

MEETING NOTES
Conference Call
May 19, 2010

Participants in the call: Bonnie Anderson, President of the House of Deputies, Kevin Babb, Very Rev. Carol Barron, Rev. Walter Brownridge, William Cathcart, Bp. Robert Fitzpatrick, Brad Foster, Joan Geiszler-Ludlum, Vice Chair, Steve Hutchinson, Mary Kostel, Sally Johnson, invited guest, Marc Smith, Kathleen Wells.

Not present and excused: Diane Sammons, Chair, due to telephone connection difficulties, Bp. Dorsey Henderson, Bp. Samuel Howard Johnson, Rev. Juan Antonio Rosario de la Cruz, Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori, Presiding Bishop.

Vice Chair Joan Geiszler-Ludlum opened the call with prayer at 4:06pm.

The Vice Chair checked the roll to verify those who were present for the call. A translator was present to assist Rev. Rosario but he had not joined the call at this point. The translator suggested, and the participants agreed, that she would stay with the call for 15 minutes and then disconnect if her services were not needed.

1. The group spent a few minutes checking in, then proceeded with the agenda.
2. The minutes of the March Conference Call were next considered. On motion by Bill Cathcart, seconded by Bonnie Anderson, the minutes were approved as submitted.
3. Reports on Old Business
 - a. A052 Voting Authority of Retired Bishops – Bill Cathcart reported the historical documents related to this item are now posted on the SCCC Extranet site. He asked the subcommittee (Henderson, Cathcart, Babb, Kostel and Brownridge) to review these and he will convene a conference call for further discussion. Bishop Fitzpatrick was asked for his observations from the House of Bishops discussion that resulted in this referral back to SCCC. He reported that there was a sea change of opinion from younger/newer bishops who were lacking awareness of the total history because they are new to General Convention and the House of Bishops. The majority of retired bishops are willing to surrender the vote. It was an emotional moment influenced

by the gracious presence of Bishop Barbara Harris. Bishop Fitzpatrick felt the education process will continue. Those who have participated in the previous discussions were ready to approve the amendment as presented, but deferred as a courtesy to the newer bishops.

Bill Cathcart noted that the definition of a quorum remains an issue. Mary Kostel pointed out the companion issue of D081, Consistency of Bishops Voting, should perhaps be considered along with A052, and there was agreement with that suggestion. D081 is assigned to Bp. Fitzpatrick, Diane Sammons and Joan Geiszler-Ludlum.

- b. Anglican Covenant – Steve Hutchinson led the discussion. He suggested that he set up an on line discussion on the various concerns. This suggestion was well received.

Mary Kostel asked for clarification of what SCCC is being asked to do regarding the Anglican Covenant draft. She stated her understanding as two-fold:

Can General Convention consider signing onto the proposed Anglican Covenant without changing the Constitution and Canons of TEC?

What provisions of the Constitution and Canons need to be changed to accommodate approval of the Covenant?

Walter Brownridge noted that New Zealand recently expressed their consent to Parts 1, 2 and 3, but objected to Part 4 as currently written.

Steve Hutchinson asked whether we are persuaded that Parts 1, 2 and 3 do not pose some Constitution and Canon issues? He offered to frame and monitor an on line discussion, listing specific concerns and note what challenges need to be reviewed.

Joan Geiszler-Ludlum asked whether this issue lies within SCCC's mandate. It was agreed that since this was a specific request from Executive Council and related to identification of Constitution and Canons issues, it is covered by the Commission's mandate.

Brad Foster pointed out the dissonance between the Anglican Covenant and TEC polity as an area of concern.

Steve Hutchinson will proceed with an on line discussion for the Commission members.

- c. B008 Extending SC Authority over Trusts – Bishop Fitzpatrick reported on his discussion with Bishop Mark Sisk, clarifying his concerns. Bishop Sisk’s concern centers on parishes spending down their endowments without the awareness of the Diocese. In some cases this is a symptom of disintegration of the parish with the Diocese becoming aware too late. Bishop Sisk knows what he wants but is not sure how to get there.

Kathleen Wells posted Bishop Sisk’s proposal on the Extranet for SCCC. The concern is the proposal gives too much authority to the Diocese to “meddle” in parish funds. However, the proposal is parallel to control of real property. She raised the question whether there are definitions in the Manual of Business Practices that might help, or is it possible to set a threshold.

Bishop Fitzpatrick noted the additional tension with parish authority over unrestricted funds. He has seen situations where the parish spends the money to keep the rector in place. Kathleen Wells noted the proposal is narrower in its effect. Bishop Fitzpatrick called it “a canonical provision for the stupid.” The wider issue is healthy v. unhealthy congregations.

Steve Hutchinson reported that the issue came up before the Legislative Committee on Canons with a concern for use as a weapon against “rogue” or dissenting congregations. Bishop Fitzpatrick said it is rather more an issue of spending down the endowment, leaving a parish with nothing when a rector retires. Steve Hutchinson said that currently there is no way for such spending to show up sooner.

Kathleen Wells suggested adding a sentence authorizing the Diocese to enact provisions for reporting and monitoring endowment funds, patterned after Canon I.7.2 which mandates that Dioceses enact canons to give effect to the standard business practices of Canon I.7.1. Carol Barron added that the Parochial Report should be showing if parishes are using endowment funds to support operating expenses.

Kathleen Wells will revise the draft and review it with Bishop Sisk.

d. D066 Official Youth Presence Vote – **[Mark: Since I was talking, I do not have many notes on this discussion. – Joan]**

Joan Geiszler-Ludlum outlined a plan to send a request for comment to a number of persons who were involved in the discussion during General Convention, to further identify the issues and concerns and gather ideas on how those issues and concerns might be addressed by revisions to the proposal. A chief concern is the one articulated by Sally Johnson and Joe Ferrell, that it provides for a “special constituency” which has been avoided in the past. Other concerns are the number of votes (Youth Presence is 18 representatives, two per Province) which are not balanced by clergy votes, the selection process for the representatives (appointed/selected v. elected), and how to address their role in a vote by orders.

The list for possible commentators includes:

Sam Gould, Deputy from Massachusetts, the Proposer

Rev (now Bishop) Brian Prior, endorser

Rev. Altagracia Perez, endorser

2009 Official Youth Presence via Cookie Cantwell, coordinator

Joe Ferrell, Deputy from North Carolina, movant of referral to a CCAB

Richard Hogue, Deputy and member of Legislative Committee on Structure

PHoD Bonnie Anderson noted that when the current provisions of the House of Deputies Rules of Order providing for the Official Youth Presence were drafted and adopted, she never imagined that the Youth Presence would have a vote.

Walter Brownridge, Bill Cathcart and Joan Geiszler-Ludlum will continue work on gathering and reviewing the input and develop a proposal for further consideration.

- e. A123 Discipline Process Clarification (Churches in Europe and Micronesia) – Bishop Fitzpatrick is working with Bishop Pierre Whalon who is looking into the concept of establishing the Convocation of Churches in Europe as a Missionary Diocese of TEC. He is waiting to hear from Bishop Whalon on his progress with that direction.

- f. A127 Structure of General Convention – Brad Foster directed the members to the May 13, 2010 memo from PHoD Anderson, Sally Johnson and himself outlining the history of Rules of Order reviews prior to and since GC 2009. The memo lists a number of suggested measures for discussion going forward. An online forum is planned for June to solicit wider feedback and ideas on streamlining GC 2012. They will report the results at the August meeting.

Thus far, the discussion has been unilateral, focusing on the Rules of the House of Deputies. How can SCCC involve the House of Bishops in the review and discussion? Mary Kostel reported that the Presiding Bishop has begun discussion with the House of Bishops Officers, along with David Beers and Bishop Clay Matthews. Bishop Fitzpatrick suggested involving Dispatch and VP of House of Bishops and also consulting the former VP, Bishop Chang. PHoD Anderson noted that she has already had some discussion with the PB about presenting remarks from invited guests by video which can then be worked in during a lull. It will remain difficult to limit the length of their remarks. Mary Kostel and Bishop Fitzpatrick will continue to coordinate efforts on the HOB side.

- g. White and Dykman – Joan Geiszler-Ludlum reported on her recent conversation with Bob Royce on progress of the updates. SCCC reviewed updates of the Constitution, Titles I, II and V in the previous Triennium and authorized their publication after final editing. After the final versions were sent to Anne Karoly for final editing, she left her position and has not been replaced. Joan urged and encouraged Bob to work with Mark Duffy of the Archives, where Bob now serves on the Board, to make these updates available through the Archives as soon as possible as previously discussed. Bob is waiting for publication of the 2009 General Convention Journal to update these before posting.

Updates for Titles III and IV are more problematic. These Titles were so completely restructured that the present format, reflecting incorporation of legislative changes into the canonical structure, would require too much rearranging. Further, the revisions reflect different theologies and philosophies from the past. Bob Royce is considering possibly an exposition only based on the Blue Book reports, rather than the current annotation format. Joan discussed with Bob the idea of a committee of folks who have been closely involved in Title IV revisions since 1994 to write a commentary. Bob responded favorably to participating in such an effort.

Mary Kostel raised the concern that has arisen in the context of the on going property litigation: just what exactly is White & Dykman? Is it a helpful historical document but not an official statement of policy and interpretation? Is it authoritative on questions of policy and interpretation? She asked that SCCC consider saying what it is, clarifying that it is commentary. Sally Johnson raised the concern that the updates need some sort of independent review.

- h. [Duplicate of item f]
- i. Canon III.12.5 (b) correction – Joan Geiszler-Ludlum reviewed the draft of the technical correction to Canon III.12.5 (b) regarding certification of medical, psychological and psychiatric condition before assuming the role of Assistant Bishop.
- j. Renunciation – due to the hour, this item was deferred to the scheduled August telephone conference call.

Next Conference Call is scheduled for August 18 from 4:00pm to 6:00pm EDT. The items scheduled for discussion include:

1. Renunciation (Mary Kostel)
2. A056 Consistency in the Certification Process of Bishops (Diane Sammons)
3. A100 Liturgical Translation (Diane)
4. D081 Consistency in Bishop Voting Procedure (Robert Fitzpatrick, Diane and Joan)
5. Follow up with Ruth Meyers of SCLM and Liturgical Resources (Diane)
6. A121 Procedure for Election of PB (Kevin Babb)