were several small conferences that had seminaries in them with a large number of student pastors. There was some concern that their annual conferences would be swamped or destabilized by a large number of participating students if that, if this, were adopted, and I wonder if, if I've confused something, or whether that discussion attended this particular resolution?

GWINN: The direct answer to that is there was no legislative committee decision on that, but yes, it was in the midst of the conversations.

BISHOP DEW: I'll recognize you, mike 4. Are you speaking for or against?

GREGORY D. STOVER (West Ohio): I want to offer an amendment.

BISHOP DEW: All right.

STOVER: I move that we amend the petition by adding the words at the end of the sentence: ". . . except constitutional amendments, election of delegates to general, jurisdictional, or central conferences, and matters of ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy." If there's a second, I'll speak briefly.

BISHOP DEW: It's seconded.

STOVER: By—by enacting this amendment, we will make this language parallel with the language that relates to the voting privileges that are given to both full- and part-time local churches, and it seems to me that this is a simple issue of equity and justice. Full- and part-time local pastors are able to have full vote, and students perform the same duties. All they would really have to do is drop out of school and pursue the Course of Study or some other direction and they will gain the right of vote. So I hope we'll adopt this amendment and the petition.

BISHOP DEW: All right, the amendment is before you. I'll recognize you back there, yes. . . mike 8. We're on the amendment.

*Rules of Order Debated
in Student Pastor Discussion*

OYVIND HELLIESEN (Norway): It's a point of information. Can the chair explain for me how it's possible that we vote nonconcurrency on Calendar Item 643 and now have 645, and it's exactly the same?

BISHOP DEW: The question is really, are those exactly those same?

WILSON: We are recommending noncurrency with all of them.

BISHOP DEW: We have voted noncurrency.

HELLIESEN: With the amendment, it will be exactly the same. So we have to vote noncurrency.

BISHOP DEW: I understand. He is saying, if you support the amendment, you will make this exactly as one you have already voted noncurrency. *(Pause)* It's my judgment that it is not in order to bring back to the body some thing that you have already voted in noncurrency. Yes? Point of order? Mike 4.

STOVER: I believe that these items were calendered separately, and that the rule of the conference is if there are conflicting motions, the later action takes precedent.

BISHOP DEW: I . . . I do not believe so.

(Laughter)

This body voted on an action, and now the amendment would come back to be the same action you have already voted on. I am ruling it out of order, and we are going to . . . Yes, I'll recognize you, yes . . . the yellow card, in the back. Yellow card in the back, mike 6?

TIMOTHY RISS (New York): They are not the same, because this particular titling specifies the annual conference membership of the student local pastor as being the place in which that vote is exercised, which was one of the points that was raised in the debate in the previous item as making it not a desirable option.

BISHOP DEW: All right if he, if he is correct it is right. Is that the way you would understand it? It is. Let's treat it that he has determined that it is different, and so the amendment is still before you. Some one in opposition to the amendment? Yes, in the back . . . Yes, mike 8?

BISHOP DEW: I'm sorry, the woman . . . mike 8.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great River): Bishop, I would simply request rule 17 be enacted at this moment and give us two to three minutes for prayer for meditation as we've had much confusion over the

last few moments. Rule 17 is a request for prayer time.

*Conference Takes Time for Meditation
and Discernment Before Vote*

BISHOP DEW: Yes, it's a motion for discernment. Let's take one moment for quiet meditation, then we will move back to the process of voting. *(Pause)*

Amen. All right. What you have before you is Calendar Item 645, and then an amendment from the floor. Do we have the amendment in the hands of the secretary? I would like for us to hear the amendment. We've taken a little time for quiet. Let's get the amendment back before us before we begin to debate again. Can I ask the secretary to read the amendment?

CAROLYN MARSHALL: By adding at the end of the sentence "except constitutional amendments, election of delegates to general, jurisdictional, or central conferences, and matters of ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy."

BISHOP DEW: All right. That's the amendment. Yes, I'll recognize you with the green card behind the back there—yes—you, yes. Come to mike 4.

RODNEY G. STEELE (North Arkansas): I call the question for all that's before us, please, if it's in order.

BISHOP DEW: All right. It's been moved and seconded to call for the question on all that is before us. That's nondebatable and if you support it by two-thirds, we move then to your voting on what is before you. All right, if you support the motion for voting on all that is before us, vote yes by pressing 1; vote no by pressing 2. *[Yes, 849; No, 73]* You supported it so we move to the amendment. If you—we do give the chair a final word.

GWINN: Bishop, on behalf of the legislative committee, I want to remind the delegates, the delegates to night, that if we were voting only with our hearts, every single one of us would probably have voted for concurrence. But you have experienced what we believe to be only the tip of the iceberg and confusion that can happen when we have student pastors with both a vote and a voice. And so, after long debate, we tried to use our mind with our heart and believe that the best direction for us presently is noncurrency.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Be on the amendment. If you support the amendment, you will press 1 for yes; if you do not support it, you press 2 for no. Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 467; No, 462]* The amendment passes. We now move to the main recommendation before you, which is

a motion for noncurrency on Calendar Item 645. If you support the recommendation of the committee, you vote yes by pressing 1; if you do not, you vote by pressing 2. Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 539; No, 381]* You supported the committee in your vote. Do you have—is that the final item?

WILSON: That is the final item, Bishop.

BISHOP DEW: All right. We want to thank the Committee on Higher Education and Ministry.

(Applause)

Yes, in the back. Yes, sir, come to mike 8. Mike 8 please.

*Consent Calendar Limit Set
at Ten Persons*

ROBERT SWEET (New England): I move to suspend the rules so that beginning immediately all calendar items with less than ten votes proposed, as reported out of committee be, approved without reading and rationale, and further, that beginning with the consent calendar printed in today's DCA, items to be lifted from the consent calendar require 10 signatures.

BISHOP DEW: All right. It's seconded. Would you like to speak to it?

SWEET: I would. As is evidenced around a couple of items all right this evening, it's apparent that we want to discuss and need to discuss some issues in great depth. Other issues are obviously going to pass quickly without dissent or little dissent.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Are you clear about what you would vote? I think they're going to need to hear that an other time before they vote. Unless maybe the debate can help us understand it. Speaking in support—anyone speaking in support? Yes, I recognize the delegate standing there. Yes mike 5.

BECKY HASSE (California Pacific): I would move to amend the motion to make it effective with the DCA consent calendar for tomorrow, because I believe we have already passed the deadline for submitting requests for removal for today's items.

BISHOP DEW: Is the amendment seconded? It's seconded. Would you like to—you already made a speech? Is there anyone opposed to that motion? The amendment then would be for the DCA for tomorrow. If you support the amendment, press 1 for yes; press 2 if you do not support the amendment. Vote when the light appears. *[Yes, 760; No, 162]* All right. You have amended the main motion. Is there opportunity—anyone wishing to hear that mo-

tion that is—I'm going to put the vote to you.

BISHOP DEW: I think they would like to hear it one more time and then I will put it to a vote. Will the gentleman come to the mike? Mike 8.

(Reads as Amended)

*Consent Calendar
Reading and Rationale Deleted*

SWEET: I move we suspend the rules so that beginning immediately all calendar items with less than 10 votes opposed, as reported out of committee be approved without reading and rationale and further, that beginning with the consent calendar printed in tomorrow's (May 10) DCA items to be lifted from the consent calendar require 10 signatures.

Vote Tallies Confuse and Cause Delay

BISHOP DEW: All right. This is the motion before the house. If you will support this motion by voting yes, press 1; if you do not support it, you will press 2 for no. Vote when the light appears. It did require two thirds and you supported it by 81.9%. *[Yes, 749; No, 166]* We will now be functioning under that rule. Yes, the DCA tomorrow. We can go back to our election process. You voted for 3 per sons. Valid votes 2757. Valid ballots 932. Need to elect 460. In valid ballots 21. *[Applause]* Daniel A. Ivey-Soto received the necessary number and was elected. *[Applause]* You need to vote for two more. Look at the names. Look at the results. Yes, point of order? Mike 8.

MARK L. DICKEN (South Indiana): I think we still have a math error in the system. Half of the total of valid votes was not 460; it should have been I believe 466.

BISHOP DEW: Let me ask the secretary. We are trying to get it back on the screen. I think it is our determination that 467 would be the number needed to elect. That would be... and so the delegate was correct to raise the point of order about the results. We do not have an election. Yes, I will recognize you. Mike 4.

DEAN S. YAMAMOTO (Oregon-Idaho): Bishop, I think it is pretty easy. Can I run the numbers by you? The last 2 have been correct. 2757 divided by the 3 votes we took equals 919, divided by 2 to get the majority is 459. *[Applause]*

BISHOP DEW: All right. Yes, I will recognize you. Come to mike 4.

MAC BRANTLEY (North Georgia): The information that was given is not correct. *[Laughter]* The 21 in valid ballots need to be divided by 3. So the 7, in instead of 21, would be what would be deducted from the total.

BISHOP DEW: Please . . . I think we might need to defer the election until we get some clarity. Let's take a . . . let's take a break. You've been working here for . . . *[Applause]* Let's take a 15 minute break. Please be back in 15 minutes.

[Break, followed by singing]

Thank you for that. Let's come to order by coming to your seats. Can you move to your seats. Please come to order. Thank you, please come, be seated when you come to your seat. I wanted to say a word to you. To get into the kind of situation we were in and one just wants to say, "Isn't modern technology wonderful?" It also made me make a very discourteous statement earlier. Please be in order. The—earlier when I made a discourteous statement it was because the voting machine had started down that road, and I apologize to any of offense to any one at that point. We really need an explanation on how to read the ballot and so that will come in the morning. We can then tomorrow morning move back to voting for the alternates to the judicial council. But you need a clear explanation on how to read it so that you don't get different delegates giving different mathematical interpretations and so we will do them in the morning. Yes, I'll recognize you in the back. There will be no more voting on alternates for judicial council till tomorrow morning. Mike 8.

PHILIP R. GRANGER (North Indiana): Bishop, I would like to try a suspension of the rules. I would like to suspend the rules; and on the next ballot go for a plurality on the remaining alternates for the judicial council.

BISHOP DEW: Would you be willing to wait till tomorrow morning because we are not going to go to a vote.

GRANGER: Bishop, I'm willing to wait if that's what you desire but I believe the problem was in the mathematical calculation of the majority and my motion would not require that calculation.

BISHOP DEW: Yes, I think I would like for this to be delayed till tomorrow morning at which time the *Discipline* calls for there being a majority vote even for every alternate. And so I think you would need to be clear about what you would be doing in that event. And then the electronic process would also be ready in the event that such a motion were either to be voted up or down at that time. So, I would still like for you to wait till tomorrow morning when that discussion can be held. We can move on then to some agenda items, get those out of the way. All right, thank you.

Faith and Order Legislative Committee is ready to present to you. Mr. Hayes.

*Report of Faith and Order
Alcohol and Drugs on Campus*

ROBERT E. HAYES (Texas): Thank you Bishop, thank you General Conference, the committees, the Legislative Committee on Faith and Order would like to present for your consideration several petitions and you can turn to p. 1908 in your DCA, to Petition 30586. It is Calendar Item 314 found on p. 532 of the *Advance DCA*. Petition 30586. It concerns the use of alcohol and drugs on campuses. The committee recommends concurrence with an amendment and it is amended at the bottom, the last paragraph in this particular petition. This is a non-disciplinary resolution which would go into our *Book of Resolutions*. And we recommended concurrence as amended.

BISHOP DEW: All right, did you want to give us a line of rationale for it.

HAYES: Well, the resolution itself speaks to the need; of the percentages of students who are reported; alcoholic related events and activities and schools. And the Methodist Church is trying to address this issue through several steps. And also at the very end of this particular resolution it strongly recommends that United Methodist Colleges and Universities prohibit the sale and possession of beverages, alcoholic beverages on their campus.

BISHOP DEW: All right, it is before you. Yes I recognize the pink. Yes. Mike 6.

J. ROBERT BURKHART (Iowa): I would like to make an amendment in the fourth paragraph, the ninth line, just before the words "the United Methodist College Presidents." I'd like to recommend that we insert the words, "the Division of Higher Education of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, and with... ." So it would read "the General Board of Church and Society partnering with the Division of Higher Education of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, and with United Methodist College Presidents" and so on. And then, under point 4, to substitute this language for what's there. "Affirming and encouraging United Methodist related colleges and universities, efforts to address alcohol abuse and use by college students." If there is a second I'd like to speak to it.

BISHOP DEW: It is seconded.

BURKHART: The first part of this amendment, I think, brings us into conformity with the *Discipline* paragraph 1414.4. And the last part, instead of making the General Conference sound like a dictatorial or dictatorial parent, it helps us join in partnership with colleges. I know our four Iowa United Methodist related colleges are struggling.

gling with this is sue, as other United Methodist related colleges are. And we as a church are struggling with them on that. And as partners I think we can do better in affirming them and working with them.

BISHOP DEW: All right, the amendment is before you do you wish to speak to it? Yes I'll recognize, yes the young man, yes. Can you come to mike 1?

Alcohol Abstinence on Campus Debated

GERALD "JAY" WILLIAMS (Western New York): I would like to speak for the amendment for several reasons. Actually, in our social principles we use language that is that promotes abstinence rather than prohibiting drinking alcohol, so I think that this amendment will bring us into conformity with that, as well. As possibly a greater reason: If we prohibit the sale and use of alcohol on our campuses, what we do is create a situation where we have students going off campus to drink and then possibly get drunk and then they have to return to campus in a drunken state. So that could potentially promote situations that are far greater than the ones that would be on campus otherwise.

BISHOP DEW: All right, speech in favor of the amendment. Is there one in opposition? I'll recognize you yes, in the pink card come to mike 4. You're on the amendment now, so you would speak to it.

MICHAEL T. MUELLER (Wisconsin): I would speak in opposition to the amendment. Our committee did discuss this quite seriously and felt that this wording best reflected what we wanted to happen. In all of our discussion, including the discussion right now, we have not said anything about the responsibility of our college students to be have responsibly, whether or not they're attending a Christian college campus. And we can certainly understand the concern for students going off campus, getting intoxicated, and then trying to drive back to the campus. But I maintain that there is a need on the part of those students to be have responsibly.

BISHOP DEW: All right, is there any one, yes in the back in green shirt. Yes you in the yellow card. Mike 8. Are you speaking in opposition?

TYSON FERGUSSON (Detroit): I speak in opposition to the amendment because we need to stand firm in our belief that we need to abstain from alcohol. We need to let the universities and colleges that we as United Methodists support—support them fully in all ways—universities and colleges are some of the most formative years of a person's life. And if we as a church want to teach responsibility and how people are supposed to change their behavior about al-

cohol, what message do we send when allow the universities to have alcohol on their campuses and in the communities?

I graduated with two degrees from Michigan State. During those seven I saw several kids lose their lives because of alcohol and the misuse of it. The president of the university is moving towards a dry campus and we have seen results. This is not just a church issue. This is a societal issue. I am now attending Duke Divinity School and this last year we have lost a couple of students because of alcohol. The president and other people in the university, as well as students, are addressing the issue. They are beginning to do it already. If this General Conference encourages them; then we were only encouraging. We need to stand firm and ask to change behavior and *teach* to change behavior. Thank you.

BISHOP DEW: All right we've had two speeches in favor and two against. I'm ready to put it . . . yes?

Are you—yes. I recognize you standing. Come into mike 5. Are you speaking on the amendment, and what side are you speaking on?

CARL GLADSTONE (Detroit): Bishop, I am in favor of the spirit of the amendment but would like to offer a substitute, if I am in order.

BISHOP DEW: Yes.

*Substitute for Alcohol Petition
Is Substituted*

GLADSTONE: I would like No. 4 of this petition to read (strike entirety of No. 4 and replace with: "Strongly recommending that United Methodist and United Methodist related colleges and universities uphold abstinence from drinking alcohol as a viable and faith-filled option, and that those institutions provide programming and social events that would foster such an environment.")

BISHOP DEW: Is there a second to that? It is seconded. You wish to speak to your substitute?

GLADSTONE: Many of the reasons have already been said, sir, and I would just like to reiterate that the language of prohibition is not—is inconsistent with the language that we have in our own social principles.

BISHOP DEW: All right. Any one wishing to speak in opposition to the substitute?

Yes, I'll recognize you in the rear, way back there with the orange card. Was somebody actually wanting to—nobody's going to? All right. Yes? Mike 8.

SHARIE MORGAN (North Indiana): With all due respect, I would like to remind

General Conference that while we are arguing about our college kids drinking alcohol, thousands of children are dying because they have no water to drink.

BISHOP DEW: Yes, mike 1.

MATTHEW G. JOHNSON (Western Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in favor of the substitute amendment. I—

BISHOP DEW: All right.

JOHNSON: I believe the substitute amendment recommends action in stead of placing this in a book, and just having it sit on a shelf. This recommends action to be taken by the colleges to promote abstinence in drinking, and abstinence of alcohol. That is why I speak for the substitute amendment.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The substitute is before you. Yes, I'll recognize you. Mike. Yes. No, the gentleman there to the left. Mike 4. The substitute is before you. Are you opposed?

JIM SMITH (Northwest Texas): I move previous question on all that is before us.

BISHOP DEW: All right. The previous question. Is that seconded? All right. I will put that to the vote. If you sustain the vote by two-thirds, we will then move to voting on all that is before us. If you support the previous question, press 1. If you do not support the previous question, press 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 872; No, 48] You've called for the previous question. We move to the substitute. If you support the substitute motion—all right. We will—excuse me. We'll have a final comment from the podium.

HAYES: I simply want to say that in relation and regards to this particular petition, the committee voted 84 to zero. We had the benefit of the young man who made a testimony here. He is a student at Harvard. We also had on that committee a person who has worked with Wesley foundations, and to think that total abstinence on our colleges and universities can be achieved is to tally unrealistic and we would urge you to support this petition.

BISHOP DEW: All right. If you would support the substitute, you vote 1. If you do not support the substitute, vote 2. Vote when the light appears. [Yes, 531; No, 393] All right. You've supported the substitute. That's the substitute for the amendment that was before you. Now that becomes a part of the main motion. The main motion is before you with the substitute to the amendment. If you would vote in support of the recommendation of the committee, press 1; if you do not, press 2. [Yes, 782; No, 134] You've supported the committee's recommendation for that calendar item.

I believe we've come to the time for the order of the day. Thank you, Mr. Hayes. We have a report of the GCOM Advance for Christ and His Church. Bishop Hearn.

Advance for Christ and His Church

BISHOP J. WOODROW HEARN: Since the General Conference of 1948 meeting in Boston, 52 years ago now, one of the most vital and exciting and helpful outreach ministries of The United Methodist Church has been the Advance. Administratively, it is connected to the General Council on Ministries. During this quadrennium, Bishop Ed Paup has given tremendous leadership to the Advance Committee and he, now, will make the presentation of this report.

BISHOP EDWARD W. PAUP: Thank you, Bishop Hearn, Bishop Dew, sisters and brothers in mission. At the 1996 General Conference in Denver The United Methodist Church was invited to a birthday party. And this party was held in the year 1998, celebrating 50 years of life in and through the Advance for Christ and His Church. Remembering how both those who came before us and we ourselves have been engaged in mission through this extraordinary second-mile journey. As with other parties, United Methodists came bearing gifts in the record amount that year of over 34 million dollars. At the party, we closed our eyes and we prayerfully considered a world where God's children would have adequate shelter, food, education, and opportunities to receive and respond to the good news. And when we opened our eyes, the breath of the world blew, but the candles on the cake would not go out. As a matter of fact, the party continues and last year, 1999, we announced the record that was set the year before as we gave in excess of \$44 million dollars to the Advance.

(Applause)

And so here at General Conference 2000 we hold high the candles of God's light, surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses.

(Video Presentation)

(Video Presentation—Board of General Council on Ministries)

(Applause)

(Song—Cynthia Wilson, Singing "How Great Thou Art")

(Applause)

DEW: If you'll be seated we will have a report from the Presiding Officers Committee and any announcements and then a closing benediction. I recognize Paul Extrum-Hernandez, chair of the Presiding

Officers Committee. Mike, you have a report for us?

Bishops Craig, Mutti, and Lyght to Preside on Wednesday

PAUL EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ: Yes sir. Thank you, bishop. Presiding tomorrow morning will be Bishop Judith Craig from the Ohio West Area. Presiding tomorrow afternoon will be Bishop Frederick Mutti from the Kansas Area and then presiding tomorrow evening will be Bishop Ernest Lyght from the New York Area. Thank you.

BISHOP DEW: All right, I'll turn to the secretary for any announcements.

CAROLYN MARSHALL: One announcement as far as Independent Commissions is concerned; a brief meeting of the committee is scheduled for low in this session. The Committee on Reference will meet in the morning at 7:15 a.m. in room 224. Please have all committee members attend. And then a reminder that as we have appreciated the music which is shared by the various choirs as they come for about 15 minutes before our morning worship, tomorrow there are some really special times in store for us. And so they will be beginning a bit earlier than we have been used to. As you arrive be aware that the choirs will be beginning for us at 7:45.

BISHOP DEW: All right. I have invited Bishop Leontine T.C. Kelly to close our evening session.

(Applause)

BISHOP LEONTINE KELLY: If you will remain in your seats and join me in gratitude to a great God who is able to weave together the lines on the page until it becomes action around the world, the miracle of God's grace. Let us pray. O eternal God, we are so grateful for your presence. At the end of the day we may be weary, we may wonder if we'll ever get to the end. We have concerns and responsibilities. But we come and just give you all that you have already given us, and ask that your Holy Spirit empower us, not only to love one another, but to care for one another and to move beyond the walls to enclose the world in your love. We thank you for the amazing things that are done through this church of ours. We know its problems, we know its weaknesses, yet we come together at General Conference to affirm our strengths and to hold one another up. And we are grateful. Let your spirit grant us the rest that we need this evening. Clear the cobwebs and the junk that we carry around with us. Oh, I hear, I hear the words of the hymn writer, "Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take. The clouds you so much dread are filled with

mercy and will break with blessings round your head." You speak through us through music, you speak through us as we work together in legislative groups. You speak to us as we work as a council, and you speak to us as we give of our selves, whatever we have, so that when we leave this place we won't be perfect but we'll be new in you. Bless us. Thank you, Lord. Thank you, Lord. Have mercy upon us, pardon and deliver us from all our sins, confirm and strengthen us in all righteousness and bring us to everlasting life on the day when we shall see our savior face to face and tell the story saved by grace. And now, may God raise you up on eagle's wings and bear you on the breath of dawn, and make you on a new day to shine like the sun, and hold you in the palm of God's hand. And may the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the powerful, energizing, enthusiastic, loving, power of the Holy Spirit be with us all, now and for ever. Will you shout Amen?

(Congregation shouts "Amen")
(Applause)

Wednesday Morning May 10, 2000

(Bishop Judith Craig, presiding)

(prayer and singing)

Archbishop of Canterbury Introduced

BISHOP WIL LIAM ODEN: For the first time in his history an archbishop of Canterbury is a guest of the General Conference. *(Applause)* This is especially significant as this visit comes at the completion of the international dialogue between Methodism and the Anglican Communion and also at the beginning of the dialogue between United Methodism and the Episcopal Church, USA. Marilyn and I were visiting Bath and Wells during a renewal leave in England, in July 1990. We came upon the palace of the bishop with beautiful grounds of placid lake, graceful swans. And suddenly a medieval town crier came around and filled the air with *hear-ye's*. He announced that Her Majesty, the Queen, had just named the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. George Carey, to be the next Archbishop of Canterbury. I thought, "now, that's the way to do a press release." *(laughter)* Later, representing the World Methodist Council at a conference of the Anglican archbishops in Cape town, South Africa, I had the privilege of meeting Dr. Carey. His lectures on evangelism were thrilling, but it was our private conversations about Methodism that became etched in my heart and mind. Dr.

Carey has a love for Methodism and the Wesleyan tradition. He has a hunger to see Methodism and the Church of England and Anglicans around the world draw closer together. We met again at Lambeth Conference, which gathered at Canterbury in 1998.

This is a conference of Anglican Bishops held once every 10 years. As an ecumenical delegate, I watched him preside with grace, guiding 800 bishops from many countries and cultures. And for the next three weeks, the Anglicans were under his leadership in a beautiful way. Dr. Carey has served as a local church pastor, a prison chaplain, head of a theological faculty. He holds a Ph.D. with an emphasis on the early church. He and his wife, Eileen, have four children and nine grandchildren. Mrs. Carey is a remarkable person in her own right. She is sitting with our Bishops' spouses. Mrs. Carey, we're delighted that you're here. Would you please stand, that we might warmly welcome you?

(Applause)

Memories of Lambeth still flood my mind, but none so enduring as being in the Canterbury cathedral for the opening processional. The voices of an overflowing crowd, along with the royal family, gathered for worship and were led by a magnificent organ. That medieval sanctuary, where Thomas More was martyred, was filled with the most familiar Wesleyan hymn: "O, for a thousand tongues to sing." I felt like a long lost relative at a family reunion. Your Grace, the Wesleys were yours before they were ours. In fact, we have mutually shared them for over two and a half centuries, as they lived and died as priests of the Church of England. We welcome you as a family member to this side of the family reunion, and following the special music and the reading of the Scripture, we eagerly anticipate your message. Let us greet His Grace, the Most Reverend and Right Honorable Dr. George Leonard Carey, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

(Applause and Singing)

BISHOP CRAIG: Hal lelujah! We are extending our consciousness of the wonderful household of God in which we are many members and in which there are many rooms. And to help us to continue to see this vision, we turn to the ecumenical officer of the Council of Bishops, Bishop William Boyd Grove, who will introduce additional ecumenical guests. Bishop Grove.

Leaders of Other Denomination Introduced

BISHOP WILLIAM BOYD GROVE: Yes, my sisters and brothers of Christ it is my privilege on behalf of the Council of Bishop to welcome to the General Conference, and to present to you representatives of many of the churches with whom we share faith and mission in this country. I invite them to come forward as I call their names and just to line up across the platform.

You can bring them on, we will greet them all at the end but if you want to recognize each as he or she comes, feel free to do that. I'm going to invite two to come together at the beginning. Both of these traditions come out of the same Wesleyan tradition, as do we. Dr. William M. Greathouse of the Church of the Nazarene, and the Rev. Jeffrey Mansell of the Wesleyan Church, if they would come.

(Applause)

Bishop Allan O. Bjornberg, of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, who is on the Lutheran side of the dialogue about to begin between The United Methodist Church and the ELCA, the chairperson of the delegation from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Bishop Bjornberg.

(Applause)

Representing his Eminence Metropolitan Maximos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, the Rev. Demetrios Simoni Idis.

(Applause)

The Most Reverend William S. Skylstad representing the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Bishop Skylstad is a good friend of mine. We coached here at the recent phase of the United Methodist-Roman Catholic dialogue, Bishop Skylstad.

(Applause)

The Rev. Bob (Robert W.) Edgar, one of our own United Methodists, now the new General Secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

(Applause)

Representing the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Rev. Robert W. Bohl.

(Applause)

We are in the headquarter city of the United Church of Christ. I hope you all are aware of that and we are happy to have with us, this morning, representing that church,

the President of the United Church of Christ, the Rev. John H. Thomas.

(Applause)

Representing the World Council of Churches, Dr. Jean Stromberg, the Executive Director of the U.S. Conference of the World Council Churches.

(Applause)

Representing the Orthodox Church in America, the Rev. Father Leonid Kishkovsky

(Applause)

Representing the Consultation on Church Union, soon to be the Churches Uniting in Christ, the Rev. Tom Dipko.

(Applause)

And holding until last, representatives of two of the Methodist churches with whom we share faith of the Wesleyan tradition, and life and mission in the modern world. From the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Rev. Dr. Floyd Alexander, and from the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, Bishop Thomas Hoyt, if they could come together.

(Applause)

And the Rev. Judson A. Souers, of the International Council of Community Churches.

(Applause)

Now will you greet them all?

(Applause)

There's one more. I didn't know she was here, she was delayed by weather and plane difficulties. Representing the Episcopal Church, Ms. Midge Roof.

(Applause)

You may be seated. We're inviting two people, two of these representatives to speak briefly. First, responding on behalf of all our ecumenical guests to the General Conference the most Rev. William S. Skylstad who is here, as I said, representing the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and who has had, over these years, a rich relationship with The United Methodist Church.

*Bishop William S. Skylstad Represents
National Conference of Catholic Bishops*

BISHOP SKYLSTAD: Good morning. *(Congregation responds-Good morning)* I am most grateful and honored to bring prayers and greetings to you on behalf of those of us who are your ecumenical col-

leagues in the pilgrimage towards that unity for which Christ prayed. As you meet here today, at this historic moment in Methodist history, you are surrounded by a cloud of witnesses, and other Christian churches, who are praying for the Holy Spirit's blessing on your deliberations and for deepening our bonds of communion as we witness with you in a suffering world. With you we pray that John Wesley's vision is spreading biblical holiness across the land. May it be a common task we can do together; bringing the justice of God and the peace of Christ to every part of the world.

In these United States, and across the globe ecumenically, open Christians have been blessed by the generosity and zeal that Methodists share with us as you spur us on to mission and to the search for full, visible, unity in faith, sacramental life and common witness. In Christ, we are one. We are in real, if yet imperfect, communion with one another. We strive, in response to God's grace in Christ Jesus, to perfect that communion together to become the church that God wills for his mission in the world. We recognize that you are boldly facing many of the issues, in your deliberations here, that we and all of our churches must face as we integrate the findings of modern science into our biblical faith; as we face the tumultuous changes abroad, and in our society; and as we strive to bring healing and reconciliation to a community driven by the concerns of the day.

We join with you in prayer. We recognize the tensions that fidelity to one another can bring in the midst of the debates the Lord has called us to engage in for the sake of unity in our churches. We pray that the Holy Spirit may be at work as you labor together, hoping that all of our church members can be with you in this journey.

We celebrate with you the witness of repentance and reconciliation, which you are engaging, this week. As Pope John Paul II reminded our church on the first Sunday of Lent a few weeks ago, there are many sins for which we must repent and which have continuing consequences in our lives as churches. Certainly your witness with the African-American churches to the sin of racism, and the continued need for repentance and conversion is a challenge to all of our churches. We can not move on in our quest for the full, visible, unity of the churches until we, especially here in the United States, have taken upon ourselves the continual task of conversion that is necessary before reconciliation is possible. We join with you in prayer and confession and we pledge our selves to work with you in the dialogue of love and forgiveness that

is necessary if the burden of racism is to be diminished in the church and in our society.

We are also most grateful to The United Methodist Church for its leadership in the ecumenical dialogues. As Dr. Edgar here witnesses, you have been most generous with the World and National Council of Churches and in local situations across this land and throughout the world. Dr. Jan Love, who is being honored today, is a sign of that tireless service we have come to know and cherish from the United Methodist ecumenical leaders. We appreciate your championing the cause of unity of the churches in the variety of dialogues in which you have been engaged. It has been a deep, spiritual blessing for me personally, to have worked these years with Bishop William Boyd Grove, my dear friend, as co-chair of Catholic-United Methodist dialogue.

This dialogue has been a testimony to our church's commitment to one another and to the goal of visible unity. In the city of Spokane, from which I come, seven of us religious leaders gather every Wednesday morning for breakfast. We come when we can, but always it is scheduled. Twice a year we get together for a day of prayer, once in Holy Week and once in Advent, sharing our faith journeys. A summer evening barbecue and a Christmas gathering are events to which we look forward. Rev. Flora Bowers (Pacific Northwest), by the way, present here, is part of our group. It is Christ who has called all of our churches on the road to unity and witness, worship and sharing of the gospel. All of us who walk with you can only pray to God that we may be as faithful as you have been and that we may respond together with hope and confidence to the new challenges we find before us. God's blessing on your work. Thank you.

(Applause)

BISHOP CRAIG: Now, I ask the Rev. Bob Edgar to come and greet you from the National Council of the Churches of Christ.

*The Rev. Robert W. Edgar Represents
National Council of Churches*

ROBERT W. EDGAR: As one of the newest member of the ecumenical community, I bring greetings from the National Council of Churches. Our new president, Andrew Young, sends his welcome to The United Methodist Church. He called and indicated his passion for working with the United Methodists and all 35-member communities at the beginning of this new decade, at the beginning of this new century, at this beginning of the new millennium—to work together for our common

unity and common good. It was Dr. Martin Luther King, who in a book published shortly after his death, said these words: "We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is to day, and in this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life of ten leaves us bare, naked, and dejected with lost opportunity. The tide in the affairs of humanity does not remain at the flood, it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is death to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residues of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words 'too late'."

God is challenging us as members of the body of Christ to recognize: It's not too late. The National Council of Churches, Church World Service, the World Council of Churches, the ecumenical community, is committed to understanding the urgency of *now*. As we begin this new time together, we are called to witness together that we have a common work: To seek justice; To care for the poor; To change the world; and To live in community one with another. So as a symbol of our love and commitment, as I begin my service as General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, as I help the National Council of Churches with a rich fifty years of history, vision its future in this new time, I invite you, as was invited by our Roman Catholic brothers and sisters, by our Orthodox brothers and sisters, by our Anglican brothers and sisters, and by our brothers and sisters of faith communities around the world, I call upon all of us to join hands together in prayer and commitment for what we can do together.

Let me ask you now to hold hands, stand and hold hands just for a moment together. As we hold hands and touch one another, let us together, in the holding of these hands, be reminded of the people around the world who need our love and care. As we hold hands with one another, let us pray for a new ecumenical vision for a new era of hope. Let us pray for a new ecumenical covenant for a people of Christ that makes all things new. As we hold hands together and firmly touch each other, regardless of culture and race and gender and sexual identity, let us pray for a new ecumenical communion of communities that touches at the very heart of God, that touches at the very heart of justice, that touches at the very heart of love.

Listen to these words shared by a politician. I wish it were Jesus on the Mount of Olives or Paul on the road to Damascus. But in 1966, in South Africa, Bobby Kennedy said, "Let no one be discouraged by the be-

lief that there is nothing that one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills, against misery and ignorance, in justice or violence." Few will have the greatness to bend history itself, but each of us can work to change a small portion of events so that in the total of all those acts are written the history of our generation as we hold hands with people here in side and outside this building. May we always remember we, who are many, are one body. Amen.

(Applause)

BISHOP GROVE: Friends, we're about to do something that I don't remember has been done before. I caught myself twice saying that we've never done something before only to be reminded that Bishop Matthews has a long memory. But today the Council of Bishops is going to recognize two ecumenical leaders who have represented this church with distinction in the ecumenical movement. And we have chosen to recognize them in the presence of the General Conference. And I hope that this will be but the first of many such recognitions that will occur, occur across the years. And I call Bishop Melvin Talbert to come forward to make those presentations.

(Applause)

BISHOP MELVIN G. TALBERT: Bishop Craig, to our distinguished ecumenical guests, sisters and brothers in Christ, I greet you in the name and in the Spirit of Jesus Christ. It is my distinct honor and privilege this morning to make two presentations. I do it as the one who was privileged to be secretary of the Council of Bishops for eight years and carrying with it the responsibility of Ecumenical Officer, as did colleagues before me: Paul Duffy, Jim Matthews, Jim Ault, and others. I do it today as the incoming ecumenical officer of our denomination.

These two persons, once they are named, will be recognized by you. But they are persons who have not only talked ecumenism, they have, in behalf of us, lived it. Ecumenism is more than talk; it is something that must be lived out in what we say and in what we do with our very lives. So it my privilege now to present to you and in behalf of you and the Council of Bishops, to present them certificates of appreciation.

The first person that I want to ask to come forward to join me at the podium is Dr. Janice Love. Jan, will you join me here?

(Applause)

*Dr. Janice Love Honored for Work
With World Council of Churches*

BISHOP TALBERT: For more than 20 years, probably more than half of her life, (laughter) Jan has represented The United Methodist Church in the ongoing and continuing work of the World Council of Churches. As a young person and into her adult life, she has done that with great distinction. Jan, words are inadequate to express to you how grateful we are as a denomination for the commitment you have made, beyond the call of duty, to represent us, at personal risk to family life. At times when it has been a difficult struggle for her to leave her daughter and family, she has left her family to be in Geneva and other places representing us as a denomination. I present to you this day this certificate of appreciation which reads as follows: "On behalf of the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church, and in the presence of the General Conference, we present this certificate of appreciation to Janice Love in recognition of her exceptional leadership in ecumenical arenas and her outstanding service on the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches from 1975 to 1998. We celebrate all she has done to promote the unity for which Christ prayed in John 17:21. Given this tenth day of May in the year of 2000 in Cleveland, Ohio. Bishop William B. Oden, President of the Council of Bishops; Bishop William Boyd Grove, Ecumenical Officer of the Council of Bishops; and Bishop J. Lawrence McCleskey, Columbia Episcopal Area." Jan. (Applause)

JANICE LOVE: Sisters and brothers in Christ, I simply want to say "Thank you" to The United Methodist Church, the United Methodist Council of Bishops, who has repeatedly sent me back to these great opportunities for ecumenism, to the General Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-religious Concerns for undergirding my work, for my local church; many thanks for being an ecumenical witness where they are in their place. And most personally, to the people I call my ecumenical mothers: United Methodist Women and the Women's Division of The United Methodist Church, the Board of Global Ministries, who nurtured in me, very early in my life, a great passion to reach across these deep differences, in deed these chasms, that divide us in our church, our Christian family, and our world. It's a great journey to the fullness of the joy of life in Christ, this ecumenical venture, and I'm so grateful that you al-

lowed me to take it in this way. Thank you. (Applause)

*Katharine Bannister Honored for Work
With World Council of Churches*

BISHOP TALBERT: The second person that I want to recognize this morning in behalf of all of us is a relatively new face. I say that, but still it's been approximately 10 years. She has served with distinction in the World Council of Churches on its Central Committee during the last 7 years of that operation and is now one of the reigning presidents of the World Council of Churches. I served as chair of the nominating committee for the last meeting of the World Council of Churches, one of the most difficult tasks one can have. And when her name came up, there was no question in our minds in the nominating committee that she was the right choice.

Kathryn K. Bannister, one of our upcoming, young, creative pastors in the lowly state of Kansas, (laughter) and she has represented us with distinction. And how proud I was to be a member of that Central Committee working with her. And now how proud I am to recognize her in your presence here today and to present to her this certificate. Kathy, will you join me here? (Applause) "On behalf of the Council of Bishops of The United Methodist Church and in the presence of the General Conference, we present this certificate of appreciation to Kathryn K. Bannister in recognition of her exceptional leadership in ecumenical arenas and her outstanding service as a president of the World Council of Churches. We celebrate all she has done to promote the unity for which Christ prayed in John 17:21. Given this tenth day of May in the year of 2000 in Cleveland, Ohio. Bishop William B. Oden, President, Council of Bishops; Bishop William Boyd Grove, Ecumenical Officer, Council of Bishops; Bishop Albert Fredrick Mutti, Kansas Episcopal Area." (Applause)

KATHRYN K. BAN NIS TER: My deepest thanks to you, the General Conference and the Council of Bishops, to my family in the General Commission on Christian Unity and Inter-religious Concerns, and so many who have been mentors. It is one of my deepest privileges in life to be able to be your ecumenical servant in the World Council of Churches. It is also a great privilege to reside in the mighty state of Kansas (laughter and applause) and to serve as a pastor in this church that I love. I am sometimes asked how it is that I bring together these two parts of my vocation, and some people say, "Well, you must be schizophrenic to be able to be both a pastor in the local setting in the middle of the United

States and some one who serves in the ecumenical movement.” But I would say, that for me, they are two parts of a whole and that those things must be kept together; so that we become ecumenical in all that we do in our local place; and in what we do as a church out in the world. I thank you and pray God’s blessing upon you. *(Applause)*

BISHOP GROVE: Bishop Craig, that concludes the ecumenical celebration for today, and we return the house to you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much, Bishop Grove, for this wonderful reminder of our extended family. I want to—to do one other thing in terms of that extended family. Bishop Irons? Bishop Irons is the president of the North American section of the World Methodist Council, and if that person Joe Hale is here we would like to honor him to day. Bishop Irons.

*Dr. Joe Hale Honored for Work
With World Methodist Council*

BISHOP NEIL IRONS (Harrisburg Area): Thank you, Bishop Craig. Ecumenical leaders, bishops, delegates, and friends of this General Conference. We have had with us, and I hope he is still here, a friend, not only of The United Methodist Church, but of Methodists around the world. As we make the turn into the next millennium, there are some 70 million members and friends of the Methodist Wesley family in this world. The one who provides leadership and holds us together is the general secretary of the World Methodist Council, Dr. Joe Hale. And if Dr. Hale is here, I would like to ask him to please rise that we might greet him.

BISHOP CRAIG: Dr. Hale. Can we find him? He’s out greeting his friends. Let’s let the record—

BISHOP IRONS: I, I will be glad to extend your appreciation to him. I’m sorry that we’ve missed him.

(Applause)

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. Now I’d like to recognize Hee-Soo Jung for a moment of privilege. Hee-Soo Jung, are you ready? Yes. Mike 4 please. Mike 4 please.

HEE-SOO JUNG (Wisconsin): Thank you, Bishop. I’d like to ask the bishop to invite Yu-Sik Lee from Korean Methodist Church, council president, is here due to delay to arriving here. So would you welcome him? And then I will move on to this call to prayer.

BISHOP CRAIG: Is he here? OK. There he is. Come, come forward and let us greet you, Bishop.

(Applause)

Bishop Yu-Sik Lee of Korean Methodist Church Introduced and Offers Prayer

JUNG: Bishop Craig and members of delegate, Bishop Yu-Sik Lee and three delegates from the Korean Methodist Church are here and plead to us and our fellow Korean-American delegates to call attention for the desperate need of our prayer to the healing and reconciliation of the Korean Peninsula; such a sad history of division and to separation over fifty years. Peace, justice, and reunification between North and South Korea are tragically overdue. Many Korean Christian communities throughout the world cry out for God’s grace for intervention for reunification. Today we hear the hopeful sign and good news that presidents of North and South Korea agreed to come together soon and embrace political healing and reconciliation, and after fifty years with her war and confrontations. Bishop, we thank our churches for prayer and the passionate emergency drive through UMCOR, through the UMCOR, for the North Korean hunger drive. Bishop, if you permit me just to pray for our bishop for this matter, we are happy to present that.

BISHOP CRAIG: Sure. I feel confident that the house would welcome this moment of prayer in turns to our colleague for leadership. Thank you.

JUNG: Thank you.

BISHOP YU-SIK LEE: (The Korean Methodist Church, Interpreted From Korean)

So good to see you, the members of this General Conference United Methodist Church. May God’s grace be with you. I bring greetings from the Korean Methodist Church, one and one half million Methodist Christians. I always think of America first with a grateful heart. We are grateful that you sent the first missionary to Korea to bring the gospel to the Korean people. And also that you helped us during the Korean conflict to maintain freedom on the Korean Peninsula; and we are grateful for that. Now, we hope that the United States of America will not only lead the world through economic and military power but through a spiritual and Christian faith. The only place on the map of the world that still has a cold war, a divided nation, is Korea. In June of this year the president of South Korea Kim Dae-jung and Kim Jong-Il of North Korea will meet. We ask you to pray for that

event. (I also ask your prayers for Bishop Kim who is translating for me right now—)

(Laughter)

I ask your prayers for the many Korean-American United Methodist churches in this country.

I’ll offer prayer for this. Let us pray together; Dear God, we are so grateful. May the grace of God and blessing be abounding in this place. May every member of General Conference be filled with the Holy Spirit; and every day may the church in the United States be growing, and advancing, and working for the whole world and dedicated to the preaching of the gospel. And also, bring your peace to the Korean Peninsula. We pray also for the meeting of two heads of state. May that event be under your grace. In Jesus’ name. Amen.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. Now, the chair is going to suggest that we’ve had this wonderful time of celebration. It’s great chairing this kind of event. I’d like just to declare the morning over and say I’ve done my bit, and we’ve had a wonderful time. It’s the chair’s judgment that we would do well to take our break now so that when we return we can turn our attention to calendar items. So if you will be back at 10:20, we will start another kind of work. Thank you for your attention.

(Music)

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, friends, let’s start back to ward our seats if you will.

(Music)

BISHOP CRAIG: Friends let us come to order. It’s easy to keep empty chairs in order, *(laughter)* but the chair would prefer to see people in those empty chairs. If you’ll come and find your seats quickly please. Thank you. Guess what! we’re behind. *(Laughter)* News flash! Whomsoever, it’s your choice how far be hind you want to be. So you can walk it as slowly or as quickly as you wish. I’m only here ‘til noon and then somebody else gets it. *(Laughter)* That’s what’s nice about General Conference as opposed to Annual Conference. All right, here comes a bishop running up the aisle. Go, Janice! *(Laughter)* All right friends, I am pleased to call us back to order. I am Judy Craig, of the West Ohio Conference, Ohio West Area. Hush down there now. *(Applause)* They’re only clapping because I’m gonna retire in 112 days. *(Laughter)* And I’m gonna be ably kept in order by my colleagues Sharon Zimmerman Rader, from Wisconsin, and Joe Yeakel who is retired. Nothing retiring about him. So they’re going to help us all. But most of all,

you're going to help and we're going to start now with the Agenda Committee. Is Mary Alice here? There she is; wishing she'd been here an hour ago. Thank you. Welcome.

MARY ALICE MASSEY (Florida): It's good to be right on time. This morning the agenda is found on the front page of your DCA. And of course with the exceptions that we are behind schedule, as all of you recognize, I lift the following things to you. All resolutions that have come across the chair of the Agenda Committee's desk will be printed in the DCA. The following committees will meet at lunch time: Faith and Order; Global Ministries; General and Jurisdictional; Conferences. With those exceptions, I move the adoption of the agenda for the day.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, you see the agenda that we've already mutilated before you today. If you will affirm this as the agenda in spite of us, please vote yes, if not, vote no. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 479; No, 9*] Now look at that. You're affirming your selves nicely. All right, we have an agenda. Now, let's turn to the Consent Calendar.

Just a moment, let's get the Consent Calendar in front of us please.

*Consent Calendars A04, B04, and C04
Approved*

FITZGERALD REIST (Coordinator of the Calendar): Good morning. Please turn in your DCA for Tuesday, May 9, 2000, volume 4, no. 7, to p.2036. The fourth Consent Calendar begins there. (*Pause*)

BISHOP CRAIG: I think they've got it.

REIST: On p.2036 Consent Calendar A04 begins with Calendar Item 649. On p.2037 Calendar Item 665 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2038 Calendar Item 671 has been removed at the request of delegates.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar A04 with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, we have A04 before us with the exceptions noted. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 599; No, 6*] We have approved Consent Calendar A04.

REIST: On p.2048 Consent Calendar B04 begins with Calendar Item 760. On p.2056 Calendar Item 804 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2059 Calendar Item 836 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2060 Calendar Item 838 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.

2061 Calendar Item 846 has been removed at the request of delegates.

MASSEY: I move the approval of Consent Calendar B04 with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP CRAIG: We have B04 Consent Calendar before us with the exceptions. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 679; No, 11*] Thank you, it is adopted.

REIST: On page 2062, Consent Calendar C04 begins with Calendar Item 851. On p.2063, Calendar Item 857 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2068, Calendar Item 916 has been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2074, Calendar Items 987 and 991 have been removed at the request of delegates. On p.2079, Calendar Item 1042 has been removed at the request of delegates. There's one more. On p.2081, Calendar Item 1064 has been removed at the request of delegates.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right.

MASSEY: I move the approval of the Consent Calendar C04 with the exceptions noted.

BISHOP CRAIG: Consent Calendar C04 as—approved, as amended, is before you. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 766; No, 19*] It is adopted. Hold please, he's not quite through. Just a moment please. Just go ahead. Is this about the Consent Calendar? Please come to mike 8.

KEVIN G. GOODWIN (Peninsula-Delaware): On p.2161 of the DCA of today, it lists that 793 was pulled at the request of delegates, including myself, and was not mentioned this morning. Is that not necessary?

BISHOP CRAIG: Let us check.

REIST: Page number again, please.

GOODWIN: On today's DCA, it's listed under "removed from consent calendar," p.2161, no. 793.

BISHOP CRAIG: In today's?

GOODWIN: But it was on yesterday's calendar, sir. It's listing the ones that were pulled from yesterday's calendar so I would thought, the gentleman would have mentioned it today because the other ones were mentioned 665, 671, 804, etc., etc.

BISHOP CRAIG: He's looking. Thank you. We want to be accurate. Thank you.

REIST: I must apologize. I've made an error.

CRAIG: No!

(*Laughter*)

REIST: Well, well, people will do a lot to keep me quiet.

BISHOP CRAIG: Grace abounds.

(*Laughter*)

REIST: Calendar Item 793 should have been listed as removed at the request of delegates.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you, it will be.

REIST: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. All right.

*Conference Approves Consent Calendar
Limits at Ten Names Immediately*

REIST: I must offer my apologies to the General Conference for another error which I made last evening. I misunderstood the motion regarding the Consent Calendar and directed that the Consent Calendar, which appears in today's DCA beginning on p.2133, include those items in which no more than ten votes were cast against the prevailing position. Consequently, there are items on the Consent Calendar which do not belong there. If you so desire, I can prepare a list of those items and announce it later this morning, or perhaps the body would choose to suspend the rules and proceed with the report as printed.

BISHOP CRAIG: Do you understand what he's saying—

MASSEY: Bishop Craig?

BISHOP CRAIG: —other than the fact they he goofed? Yes?

MASSEY: I move to suspend the rules so that beginning immediately all calendar items with ten or fewer votes opposed, as reported out of committee, be placed on the Consent Calendar.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. We have support for a motion to suspend the rules so that we can alter how we get items on the Consent Calendar. The first vote we need is to suspend the rules, requires two-third. If you will suspend the rules, will you vote now? Well, whether you will or not, vote now. [*Yes, 752; No, 76*] All right. You suspended the rules. Now the motion is that anything with—just say the motion for us again now. We're going to change the rules now that we've suspended them.

MASSEY: That beginning immediately, all calendar items with ten or fewer votes opposed, as reported out of committee, be placed on the Consent Calendar.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. That's the motion before you immediately. Anything with ten or fewer opposing votes is on the Consent Calendar. Yes. Right here, mike 1.

EWING WERLEIN (Texas): Could I request that the chair of the committee give us those numbers of the petitions affected, because we have not had opportunity, if this

rule is suspended, to examine its effect. And it would be helpful, it seems, to all delegates to know which ones we're talking about in the, the event the delegates would want to assemble the required ten persons to remove from the Consent Calendar.

REIST: If I could have approximately an hour to do that.

BISHOP CRAIG: Would that be satisfactory, sir? You say, no? We would not be acting on that Consent Calendar at that hour anyway.

WERLEIN: Oh, yes, certainly. It seems to me that should be acceptable.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. We still need to, to vote on placing items with ten or fewer on the Consent Calendar. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 773; No, 58*] You've done that quite well, thank you very much. I keep for getting to look.

BISHOP CRAIG: We're going to turn now to Faith and Order and Bob Hayes. Do you know that these committee chairs get up every morning and get over here for breakfast at 7 o'clock? And I went there this morning, and I tell you: They have breakfast!

(Laughter)

I haven't been having breakfast; it was really kind of nice. They're working very hard. Thank you.

HAYES: Thank you, Bishop.

BISHOP CRAIG: Yes, one of the cards back here. Come to mike 5. Stay steady, Bob. We'll see what this is.

*Conference Prays
for Arrested Demonstrators*

TIM JONES-YELVINGTON (New York): I would like to ask for the prayers of the body on the matter: We express our appreciation for the several hundred pastors, lay persons and bishops, family and friends who were arrested in obedience to their conscience and faith in Christ. And we acknowledge that we are not all in agreement with their stand, but we respect their conviction and lift them in prayer.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, this is a reminder that some acts of conscience have been occurring outside of our, our hall this morning and some of our brothers and sisters have placed themselves under—in a position to be arrested. And their request is that we not forget that but keep them in our consciousness. The chair would invite us to a time of silent meditation and thought, for each of us knows that God looks into our hearts and knows our anxieties and our con-

cerns and our convictions. Let us call these brothers and sisters to mind.

God have mercy. Christ have mercy. God have mercy. Amen. All right, Bob. Thank you.

HAYES: Thank you, Bishop, and members of the General Conference. I'm the chair of that committee, and I'm here with Scott Jones, the vice-chair, and I'm very pleased to introduce to most of you today our very capable secretary, Mary Elizabeth Moore. She will be reporting tonight with us, so I wanted to introduce her to you this morning and let you know who she is, so when you see her tonight. We will begin where we left off last night, on p. 1908 of the *Advance DCA*. Page 1908, Calendar Item 31351 found on p. 507 in the *Advance DCA*. It is subsection on "Media Violence and Christian Values." And it is recommended by the committee concurrence with an amendment. And this amendment is to appear at the end of ¶66p whereby we inject three sub-paragraphs there that call for encouraging local congregations to work with and support parental responsibilities and individuals to express opposition to the violence that is on our media and televisions, and also encourage individuals to express their opposition to corporate sponsors. As I said, the committee recommends concurrence with this petition.

BISHOP CRAIG: Very well. We're on Calendar Item 315, p. 1908, with a recommendation of concurrence as amended. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 899; No, 18*] It is adopted.

*Inherent Value of Non-human Creation
Is Recognized*

HAYES: If you would look at the next page, 1909, at the very top left-hand corner of that page, you will see Petition 31717. It is Calendar Item 320. It is found on p. 1279 of the *Advance DCA*, 1279, and it is the recognition of the inherent value of non-human creation. The committee recommends concurrence, and the strength of this particular petition is that the first sentence under "Energy Resources Utilization" will affirm the inherent value of non-human creation, such as minnows, etc. We recommend concurrence with this petition.

BISHOP CRAIG: Calendar Item 320 is before you with a recommendation of concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 847; No, 55*] You have agreed with the committee. Next?

HAYES: The petition below that was to be dealt with today, but under the new motion and rules, if we have to come back with that, we will. But lacking the necessary

votes, we will remove that to the Consent Calendar.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you, Scott?

Disability Rights Addressed

SCOTT J. JONES (North Texas): Bishop, I would call the body's attention to p. 1990. That's 1-9-9-0. The Calendar Item 609. It refers to Petition 1270—1288. I'm sorry. The Petition is 31918, on p. 1288. The petition is dealing with Paragraph 1004 in *The Book of Discipline*. This is the paragraph about the responsibilities of the General Board of Church and Society. The petition asks that we add the words *disability rights* to the first sentence in this paragraph about the prime responsibility of the board. The committee's recommendation is nonconcurrency, because the paragraph, as it reads already, says that the board and its executives shall provide forthright witness and actions on, action on issues of human well-being, justice, peace, and the integrity of creation. It is the committee's judgment that disability rights are already included in this, and that the General Board of Church and Society is doing a good job of addressing these issues. So we recommend nonconcurrency, Bishop.

BISHOP CRAIG: Very well. Calendar Item 609, on p. 1990 before you with a recommendation of nonconcurrency. Back there? Go to mike 7, please.

KENNETH M. SCHROEDER (Baltimore-Washington): Bishop, I'm speaking against the committee's recommendation about disability. We need to add it. It's very, very important that Church and Society be aware of this, this problem. It's about human beings. Disability rights needs to be presented as often as possible. It's a very important issue.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you very much. There's a speech against nonconcurrency. Is there some one who wishes to support nonconcurrency? Do you have a final word?

JONES: Our committee is strongly in favor of our church addressing issues of justice and especially disability rights. I think the sense of the committee was that adding words to the *Discipline* is not necessary. We were in favor of simplicity and clarity, and so that was the reason for our decision.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, Calendar Item 609 is before you with the recommendation of nonconcurrency. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 680; No, 253*] You have sustained the committee.

JONES: Bishop, that ends what Faith and Order has to deal with for the moment.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you, we'll see you another time I'm sure.

(Laughter)

Some other for tu nate bishop.

(Laughter)

Let's—hey, you take every little celebration, you know.

(Laughter)

Let's turn to Conferences with Charles Courtoy. Conferences, are you ready?

CHARLES W. COURTOY (Florida): Bishop, we need you to give us some clarification. We're confused about whether items previous to day that had less than ten votes are to be removed and not debated or whether not they're not to be presented today. We, we don't know whether it immediately meant beginning with the Consent Calendar today, or did it mean calendar items previous to today?

BISHOP CRAIG: Mary Alice? She's thinking as she comes to the mike 2.

MASSEY: No, actually I'm chewing.

(Laughter)

BISHOP CRAIG: Sometimes I do that when I think.

(Laughter—Applause)

Please share.

(Laughter)

MASSEY: I ate the last piece, Bishop.

(Laughter)

I, that was an enabling motion from Gere Reist. And I took it to mean that it meant immediately. Today—

BISHOP CRAIG: Every thing.

MASSEY:—right now; every thing.

BISHOP CRAIG: Is there any objection from the house to interpret that way? I think the house is ready to read it that way. Does that help you?

COURTOY: Well I think so, if I've heard correctly now, those items less than ten, we do not present. Correct?

BISHOP CRAIG: Correct.

COURTOY: Okay, thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Got anything to present?

COURTOY: Oh, yes.

(Laughter)

You were wish ing not, huh?

(Laughter)

We begin with a couple of petitions that our vice-chair, Donde Ashmos, will present to the, Bishop, to the conference.

Open Meeting Rules Considered

DONDE P. ASHMOS (Southwest Texas): Bishop, members of the conference, I direct your attention to p. 2088 in the DCA. Calendar Item 1151, Calendar Item 1151, Petition 30475. The full text could be found on p. 176 of the *Advance DCA*. This petition concerns having all meetings of boards, agencies, commissions, etc., of the annual conference open, as open meetings, with provisions for times when it needs to be closed. The committee recommends concurrence. The rationale is this language is very similar to language covered in the section of the *Discipline* on General Conference. This just specifies it to the annual conference.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. Calendar Item 1151 on p. 2088. Recommendation of concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 785; No, 132] Thank you. You sustained the committee.

ASHMOS: The next item is found on p. 2089, Calendar Item 1155. It's down at the very bottom of the page on the left-hand side. Petition 31513. The full text can be found on p. 169 of the *Advance DCA*. This petition recommends that changes in church laws should take effect as soon as possible. Our committee recommends nonconcurrence. The rationale for our recommendation is that this would create much confusion, implementing changes before even the first, the next, new *Discipline* is published.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, this item is before us, 1155. Calendar Item 1155, recommendation nonconcurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 890; No, 42] You've sustained the committee. Thank you.

Full, Unlimited Laity Voting Rights Denied to Central Conferences

ASHMOS: The last item I present to you is found on p. 2090, Calendar Item 1157. It is Petition 31045. The full text can be found on p. 163 of the *Advance DCA*. This is a recommendation that jurisdictional and central conferences may give lay members full vote on every thing. The committee recommends concurrence with the following amendment. We recommend deleting the words *jurisdictional* and, so that it would just read, it would begin with *central conferences*. The committee recommends concurrence and the rationale was that we need to do as much as possible to let central con-

ferences have the flexibility they need to do things in ways that work for them.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, Calendar Item 1157 before you with the recommendation of concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. Excuse me? I'm sorry, excuse me, yes. Mike 3. Pardon me? You're on my blind side.

PATRICK STRIEFF (Switzerland-France): I come from a central conference, and I think that there are already in the Constitution some items where central conferences have special rights and powers. But I think it is a difficult thing to act in other constitutional paragraphs such as splits between jurisdictional and central conferences, because the Constitution is something we should have in common. And, therefore, I speak against this amendment.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, there's a speech against this calendar item. I see no one else wishing to speak before I respond. Way in the back, way in the back, two hands up. Yes, come to Mike 8. Are you speaking for the committee recommendation?

KARSTEN W. MOHR (Germany North): This motion comes from our conference, and it is rooted in the good experience of fair and faithful partnership in mission and to ministry between clergy and laity throughout many years. And also in the good community in that it dispenses between laity and clergy in all matters concerning ordination, character, and conference relations of clergy. Therefore, we think it is time that the laity can not only discuss these matters, but also to extend the rights to the laity so that they have full right to vote on all these matters including those concerning ordination, character, and conference relations. And as you have seen, we do not urge this for the whole church, we just want a little more freedom and flexibility to do it in those central conferences which want to do it. And I ask the conference to open this door for doing the work in the way in our country which we think is most helpful for us. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. This is speech for the committee's recommendation. Yes, mike 4?

CHARLES D. (DENNY) WHITE, JR. (Western North Carolina): Thank you, Bishop Craig. Would the officers of the legislative committee be so kind as to inform us: Does this, in the intent of this, the doing of this, also include the right of lay members of the central conference, an annual conference to elect the clergy delegates to the General Conference and the central conferences?

ASHMOS: Our understanding was no.

WHITE: Well, Bishop, not, not to be arguing the case, but I would argue for the sake of the record that the words *full unlimited right to vote* includes everything. And ¶31 of the Constitution, if one had it open before one, includes the sentence about lay members not voting for clergy, and clergy not voting for laity. But *full unlimited* strikes me as meaning what it says. And therefore, I would urge the body to defeat this particular amendment to the Constitution.

BISHOP CRAIG: I thank you, that's a speech against, is someone speaking for? Speaking for? For? Speaking for? Come to mike 2 please. Come to mike 4 please.

TSHIBANG KASAP (Northwest Katanga): (*speaks in French*)

BISHOP CRAIG: This has to have a translation, please.

KASAP: In our country there are certain meetings in which lay people can not take part. We have, for example, the ministerial conference where the lay people cannot take part. I think this petition was presented in a particular context and it can't be applied to all Central Conferences. Thank you

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. It is a speech against. Yes, card in the middle. Pink card there in the middle. Mike 4 please.

TOM GARNHART (Wisconsin): I think this is a related point of order but maybe there is an explanation. It appears that we are attaching this action to paragraph 32 which is a paragraph in section 6 dealing with annual conferences, whereas section 5 preceding it deals with Central Conferences. And is this not related to the Central Conferences? And does it not therefore belong in that part of the *Discipline*?

BISHOP CRAIG: Can you help us, committee?

ASHMOS: Our view of it was we recommended placing it where the petitioner asked for it. So I guess our answer is no on that.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right we have this before us. Further questions? Yes, yellow card straight back in the middle. Mike 6 please.

NANCY DUEL (Northern Illinois): I'd like to speak in favor of the petition, because it is permissive. Those conferences that do not want to do that, do not have to, but it allows those conferences that would like to, have permission to do so. And also the concern that was expressed before whether this would give the permission for laity to vote for clergy and clergy to vote for

laity in elections to this General Conference, again I think it is up to those conferences to decide. But I think that maybe we should all be moving in that direction. Don't we interact with each other and all have opinions of who we would like to elect? I think this is ahead of our thinking, where we do separate voting by orders.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. We are coming close to the end our ability to speak. The chair can entertain a speech for the motion. That is all that can be entertained. All right any last word.

ASHMOS: At this point we would just like to let the body decide.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. Just a moment please.

All right thank you. That is why you have good colleagues behind you. Let us remind you that this is a constitutional amendment and will require two thirds. The committee's recommendation is concurrence. We are at the end of speeches. Is this a question? Mike 7 is closer to you or 4, whichever way you want to go. Come to 4 please. According to our rules we are ready to vote.

DONALD FADO (California-Nevada): Simply a question. Under our constitution now, if I read it correctly, on page 29, article 4 under Central Conferences, it says "to make such rules and regulations for the administration of the work within their boundaries, including such changes and adaptations of the general *Discipline* as conditions in the respective areas may require, subject to the powers that shall have been or vested in the General Conference." I have here the *Book of Discipline of the African Central Conference*, if you will notice it is much smaller than ours, which might have a message to us, but it also, I noticed, has a different procedure for the election of bishops, quite a few different rules. Do not they now have the right to do what this is asking for and why have an amendment to our Constitution go through this procedure, or do they not have that right?

ASHMOS: We are not clear on that.

BISHOP CRAIG: Let's let the house decide. It is time to vote. All right let us see what the house wills and then we will see, we may have a procedure to help us. I am sorry we are really under the order to vote. Is that a question back there? We are out of speech time. Go to mike 7 and help the chair know what you wish.

JAMES EHRMAN (East Ohio): It's an answer to the question that was just asked.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, Jim.

EHRMAN: The provisions of 537.9 allow for Central Conferences to alter things

in the *Discipline* except things that would be contrary to the Constitution and general rules of The United Methodist Church.

That's why the need for the amendment, as just proposed to just a general rule.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. All right we are ready to vote. The recommendation is concurrence, requires 2/3. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 461; No, 468*] The motion fails. The petition is not enough. All right.

[unintelligible] when you're looking at the *Book of Discipline* as it's printed, let us remember that there are some constitutional amendments that were passed and have some effect on the Constitution including some of this matter, we believe, that will not appear in the current printed *Discipline*. Because the *Book of Discipline* was printed and then an errata sheet sent so we may be working off of dated material. Nevertheless, the house has spoken it's will.

Formula for Apportioning General Conference Delegates Debated

COURTOY: Are you ready bishop? This is the Majority Report. There is a Minority Report, that you will find on p. 2088 of your *DCA*; p. 2088. It is Calendar Item 1147, it is Petition 30120; it is found in the *Advance DCA* on p. 168. It is entitled, "Change the number formula for General Conference delegates to restore fairness and balance." The committee moves concurrence. The ratio is the current formula, which is found in paragraph 502 of the *Discipline*, was adopted in 1968, and was as fair as the General Conference of that day could make it. This, now, is an outdated formula due to the fact that much has changed since 1968, both within the United States and within the Central Conferences where explosive growth has occurred. This legislation, presented by the committee, will update the formula and bring fair representation to the 2004 General Conference and forward. The formula in no way changes our Constitution, which guarantees every conference, no matter how small, one lay and one clergy member. Neither does the formula, as recommended, change the fact that every annual conference delegation will be comprised of one-half lay delegates and one-half clergy delegates. The committee believes the proposed formula will rectify some of the worst disparities. For example, we have here now one conference with 100,000 members and another conference with 300,000 members who have the same number of delegates, namely 16. The committee believes that the proposed formula will produce the most equitable system The United Methodist Church has ever had.

VANCE SUMMERS (West Ohio): Bishop, point of order.

BISHOP CRAIG: Please come to a mike. Mike 4.

SUMMERS: I think that the rule of General Conference is that the chair person will give a succinct, non-argumentative explanation.

(Applause)

BISHOP CRAIG: All right friends, we don't need to vote with our hands, we vote with our butts, on the table. (Laughter) I think the word is well heard. Thank you. All right, now we have an amendment here, right?

COURTOY: There is a Minority Report.

BISHOP CRAIG: It is before us, as printed.

SUMMERS: This is before us as printed.

BISHOP CRAIG: Calendar Item 1147. It is before us with a recommendation of concurrence.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bishop, there's (unintelligible) behind you.

SUMMERS: There is a Minority Report.

BISHOP CRAIG: Oh, there's a Minority Report. Come, please, let's hear the Minority Report.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you explain the procedure—minority, majority?

BISHOP CRAIG: Let's hear the minority report then we will talk about procedure.

Minority Report on Delegate Apportionment Is Delivered

ROBERT SWEET (New England): Minority Report is right there with the Majority Report on p. 2088, no. 1187. Minority Report is that one clergy delegate for the first 209,000 members of the annual conference, and 1 clergy delegate for an additional, I'm sorry—yeah, that's right. One clergy delegate for the first 140 clergy members of the annual conference and one clergy delegate for each, I think I've got that wrong the second time, excuse me. One clergy delegate for the first 209 members, clergy members, of the annual conference and one clergy delegate for each additional 209 clergy members of, or major fraction thereof, and b) one clergy delegate for the first 41,800 members of local churches of the annual conference, and one clergy delegate for each of the 41,800 local church members or fraction thereof.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, the chair sees this as an amendment to the proposal; is going to receive this Minority Report as amendment, and the amendment as you see

it printed under Calendar Item 1147 is before you for discussion.

SWEET: May I speak to it?

BISHOP CRAIG: You may.

UMC Representation Compared to Other Denominations

SWEET: Would you let the budget alone determine the mission and ministry of your local church? So we should not be looking at numbers alone when it comes to representation of delegates at the General Conference. This comes in as a Minority Report because the two figures that you're giving in the majority and minority reports split on a 37-37 vote within the committee. The issue goes right straight to the heart of our doctrine, our theology, our ecclesiology, our polity as United Methodists. It's about our identity of who we are in the ecumenical family. We're not Roman Catholic, with order from the top down. We are not ordered by the laity alone as in the Congregational and Southern Baptist traditions. The buck stops in the local church with the charge pastor, not with the Board of Deacons. Our clergy covenant is to be ordained to the Ministry of Sacrament, Word and Order. Our membership as clergy is not in the local church but in the annual conference. Our bishops have their membership in the Council of Bishops not in the annual conference. Numbers . . . most of our pastors in our denomination, serve membership churches of much smaller numbers. Our representation in General Conference should be determined by where we are located. One-half where the clergy members are found, one-half where the lay members are found; 3.3 per cent of our churches in our denomination have membership of 1000 or more, but 53.7 per cent of us clergy, sitting here this morning, come from membership of 1000 or more churches; 67% of our churches have less than 200 members, but only 5.3 percent clergy delegates voting here today come from those congregations. We do much better with our laity representation already; 78 per cent of our churches are under 1000 in membership, 67 per cent of the lay delegates are from those churches.

BISHOP CRAIG: You should be summing up sir.

SWEET: In summary, I ask you to remember who we are, we are unique in the ecumenical family. We are not a denomination of churches of 1000-members or more, one-half of our churches are under 500, we are a church, in which we were so beautifully reminded in the lay address, in which we are in partnership with one another;

clergy and laity together. I urge you to vote for the Minority Report.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. We have before us the amendment. I saw you back there first on the aisle. No sir, the card on the aisle. Yes. Please mike 5. We have had one speech for the amendment. Are you speaking against the amendment?

Proportional Issue Is a Matter of Equity of Annual Conferences to General Conference

JAMES LOGAN (Virginia): Yes, I'm speaking in opposition to the amendment. When I came to this General Conference session, I knew very little about the proposal that is before us. When I came to the Committee on Conferences, I had heard arguments that followed the logic of pluses and minuses and I was not impressed with that logic of arguing in terms of pluses and minuses reckoned on the basis of the sizes of our memberships or representation from our annual conferences and from the jurisdictions. What I discovered in exploring further on this particular proposal, there is indeed a much deeper issue. Particularly those of us who come from the former Methodist tradition, come from a tradition where the representation in the General Conference has been heavily weighted on the side of clergy, all the way from the time when we were an all-clergy General Conference to the middle of the 19th century when we began to have limited lay representation in the General Conference to the turn of the century when we finally got lay women representation in the annual conference. We did have a formula in 1968 that did grant us a degree of equity in the representation of lay and clergy. Time has passed us by on that and we're now at a place where there are some very serious problems in terms of equity. The issue that is at heart in this proposal is the issue of, "To what extent do we grant equity of vote in terms in our annual conferences reckoning the size of the delegations to the General Conference?" The proposal in the amendment moves in the right direction, I think, because that proposal is a 50-50 proposal. As membership grows, or the trend as we see it now, that proposal will soon be out of date. The proposal of the committees with which the committee concurs is a proposal of 75-25. 75% based on lay membership and 25% on clergy.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right sir, you're about out of time.

LOGAN: Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Would you please restate your name and conference for the record.

LOGAN: James Logan, Virginia, clergy.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. All right, right here. The chair man spoke, now that is one speech against. The presenter's minority report speech does not count as for, so we have one speech against. Are you for the amendment?

TERRELL SESSUMS (Florida): Madam Chair man, I re ally just have a ques tion.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right sir. Your name please.

*Impact of Proportional Change
Questioned*

SESSUMS: I am Terrell Sessums from the Florida del e ga tion, a lay mem ber, and Rev. Mr. Sweet might be able to an swer it. We've had the text of the orig i nal res o lu tion that was sub mit ted by a num ber of con fer ences and ju ris dic tions well in ad vance and I know some of the im pacts. But I don't know, and have not had an op por tu nity to do the math to know the im pact of yours. And my ques tion spe cif i cally is this. Under the orig i nal pro posal I know that, for in stance, the cen tral con fer ences would re ceive an ad di tional 15 or 16 dele gates to the next Gen eral Con fer ence, half of whom would be clergy, half la ity be cause of the growth in their mem bership. Under your par tic u lar amend ment, as I un der stand it, the cen tral con fer ences would not re ceive any ad di tional rep re sen ta tion. Is that cor rect and is that eq ui ta ble?

SWEET: Bishop, may I refer to Paul Extrum-Fernandez who has done some num ber punch in on that.

BISHOP CRAIG: If he's here. Mike 4, Paul.

PAUL EXTRUM-FERNANDEZ (Cal i for nia-Ne vada): Actually, that's not quite true. There would be ac tu ally some in crease in cen tral con fer ence rep re sen ta tion. It's about 6 or 8, as I re call, it's not the 15 I be lieve that Terrell Sessums was talk ing about with the for mula that came out. Now, one point of in for ma tion. The only in for ma tion that came to our com mittee was the 375,000-26,000 mem ber fig ure. There was no oth er sup port ing in for ma tion in terms of how that im pact ed an nual con fer ences.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. Does that help? All right, we are on the amend ment. We have had a speech against. Do you wish to speak for? The pink card, do you wish to speak for? Please come to mike 6. It's for the amend ment.

*Porportional Is sue Is a Mat ter of Fair ness
to Small and Ru ral Churches*

SUE MULLINS (Iowa): Thank you Bishop. The ti tle or sub ti tle on the in for ma

tion which co mes to you from the com mittee as they ask for con cur rence said that this would re store fair ness and bal ance. I would call your at ten tion to the fig ures that the Rev. Dr. Sweet gave you early about the dis prop or tion ate rep re sen ta tion we pres ently have for those of us who live in the vast ru ral ar eas of this na tion and of oth ers and the ur ban ar eas. I speak as a farmer. I speak as a church with 143 mem bers. There are a lot of churches like mine. I think it's im por tant that whether we live in the pan han dle of Ne braska or on the home steads of the ar eas of the cen tral con fer ences or the plains of Iowa, that we need to heed the voices of the small heard in higher pro por tion than what is al lowed pres ently or would be al lowed un der the com mit tee pro posal that is be fore you. Please sup port the mi nority re port in be half of fair ness to all broth ers and sis ters. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you. The chair would now entertain a speech against the minority report. Are you against? Mike 2 please.

DEBORAH MCLEOD (Florida): I think the real is sue here is about whether or not we re ally value a shared min is try with la ity. We talk about how we as clergy value la ity, but our la ity are se verely un der rep re sented in this cur rent for mula. The sta tis tics that Rev. Sweet gave you are cor rect that the ma jority of our United Meth od ist Churches are small mem bership churches, and the ma jority of our United Meth od ist pas tors serve small mem bership churches. But ac cord ing to Lyle Schaller, there's another piece of in for ma tion that's also in cluded that Rev. Sweet did not men tion to you. And that is that the ma jority of United Meth od ists wor ship and are mem bers of large mem bership churches. And they are the United Meth od ists that are se verely un der rep re sented in the cur rent for mula and would be even more so un der rep re sented in the amend ment. So I urge you to de feat the amend ment and to re ally re cognize the value of shared min is try with la ity.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. We could now entertain a speech for the amendment. We are on the amendment. Way back there, that or ange card.

Mike 7. Is this for the amendment?

*Dis cern ment Needed to Clarify
De legate Ap portion ment Is sue*

BERNARD (SKIP) KEELS (Bal ti more-Wash ing ton): It seems to me at a time like this we re ally need to seek dis cern ment. There are so many in stances of peo ple pass ing notes around talk ing about the nu mer ical im pli ca tions of this that I won der if the body's re ally fully in formed, but I would

state as a for mer su per in ten dent that those sis ters and broth ers in small churches, by the grace of God, are equal in the eyes of God. It is not how big the church is, it's how big the faith in the church and so many peo ple find that in this con fer ence we argue about nu mer ical su pe ri ority and in fe ri ority when we re ally ought to be ar gu ing about what are we doing for Christ. It is only what we do for Christ that will last, and I think that whether it is a small farmer in Iowa or an inner-city church in Baltimore with small membership, those people need to hear pro phetic words from this body, and not a word that says we wres tle against prin ci pal i ties and num bers and not that we live in the body of Christ.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. Now let's re mind us where we are. We are on the mi nority re port, Cal en dar Item 1147. There have been two speeches for and two against. Down here. Mike 1, please.

KEITH WHITAKER (Texas): The way I read this it has nothing to do with large churches or small mem bership churches. I serve in a small non-met ro pol i tan area in a county that is filled with small mem bership churches and I be lieve very strongly in the im portance of rep re senting those churches. I be lieve that what is be fore us has to do with the to tal mem bership of an nual con fer ences and has noth ing to do with whether we're in fa vor or op posed to small or large mem bership churches. I would speak against the amend ment and in fa vor of the com mittee.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you, the chair can en ter tain a speech for the amend ment, right there, green. Num ber 4 please.

SUMMERS: There is no one vote/one per son rep re sented here, as we know. Rep re sen ta tion to Gen eral Con fer ence is based on a for mula and I would agree that it is in ad e quate at this time. How ever, the amend ment that is be fore us to the com mittee's re port of fers the best chance for rep re sen ta tion of lay and clergy. As Dr. Sweet said it's closer to a 50/50 as it co mes from con fer ences that rep re sent a higher per cent age of la ity against clergy and so I would urge you to vote for the mi nority re port which gives us a better chance of equal rep re sen ta tion. That's what we ought to be about.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you. Now we ex hausted our free dom to of fer a de bate and we turn first to the maker of the mi nority report and then the com mittee chair for fi nal words.

KEELS: The rep re sen ta tion is sue co mes in part to: Where do the clergy serve? The clergy serve in a much wider geo graph ical area and that's one of the is sues that we are try ing to get at in the mi nority re port. It does

not change the ratio of lay or clergy delegates from the annual conference to the general conference. And the ratio at the general conference would continue to be 50/50. Some of our ministry is performed in a milieu where there is a much greater tenacity of clergy required. For instance: multi-ethnic, rural churches that have hospitality an hour and a half away for pastors to make one hospitality visit, for instance. And so our clergy are by necessity scattered further and wider across the conferences of the denomination. The laity are more concentrated as has been pointed out in the larger churches. Yesterday morning we voted nonconcurrency on a petition that would have given every local church lay representation in the annual conference in stead of every charge. When we give every charge representation we are talking about pastor, we are talking about annual conference membership being based on the number of pastoral charges. We need to be consistent.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you, now let's hear from the chair.

*Retirees and Special Assignment Clergy
Unbalance Proportional Formula*

COURTOY: Thank you, Bishop. We've couched this argument it seems to me in terms of small and large churches. There are 13 annual conferences that passed the petition to send to this body, plus other individuals from 3 other conferences that represented 3 of our jurisdictions. This is certainly one of the most considered pieces of legislation. It's a fairness issue, and we've talked about it in terms of small churches. I would remind if you look at those annual conferences who sent it in there are many rural small membership churches and throughout the South and South Central as well as in the North East, North Central, so I don't think that's the issue. The problem is that the clergy which right now weights heavily in the current formula represented less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the membership of the total United Methodist Church and where conferences are declining in membership but have been once strong, there are more retirees and often more ministers on special assignments than are assigned to local churches and that tends to build the number of clergy that figure into the formula of those conferences. We feel that the current formula, the current proposal, which amends the current formula, is the way to go. We are against the substitution.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much, now, questions only. Right here, mike 1.

BARBARA LEMMEL (Troy): I would like to make a motion to refer, is that in order at this time?

BISHOP CRAIG: By our rules, at the end of three speeches for and against we are effect under the call to vote. Which makes that motion not in order.

LEMMEL: I would appreciate it if I would have a chance to make this motion after the vote. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: We'll give it a try. All right, we're ready to vote on the minority report as you find it in Calendar Item 1147. We got another question? Yes, back by mike 8. Question only.

PORTER WOMELDORFF (Illinois Great Rivers): Could somebody advise me if both of these proposals, the minority and the majority, maintain the 50/50 balance of clergy and lay members for each annual conference?

BISHOP CRAIG: The answer is yes, is it not?

WOMELDORFF: Both of us answer yes together.

BISHOP CRAIG: Yes, yes. (Laughter) Which twin has the Toni? (Laughter) All right, we're ready to vote on the minority report. On the minority report, Calendar Item 1147, please vote when the light appears. It has failed. [Yes, 383; No, 564] We are now back to the original recommendation of concurrence for Calendar Item 1147. Questions only, what is, do you have a question with a green card, we're under the order to vote. Let's vote, unless, only a question, only a question, all right, mike 6.

DAVID RICHARDSON (California-Pacific): This is a question; I thought we would have opportunity to debate the majority report too.

BISHOP CRAIG: You're correct, sir; we can have speeches on this.

RICHARDSON: May I make one?

BISHOP CRAIG: All three of us responded together. It's a wonder. Three bishops agree.

RICHARDSON: May I speak?

BISHOP CRAIG: Yes, you may speak.

*Majority Report on Delegate
Apportionment Is Debated*

RICHARDSON: I would like to speak against the majority report. I think we'd be better served by voting nonconcurrency and at this stage staying with the formula that we currently have. One of the things that has not been talked about, I think, to the extent that it needs to be, is the place in which we serve what is a great deal of diversity

and in those areas it does require an enormous difference in terms of ratio, clergy to laity. I served a church which had 13 languages; those are spoken, living languages in that church and it required a higher percentage of clergy to the laity in the church, because of language ministries. I then moved to a mono-culture and I was able to serve a church the same size with a much smaller ratio of clergy to laity. And so I think where we serve makes a great deal of difference, and at this point I think the way that the majority report serves us it would do disservice to those of us who serve in places where there is a great deal of diversity and it would do disservice to places where there is sparse population. How can we serve and reach the unchurched if we base delegation allotment only on numbers and we'd have fewer representation, or representatives from those areas where the membership is low? We heard the other night when we had our penance service that the majority rule is not the way of God and I think it is important for us to concern ourselves with those areas. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much, there's a speech against. Yes. Mike 1.

We are on the main motion now of 1147, the recommendation of concurrence. We've had a speech against, now we'll hear this.

LEMMEL: I wish to make a motion to refer the issue of representation to General Conference to the Council of Bishops, asking that they put together a task force to study this matter and return to this body in 2004 with a recommendation for a more just representation system than we have currently. If I have a second, I will speak to it.

BISHOP CRAIG: I hear a second. You may speak.

*Polity, History, and Globalization
Inform Proportional Issue*

LEMMEL: I want to thank the group from the Southeast Jurisdiction that has brought this matter to our attention; the current imbalances that are in our current system of representation to General Conference. I join their concern that we have a more just system created. However, this is more than just a regional issue and it is about more than just population; it is also about our polity and our history in The United Methodist Church, and about our increasing globalization. I believe that we are being asked to vote on something that we do not fully know the implications of, that's quite complicated. One of the reasons it is complicated is that there are several issues of justice here: clergy and laity, numerical considerations, representation of regions

and races, representation of small and large membership churches. Many of these are new to us, but we are rarely addressing them as a whole. I believe the best way to address them most carefully and most thoughtfully is to refer them to a task force whose members are drawn from our whole church, and that the Council of Bishops has the global and historical insight to help that take place. I realize that this would preserve for another 4 years our current not-entirely-just-system, but I think it would be better to stay where we are for 4 years and approve a system that is truly just for all of us. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you. We now have before us the motion to refer this matter to the Council of Bishops. I see cards way back there. Mike 7.

MARK FENSTERMACHER (North Indiana): It seems to me this is an issue of justice. We've talked about this, prayed about this; others have before the conference. I would vote against the motion, recommend that we not refer this issue and delay justice. I would hope that the body would be willing to defeat the motion to refer and to take action today.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. That is a speech against referral. Is there a speech for referral? For referral? Mike 2.

RON BRETSCH (North Central New York): Thank you, bishop. I support the motion to refer because I think that in doing so some wider issues, which have not surfaced yet in the discussion, would be addressed. For example, the variations among the jurisdictions as to how membership is counted.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you. That is a speech for referral. Is there a speech against referral? Or angle card back there in the middle. Mike 7.

*Referral of Issue Would Delay Justice,
Alleged*

STEPHEN McALILLY (Mississippi): I'm a lay delegate from Mississippi. I speak against referral today because we're trying to make this issue a lot more complicated than it really is. It's strictly about how to determine the number of delegates to Jurisdictional and General Conference; whether we are going to base it more on the total membership of the church or more on clergy. Presently, the simple division right now favors clergy. I'm concerned that referral would delay justice. Our church has a history of inaction, of dragging our feet, even though we sit back and watch our membership decline. I love this church, and I'm scared that it is withering away. This church raised me in a parsonage family. I met my wife at a Methodist Church Camp. I was ed-

ucated at a Methodist college. And today, I work for a Methodist institution. This church is my life, but I'm afraid if we keep delaying action and not addressing and denying the problems that we have, we're going to wither away and this church won't give my children the same opportunities of life that it's given me. So I would vote against referral so that we can decide this issue today.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. The chair can entertain a speech for referral. For referral? Yellow card? Yes. Mike 8. Or 6, wherever you like, 6.

DEEDEE AZHIKAKATH (Desert Southwest): I would like to speak in favor of referral. I am 23 years old, have a long time ahead of me in the Methodist Church, and I realize that this issue is very important, and I don't think it is something that we should just jump into blindly because I will be affected by this decision for many years to come. And I think we need to do it cautiously, fairly, and let justice prevail.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. Now we can entertain one more speech against referral. Yes. Mike 1. You are against referral?

WERLEIN: Yes. I would speak against referral. I heard what the chair of our legislative committee said when he remarked that this was one of the most considered pieces of legislation that has come to the General Conference. I notice that the committee has voted this out with approval, according to the DCA, by an overwhelming vote of 51 in favor and only 24 against. I think it is time for us to trust our own processes and the legislative processes that have served us here. The bishops have no organization ready to do this kind of a study. It would simply be delaying unduly the justice that has been described in the earlier speeches. I would vote against and urge the conference to vote against referral.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. We are at the position where we can entertain one more speech for referral and then we will be under vote. Yes, the green card right there.

I'm sorry, mike 4.

JOHN D. PETERSON (West Ohio): I'd like to call the question for all that's before us.

BISHOP CRAIG: On all that is before us?

PETERSON: I'm sorry, on the amendment.

BISHOP CRAIG: On the amendment. I—the referral, or all that is before us, John?

PETERSON: I'm sorry. I rescind my motion.

BISHOP CRAIG: On the amendment . . . ?

(Laughter)

We're already at three and three. We have room for one more speech for, and then we'll be under the Call to Order anyway. We can take one speech for. All right, yellow cards back there. Who's your spokesperson? Right there at 8. It's hard to know who you're calling on when it's a group event. It's okay.

(Laughter)

Mike 8.

*Weekly Worship Attendance Preferred
Over Membership*

LINDA CAMPBELL-MARSHALL (New England): I've been a superintendent for some number of years, and each year at conference, churches move to remove persons who have been inactive in their membership for a long time. One of my concerns about this is that the lay membership and the integrity of the lay membership rolls might well be impeded by basing the membership anywhere on the number of laypersons. It's much more difficult to maintain an integrity liability roll that has nothing to do with the integrity of the people. It has something to do with the integrity of record keeping. It's very difficult to really know what the membership is of any church. If we're going in this direction, I would prefer to see us base figures on average weekly attendance, which are more representative of the actuality that are a part of The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, now, we're speaking on referral, okay. Friends, take a big breath . . . exhale. We are under the call to vote by our rules on the motion to refer. I see a card waving. Questions only, and we have to go back over to our chair. Just a moment, we're going to see what's at mike 8.

BEVERLY L. WILKES (Illinois Great Rivers): And again, I would ask for Rule 17 for a few seconds of prayer, as we've been in this tough debating trying to make up our minds. And the time limit is up to you, but just silent moments, please.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, thank you. May we hear from the chair first, and then we'll, we'll have a time to kind of breathe and listen, and we'll vote. We need a speech about referral.

COURTOY: Thank you, Bishop. I'll remind this body, this is the third General Conference this issue has come to us. We have debated it. We debated it in Louisville. We debated it in Denver. And here we are again. It has been considered and reconsidered by this body. There have been groups studying it that presented information to the

committee. We think it's time for us to act. We are opposed to referral.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right, now let's—we're, we're under the call to vote, and we're under a request for quiet time. And we're gonna vote. So let's just settle our souls . . . remind ourselves whose church it is any way . . . and be quiet.

(Moments of Silence)

Grant us your peace, Holy One. Amen.

We are voting on the motion to refer. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 305; No, 640*] It is not referred. We are back on the main motion. There has been one speech against. We can entertain a speech for the main motion. Yes, right over here. Mike 3.

JAMES R. ALLEN (South Carolina): I'd call the question.

BISHOP CRAIG: It's not in order. We haven't had two speeches for and against on the main motion. We've only had one speech against the main motion. Thank you. Are you speaking for the main motion? Please go to mike 7.

*Current Formula Discriminates
Against Growing Conferences
and Central Conferences Argued*

MICHAEL B. WATSON (Alabama-West Florida): The facts clearly show the unfairness of the present formula for distributing delegates. The unfairness is obvious. The real question is this: Do we want to continue this unfair treatment of our brothers and sisters in Christ or do we want to move toward being more fair? We talk of a global church. These changes will ensure much greater central conference inclusion, now and in the future. It will also treat many conferences in the United States more fairly. Our own past practice has been to overemphasize the numbers of ministers in a conference in the allocation of General Conference delegates. This works to discriminate against growing conferences and central conferences. I'm a clergy member, but I believe that it is unfair for clergy to be represented 200 times more than laity. Let's take a decisive step toward eliminating this discrimination and toward fairness and justice by voting yes on this resolution.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. The chair could entertain a speech against the main motion. Clear back in that corner. Yes. Come to mike 5, please. Against the main motion?

JEREMIAH PARK (North ern New Jersey): I am speaking against the motion. The fairness can be shown from a different perspective. And when there is a much larger

ratio in terms of one clergy versus the membership, those churches are having much more privileges because they have lots of opportunities for programs in mission and ministries, and small churches are much less privileged in that regard. And we as a church, as a body of Christ, should give more attention and care to hear their concern and voices of small membership churches. And the other aspect, the other aspect, is that from Korean community perspective, to be truly a chartered church, much less membership probably is needed. With about 50 active members of a local church, they can be a fully chartered, very active church, so I plead for fairness to defeat this motion. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. The chair can now entertain a speech for the main motion. Pink card, right in the middle.

WARREN R. LATHAM (North Georgia): I pastor a church that's made up of a lot of different kinds of folks: 200 of our worshippers are Hispanic, Spanish-speaking people. This is not about representation of small churches. It's about fair representation of the laity. And in the current formula, those Hispanic members of our church, as well as the other members of our church, the lay members of our church, do not have fair representation. This is an effort to correct that, and I very much would hope that this General Conference will take the action necessary to bring about fairness and justice on this issue.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. We're on Calendar Item 1147, main motion. We've had two speeches for, two against. The Chair could entertain a speech against. No, I'm sorry, the woman behind you. Thank you. Mike 4.

MARIELLEN SAWADA (California/Nevada): Thank you, Bishop. You know this is sue, I have to tell you, really pulls at me. It's an issue that my daddy in North Montgomery, Alabama and I talk about a little bit. I grew up in the parsonages also. What I am realizing in this particular issue, is that it is not about small membership and large membership churches. We—all our conferences have that. It is not about lay and clergy representation. We've all got that. But it's about—and this is what I'm saying—it's about regionalism. Now, you know—hear me out, hear me out on this one now—I come from a jurisdiction right now, that entire jurisdiction made up of all these different kinds of churches—we have 56 representatives here—our entire jurisdiction. This new petition, well-written as it is—and I have spent time pouring over it, I received it in January and I looked at it and looked at it—this petition as it is brings our

lit 56 down to 48 for an entire jurisdiction. It is, I would agree, it is a justice issue and I would ask that the General Conference delegates—the House—give to us some justice, not only to the western jurisdiction, but for The United Methodist Church.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you very much. The Chair could entertain one more speech for the main motion, for the motion. Mike 1. Well, you can still move, that's good. After a morning like this, that's great.

E. MALONE DODSON (North Georgia): I'm for it and now we can vote.

(Laughter and applause)

BISHOP CRAIG: Right you are. All right, Mr. Chair, you've got one more chance.

COURTOY: I'm for it. We can vote too, Bishop.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. All right. We are ready to vote on Calendar Item 1147, as the main motion. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 569; No, 377*] The motion is adopted. All right. What can you do in five minutes? Anything?

COURTOY: Bishop, shall we try one short one, and hope it's short?

BISHOP CRAIG: Sure. Let's try.

COURTOY: Deborah Pritts, our secretary has one.

DEBORAH L. PRITTS (North Central New York): I will present this to you with a disclaimer that I can not guarantee it will be a short one.

BISHOP CRAIG: Well, then for get it.

PRITTS: Well, on Page No. 2088 in the DCA, 2088, and we are looking at Calendar No. 1150, p. 2088, Calendar Item 1150 deals with Petition 31710 which can be found on p. 175 in the *Advance DCA*. The subject is: An annual conference may decide to be in session every second year. The committee is recommending non-concurrence. As we discussed this petition, we were cognizant of the costs associated with holding an annual conference sessions on an annual basis, but we were of the opinion that *The Book of Discipline* assumes the host of duties assigned to the annual conference would be conducted and considered on an annual basis.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. Item 1150 before us with a recommendation of non-concurrence. Please vote when the light appears. [*Yes, 800; No, 116*] The motion carries—non-concurrence. Have another one? We're going to stop there. All right. Madam Secretary, why don't we go to

an nounce ments? Yes, in the mid dle. Mike 4.

ALVIN J. HORTON (Vir ginia): I just, I need some clar ity in my life.

BISHOP CRAIG: Yes. Don't we all!

HORTON: This morning, I think you clar i fied that the mo tion that we made last night and ap proved; that pe ti tions that re ceive less than ten votes would be part of the con sent cal en dar?

BISHOP CRAIG: Cor rect.

HORTON: And then, this morning, I think it was clar i fied that would take place im me di ately. My ques tion is, if an item had been taken off pre vi ously, off of the con sent cal en dar, where we were un der the pre vi ous rule of hav ing to have five sig na tures, is that now on the cal en dar or not or do we . . .

BISHOP CRAIG: No, it's off.

HORTON: How do we get it back?

BISHOP CRAIG: Anything previously re moved from the cal en dar is still re moved from the cal en dar. It's con sidered cal en dar.

HORTON: So that it is sub ject for dis cus sion?

BISHOP CRAIG: It will come for dis cus sion.

ALVIN HORTON: Thank you very much.

BISHOP CRAIG: You're quite wel come. Mike 4. Just a mo ment please. I have some one on 4.

CHARLES D. (DENNY) WHITE, JR. (Western North Carolina): Thank you, Bishop Craig. I might di rect the Chair's at ten tion to p. 1715 of the DCA. I have a ques tion which may assist us in our future de lib er a tion—or maybe not. On p. 1715, in the left-hand col umn, Rule 37—that's Part 2 of that—says that "no report shall be adopted or ques tion re lat ing (to the same) decided without opportunity having been given for at least 2 speeches for and 2 against." The rule is, I believe, Madam Chairperson, that opportunity has to be given only for 2 on each side and then the mo tion for the pre vi ous ques tion would be in or der. The rule about 3 speeches is you have to put the ques tion af ter 3, but you do not have to have 3. Is the Chair in agree ment with that?

BISHOP CRAIG: The Chair is in agree ment with that and it has been at tempt ing to act un der that.

WHITE: Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. Yes, right here. Mike 4.

ROLAND SIEGRIST (Austria Pro vi sional): Bishop, I have a ques tion: Who

could pro tect us of the heavy winds on the floor here. We have the wind out side yes ter day of our convention center. It's now blow ing here in a way that even my Swed ish col leagues are freez ing.

(Laughter and Applause)

BISHOP CRAIG: We will cer tainly ask the convention personnel to check that. Would you blow some up here, please?

SIEGRIST: Thank you very much.

BISHOP CRAIG: It may be where the ori gin of most of the air move ment is, but I'm sur prised it's cold.

(Laughter and Applause)

SIEGRIST: Thank you. Thank you.

BISHOP CRAIG: All right. Let's turn to our secretary, Carolynn Marshall, for an nounce ments, please. We give her your un di vided at ten tion?

CAROLYN M. MARSHALL: Thirty sec onds ago there was one an nounce ment. There are now three. One in which you will all be in ter ested, I'm sure, is the fact that they're work ing on this blower prob lem and hope fully after lunch, you will be more com fort able. I was just re joic ing yes ter day that no notes on the com fort level in the audi to rium had ar rived for a cou ple of days.

I just had word that the body needed to be in formed that as we adopted Cal en dar Item 1147, as far as the Gen eral Con fer ence del e gates and dis tri bu tion num bers and so forth were con cerned, that is adopted with re fer ral to GCFA for the fi nan cial im pli ca tions. And then this one, on a com pletely dif fer ent vein, has come from the United Church of Christ in the Phil ip pines. That is one of our af fil i ated, au ton o mous bod ies, repre sen ta tion from which has been with us the time that we're gathered here in Gen eral Con fer ence. Let me share this mes sage with all of us. This is written by Bishop Elmer M. Bol DCA n from the United Church of Christ in the Phil ip pines.

"I received a call last night from the United Church of Christ in the Phil ip pines in Ma nila about the un timely death of an in cum bent bishop of the UCCP, Bishop Nelinda "Ellen" Primavera Brionos. Bishop Ellen was attending the north BICOL annual conference two days ago when she suf ered a stroke and did not re cover. She joined her Cre ator while serv ing the Master. Bishop Ellen was the first woman bishop in the Phil ip pines. At age 47, she was elected Bishop in May 1998 to serve her term of four years, 1998 to 2002. She was as signed to the South ern Luzon Ju ris dic tional Area which covers nine con fer ences. As a bishop of the area, she had to

at tend all of the an nual ses sions in or der to pre side at the elec tion of of fi cers and the or di na tion of min is ters."

[She had in tended to be here with us for General Conference but was not able to come be cause of the re spon si bil i ties there and was plan ning to at tend another event.] We request that this General Conference keep a mo ment of sil ence and thank God for the life and min is try of Bishop El len and pray for her be reaved fam ily as well as her con stitu en cies in South ern Lo zon Ju ris dic tion, United Church of Christ in the Phil ip pines."

And I have spo ken with Bishop Craig and we would cer tainly want to be re spon sive to this re quest to re mem ber our friends and our sis ters and broth ers in Christ in the Phil ip pines in this particular denomination, the United Church of Christ. Bishop Craig, I refer it to you.

BISHOP CRAIG: Thank you. In just a mo ment, we're go ing to ask Bishop James K. Matthews to dis miss us for our lunch recess with prayer and ask him to in clude this heart-rending reality in our midst. Do we need to hear from the Com mit tee on Pre siding Of fi cers, Carolyn? Do we need to hear from the Com mit tee on Pre siding Of fi cers? No? No. All right. Then the Chair's go ing to take some lib erty here. We're ad journeying fif teen min utes early for—we're recessing fif teen min utes early—so we're go ing to come back fif teen min utes early. Oh, so let's have gath er ing mu sic at 2:10 and be in our seats and ready to be gin at 2:20. I thank you for your good spirit this morn ing and the plea sure and the priv i lege of chairing this Gen eral Con fer ence. I thank my col leagues who have helped keep me in or der while you have kept your self in or der and trust that you will find re fresh ment and joy in your break. Bishop Matthews, will you pray for us?

(Applause)

BISHOP JAMES K. MATHEWS (Re tired): Af ter a brief prayer, I will, in keep ing with the spirit of this morning, give the bene dic tion in the Shona lan guage of Zim babwe, in the Marathi language of India, and then to get right with St. Paul, will give the same benediction in English. Let us pray:

(Prayer)

BISHOP MATHEWS: Oh Lord, what a morn ing, and we have af firm ed our one ness in Christ when we have ac knowl edged the Oikumene, the whole in hab ited world, the whole Church through out the whole in hab ited world, the whole task of the whole church throughout the whole in hab ited

world. With praise we give thanks for your great love for us all, for you have sent your Son, Je sus Christ, to be our Sav ior and Lord and have sent the Holy Spirit to continue that min is try to day. We crave the bless ing of the tri une God upon us and espe cially for those who mourn the death of our sister, Bishop Nelinda Briones, who has gone to be with you and for oth ers who suf fer such loss. [Prayer in Shona and Mara thi fol lowed by Eng lish trans la tion], which is to say: The grace of the Lord Je sus Christ, which is the love of God the Cre ator made real and pres ent with us right here and right now, be with you and re main with you all along the way. Amen.

Tuesday Afternoon May 9, 2000

(Bishop Albert Mutti, *pre sid ing*)
(Singing)

BISHOP ALBERT "FRITZ" MUTTI (Kan sas): Let the con fer ence be in or der, come take your seats please. You'll re member that we set the be gin ning time for this afternoon fifteen minutes earlier, so let's come take your seats please. All right, sis ters and brothers, let's take your seats please and be in order. My name is Fritz Mutti. I'm the Bishop of the Kan sas area, where Kathy Ban nis ter is one of our pas tors. Some times you see my name as Al bert, some times you see it as Fred er ick; but I go by Fritz most of the time, as a nick name I've had all my life and the of fi cial pub li ca tions at the church put out, you never know what will appear. It's my pleasure to be here helping you do your business this af ter noon, and I'm grate ful for the op por tu nity to work with you. We're faced with the need to move ahead as quickly as pos si ble with as many de ci sions as we can make this af ter noon. So we ask your pa tience, your *Discipline*, and your full par tic i pa tion in the pro cess. I'd like for us to be gin with a word of prayer.

(prayer)

I want to turn to the co or di na tor of the cal en dar, Fitz ger ald Reist, to be gin this af ter noon's ses sion, for in for ma tion you need about items listed in the *DCA*, that will be shifted to consent.

FITZ GER ALD REIST: Good af ter noon. I hope I've done what was asked of me. If you were to turn in your *Daily Chris tian Ad voc ate* for today, Wednesday, May 10, 2000, Vol ume 4, No. 8, to p. 2135. I'm going to give you the cal en dar num bers that are af fected in that cal en dar that would not have been on the consent cal en dar un der the

old rules. On p. 2135, Cal en dar Item 1222, which is committee item FA92. On the same page, Cal en dar Item 1223, which is committee item FA175. Continuing on same page, 1224, com mit tee item FA181, and Cal en dar Item 1225 which is com mit tee item FA191. If you would turn to p. 2137, Cal en dar Item 1244, which is com mit tee item HE216. And if you would turn to p. 2142, Cal en dar Item 1265, which is com mit tee item CS82. And on p. 2144, Cal en dar Item 1269, which is com mit tee item CS147. On p. 2148, there are two items, cal en dar 1287, which is committee item FA130, and cal en dar 1288, which is com mit tee item FA190. Turn ing to p. 2149, Cal en dar Item 1296, com mit tee item GJ103. On p. 2150, Cal en dar Item 1311, com mit tee item HE222. On the next page, 2151, Cal en dar Item 1317, com mit tee item HE237. Af ter I went down stairs, I un der stand that you also made an in ter pre ta tion to the ac tion that made it retroac tive to the things that have been pre vi ously printed on the cal en dar. I pulled those to gether with a lit tle bit less in for ma tion and it's not quite in or der, be cause I did n't have enough time to gather that. But, if you would like to just take maybe a pencil and write these numbers down, I think that would be the eas i est way for us to do these num bers.

The fol low ing are Lo cal Church com mit tee items. 1210 is the cal en dar num ber, LC9 is the committee number. Calendar Item 648, com mit tee item LC57. Cal en dar Item 1213, com mit tee item LC85. Cal en dar Item 1215, com mit tee item LC114.

Independent Commissions;. Calendar Item 1207, com mit tee item IC47.

Higher Edu ca tion and Min is try; there are two items; Cal en dar Item 1201, com mit tee item HE168. Cal en dar Item 1204, com mit tee item HE192.

In Gen eral and Ju di cial Ad min is tra tion; Cal en dar Item 1194, com mit tee GJ93.

In Faith and Or der—you might want to find a new piece of pa per. Cal en dar Item 318, com mit tee item FO26. Cal en dar Item 319, com mit tee item FO27. Cal en dar Item 321, committee item FO29. Calendar Item—now I'm prob a bly going to make a mis take on this one be cause I don't have a no ta tion be side it that I dou ble checked it. But I will give it to you and if you no tice that it has a flag be side it, or its con sti tu tional, it does n't be long here. I will dou ble-check it when I get down stairs, I apol o gize. It's Cal en dar Item 606, com mit tee item FO32. Cal en dar Item 607, committee item F061. Cal en dar Item 608, com mit tee item FO64.

Financial Administration has one. It's Calendar Item 1171, com mit tee item FA57. Con fer ences; Cal en dar Item 597, com mit

tee item CO487. Calendar Item 1149, com mit tee item CO71.

REIST: Cal en dar Item 1,152, Com mit tee Item CO82; Cal en dar Item 1,153, Com mit tee Item CO97; Cal en dar Item 1,154, Com mit tee Item CO195; Cal en dar Item 1,156, Committee Item CO111; Calendar Item. 1,158, Com mit tee Item CO118. If you discover that I have made any mis takes, please advise me before 6:00 because I hope to have this printed in the *DCA* tomorrow morning for a clearer reference for all of you. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Jerry, hold it right there. Just say one more time why we have lifted these from the consent calendar so that the con fer ence will un der stand.

REIST: We took an ac tion this morn ing to make the num ber re quired to be on the consent cal en dar 10 or fewer votes op pos ing the pre vail ing rec om men da tion of the com mit tee. That was in ter pre ted re tro ac tively so it went back to all those items that were al ready passed that had not been on the consent cal en dars, but were on the reg u lar cal en dars where there were 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 votes in op po si tion. Those then rolled over into a consent cal en dar that we will be put ting together manually for your consid eration to morrow.

BISHOP MUTTI: Pink card, mike 4.

JANET R. ELLINGER (Wisconsin): Bishop, cor rect me if I am wrong, but my un der stand ing was the ac tion we took said the items had to have 10 or more votes. I think this feels very back wards to me that they had to have 10 votes to get onto the consent cal en dar, and we had 5 or less. And, I thought the ac tion said we had to have 10 or less.

BISHOP MUTTI: The is sue is the tim ing, I be lieve. So, as we met this morn ing we de ter mined that we needed to lift these to day, and that will be in effect in tomorrow's print ing. We did change the rule that re quired 10 votes to lift, rather than 5, but we needed to lift these today be cause of the time limit.

ELLINGER: All right, I'm still con fused, but that's not un usual.

REIST: If you'll keep your hand up or wave some thing, I can find you. I'll come straight back as I leave the plat form.

BISHOP MUTTI: Geri, if you'll help peo ple un der stand that we re ally do ap pre ci ate your work as co or di na tor of the cal en dar. This is a hard job, and we're grate ful for all that you do for us. Thank you.

(Applause)

BISHOP MUTTI: Now then, we turn to Gen eral and Ju di cial Ad min is tra tion for our

Calendar Items. If we can move through that we'll be looking at Local Church, and Financial Administration later this afternoon. Let's do the best we can to move through as many as possible. Christine Harman.

CHRISTINE HARMAN (Kentucky): Thank you, Bishop Mutti. We will be presenting a number of items this afternoon. And our first presentation will be done by Tom Jackson, who is a lay delegate from South Georgia. After that, the following—the rest of the presenters will introduce themselves as they come forward. Tom?

TOM JACKSON (North Georgia): I did once live in South Georgia, but I'm a lay delegate from North Georgia now. Thank you.

(Applause)

Bishop Mutti, I call your attention and the attention of the conference to p. 2059, Calendar Item 836, Petition 31967. This is found on p. 1686 of the *Advance DCA*. It is entitled, "Living Into the Future." This is the Committee on General and Judicial Administration's action on the connectional process team report. If I may speak to our recommendation, our committee held an open discussion for more than 2 hours, suspending Robert's Rules of Order which were proving to be an obstacle to our discussion. In this way, 73 different persons addressed the CPT in a most useful discussion, including 2 who spoke through their translators. Through this process of listening and sharing, we came to appreciate that the report identifies a set of core values which in deed can and should guide our direction for living into the future. While we had serious concerns about the CPT's top-down imposition of a radical structural change in the church, we believe the valuable core principles should not be lost. The committee did not want to refer the report, nor did we want to mandate yet another expensive 4-year study. We did not want to create the Covenant Council nor did we want to create another structure to handle this action within our church. We wanted to put these transformational directions to work now and through this quadrennium. A number of annual conferences are already ahead of the General Conference in this regard. We believe this plan as written utilizes existing structure throughout the church from the local to the general level. It is not to be a top-down imposition of program or structure. If fact, we hope and believe it has a lot of potential for something good to bubble up from the local church. In the end, our discussions lead us to amend the report by deleting the existing text in its entirety, and

adding the new text you see printed in your *DCA* on p. 2059. The committee recommendation is concurrence as amended, and our vote was 79 for, 2 against, and 1 abstention.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. The recommendation from the committee is for concurrence with amendments to it. Mike 4, a green card.

MARY BROOKE CASAD (North Texas): I move to amend by deleting the phrase, "To guide us in this way, the General Conference charges the General Council on Ministries" and every thing that follows that—and then substitute the following in its place: "To guide us in this way, the General Conference establishes and charges the Transformational Leadership Team as follows: 1) There shall be a Transformational Leadership Team made up of the following persons: 8 bishops (one from each jurisdiction, and one each from Asia, Europe, and Africa) to be elected by the Council of Bishops; a total of 17 representatives from the jurisdictions of the United States elected by the 2000 Jurisdictional Conferences. [The number elected by each jurisdiction shall be proportional to that jurisdiction's representation among the U.S. delegates to the 2000 General Conference as determined by the Secretary of the General Conference. Insofar as possible, those elected shall be balanced between lay and clergy.]; also, one representative from each Central Conference elected by that Central Conference, or if the Central Conference does meet before January 1, 2001, the representative is to be appointed by the bishops of that Central Conference; additionally, 4 persons chosen for their expertise in organizational behavior or systems theory by the team after its first meeting. 4 additional persons may be added to ensure inclusivity to be chosen by the team. Staff of the General Agencies shall make themselves available as needed to serve as consultants to the team. 2) The Transformational Leadership Team is charged with leading the church's conversation in preparing specific proposals for the 2004 General Conference around the following issues: 1) How our connectional structures can further enhance the effectiveness of our church in accomplishing its task of making disciples of Jesus Christ, 2) How our Connectional Program Agencies can better serve local churches in their mission or accomplish for local churches missional actions which local churches cannot do for themselves. 3) . . .

BISHOP MUTTI: Now, if you can finish your motion, Mary Brooke.

You're under the three minute time limit also.

CASAD: All right. There are several other items that apply to directing the transformational leadership team.

BISHOP MUTTI: Well, let's just a minute and see if the conference would be willing to give you time to read the entire amendment. Objection to letting her read the entire amendment? All right, if you would extend the limit please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 363; No, 490] Do the best you can, Mary Brooke.

CASAD: Bishop, may I move to suspend the rules so that we might pass out the amendment to all of the delegates so they could have it in writing.

BISHOP MUTTI: This is an amendment to suspend the rules to pass out the entire amendment. That would put it in your hands. It'd take two thirds to do so. Point of order stated in the back. Mike 8.

DAVID SEVERE (Oklahoma): Can she make that motion and then also make a motion to suspend the rules?

BISHOP MUTTI: The chair understands that she had not finished the motion and so there was no second yet. I believe it's in order.

SEVERE: All right, thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, if you would suspend the rules and allow the passing out of this amendment, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 412; No, 441] I'm sorry.

CASAD: Bishop, may I just briefly conclude. Can I briefly conclude the amendment?

BISHOP MUTTI: I think we'd let you do that.

CASAD: All right. The team would report to the 2004 General Conference and receive the necessary funding to do its work from the budget of the General Council on Ministries. Therefore, there would be no need for any additional funding.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, is there a second? All right, Casad's motion is before you, but if you'd like to speak to it further.

CASAD: Yes I would. Only a few short days ago this conference participated in discussion groups about the CPT report. One of the many concerns lifted up from these groups was the focus on maintenance rather than mission. The current culture of our structure simply will not allow effective change in reorganization from within. This proposed amendment would empower a group from the grass roots at the heart of United Methodism elected by our regional conferences. This group has a mandate to focus on how we'd better carry out the mission of the church. It will have the benefit of CPT's data without being committed to its

conclusions. It provides for the input of persons with organizational behavior expertise. It calls upon general agencies in an advisory capacity without vote. And it can be accomplished by using monies within the current budget, not additional funding. I urge you to support the amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the amendment is before you for debate. Green card, mike 2. You wish to speak against the amendment.

WILLIAM HATCHER (South Georgia): I rise to speak against this amendment. In our legislative committee we began miles apart, yet we moved from a harsh and combative spirit to an amazing oneness, being led by the Holy Spirit. This is evidenced by the vote on the committee proposal of 79 for, 2 against, and one not voting. This amendment creates a new independent study committee composed of 40 persons. As a member of the CPT, that's not a good place to go. I believe the main motion is the better proposal to get us to God's preferred future. I urge you to vote no on this amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you. Is there some one who wishes to speak for the Casad amendment? Green card, mike 2.

JIM HARNISH (Florida): I think the amendment offers us an effective way to move the very helpful information from the CPT report into the hands of a group that is not a study committee. Unfortunately, the document was not permitted to be put in our hands, but as described it is not another study committee, it is a group specifically designed to lead us in implementing the best learnings of the CPT document. But it does, as the maker of the motion presented, emerge out of the jurisdictional representation and therefore provides a fresh look that is not bound by the ethos or experience or tradition of the General Council on Ministries and the existing bodies. I support it because I believe it provides us a way that is much less expensive than maintaining the total budget of another agency and provides a way for an objective look at how best to implement the best learnings of the CPT.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you very much. A speech in favor of the amendment. Come back here to the pink card. Go to mike 4. You're speaking against.

RANDALL FLANAGAN (West Virginia): I rise to speak against the amendment. First of all, I believe it would delay rather than encourage the spirit-driven transformation and reformation of this great church that we love. To study for another four years, and possibly eight knowing our own proclivities, would disengage us from the spirit and the energy that is already mov-

ing and is manifest among us and through us. Secondly, we already have in place a structure that can be empowered and is prepared to be responsive to carry forth the transformational directions that the church has so clearly called for. With a new commitment to the conciliar form of ministry, the General Council on Ministries can fulfill a new mandate, mandated by this General Conference, mandated by the words of this resolution, so that we can come to a common table for dialogue, for strategy, and most of all for the guidance of God's holy and transforming Spirit. Let us not delay. Let us proceed now.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you. We've had two against and two for. Some one wish to speak in favor of the amendment? Green card, mike 4.

SCOTT JONES (North Texas): I yearn for a church that is much more effective in more places and in more ways than we are now. I yearn for a church that is more truly global, one where evangelism is more effective in reaching the unchurched, where there is a stronger witness against racism in society and within our church; a church that is more effective in our social action to fight poverty and other forms of injustice; for a church that is dynamic and culturally relevant in its worship in better ways than we are now, one that encourages small groups for Bible study and spiritual formation. In short, a church that has lived into the mission statement which we adopted the last General Conference. The committee's report makes no reference to the mission statement of the church. That ought to be guiding our transformational leadership. Also, then, I have to ask "Who do I trust most to lead us in this transformational period? Do I trust an agency that's been around for 28 years and has an investment in the status quo? Or do I trust people that will be elected in our central and jurisdictional conferences to lead us in the future?" I urge us to support the amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: Okay, I'm gonna look in the back. You wish to speak against the amendment? Pink card. It's easy to see a pink card in the middle of yellow ones there. You in the back, mike 8.

DAVID SEVERE (Oklahoma): I speak against this amendment. The General Council on Ministries is the only agency except for the Council of Bishops that now has representation on it from every annual conference. We are being proposed to approve something that would take very few people to make very magnanimous decisions on our behalf. We need the centrality of the General Council on Ministries. I would point out to you that the CPT was not an in-

sider group. It was named and it has functioned outside. And we did not like what they brought. We did not like the very small group they were proposing. We have rightly chosen a better way. Please defeat this amendment.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, you've three for and three against the amendment. According to your rules we take the vote after we hear from the chair and the committee.

TOM JACKSON (North Georgia): Bishop, the transformational leadership team by any other name sounds like a rather exclusive group and it sounds a lot like a study committee. Our calendar item places this responsibility within the GCOM's regular work including two responsibilities already assigned by the *Book of Discipline* 906.12 "to study the connective structures of the church" and 906.19 "to assure inclusion of central conferences and its members within the life of the church." The amendment for a proposed separate study team does not provide support for ongoing staff. It only provides that agency staff are to be consultants as needed. A group of this importance could not function effectively without adequate staff support and the GCOM has the staff in place to do this. The GCOM is prepared to carry out this assignment within the resources provided in its quadrennial budget. And I believe one group would be cheaper than two.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. We are ready to vote then? What's before you is the Casad Amendment. If you are ready to vote you can press one for "yes" for the amendment, two for "no." Please vote when the light appears. And the motion is defeated. [Yes, 226; No, 677] We're back to the main motion. Pink card, mike 4.

PAUL ERVIN (North Georgia): I move to amend Petition 31967 as amended, Calendar Item 836 by deleting everything that follows the paragraph that ends with the words, "All levels of the general church shall begin to live out these transformational directions," except the penultimate paragraph, the next to last paragraph, which reads, "In order to be good stewards of the time and money invested in the CPT report, it and all its related research are forwarded to the General Council on Ministries with deep appreciation as resource material for its ongoing work."

BISHOP MUTTI: Is there second? I hear second. Can you help us find the page where the deletion is to be again?

ERVIN: If you'll look in DCA 2059, p. 2059.

BISHOP MUTTI: It's in the printed amendment that comes with committee?

ERVIN: Yes. 836 is the item. What I'm suggesting is that we keep, down to the, it's about the third paragraph after the numbered items. You see 1,2,3,4 and 5. We keep that and that last paragraph that says, "These valuable principles and ideas need to be brought to life at every level of The United Methodist Church over the next quadrennium. Each organizational level of the church, from the local church through all levels of the general church, should begin to live out these transformational directions." It would eliminate everything else except for the next-to-last paragraph on the next page which reads, "In order to be good stewards of the time and money invested in the CPT report, it and all its related research are forwarded to the GCOM, with deep appreciation, as resource materials for its ongoing work." The last paragraph would not be included which would have a report coming back from the Council on Ministries to our group. Might I speak to the amendment?

BISHOP MUTTI: Yes.

ERVIN: That was in response.

BISHOP MUTTI: You've about taken your time.

ERVIN: Well, very quickly, the affect of this amendment would be to thank the wonderful work that our friends have done and I have many friends on the CPT, Council, and on this committee, the presenter's from my conference. But, many of us in the church feel that we need to go bottom down, not bottom down, but bottom up. Let's let these great things that have been suggested go back to our local churches and annual conferences and if there is reason to bring petitions back, let's bring it back from them on the floor. Let's don't spend another four years. This was n't the first four years we've studied structures. Let's not worry about the location of the chairs. Let's worry about leading this ship to safe waters.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you very much. The Ervin motion is before you. Those of you in the back, one of you with the orange card wish to speak in opposition? Come to mike 7. Let me suggest that when you put up a lot of cards way in the back, you kind of alternate speakers. So we have a variety of voices in the conference.

AILEEN L. WILLIAMS (Minnesota): I speak in opposition to this amendment. What the amendment actually does is take out of the heart of the work that has been done, not only in the CPT the last four years, but in the legislative committee. It was quite a remarkable thing for the legislative committee to take the understanding that we have to put some outcomes or some expectations in front of what ever group is going

to work on these ideas to say, "We want to see some results at the end of four years in 2004 in relationship to how our general church operates." It always intrigues me that we assume that because people we elect throughout the church come and sit on a general agency, they are no more part of the grass roots. That we put them in a hierarchical position and say, "This is n't us." But most of us in this room have had experience working with our brothers and sisters from across the church in variety of settings and we know we always bring with us our understandings of what it means to be long to a local congregation. I urge this group not to nullify the hard work that's been done and trust that we can put some outcomes in front of the GCOM and say, "We expect you to work on these things in the next four years."

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you a speech in opposition. Come down to this section some one wish to speak for the Ervin Motion—amendment. It may have emotion to it, but it's really an amendment. Green card, come to mike 2. Speaking in favor.

TERRELL SESSUMS (Florida): I have watched the work of the CPT. I think they have done some very creative work and given many new ideas about the direction of the church. But I tend to agree with my colleague that made the motion. I think we need to have a period of time in which to digest and consider what they've done. I don't believe that we need to have an agency of the church or any group continue with this on a formal basis. One of the virtues of our connection is [that] we have in recent years given our annual conferences a great deal of flexibility to work out programs of effective ministry. I think that that process is still unfolding. I think that four years from now we'll be in a much better position to profit from that experience, and to perhaps find some ways to simplify the suggestions of the CPT team, in a way that would not, as some of us fear, would substantially confuse and destabilize much of the work of the church, in attempting to make a well-conceived transition. So, I would support Mr. Ervin's motion. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, we've had two speeches for and one against. Any one in this section who wishes to speak against. A pink card, come to mike 2.

MINERVA CARCAÑO (Rio Grande): I apologize for my voice on this afternoon. I want to speak against the amendment. The section that is being removed through the amendment, or that were to be removed through the amendment, actually goes contrary to the concept of assisting and being in touch with local congregations. This section is about supporting local congregations.

We have said that our general agencies need to find ways to reconnect with our local congregations. We're asking the General Council on Ministries to help facilitate that process. We have taken action in the previous General Conference to allow local congregations and annual conferences a greater degree of flexibility, but they have gotten stuck with the Judicial Council. They need some assistance. And one of the points that would be removed would be that request to have GCOM walk with those annual conferences and those local congregations as they move towards greater flexibility. When we talk about our local congregations, we're not talking just about local congregations in this country. We're talking about local congregations in other parts of the world. We must continue to dialogue about the global nature of our church. We've been about study for eight years. This is a good opportunity to move to take some action to be in support of local congregations, of annual conferences and to model a different way of being the church by visioning together for our future. Thank you.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you. You've had two speeches for, and two against. You could vote, but you can have one more for and one more against. Pink card in the back section. Mike 6. Do you wish to speak in favor?

JANET STEPHENSON (Iowa): I am making an amendment to the amendment on behalf of Yong Lee who was a member of the Connectional Process Team. In the next to the last paragraph that begins with the words, "In order to be good stewards," after the phrase, "research are forwarded to the GCOM," the amendment would be, "to be used as a guide for its continuing work." If I could have a second I would speak to that.

BISHOP LOONEY: Is there support? Yes, there is. Give us your name again.

STEPHENSON: This is really a friendly amendment, I think. But the concern of Yong Lee was that if you say the team report is to be used as resource material that it will sit on a shelf some place, never to see the light of day again. "To be used as a guide in ongoing work" would indicate that the material would have a life that would extend beyond this conference.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, what's before you now is the amendment to the Ervin amendment. With that one speech in favor, is there someone who wishes to speak against? It'll stop whistling in a minute here. Against over here, green card. I don't think that's my hearing aid. Mike 3.

PATRICK STREIFF (Switzerland-France): I think even the amendment of the

amendment is not a better thing than what the commission of the legislative committee proposes you in or i gin. We realize the importance of the five transformational directions. And the question is not whether you think you have to start from the bottom up or from upside down. The question is, whether we really give a mandate to a body of the church to work with these transformational directions. If we do not do it, we can all go home and say what wonderful five transformational directions we have had at General Conference and then everyone for gets about it. We need to have a body that has a mandate to work with these transformational directions, that's the first point which we will lose with the amendment and the amendment of the amendment. And the second point we will lose is that we continue to discuss about the nature of the global church and how we can go on to be more global in the way we live as a General Conference. And therefore, I would really support the proposition as it comes from the legislative committee.

BISHOP LOONEY: All right, we're speaking to the Stephenson amendment to the Ervin amendment. We've had a speech for and a speech against. Way in the back, or angle card, mike 8.

BISHOP MUTTI: Are you speaking against, for, or . . .

J.N. HOWARD (Holston): Neither

BISHOP MUTTI: Mike 8. All right.

HOWARD: I move the previous question on all that's before us.

BISHOP MUTTI: No, we have to have opportunity for two speeches for and against before we can have the previous question motion. Yes, you have another question, mike 8?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I move to suspend the rules, that we go on with the action now on all that's before us?

BISHOP MUTTI: Well, the chair would suggest that we have n't even debated the main motion yet. But, maybe it's in order. If you want to make that motion, we'll see what the conference thinks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll try it.

BISHOP MUTTI: The motion is to suspend the rules, takes two-thirds, is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seconded.

BISHOP MUTTI: Will you suspend the rules so that we can have the previous question put? Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 668; No, 227] Well, the conference has voted to do that. And the question that's before you is the previous question motion, then. We'll give you a chance to—yeah, OK.

Previous question would end debate on all that's before us, as I understood the maker of the motion, so that if you approve this, we move immediately to a vote on Calendar Item 836. If you support the previous question, press 1; if you do not, press 2. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 717; No, 184] And you have supported the previous question.

We'll turn to Tom Jackson for summary from the committee.

JACKSON: Thank you, Bishop Mutti. I think that those on the floor have spoken eloquently and well. I do want to point out that we have just discovered an editorial printing error in Item No. 3, at the top of page 2060. Let me read that language to you from the actual petition so you have it for your records. Number 3 should read, "To determine the most effective design for the work of the general agencies and to provide implementing legislation to the 2004 General Conference." That's the petition as it was submitted, that seems to be a misprint in the DCA.

(Continued Next Issue)

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

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

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

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

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

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

KATHIAUSTINMAHLE (Minnesota): Thank you Bishop; General Conference members. We have an other constitutional amendment that we need to—

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

MAHLE: Excuse me?

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

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

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

(Laughter)

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

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

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

MAHLE That's correct. Please scratch the word for merely. Please delete it.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, you'll note that correction. Any one else wish to speak to it? This is a constitutional matter, so it takes two-thirds. The recommendation is concurrency as amended. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 865; No, 32] And you have approved it with the needed majority.

MAHLE: Thank you very much.

BISHOP MUTTI: Thank you, Kathi.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. Dr. Johnson.

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

The first one is the United Methodist Committee on Research and Planning, and

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

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

Finally, the last two would be the General Council on Ministries Office of Research, which is currently in place but this office could function in the next quadrennium. And finally, the piece that you might find the most exciting would be item #4, which is the United Methodist Central Conference Forum on Research. One of the issues that continually is facing the General Council on Ministries and faces the denomination is that of ten times we base many of our decisions without adequately done research prior to doing that. And particularly, if we begin to look at the myriad of issues that face central conferences, one might be, "How does the church address issues in a closed communist society?" When we look in situations of the Africa Central Conference, what are the needs for leadership as we look at a post-war situation? As we look in Asia, what does it mean to develop leadership, as we look at global economic structures? And so the ability to have a coordinated and collaborative research project that is developed within the denomination where we can share and use those resources.

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

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

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

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

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

BISHOP MUTTI: We will ask the committee.

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

WERLEIN: That is the half-million dollars in round figures that I had noticed and it seems to me that given the numbers of items that we are already asking GCFA to examine in the millions of dollars, over and above the 0-0-1-2% increase that GCFA has recommended at the outset, we need at some point to begin to bring some disciplinary thought to our voting and I'd rather suspect that the kind of research that we need to do at our local churches and annual conferences and at the general church can be done at the established church, conference, and general boards and agencies with the other apportioned funds that we are expected to vote for them. I would be inclined to think that this might be one of those areas where we could begin to take note of how much more we're adding to this budget. In stead of going up 3.5% over the quadrennium, if we do all of the things that are being proposed, that I understand are between \$50-70 million, we will be talking about increased apportionments of 15% and 20% and those conferences under the new proposed plan that are expecting to have no apportionments or reduced apportionments are not going to have any reductions. Other conferences are going to have staggering increases. I would suggest we vote no on this one.

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

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

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

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

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, the Harnish amendment is before you any one wish to speak against it. I take it you are ready to vote? The Harnish Amendment is before you, please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 589; No, 290] And it carries and you have amended the main motion that comes from the committee then. We are back to the main motion as it is amended. We had one speech for and one against, but now we have a different motion. Yes, over here, mike 1.

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

BISHOP MUTTI: All right, speech against. Any one wish to speak for it? The pink card in the back, Come to mike 3 please.

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

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

ELIZABETH FENNER (Missouri West): I have a question. If this is approved,

would this research plan replace the research that is being done by such agencies as the General Board of Global Ministries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HARMAN: I direct the General Conference's attention to page 2158 consent Calendar Item 1379. And under the previous rule I just mentioned a moment ago at this

time I would call Sam Wynn to give information about this item.

WYNN: Bishop, at the 1996 General Conference, GCOM was mandated to provide a coordinating role for an interagency report for the National United Methodist Native American Center. In September of 1998, GCOM, along with the directors of the board of NUMNAC, prepared projected budgets and funding processes based on the ministry of this center for the 21st century. And after these projections were put together there was consultation that took place with GCF&A as well as with the Board of Higher Education and Ministry in addition to the General Board of Global Ministries. The results of the consultation brought about a review of the ministry for the center for the quadrennium, enabling the center to project where its vision would be for the future. And in light of those projected ministries and funding requests, a renewed funding proposal was presented to the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, GCF&A, General Board of Global Ministries as well as to BHEM. And as a result of that, we bring this petition to you for support of the National United Methodist Native American Center for the new quadrennium. Bishop, I would encourage the conference to remember that this is a center that is supported by the entire church. And we have finally moved to the level in the church where its becoming an inter-agency center for the purpose of recruiting, training, employing, and engaging Native American ministries in our denomination.

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

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

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

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

agree to this kind of recommendation. I need some help from the chair of the committee that will give us a rationale that makes this understandable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

want to give us a brief word on that Christine?

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

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

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

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

(Pause)

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

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

(Pause)

NANCY L. DENARDO (West Virginia): I sat in this subsection and we debated many different dates, but we came back to the date in April based on the wording in our *Book of Discipline* in Section 268, Heritage Sunday, and it is that, "Heritage Sunday shall be observed on April 23, the day of 1968, when The United Methodist Church was created by the union of The Evangelical United Brethren Church and The Methodist Church." And the reason being, we did not want to particularly lift up the May date and just Wesleyan tradition because there are so many heritages of our church, including our black churches, that we felt could be encompassed by staying with the date in April.

BISHOP MUTTI: All right. In support of the committee's recommendation of nonconcurrency, if anyone else wishes to speak, we've had one for and one against. All right, I think you're ready to vote. The recommendation is nonconcurrency. You push one if you wish to support the committee.

tee, two if you do not. Please vote when the light appears. [Yes, 754; No, 135] And you've supported the committee's recommendation.

HARMON: That concludes our presentation this afternoon.

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

CAROLYN MARSHALL: This is Judicial Council decision No. 888. It is the request from the General Conference for a

declaratory decision on the meaning, application and effect of the adoption of Petition 31789 as it relates to the election of a person to the Judicial Council to fill the remaining four years of an existing eight-year term. The conclusion to which the Judicial Council came is this. The General Conference by its own action in the adoption of Petition 31789 GJ 2602D has negated the election of the person to fill the remaining four years of the eight-year term.

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

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

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

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

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