

Part III

**Interim Meetings
of the House of Bishops**

Meeting of the House of Bishops
Camp Allen, Texas
March 19–24, 2010

Wednesday
March 24, 2010

Call to Order

The business meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the Presiding Bishop, the Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori. This meeting followed Morning Prayer, which sufficed for the opening devotions.

Roll Call

The roll of bishops registered was called. Fifty-four bishops were needed for a quorum and 107 were present.

RECESS

The meeting recessed at noon for lunch and continued into the afternoon.

Recognition of the Senior Bishop

The Senior Bishop present was the Rt. Rev. David Reed.

Reading of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

A motion was made to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last business session, held at General Convention, 2009.

Motion passed

Change in Status

The following officially recorded acts since the last Convention were announced:

New Consecrations

The Rt. Rev. Luis Ruiz, Bishop of Ecuador Central
The Rt. Rev. Lawrence Provenzano, Bishop Coadjutor of Long Island
The Rt. Rev. John Tarrant, Bishop Coadjutor of South Dakota
The Rt. Rev. Scott Benhase, Bishop of Georgia
The Rt. Rev. Brian Prior, Bishop of Minnesota

Elections, consents received

Michael Hanley, Oregon
Ian Douglas, Connecticut

Elections, consents not yet received

Morris Thompson, Louisiana
Diane Bruce, Los Angeles, Suffragan
Mary Glasspool, Los Angeles, Suffragan
Andrew Waldo, Upper South Carolina

Status Changes

The Rt. Rev. Wilfrido Ramos-Orench, Ecuador Central, Resigned Provisional Bishop
The Rt. Rev Peter Lee, Virginia, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Shannon Johnston, Virginia, Coadjutor to Diocesan
The Rt, Rev, Orris Walker, Long Island, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Lawrence Provenzano, Long Island, Coadjutor to Diocesan
The Rt. Rev. Creighton Robertson, South Dakota, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev. John Tarrant, South Dakota, Coadjutor to Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Dorsey Henderson, Upper South Carolina, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Charles Jenkins, Louisiana, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Bavi Rivera, Olympia, Resigned Suffragan
The Rt. Rev Andrew Smith, Connecticut, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, Peter Beckwith, Springfield, Resigned Diocesan
The Rt. Rev, James Jelinek, Minnesota, Resigned Diocesan

Appointments of Bishops serving other Dioceses

The Rt. Rev. Kenneth Price, Pittsburgh, Provisional Bishop
The Rt. Rev. Wallis Ohl, Fort Worth, Provisional Bishop

Necrology

The Rt. Rev. Robert O. Miller, Resigned Bishop of Alabama
The Rt. Rev. Robert M. Hatch, resigned Bishop of Western Massachusetts
The Rt. Rev. John B. Coburn; resigned Bishop of Massachusetts, former President of the House of Deputies
The Rt. Rev. James D. Warner, resigned Bishop of Nebraska
The Rt. Rev. John H. Burt, resigned Bishop of Ohio
The Rt. Rev. C. Charles Vaché, resigned Bishop of Southern Virginia
The Rt. Rev. Robert Rowley, Jr., resigned Bishop of Northwestern Pennsylvania

Point of Order

The Rt. Rev. James Wagoner, speaking for the Pastoral Development Committee, reviewed Rules of Order XXIV, XXV and XXVI regarding membership and those eligible to vote in the House of Bishops and clarified the difference between voting members, collegial members and honorary members.

Election of Bishop for Federal Ministries

Balloting for the Bishop for Federal Ministries was conducted. Interviews of the eight nominees had been held earlier in the meeting on March 19.

Results of Ballot #1 for Election of Bishop for Federal Ministries:

107 Ballots cast, 54 needed to elect

The Rev. Carl Andrews	19
The Rev. Canon Robert Certain	6
The Rev. James Magness	35
The Very Rev. Richard Martindale	7
The Very Rev. Babs Meairs	12
The Rev. C. Christopher Thompson	10
The. Rev. John Weatherly	6
The Rev. Carl Wright	12

Results of Ballot #2 for Election of Bishop for Federal Ministries:

106 Ballots cast, 54 needed to elect

The Rev. Carl Andrews	19
The Rev. Canon Robert Certain	1
The Rev. James Magness	64
The Very Rev. Richard Martindale	1
The Very Rev. Babs Meairs	6
The Rev. C. Christopher Thompson	5
The. Rev. John Weatherly	4
The Rev. Carl Wright	6

A phone call was placed to the nominee, and the Rev. James Magness accepted the election as the Bishop for Federal Ministries. The bishops present signed his testimonial.

Religious Communities

The Rt. Revs. Russell Jacobus, Mark Sisk and Barry Howell then led the House in a discussion of Anchorites/Solitaries in the Episcopal Church. Bishops were directed to a paper, The Eremitic Monastic Vocation, a brief description of vowed solitary life by the Rev. Sister Judith Schenck. Bishops were reminded to return surveys on this subject which had been distributed.

Resignations

The Rt. Rev. Neil Alexander reported for the Committee on Consecrations and Resignations and presented the following for approval of resignation:

The Rt. Rev. Chester Talton as Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles
The Rt. Rev. Sergio Corranza, as Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles

Motion passed

The Rt. Rev. Neil Alexander then gave a brief report on the Episcopal Transitions Project.

Bishop of Navajoland Area Mission

Balloting was conducted for the election of the Bishop of Navajoland. The Rev. Canon David Bailey had been chosen by forty delegates from the Church in Navajoland and the House of Bishops was being asked to affirm this choice. The Rev. Canon David Bailey was affirmed as the Bishop of Navajoland, with 105 voting in the affirmative and one abstention. All bishops who voted signed the testimonial. The bishops with jurisdiction were then asked to sign consent forms for his consecration.

The Rt. Rev. Mark Sisk gave a report on the General Theological Seminary, reporting that the debt of that seminary had been reduced by two-thirds. The Rt. Rev. Michie Klusmeyer then expressed a need for clarity and more accountability and in the interest of entering into an ongoing conversation offered the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the House of Bishops, gathered at Camp Allen March 24, 2010, call upon the Board of Trustees and Administration of the General Theological Seminary to enter more fully into an open and deep conversation with members of this House about its financial, temporal and spiritual realities, so that this body may more fully support, encourage and pray for the General Theological Seminary.

Motion passed
Resolution adopted

A letter had been introduced to and affirmed by the House earlier in the meeting so that it could be sent to those concerned, and was now officially introduced for ratification by the House during its business session. The Rt. Rev. Wayne Wright, chair of the Committee on Dispatch of Business, moved acceptance.

Motion passed
Letter ratified

March 20, 2010
Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindsfarne

To the People of the Episcopal Diocese of El Salvador

Grace and peace to you in Christ Jesus who is our hope and our salvation

We write to you from Navasota, Texas, where we gather as a House of Bishops of The Episcopal Church, to express our solidarity with you and our condemnation of the attempted assassination of our brother bishop, Martin Barahona, and his companions on Wednesday evening. We hold everyone involved in our prayers, Bishop Martin and those assaulted with him, particularly Francis Martinez, as he recovers from his wound, the families of the victims; all who are more fearful in the wake of this violence, the perpetrators of this act, those who assisted him; and those who were passive in response.

As we prepare to commemorate the life and ministry of Archbishop Romero on the thirtieth anniversary of his martyrdom, we know too well the cost that can be paid for being a servant of Christ. We fear that those who can prevent a repeat of this heinous act will be too slow to respond. We call upon the civil authorities, particularly the Department of Justice, to promptly investigate, apprehend, and bring to justice those who are responsible for this crime.

We stand in steadfast solidarity and love with our brother Martin and all the people of the Diocese of El Salvador. The apostle Paul said, "If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it." Indeed, today we suffer with Bishop Martin and the people of El Salvador. We pray that through our solidarity and the resolve of those who carry the responsibility for civil order that we will one day soon rejoice with all our brothers and sisters in El Salvador when their land has become a place of Shalom.

In the hope found in Christ,

The House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church

A report was given to the bishops on the revisions of Title IV by Duncan Bayne, Esq.

The Bishops gratefully acknowledged the discussion that had occurred during this meeting on the Anglican Covenant and noted especially contributions made by Dr. Kathy Grieb.

It was also noted that discussion on the Emergent Church with Phyllis Tickle, Diana Butler-Bass, Karen Ward, Tom Brackett and Stephanie Spellers had also been a significant contribution to this meeting.

Finally, thanks were given to the Theology Committee for its work and appreciation expressed for the session, held earlier in the meeting and chaired by the Rt. Rev. Henry Parsley and to Dr. Willis Jenkins, the Rev. Dr. Grant LeMarquand and Dr. Ellen Charry who formed a panel for that report.

The Rt. Rev. Pierre Whalon offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Bishops thank the Theology Committee of the House for overseeing the creation of the document “Same-sex Relationships in the Church”; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Bishops direct the Theology Committee to build upon the foundation of that work and present to the House a second document that lays out exegetical and theological grounds for a new teaching of the Church concerning same-sex relationships; and be it further

Resolved, That this document be submitted to the House for consideration in such timely fashion that this House could, if so desires, after consideration, present it to the 2012 General Convention for approval; and be it further

Resolved, That the Theology Committee work in consultation with the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music as that body collects theological and liturgical resources for same sex blessings as mandated by Resolution C056 of the 76th General Convention; and be it further

Resolved, That any such work include effective provisions for the full inclusion of those who may disagree with possible changes to the Church’s official teaching with respect to same sex relationships.

The motion was tabled.

After lengthy discussion, and other motions which were withdrawn, Bishop Whalon offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That, with appreciation to the Theology Committee for its work, the House of Bishops declines to accept the report as a document of this House.

The motion was tabled.

Following this, the concern that this report not be released as the approved work of this House or sent to the Anglican Theological Review was registered and the discussion ended.

One final resolution was then offered by the Rt. Rev. Thomas Breidenthal on the subject of theological education:

The House of Bishops acknowledges the financial crisis that, in varying ways, faces all of our seminaries and recognizes the opportunity for creative solutions offered by this crisis. Such solutions must be sought at a systemic level, with all options on the table, including radical structural change, for the sake of sustainability, forward thinking formation and theological education. The Bishops bear significant responsibility for theological education in the Episcopal Church, and commit themselves to exercise leadership in this church's ongoing conversation regarding the state of our seminaries and to identify and encourage creative solutions with all urgency and dispatch.

Motion passed
Resolution adopted

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
(The Rt. Rev.) Kenneth L. Price Jr.
Secretary

Certified by:
(The Rt. Rev.) Wayne Wright
Chair, Dispatch of Business

(The Rt. Rev.) Don Johnson
Vice Chair, Dispatch of Business

Appendix A
Camp Allen, Texas

Meeting Agenda

Friday, March 19 – MC: Nedi Rivera

- 3:00 p.m. Session I
 - Welcome by the Presiding Bishop
 - Comments from Bishop Price, Secretary of the House of Bishops
- 3:30 p.m. Check In
- 4:00 p.m. Walkabout with Nominees for Bishop Suffragan of Federal Ministries
- 5:30 p.m. Opening Eucharist
- 6:30 p.m. Dinner
- 7:30 p.m. Session II
 - Walkabout Continues
- 9:00 p.m. Hospitality (hosted by the Diocese of Texas)

Saturday, March 20 – MC: Michael Smith

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
- 9:00 a.m. Morning Prayer and Bible Study
- 10:00 a.m. Session III
 - Theology Committee Presentation (with Dr. Ellen T. Charry, Dr. Willis Jenkins, and The Rev. Dr. Grant LeMarquand)
- 12:00 p.m. Holy Eucharist
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
- 2:00 p.m. Session IV
 - Around One Table
- 5:30 p.m. Evening Prayer
- 6:00 p.m. Class Dinners

Sabbath Begins

Sunday, March 21

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
 - 10:00 a.m. Holy Eucharist
 - 11:30 a.m. Brunch
 - 6:00 p.m. Dinner
 - 7:30 p.m. Session V
 - Fireside chat
 - 9:00 p.m. Hospitality
-

Monday, March 22 – MC: Sean Rowe

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
- 9:00 a.m. Morning Prayer and Bible Study
- 10:00 a.m. Session VI
The Emergent Church (with Phyllis Tickle, Diana Butler-Bass, Karen Ward, Tom Brackett, and Stephanie Spellers)
- 12:00 p.m. Noon Prayers
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
- 2:00 p.m. Session VII
The Emergent Church continued
- 4:00 p.m. Workshops
- 5:30 p.m. Eucharist
- 6:30 p.m. Dinner
- 7:45 p.m. Evening Prayer
- 9:00 p.m. Hospitality

Tuesday, March 23 – MC: Victor Scantlebury

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
- 9:00 a.m. Morning
Prayer and Bible Study
- 10:00 a.m. Session VIII
The Emergent Church continued
- 11:45 a.m. Holy Eucharist
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
- 5:30 p.m. Evening Prayer
- 6:00 p.m. Dinner
- 7:30 p.m. Session IX
Town Hall Meeting
Mission Funding (Greg Rickel and Susan McCone)
Anglican Covenant (Kathy Grieb)
- 9:00 p.m. Hospitality

Wednesday, March 24 – MC: Skip Adams

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
 - 9:00 a.m. Morning Prayer and Bible Study
 - 10:00 a.m. Session X
Business Session (includes First Ballot in Federal Ministries election)
 - 11:45 a.m. Holy Eucharist
 - 12:30 p.m. Lunch
 - 2:00 p.m. Session XI
Business Session *continued*
-

	Anglican Covenant conversation
5:30 p.m.	Holy Eucharist (with Renewal of Vows)
6:30 p.m.	Reception and Closing Dinner

Appendix B
Camp Allen, Texas

Bishops Present at the Interim Meeting of Spring 2010

Adams, Gladstone	Harrison, Dena	Prior, Brian
Ahrens, Laura	High, Rayford	Provenzano, Lawrence
Alexander, Neil	Holguin, Julio	Rabb, John
Allen, Lloyd	Hollerith, Herman	Reed, David B.
Alvarez, David	Howard, Samuel	Reed, David M.
Andrus, Marc	Howe, John	Rickel, Gregory
Bauerschmidt, John	Howe, Barry	Rivera, Nedi
Baxter, Nathan	Ihloff, Robert	Robinson, Gene
Beckwith, Mark	Irish, Carolyn	Roskam, Catherine
Beisner, Barry	Jacobus, Russell	Rowe, Sean
Benfield, Larry	Jefferts Schori, Katharine	Ruiz, Luis
Benhase, Scott	Johnston, Shannon	Salmon, Edward
Breidenthal, Thomas	Jones, David	Sauls, Stacy
Brookhart, Franklin	Keyser, Charles	Scantlebury, Victor
Buchanan, John	Klusmeyer, Michie	Scarfe, Alan
Burnett, Joe	Konieczny, Edward	Scruton, Gordon
Caldwell, Bruce	Lai, David	Singh, Prince
Councell, George	Lamb, Jerry	Sisk, Mark
Curry, Michael	Lambert, Paul	Sloan, John
Curry, James	Lane, Stephen	Smith, Wayne
Daniel, Clifton	Lee, Peter	Smith, Michael
Douglas, Ian	Lee, Jeff	Smith, Kirk
Doyle, C. Andrew	Lillibridge, Gary	Smith, Dabney
Duncan, Philip	Little, Edward	Sutton, Eugene
Duque, Francisco	Love, William	Tarrant, John
Duracin, Zache	MacPherson, Bruce	Taylor, Porter
Edwards, Dan	Marble, Chip	Thom, Brian
Ely, Thomas	Marray, Santosh	Thompson, Morris
Fitzpatrick, Robert	Mathes, James	vonRosenberg, Charles
Frey, William	Matthews, Clayton	Waggoner, James
Gallagher, Carol	Mayer, J. Scott	Waldo, W. Andrew
Garrison, Michael	Miller, Steven	Waynick, Catherine
Gepert, Robert	Morante, Alfredo	Whalon, Pierre
Gibbs, Wendell	O'Neill, Robert	Whitmore, Keith
Gray, Duncan	Ousley, Todd	Williams, Arthur
Gray-Reeves, Mary	Parsley, Henry	Wimberly, Don
Gulick, Edwin	Payne, Claude	Wolfe, Dean
Hanley, Michael	Powell, Neff	Wright, Wayne
Harris, Barbara	Price, Kenneth	
Harris, Gayle	Price, Peter	

Appendix C
Camp Allen, Texas

Changes in Status

Newly Consecrated Bishops

Bishops who have been consecrated since the meeting of the 76th General Convention, held in Anaheim, California, July 8–17, 2009:

August 1, 2009	Luis Ruiz Bishop of Central Ecuador
September 19, 2009	Lawrence Provenzano Bishop Coadjutor of Long Island
October 31, 2009	John Tarrant Bishop Coadjutor of South Dakota
January 23, 2010	Scott Benhase Bishop of Georgia
February 13, 2010	Brian Prior Bishop of Minnesota

Necrology

Since the meeting of the 76th General Convention, held in Anaheim, California, July 8–17, 2009, the following bishops have departed this life:

July 16, 2009	The Rt. Rev. Robert M. Hatch Resigned Bishop of Western Massachusetts
August 8, 2009	The Rt. Rev. John B. Coburn Resigned Bishop of Massachusetts and former President of the House of Deputies
September 9, 2009	The Rt. Rev. James D. Warner Resigned Bishop of Nebraska
October 20, 2009	The Rt. Rev. John H. Burt Resigned Bishop of Ohio
November 1, 2009	The Rt. Rev. C. Charles Vaché Resigned Bishop of Southern Virginia
January 18, 2010	The Rt. Rev. Robert Rowley, Jr. Resigned Bishop of Northwestern Pennsylvania

**Meeting of the House of Bishops
Phoenix, Arizona
September 16–22, 2010**

Monday
September 21, 2010

Call to Order

The business meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. by the Presiding Bishop, the Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori.

Roll Call

The Secretary, the Rt. Rev. Kenneth Price, called the roll and declared a quorum to be present to do business. The agenda as distributed was accepted.

Reading of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

A motion was made to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last business session.

Motion carried

Change in Status

The following officially recorded acts since the last Convention were announced:

New Consecrations

The Rt. Rev. Michael Hanley, Bishop of Oregon
The Rt. Rev. Ian Douglas, Bishop of Connecticut
The Rt. Rev. Morris Thompson, Bishop of Louisiana
The Rt. Rev. Diane Bruce, Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles
The Rt. Rev. Mary Glasspool, Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles
The Rt. Rev. Andrew Waldo, Bishop of Upper South Carolina
The Rt. Rev. James Magness, Bishop Suffragan for Federal Ministries
The Rt. Rev. John Smylie, Bishop of Wyoming
The Rt. Rev. David Bailey, Bishop of Navajoland Area Mission
The Rt. Rev. Mark Lattime, Bishop of Alaska

Elections, consents received

Terry White, Kentucky
Michael Vono, Rio Grande
Scott Hayashi, Utah

Resignations

The Rt. Rev. Chester Talton
The Rt. Rev. George Packard
The Rt. Rev. Sergio Carranza

Restorations

The Rt. Rev. Daniel Herzog
The Rt. Rev. Charles Bennison

Necrology

The Rt. Rev. G. Paul Reeves, Resigned Bishop of Georgia
The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Cochrane, Resigned Bishop of Olympia
The Rt. Rev. Harry B. Bainbridge, Resigned Bishop of Idaho

The Presiding Bishop asked for a moment of silence in honor of those deceased.

Special Business of the House

The first order of special business was discussion and of a Pastoral Letter on Immigration.

Three amendments were discussed, two accepted and one failed.

Resolution adopted

Accompanying the letter was a study document prepared by a select committee titled “The Nation and the Common Good; Reflections on Immigration Reform.” The House agreed to include this document not to be read in all congregations, but to accompany the pastoral letter as a theological resource on migration and Immigration.

The House, through the Presiding Bishop, then expressed appreciation to the committee, which had worked throughout the summer, to produce these documents.

A Pastoral Letter on Environment was then introduced but after discussion it was moved and seconded to refer it back to the theological committee for further refinement and to return to a future meeting.

Motion carried

Resolution re-referred to Committee

Mind of the House Resolutions

A Mind of the House resolution was introduced regarding the Rt. Rev. Charles Bennison, bishop of Pennsylvania.

Four amendments were offered, two passed and two failed.

A vote was taken on the final resolution as amended.

Motion carried
Resolution adopted

A Mind of the House resolution appealing for the Rebuilding of the Episcopal Church of Haiti was introduced.

Motion carried
Resolution adopted

Final Text of the Resolution

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, continue to give, work, and pray for the welfare and spiritual needs of the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January, 2010, and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Bishops receives gratefully the draft plans for a \$10 million appeal for the initial "Rebuilding of the Diocese of Haiti" (L'Eglise Episcopale d'Haiti) as developed in response to The Episcopal Church's Executive Council resolution on rebuilding the Diocese of Haiti (February 2010); and be it further

Resolved, That we the bishops of The Episcopal Church commit ourselves to, and call upon our dioceses to participate fully in, the Haiti Appeal initiated by the Executive Council in consultation with L'Eglise Episcopate d'Haiti.

College for Bishops

The Rt. Rev. Neil Alexander then presented two resolutions on behalf of the College for Bishops.

The first regarded non-profit incorporation for the College.

Motion carried
Resolution adopted

Final Text of the Resolution

Resolved, That the House of Bishops requests that the Office of Pastoral Development undertake to incorporate the College for Bishops as a nonprofit educational and religious entity affiliated with The Episcopal Church in such a manner as to make it eligible for exemption from federal income taxation under the Church's group exemption; and be it further

Resolved, That the incorporated entity be governed by a Board of Directors who shall be elected by the House of Bishops upon the nomination of the Presiding Bishop for terms provided in the entity's bylaws. Such elections shall be held annually during a business session of the House at its regularly scheduled fall meeting, or if there is to be no fall meeting, then at the meeting that precedes it. The House shall at any meeting have the authority to elect persons upon the nomination by the Presiding Bishop to fill vacancies

among the Directors to complete unexpired terms. The Presiding Bishop shall have the authority to fill vacancies among the Directors to serve until the next meeting of the House.

And be it further

Resolved, **That all funds received by the College from any source shall be used exclusively for the work of the College pursuant to its charter and bylaws as directed by the Directors; and be it further**

Resolved, **That the consent of the House of Bishops, voting at a regular or special meeting, shall be required for any amendment to the charter of the College and for the adoption of and all amendments to the bylaws of the College; and be it further**

Resolved, **That the bylaws of the College shall provide that the House of Bishops shall have the authority at any regular or special meeting to direct the Directors to dissolve the corporation. Upon dissolution of the College, all funds remaining after satisfying any outstanding obligations of the College shall become the property of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America to be used for the continuing education and training of bishops of this Church and bishops of churches in communion with this Church under the direction of the House of Bishops.**

And be it further

Resolved, **That the College shall report in writing to the House annually and at such other times and by such other means as the House shall direct.**

The second ratified the Board of Directors.

**Motion carried
Resolution adopted**

Council of Advice

The Rt. Rev. Dean Wolfe, reporting for the Council of Advice reported on issues in the Diocese of South Carolina and anticipated canonical change. Discussion followed. No action was taken.

Millennium Development Goals

By a 2/3 vote, members of the House agreed to consider a late filed Mind of the House resolution by the Rt. Rev. Ian Douglas on a Renewed Commitment to the Millennium Development Goals.

The Presiding Bishop passed the chair to Vice-Chair, Bishop Dean Wolfe. The Rt. Rev. Nerva Cot Aguilera, Bishop Suffragan of Cuba, brought greetings from her diocese and spoke of conditions there.

Bishop Wolfe then called for a vote on the Millennium Development Goals resolution.

**Motion carried
Resolution adopted**

Final Text of the Resolution

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, September 16-21, 2010 recognizes that our meeting is occurring concurrent with the United Nations Summit 2010 in New York City evaluating progress on meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Bishops recalls our commitments to the Millennium Development Goals through General Convention resolutions 2003-D006, 2006-D022, 2009-D019, and in actions and resolutions of our own dioceses; and be it further

Resolved, That we the bishops of The Episcopal Church recommit ourselves to the Millennium Development Goals as a response to God's mission of restoration and reconciliation, and pledge to reengage our dioceses in helping to achieve the goals of the MDGs.

Bishop Spouses and Partners

By a 2/3 vote, the members of the House agreed to consider a late filed Mind of the House Resolution by the Rt. Rev. Cathy Roskam regarding Welcome for Spouses and Partners.

**Motion carried
Resolution adopted**

Final Text of the Resolution

Resolved, That during all joint meetings, the spouses and partners of this House be welcomed without condition and without exception to all liturgies and appropriate programmatic and topical presentations to this House.

Liturgy

By a 2/3 vote the members of the House agreed to consider a late-filed Mind of the House resolution by the Rt. Rev. Bill Gregg on liturgy.

Text of the Resolution

Whereas, alternative liturgies and other liturgical texts, including Enriching Our Worship texts, require the permission of the Bishop Diocesan for use; therefore be it

Resolved, that the SCLM provide to the House of Bishops the draft texts of their work in fulfillment of Resolution 2006-C056 prior to their publication for critical review by the Bishops.

It was moved to table this Resolution until the next meeting.

**Motion carried
Vote postponed**

A second late-filed Mind of the House Resolution by Bishop Gregg regarding liturgy was considered.

Original Text of the Resolution

Whereas, the liturgical life of the House of Bishops is an essential part of our life and work together; and

Whereas, the Book of Common Prayer is the standard of our worship, providing the stability of common worship that nurtures the hearts and souls of this House; therefore be it

Resolved, that the ordinary form of our worship will be the Book of Common Prayer, and that alternative and experimental texts be used only occasionally for specific occasions.

Resolution withdrawn

Respectfully submitted,
(The Rt. Rev.) Kenneth L. Price Jr.
Secretary

Attested by:
(The Rt. Rev.) Sean Rowe
(The Rt. Rev.) Gladstone Adams

Appendix A
Phoenix, Arizona

Bishops Present at the Interim Meeting of Fall 2010

Gladstone Adams	Edwin Gulick	F. Neff Powell
Laura Ahrens	E. Ambrose Gumbs	Kenneth Price
J. Neil Alexander	Michael Hanley	Brian Prior
Lloyd Allen	Gayle Harris	Lawrence Provenzano
David Bailey	Dena Harrison	John Rabb
John Bauerschmidt	Rayford High	David Reed
Nathan Baxter	Herman Hollerith	Gregory Rickel
Mark Beckwith	Barry Howe	Bavi Rivera
Barry Beisner	John Howe	Catherine Roskam
Scott A. Benhase	Carolyn Irish	Sean Rowe
Charles E. Bennison, Jr.	Katharine Jefferts Schori	Edward Salmon
Thomas Breidenthal	Don Johnson	Stacy Sauls
C. Franklin Brookhart	Shannon Johnston	Victor Scantlebury
Diane Jardine Bruce	David Jones	Gordon Scruton
J. Jon Bruno	Charles Keyser	Prince Singh
John Buchanan	William Klusmeyer	Mark Sisk
Joe Burnett	Edward Konieczny	John McKee Sloan
John Chane	Chilton Knudsen	Dabney Smith
Otis Charles	David J.H. Lai	G. Wayne Smith
George Councill	Paul Lambert	Kirk Smith
Michael Curry	Stephen Lane	Michael Smith
James Curry	Mark Lattime	John S. Smylie
Clifton Daniel	Jeffrey Lee	Eugene Sutton
Ian T. Douglas	Peter Lee	Chester Talton
C. Andrew Doyle	Henry Louttit	John T. Tarrant
Philip Duncan	William Love	G. Porter Taylor
Dan Edwards	James B. Magness	Brian Thom
Thomas Ely	Alfred Marble	Dean Wolfe
Robert Fitzpatrick	James Mathes	Morris K. Thompson
Carol Gallagher	F. Clayton Matthews	W. Andrew Waldo
J. Michael Garrison	J. Scott Mayer	Vincent Warner
Robert Geper	Steven Miller	Catherine Waynick
Wendell Gibbs	Rodney Michel	Pierre Whalon
Mary Glasspool	Robert O'Neill	Keith Whitmore
Duncan Gray	C. Wallis Ohl	Arthur Williams
Mary Gray-Reeves	S. Todd Ousley	Don Wimberly
William Gregg	Henry Parsley	Geralyn Wolf
Orlando Guerrero	William Persell	

Appendix B
Phoenix, Arizona

Changes in Status

New Consecrations

The Rt. Rev. Michael Hanley, Bishop of Oregon
The Rt. Rev. Ian Douglas, Bishop of Connecticut
The Rt. Rev. Morris Thompson, Bishop of Louisiana
The Rt. Rev. Diane Bruce, Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles
The Rt. Rev. Mary Glasspool, Bishop Suffragan of Los Angeles
The Rt. Rev. Andrew Waldo, Bishop of Upper South Carolina
The Rt. Rev. James Magness, Bishop Suffragan for Federal Ministries
The Rt. Rev. John Smylie, Bishop of Wyoming
The Rt. Rev. David Bailey, Bishop of Navajoland Area Mission
The Rt. Rev. Mark Lattime, Bishop of Alaska

Elections, consents received

Terry White, Kentucky
Michael Vono, Rio Grande
Scott Hayashi, Utah

Resignations

The Rt. Rev. Chester Talton
The Rt. Rev. George Packard
The Rt. Rev. Sergio Carranza

Restorations

The Rt. Rev. Daniel Herzog
The Rt. Rev. Charles Bennison

Necrology

The Rt. Rev. G. Paul Reeves, resigned Bishop of Georgia 04/15/2010
The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Cochrane, resigned Bishop of Olympia 05/07/2010
The Rt. Rev. Harry B. Bainbridge, resigned Bishop of Idaho 05/27/2010

Appendix C
Phoenix, Arizona

A Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops

Phoenix, Arizona, September 21, 2010

There shall be before you and the resident alien a single statute, a perpetual statute throughout your generations; you and the alien shall be alike before the Lord. You and the alien who resides with you shall have the same law and the same ordinance (Numbers 15:15-16).

So [Christ] came and proclaimed peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him both of us have access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God (Ephesians 2:17-19).

Dear People of God,

Throughout our meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, we have reflected on the immigration crisis facing our host state, the United States, and all nations globally. A number of us visited the United States-Mexico border and saw first hand the many troubling and complex issues that face migrants, immigrants, the border patrol, local ranchers, and Christian communities seeking to minister to all of these groups. We are also mindful that similar border issues confront other nations represented in The Episcopal Church, especially countries in Europe, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, and Colombia and Ecuador.

Holy Scripture teaches us that all human beings are made in the image of God, and that Jesus Christ gave his life for all people. Furthermore, both the Old and New Testaments declare the importance of hospitality to resident alien and strangers, a hospitality that rests on our common humanity. All human beings are therefore deserving of dignity and respect, as we affirm in our Baptismal Covenant (Book of Common Prayer, p.305). So our gracious welcome of immigrants, documented or undocumented, is a reflection of God's grace poured out on us and on all. In this light:

(I) Ours is a migratory world in which many people move across borders to escape poverty, hunger, injustice and violence. We categorically reject efforts to criminalize undocumented migrants and immigrants, and deplore the separation of families and the unnecessary incarceration of undocumented workers. Since, as we are convinced, it is natural to seek gainful employment to sustain oneself and one's family, we cannot agree that the efforts of undocumented workers to feed and shelter their households through honest labor are criminal.

(2) We profess that inhumane policies directed against undocumented persons (raids, separation of families, denial of health services) are intolerable on religious and humanitarian grounds, as is attested by the consensus of a wide range of religious bodies on this matter.

(3) We call on the government of the United States and all governments to create fair and humane immigration policies that honor the dignity of people on all sides of this issue. In the United States, we seek a reasonable path to citizenship for undocumented workers; a plan to reunite families; and a viable system for receiving temporary or seasonal guest-workers, with clearly identified points of entry. These measures would free the United States border patrol to concentrate its efforts on the apprehension of drug traffickers, terrorists, and other criminals, and not on ordinary people who are simply seeking a better life for themselves and their children.

(4) We acknowledge the duty of governments to protect their people, including the securing of borders. The church has always respected this duty, which is grounded in government's God-given duty to protect innocent people and punish wrongdoers (Romans 13:1-7; 1 Peter 2:13-17).

(5) We recognize that racism and bigotry impact debates over migration and immigration. The Episcopal Church is committed to the eradication of all forms of racism, and decries the use of racial profiling in the arrest of persons suspected of being undocumented.

(6) We confess our own complicit sinfulness as people who benefit from the labor of undocumented workers without recognizing our responsibility to them. We passively tolerate an economic and political system that accepts this labor from millions of undocumented workers, and which has received approximately \$520 billion in social security revenue from them—revenue from which they will never benefit. Yet at the same time we treat them as a threat.

(7) We do not discount the concerns of our fellow citizens regarding the danger uncontrolled immigration poses to our safety and economic well-being. We insist, however, that these concerns be approached within the broader context of a national commitment and covenant to inclusion and fellowship across all lines for the sake of the common good.

(8) We take seriously our commitment to and responsibility for our fellow citizens, as we strive to face the spiritual, moral and economic challenges of life in all sixteen nations represented in The Episcopal Church. We call on our fellow citizens to remember that the good of a nation lies beyond its own self-interest, toward a vision of a humanity restored in Jesus Christ, for in him "you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ" (Ephesians 2:13).

(9) We offer for additional study a theological resource, "The Nation and the Common Good: Reflections on Immigration Reform."

God's grace be with us all.

Appendix D
Phoenix, Arizona

“The Nation and the Common Good: Reflections on Immigration Reform”
A Theological Resource on Migration and Immigration from the House of Bishops of the
Episcopal Church

"The great crisis among us is the crisis of 'the common good,' the sense of community solidarity that binds all in a common destiny - haves and have-nots, the rich and the poor. We face a crisis about the common good because there are powerful forces at work among us to resist the common good, to violate community solidarity, and to deny a common destiny. Mature people, at their best, are people who are committed to the common good that reaches beyond private interests, transcends sectarian commitments, and offers human solidarity."

-Walter Brueggemann, *Journey to the Common Good*

The church was born out of the passionate conviction of a growing number of people that, united with the crucified and risen Jesus in baptism, and empowered by the same Spirit that empowered him in his humanity, they could welcome one another, and everyone else, just the way Jesus did. They rightly discerned the social critique embedded in Jesus' own total availability to others, and, beginning with the admission of the Gentiles and the blurring of distinctions between slave and free, rich and poor, they organized themselves as a community geared to transform Jesus' personal example into a collective way of life that could challenge prevailing cultural and social norms. This has practical consequences for our approach to immigration reform as followers of Jesus, since it shifts the focus away from advocacy to formation, from the voting booth to our prayer life. What are the spiritual and moral practices we must maintain, recover, develop and take up so that we, as Episcopalians, can witness responsibly on behalf of the undocumented, can acknowledge our own complicity in injustice, and can recognize our own obligation to fellow citizens who fear that a more open immigration policy spells increasing danger and economic loss for themselves?

We have been asking these questions as we meet in Phoenix, Arizona, the epicenter of national debate over immigration reform. We acknowledge with gratitude the many contributions to this debate that have recently been made by various Christian, Jewish and Muslim bodies. We are also grateful for the work already done by General Conventions of the Episcopal Church in this area.

As bishops of a church deeply formed by the idea of nationhood, we are painfully aware of the many ways in which concern for national identity can stereotype and exclude the outsider. We are also aware, however, of the spiritual value of national identity when it is informed by Gods' love for all nations and peoples, and seeks, within its own borders, to emulate that love.

The Problem of Nationalism

We acknowledge that the modern nation state is itself in flux and may be on the wane under the pressures of globalization, increasing ethnocentricity, and the vast number of human beings who are effectively stateless due to ever increasing migration. We also give thanks for the fact that The Episcopal Church is no longer constituted as a strictly "national" church, but comprises a number of dioceses and judicatories well beyond the geographical boundaries of the United States of America.

This is not to deny the expansionist nationalism that produced this rich diversity. In the early twentieth century, The Episcopal Church extended its reach beyond the borders of the United States wherever the United States asserted its control. Historic missions of The Episcopal Church in such "extra-continental missionary districts" as the Philippines, Cuba, Panama, and Haiti coincided with United States occupation of those countries. Nationalism has thus been a potent force in the missionary work of the Episcopal Church as we sought to support the exportation of American democracy and, at the same time, to export the richness of Anglican tradition in our foreign missions. We rejoice that today many of the historic missions of The Episcopal Church are now self-governing Anglican churches in their own right, or are taking significant steps in that direction.

We therefore approach the question of immigration reform aware that our own history as a national church is a double-edged sword. We are deeply bound up with the American story, and therefore have a quintessentially American perspective to bring to the present crisis. At the same time, the very fact that we are now a multi-national church bears witness to our past complicity in imperialist policies, which even now may raise questions about where we are coming from in the debate over immigration reform. Such questions are sure to arise, inasmuch as we will argue that immigration reform must take into consideration not only the human rights of undocumented immigrants, but also our obligation to fellow citizens who wish to stem the flow of illegal immigration. That said, we turn to the matter at hand.

Resident Aliens: Then and Now

Proponents of immigration reform frequently cite Leviticus 19:33-34 as representing Biblical teaching regarding the resident alien: *"When an alien resides with you in your land, you shall not oppress the alien. The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt; I am the Lord your God"* (NRSV). Here we are dealing with a passage which seems to deal explicitly and specifically with immigrants. The resident alien (Hebrew: *ger*) refers specifically to someone residing in Israel who was not born there, and the term translated here (probably anachronistically) as "citizen" (Hebrew: *eizrach*) means, literally, someone who *was* born there. But we must not be too quick to establish an easy correlation between this command and our present experience. Ancient Israel was, for the most part, an ethnic entity, for which citizenship (that is, full membership in the community) meant nothing more than the status enjoyed by those who were members of this ethnic entity by birth.

That is to say, membership had nothing to do with having been born within the territory of Israel, and no amount of "naturalization" could procure full membership for those who belonged outside the ethnic group.

Thus the situation envisioned by Leviticus 19:33-34 is significantly different from ours. On the one hand, every resident alien is vulnerable; on the other, there seems to be no such thing as an "illegal" alien. Since all resident aliens are permanent outsiders, there is no point in distinguishing among them. This lends an attractive universality to the command: all resident aliens, whatever their particular status, are to be loved as if they were Israelites. But it is the *as if* that is crucial: they are to be universally loved, even as they are (at least for the time being) universally excluded.

How, then, can Leviticus 19:33-34 be applied today? One option might be to concentrate on the love command here, and relate the passage in general terms to Jesus' availability to everyone, without exception. But since the command to love the resident alien assumes continuing exclusion, it cannot be identified with Jesus' welcoming of the stranger. This does not mean that exclusion is what the people of Israel represent - far from it. But it does mean that this passage is not on its own as helpful to the cause of immigration reform as we might have hoped. Nevertheless, its very unhelpfulness performs an important function, by highlighting an element of our own situation that we might have taken for granted otherwise.

"Citizenship" means something completely different in our context because "nation" means something completely different. It's not that the existential anxiety of being a stranger in a strange land has changed all that much - of course it hasn't. But what *has* changed is how we understand the entity within which the alien is trying to make a home. Before 1500 CE or so, a nation was largely defined either as the homeland of a particular ethnic group (e.g., medieval England) or, in a more complex way, as the region over which a particular ruler had jurisdiction (e.g., medieval France).

It was understood that nations in the first sense might contain large minorities who were not, as it were, part of the nation (e.g., Jews in medieval Russia), and that nations in the second sense would persist no matter how populations might shift within them (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina under Turkish rule).

By contrast, the modern nation state, which began to emerge about five hundred years ago, has had less and less to do with ethnicity or with the sway of particular rulers, and more and more to do with a clearly defined territory, with citizenship conferred on all who are born within those borders, or who are permitted to make their permanent home there. We recognize there are nations that have never fit this model or do so no longer, but the United States is not one of them.

The United States is the iconic expression of the modern state since, quite apart from its democratic ideals, it is all about citizenship. It is therefore no surprise that United States citizens have a difficult time dealing with a category of persons who are residing in their midst, but who are not, whether by choice or for fear of deportation, on the path to citizenship. In the United States context, to be a permanent resident alien (as many inhabitants of ancient Israel apparently were) introduces a burdensome tension into the national life.

In any case, prior to the modern notion of citizenship, there was no such thing as illegal immigration. The question on which the present debate turns - what to do with *illegal* immigrants - is one which the ancient world would have been mystified by, and which indeed, apart from anti-Semitic legislation (which probably paved the way for modern immigration law), much of the western world would probably not have understood even two hundred years ago.

Church and Nation

So where does all this bring us? Jesus' ministry of welcome has always called the church into radical openness. How shall we respond to that call, particularly as it relates to undocumented immigrants? Again, how can a church that is striving to emulate Jesus enlist society - or, rather, the nation - as a companion? Since nothing like the modern nation - good or bad - is to be found in the Bible, how shall we discern where nationhood's potential for radical openness lies?

This comes down to one question: what do church and nation have to do with each other at this time? This question calls attention to the delicate and rich dialectic of Christianity concerning "discipleship and citizenship." It is clear that Christians are summoned to discipleship, to participate fully in Christ's ministry of welcome. It is equally clear that such discipleship cannot be transposed into citizenship wholesale, because citizenship in a pluralistic state faces other considerations.

At the same time, it is inescapable that "discipleship" goes far to shape our sense of "citizenship." This is the deeper question raised by the church's advocacy for undocumented workers. Unless we, as Christians, are clear about our own place within the national life, and can demonstrate that we not only care about our nation but see into its spiritual heart, we won't have much to say that hasn't been said better by others.

In fact, the Anglican tradition has a lot to say about this. When the Church of England was established in the sixteenth century, it was, to some extent, part of a strategy to assure the absolute authority of the state, at the very moment when England was transforming itself into a modern state. But this is not the whole story. The Church also seized this opportunity to forge a partnership between church and state, grounded in the stake each shared in the spiritual life of the nation.

Several centuries later, The Episcopal Church emerged out of the attempt to transplant that experiment into a decidedly un-Anglican and highly modern republic. Today, as we have noted, The Episcopal Church includes a number of dioceses and jurisdictions beyond the United States. We need to know what that experiment was about if we are to witness effectively about immigration reform, as imbedded as that issue is in our understanding of citizenship and national life.

Hooker and Nationhood

Our best starting-point is Richard Hooker (1553-1600), the first - and seminal - architect of an Anglican theology of nationhood. We turn to his greatest work for guidance, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

Hooker wrote his *Laws* against the backdrop of increasing royal power under Elizabeth I, as England made good its bid to establish itself as a major European power, and the Church of England, amid increasing criticism from Presbyterian circles, settled into life under the royal supremacy. Hooker is sometimes viewed as an apologist for the establishment, and it is true that he defended the forms and worship of the established church with great cogency and vigor. But his analysis of the origin and purpose of the body politic, while it cannot be said to be critical of the Elizabethan regime, does invite a critical assessment of the emerging nation state.

In Book 1 of the *Laws*, Hooker argues that all political rule derives its legitimacy from an original compact (or covenant) among equals. This is not a new idea - it was a commonplace in medieval and renaissance political theory that people were governed because they not only needed but *wanted* to be governed, if only because they wished to be protected from each other:

“To take away all...mutual grievances, injuries and wrongs, there was no way but only by growing unto composition and agreement amongst themselves, by ordaining some kind of government public, and by yielding themselves subject thereunto, that ... by them the peace, tranquility, and happy estate of the rest might be procured (1.10.4).”

But this passage needs to be read in light of Hooker's strong assertion that human beings are essentially sociable and crave interaction with one another. While Hooker opens his discussion of political rule by suggesting that human beings form societies because they can survive better together than separately (1.10.1), he closes it by reflecting at some length on the "law of nations" (*ius gentium*), the dimension of law which since late antiquity had been defined as that body of rights and obligations on which there was general consensus throughout the world.

More particularly, the "law of nations" referred to how people and nations were expected to treat one another in situations where local law did not reach or could not be enforced (e.g., on the open seas or in time of war), or where foreigners were particularly dependent on the protection of

their hosts (e.g., ships seeking harbor, ambassadors, travelers, tradesmen bringing goods from afar, and resident aliens). In other words, it was a precursor of international law, enshrined not in particular treaties or written codes but in custom.

But Hooker saw something else in the law of nations. For him it cast light on something all human beings have something in common, namely, our desire for fellowship, even and perhaps especially with those who differ most from us.

Moreover - and this is significant for our discussion - Hooker uses the origin of civil society itself as his primary illustration of this universal desire:

“Civil society doth more content the nature of man than any private kind of solitary living, because in society this good of mutual participation is so much larger than otherwise. Herewith notwithstanding we are not satisfied, but we covet (if it might be) to have a kind of society and fellowship with all mankind (1.10.12).”

Hooker is trying to say two things about government. On the one hand, we have the notion of government as a necessary check on the selfishness and potential violence of human beings who have been driven by necessity to associate with one another. On the other, we have the notion of the human race as a species that cannot flourish without an abundant - one might say limitless - social life. Hooker seems to be suggesting that, given our sinfulness, we do need governance, but that this governance must function not simply to protect us from one another, but to maximize the opportunities for communion and fellowship with one another.

We can then take this to be Hooker's view of the purpose of a nation. As such, we may begin to draw certain implications about what it means for us to be fellow citizens of such a nation as we seek one another's common good.

We have only to look back at the rise of the early modern nation state to see the economic and geopolitical forces that drove the process of centralization, militarization and religious conformity in England, France and Spain. It is as if Hooker were saying, if we are to think nationally rather than locally, let it be for the sake of wider fellowship within our borders, not for placing power in fewer and fewer hands, or creating a more efficient economy, or competing more successfully with other governments for the world's goods. However that may be, Hooker's invocation of the law of nations makes it clear that communion and fellowship with the widest possible range of people is the ultimate goal of national life.

This idea can be understood in two ways. On the one hand, any legitimate government must ensure that national life be characterized by more opportunity for internal social exchange, not less. On the other, the government must encourage and support its citizens' contact with the

world beyond its borders by adhering to the basic tenets of the law of nations: keeping borders as open as possible, welcoming strangers, and promoting the circulation of ideas and material goods.

What emerges here is the idea of the nation state as an essentially moral enterprise, in which a relatively diverse collection of people from different local regions, speaking different local dialects, belonging to different classes and harboring different religious views, are expected to achieve common ground through the exercise of that "natural delight which man hath to transfuse himself into others, and to receive from others into himself especially those things wherein the excellency of his kind doth most consist" (1.10.12).

What for some may have been a strategic social agenda was for Hooker a spiritual challenge. It was nothing less than the transformation of England into an occasion for love of neighbor on a broad scale. In imagining the emerging nation state as an opportunity for respectful engagement with a wide range of fellow citizens, Hooker is seeing the national community as an anticipation of what the universal church mystically already is.

Hooker's assertion that the church is a spiritual body politic which is universal (not national) in its essence underscores the extent to which he hoped that the body of Christ, as it found itself situated in each particular nation, might aid in bringing the deepest spiritual implications of nationhood to the fore. At their most authentic, church and nation are bound together under God's providence by a common agenda: despite human sinfulness, to be the occasion for as many people as possible to interact peaceably with one another as equals.

We are aware that the society inhabited by Hooker was anything but a community of equals. But the inner logic of his thought clearly points in that direction. It is no accident that John Locke admired "the judicious Hooker's" analysis of civil society and political rule. Even more to the point, it was to Hooker that the young Episcopal Church looked for guidance as it struggled to discover its proper role in the new republic. For John Henry Hobart (1775-1830), third bishop of New York, Hooker's defense of episcopacy and *The Book of Common Prayer* showed Anglicanism to be the true reviver of the early ("primitive") church, and the subsequent establishment by the American church of a polity which empowered all orders of the church completed that process of revival. Indeed, Hobart was thoroughly egalitarian in his understanding of the church, viewing it as a spiritual community in which "the distinctions of life are leveled" (quoted by R. Bruce Mullin in *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*, ed. Marsha L. Dutton and Patrick Terrell Gray, [Eerdmans, 2006], p. 141). While he reviled the rise of partisanship and political wrangling, Hobart also embraced America's steady movement away from a rigid class system, and clearly viewed the life and discipline of the church as a model for national life (See Hobart's sermon, *The Security of a Nation* <http://anglicanhistory.org/usa/jhhobart/security1815.html>).

Thus for Hobart, as for Hooker, the church had everything to do with the nation as its context for living out its mission; and the nation, all the more because of its free and equal citizenry, was in a God-given position to benefit from the church's influence. The effect of this vision of the Episcopal Church on its subsequent development cannot be underestimated. Not that we have resisted the separation of church and state, still less dreamed of a United States populated by Episcopalians. But our self-identity as Episcopalians has largely been formed by our effort to discern how our presence *in* the nation might be of service *to* the nation.

Serving the nation remains a viable and authentic agenda for the Episcopal Church in the United States. Our tradition emphasizes common prayer and devotion to the common good. As such, it does not see any contradiction between following Jesus and engaging actively in public life, in this case, national life. We recognize its failings, but we also perceive its spiritual potential as a basis for respectful interaction across economic, ethnic and religious lines. We can reasonably claim that the United States has been shaped, in part, by something like Hooker's vision of the nation as a laboratory for the love of neighbor, and can invite our fellow citizens to look at themselves anew in light of that claim.

In any case, It can certainly be argued that the founders of our nation, while they did not seek to establish a Christian nation in the strict sense, did seek to establish just such a laboratory, since, as Hannah Arendt pointed out, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" included "public happiness," that is, the enjoyment of vigorous debate and creative collaboration in the civic arena, where mutual respect is the political equivalent of love. If that is the case, the collective political will that established our independence and bore fruit in our union is an historical example of that compact or covenant which for Hooker is the origin of all authentic national life, namely, the collective decision to value whoever happens to be around. If Hooker is right that this emergent national covenant implies a decision to value *all* human beings without distinction (including those who are not born or naturalized into the nation), then it is no surprise that our nation began instantly to welcome wave after wave of immigrants.

The Challenge Before Us

To be sure, there were economic incentives for this open door policy, but could it not be said that we welcomed a constant stream of newcomers in order to keep the original compact alive, both by enlarging the circle of those who 'happened to be around,' and by keeping ourselves attentive to the wider human community from which they came"?

We do not mean to idealize our history here. We cannot overlook the forced immigration of Africans into slavery, the breaking of treaty upon treaty with the original inhabitants of this continent, and the contempt endured by many immigrants who came here more or less freely (yet also often driven by oppression and poverty at home). Racism and colonialism are deeply woven into our story, and our church has been complicit in the death and marginalizing of countless

people. But whenever we have the political will to face this history, the covenant Hooker had in mind has a chance to be reasserted and renewed.

Since the very beginning, the biblical community (ancient Israel and the early church) have faced the tension of being a covenantal community bound to neighborly relationships with all the neighbors and being a community of ethnic identity that readily tilts toward exclusivity. In the Old Testament, the temptation to ethnic exclusivism is visible in Ezra's mandate concerning "Holy Seed" (Ezra 9:2), a mandate countered by the inclusionary statement of Isaiah 56: 3-7. The New Testament church experienced the same tension when it grappled with the inclusion of Gentiles into what had so far been a purely Jewish enterprise. And indeed, every nation state—notably Britain with its recurring image of a "true Englishman" and the United States with its recurring image of a classical "American"—is tempted toward an identity that excludes all those who are "otherwise." That same tension between embracing and excluding the other exists in each of us as persons.

But of course a neighborly national covenant stands against exclusivity and sees that the truth of covenant depends precisely upon the act of welcoming the other. There is no doubt that the temptation to cultural superiority is operative in the current debate on immigration policy. The challenge facing the Church today is to assist the nation in its walk to neighborliness at a time when the nation is fearful. As Walter Brueggemann has noted:

“That journey from *anxious scarcity* through *miraculous abundance* to a *neighborly common good* has been peculiarly entrusted to the church and its allies. I take 'church' here to refer to the institutional church, but I mean it not as a package of truth and control, but as a liturgical, interpretive offer to re-imagine the world differently. When the church only echoes the world's kingdom of scarcity, then it has failed in its vocation. But the faithful church keeps at the task of living out a journey that points to the common good” —Walter Brueggemann, *Journey to the Common Good* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), p. 2.

Witness and Action

So where does that leave U.S. Episcopalians with regard to immigration reform? As a spiritual body politic whose emerging goal is to display Jesus' radical welcome to everyone, it is clear that we have an obligation to advocate for every undocumented worker as already being a citizen of God's reign on earth and one for whom Christ died. This must always be our starting point.

We are part of the universal church, and as such our horizon of concern is global in scope. Our imagination should be informed by the law of nations, with its assumption that humankind as a whole is meant for communion and fellowship, and its bias in favor of spiritual, intellectual or material exchange across all lines. We should not hesitate to join other faith communities in actively protesting racial stereotyping, and demand a halt to practices that treat undocumented

workers as criminals - resulting in raids, incarceration, and deportation involving the separation of families. We should continue to offer material and spiritual support to undocumented workers and their families, wherever possible, and should expect that they will continue to receive medical attention and police protection as needed. This is simply a matter of respecting basic human dignity, and we have every moral warrant for calling the nation to account, whether we appeal simply to human rights, divine law, natural law, the law of nations, our national covenant, or to the Bible that grounds them all.

What may not be so obvious is how to pursue this witness in solidarity with the nation as whole. There is a sense in which opposition to inhumane practices needs to move forward whether or not it wins broad approval in the larger community. But certain elements of immigration reform -- in particular, changes in policy that would make it easier for undocumented workers to regularize their presence in the United States, and would make citizenship much easier to achieve - require and deserve a different approach.

Such policies do not fall under the category of humanitarian relief and, generally speaking, no nation is morally obligated to implement them. Indeed, opponents of such policies can and do bring reasonable arguments to the table. For instance, the United States citizens in our House of Bishops are aware and understand that many of our fellow-citizens are opposed to any reform that appears to condone illegality by granting amnesty to undocumented workers.

We know that some are wary of any policy that might further tax the public infrastructure (schools, hospitals, police and fire protection, roads), and are fearful of a glutted labor market that might further increase unemployment and bring wages down. To the extent that we own our own participation in the national community, it is hard to see how we can withhold sympathy from these views, or, at least, not entertain them respectfully, since, if we take the church-nation alliance to heart, apart from matters of humanitarian urgency, our fellow citizens have as much of a claim on our attention and cooperation as do the undocumented workers in our midst.

The claim of the vulnerable is always a strong claim, and undocumented workers are unquestionably vulnerable. Yet so is the claim of those with whom we have entered into covenant as fellow citizens, if, indeed, we, as Episcopalians, regard the modern nation as a collection of more or less diverse communities and individuals who have agreed to engage with one another as equals and, insofar as they are fellow citizens, to love one another. Those who are related to each other by such a covenant have a prior claim on one another. This is so because they depend on one another for the fulfillment of the common goal which the national covenant is meant to serve.

As Episcopalians, we have a twofold relationship with this covenant. On the one hand, we believe this covenant to be essential to any national integrity, whether we are speaking of the United States, or Mexico, or Ecuador, or any nation in which the Episcopal Church makes its witness.

On the other, those of us who are citizens of a particular nation bear a responsibility to that particular national covenant as citizens.

This means that the voice and the perspective of our fellow citizen deserves attention. However, it does not mean that we turn our backs on resident aliens and the world community they represent, still less that we place our fellowship with fellow citizens above our fellowship with Christ, but that we remain true to nationhood's more limited and preliminary goal, which is to strive for genuine communion and fellowship within its own borders, for the sake of a wider communion even now.

We do not discount the concerns of our fellow citizens regarding the threat uncontrolled immigration poses to our safety and economic well-being. We insist, however, that these concerns be approached within the broader context of a national commitment and covenant to inclusion and fellowship across all lines for the sake of the common good.

Furthermore, we profess that inhumane policies directed against undocumented persons (raids, separation of families, denial of health services) are intolerable on broadly religious and humanitarian grounds, as is attested by the consensus of a wide range of religious bodies on this matter. With that in mind, we look to another passage from the Torah: "There shall be one law for you and for the resident stranger; it shall be a law for all time throughout the ages. You and the stranger shall be alike before the Lord" (Number 15:15).

Needless to say, before we can use the national covenant as an argument for new policies, we must convince our fellow citizens that such a covenant exists or is at least worth striving to make real. We will do that not so much with words as with our willingness as church people to be involved in civic life at every level, and with our renewed passion to reinvigorate and if necessary reinvent a national life that draws us into lively fellowship across all lines.

Appendix D-1: Ecumenical and Interreligious Resources

The issue of immigration has been a central concern for our ecumenical and interfaith partners, who have focused on issues of fairness, equality, and social justice, while at the same time taking a stand against racism. For instance, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America formulates official policy through Social Statements, produced by Churchwide units and adopted formally by the Church Council and Churchwide Assembly. Its statement on Immigration calls for justice and fairness in immigration policy. The ELCA has also adopted a social statement on Economic Life, which calls for "sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all." Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services (LIRS) is the refugee resettlement organization for the ELCA, and also engages in advocacy. The LIRS has an Action Network to mobilize grassroots support and spread information. The ELCA also participates in the Ecumenical Advocacy Days sponsored by the

National Council of Churches, which this year focused on questions of immigration. Here are some pertinent websites :

Lutheran Immigration and Relief Services: www.lirs.org

Social Statement on Immigration:

<http://www.elca.org/What-We-Believe/Social-Issues/Messages/Immigration.aspx>

Social Statement on Economic Life:

<http://www.elca.org/What-We-Believe/Social-Issues/Social-Statements/Economic-Life.aspx>

The United Methodist Church's General Board on Church and Society has likewise been heavily involved in issues of immigration reform and fairness in immigration policy. It issues a "Faith in Action" Newsletter to raise awareness and develop a grassroots network. The General Secretary of the General Board also serves as the primary Washington advocacy person for the United Methodist Church, and for 2010 the UMC has made immigration reform and economic justice as two of its four Legislative Priorities for its Washington office. The UMC has played an important role in issues of social justice, and its 1908 Social Creed is an important theological foundation. {UMC General Board on Church and Society: <http://www.umc-gbcs.org>}

The Roman Catholic Church has also been an extremely important voice in calling for immigration reform as well as advocating for issues of social justice. Cardinal Roger Mahoney of Los Angeles, for instance, issued a pastoral letter ordering priests to ignore a potential California law which would make it a crime to assist illegal immigrants. On a formal level, the US Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral letter in 2003, *Strangers No longer: Together on a Journey of Hope* which calls for comprehensive and fair immigration reform. It also set up a diocesan-based Justice For Immigrants {JFI} network. It has also set up the Catholic Legal Immigration Network Inc {CLINIC} which provides a number of resources as well as advocacy.

Strangers No Longer: <http://www.nccbuscc.org/mrs/strangers.html>,

Justice for Immigrants (JFI): <http://www.justiceforimmigrants.org/>

Catholic Legal Immigration Network Inc (CLINIC): <http://cliniclegal.org/>

The National Council of Churches of Christ consists of 36 member communions, including The Episcopal Church, and has historically been an important voice in issues of social justice. It has also made immigration reform, along with economic and social justice, a priority for 2010. A collection of resources is available at <http://www.nccusa.org/immigration/immigmain.html>.

See also the following statement, submitted by the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism to the 696th Union for Reform Judaism General Assembly and adopted on December 14, 2007 in San Diego, California.

BACKGROUND

American immigration policy has long reflected the tension between those who seek to welcome new immigrants and those who seek to limit their entry into the United States. Historically the Jewish community has identified closely with those supporting opportunities for newcomers. As noted in the 1995 Resolution on Immigration adopted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (now the Union for Reform Judaism), "we support those efforts that compassionately seek to regulate and to aid newcomers to this land but we oppose those that will unduly restrict immigration or burden the lives of illegal immigrants." Other resolutions adopted by the Union related to the status and treatment of immigrants include Refugees in Canada {1989}, Immigration {1989} and Citizenship {1997}. In 2006 the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) adopted a resolution supporting efforts seeking "comprehensive immigration reform, which would include not only better enforcement of our nation's laws, but also a guest worker program and a path to earned legalization."

JEWISH TEXTS AND VALUES

Both our Jewish tradition and our historical experiences lead us to support immigration policy that is compassionate and fair. The Torah teaches us to reach out to and care for vulnerable populations, including non-citizens and resident aliens: "If your brother, being in straits, comes under your authority, and you hold him as though a resident alien, let him live by your side" {Leviticus 25:35}. We are repeatedly commanded to care for the needy within our extended family: "If there is a needy person among you, one of your kinsmen in any of your settlements ... do not harden your heart and shut your hand against your needy kinsman. Rather, you must open your hand and lend him sufficient for whatever he needs" {Deut. 15:7}. Rabbinic Judaism also entitled non-Jewish individuals to financial and emotional support from the Jewish community in order to create a harmonious society: "Our rabbis have taught: 'we support the poor of the non-Jew along with the poor of Israel, and visit the sick of the non-Jew along with the sick of Israel, and bury the poor of the non-Jew along with the dead of Israel, in the interests of peace'" (BT Gittin 61a).

Our historical experience also sensitizes Jews to the need of family members to extend a helping hand to one another, even across borders, in times of economic hardship. As told in the Book of Genesis, during the difficult years of famine throughout the Middle East, Joseph's position in Egypt made possible the resettlement and survival of his family: "God has sent me ahead of you to ensure your survival on earth, and to save your lives in an extraordinary deliverance ... come down to me without delay-you and your children and your grandchildren, your flocks and herds, and all that is yours. There I will provide for you... (Genesis 45). The Book of Ruth similarly personalizes the

required response of the Jewish community toward the immigrant. Ruth, the impoverished recent arrival to her new land, gleans alongside full Israelite citizens who are also in need-a privilege to which Ruth is entitled once she adopts her new homeland and links her fate with its citizens. From the patriarchs' and matriarchs' sojourns in foreign lands to our seminal experience as strangers in Egypt, the plight of the non-citizen resonates for Jews.

The halachic (legal) obligations to resettle family members apply to our extended family. Taken literally, we might conclude that these mandates only obligate us to work for the resettlement of Jews. However, our desire to care for members of our own extended family sensitizes us to similar claims for family reunification expressed by other immigrant groups in America. Further, our historical memory of dangerous flights in search of safe havens inspires a desire to help others in similar distress. The Union reaffirmed these views most recently by adopting the 2003 Resolution on Civil Liberties, which states our opposition to "measures that strip the power of immigration and federal judges, to review decisions and exercise discretion regarding the status, detention, and deportation of non-citizens."

As a community of immigrants and refugees with a long history of sojourning in foreign lands, American Jews have a unique responsibility to ensure that the rights of non-citizens are protected by our nation's immigration policy. Just as our ancestors were permitted to reunite their families and resettle refugees from their lands of origin to their newly adopted homelands, today's immigrant communities deserve similar opportunities.

TODAY'S IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Despite a sweeping overhaul of the United States' immigration policy a decade ago, it is clear that our immigration system is still inequitable. There are currently nearly 12 million individuals living in the U.S. without legal status. Chronic backlogs in visa distribution result in families being separated for years. While "immediate relatives" face the shortest wait for visas, those in lower preference categories are plagued by delays as long as 11 years. Employment-based visas are available in numbers too small to meet either employer demands or accommodate the laborers available for work. Unauthorized crossings at the U.S.-Mexico border-aggravated by Border Patrol strategies-have led to a record number of deaths in the past year alone.

The failure to address these problems within our current immigration system has created an enforcement vacuum, too often leading non-federal authorities to attempt to enforce federal immigration law. In addition to the humanitarian issues these problems create, domestic security can be undermined when so many people live in the shadows of society and are unable or unwilling to work cooperatively with law enforcement

agencies. We cannot ignore the economic, social, and human reality of these "strangers" who are, in fact, our neighbors.

THE CURRENT IMMIGRATION DEBATE

Recent discussion in Congress has reflected the historic tensions in our immigration policy. Debate in both the House and Senate has primarily focused on two approaches: 1) legislation that promotes enforcement or border security measures exclusively (the "enforcement-only" approach) and 2) legislation that promotes security measures but also includes a path to earned citizenship for undocumented immigrants, along with measures to ensure that those who came here illegally make appropriate restitution (the "comprehensive immigration reform" approach). In October 2006, President Bush signed into law the Secure Fence Act embodying the enforcement-only approach. The law authorizes the construction of 700 miles of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Measures designed solely to keep immigrants out of the U.S. ignore the domestic and global forces that lead to rising levels of immigration. A truly comprehensive immigration policy must address these circumstances. In the U.S., undocumented immigrants are concentrated primarily in low-skilled, low-paying jobs in the service sector. Contrary to arguments of those who claim that there are fewer job opportunities available for American workers because of the high rate of illegal immigration, undocumented immigrants often fill positions others are unwilling to take. By doing so, they play a vital role in the American economy. In addition, immigrants, including many undocumented workers, pay federal income taxes and contribute to Social Security. In fact, the Social Security Administration estimates that three-quarters of undocumented immigrants pay Social Security taxes, even though they are ineligible for benefits.

Advocates of a comprehensive approach to immigration reform believe that an earned legalization program would 1) be more humane than the alternatives, 2) grant new immigrants the opportunities that generations of immigrants to the United States have enjoyed, 3) acknowledge that undocumented workers meet our demand for essential workers, and 4) broaden the tax base by integrating millions of new workers into the above-ground economy. They also stress that a program of earned legalization for undocumented residents would enhance cooperation with law enforcement officials by members of the immigrant community who would no longer fear deportation, likely resulting in reduced crime and improved national security.

Even some provisions in Comprehensive Immigration Reform proposals would create unreasonable family and economic hardships for those seeking to legalize their status. For example, proposals that would provide visas to those who are currently undocumented by requiring immigrants to first leave the U.S. and return to their country of origin, known as "touchback," are unreasonable. Recent ICE (Immigration

and Customs Enforcement) raids raise due process concerns and have led to families being separated and deportation of parents of U.S. citizens.

A comprehensive approach to reforming our nation's immigration system is the most realistic and humane solution to this escalating crisis. Such an approach takes into account not only the importance of securing our nation's borders and upholding the law, but also the fact that millions of undocumented immigrants currently live in the shadows of society where they are potential targets for unscrupulous employers. They live in fear of law enforcement and thus are afraid to report crimes, including domestic violence, or threats to our nation's security. And they face obstacles to obtaining needed health care, posing a threat to public health. When local law enforcement agents or health care professionals are required to enforce federal immigration law, it undermines their ability to work cooperatively with the immigrant community on such issues. Providing opportunities for the undocumented to eventually become legal citizens after meeting specific requirements is a necessary component of comprehensive immigration reform.

THEREFORE, the Union for Reform Judaism resolves to:

1. Call for a comprehensive and generous United States immigration policy that treats all immigrants justly and reflects the basic principles of human dignity and human rights;
 2. Oppose enforcement-only legislation while maintaining support for effective and humane border security to curb illegal immigration as part of a comprehensive immigration policy;
 3. Support legislation providing for pathways to earned citizenship for undocumented immigrants that reflect fair and compassionate eligibility standards;
 4. Call on the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement units act within the framework of U.S. law, which requires court-ordered search warrants, due process, and humane treatment of detainees and their families.
 5. Call for Congress and the Administration to adopt:
 - a. Fair and expeditious processes to deal with the problems of family separation and backlogs in resolving applications for citizenship, asylum, and visas,
 - b. Provisions that would allow undocumented immigrants in the process of applying for legal status to remain in the U.S.;
-

6. Support measures to clarify that enforcement of federal immigration law is the exclusive province of the appropriate federal legal authorities by:
 - a. Opposing efforts by non-federal entities and local law enforcement officers to enforce federal immigration law;
 - b. Opposing efforts by non-federal entities to establish punitive regulations or legislation targeting undocumented immigrants;
7. Support legislation that recognizes the contribution of immigrants to the U.S. economy and labor force by providing increased opportunities for immigrants to work legally in the United States through temporary worker visas;
8. Support legislation and policies that address the causes of illegal immigration including legislation that:
 - a. Increases the number of visas allowing unskilled laborers to work in the U.S. legally;
 - b. Increases guest worker programs and temporary worker visas; and
 - c. Addresses the U.S. policies that contribute to the flow of immigrants;
9. Oppose the exploitation of immigrants in the workplace and encourage employers to maintain the highest safety standards and provide fair and just compensation for all workers;
10. Encourage congregations and other arms of the Reform Movement to:
 - a. Educate their own members and the broader community on the important and beneficial role that immigrants play in our nation's economic, social and cultural life and the need for a fair, compassionate and comprehensive immigration policy;
 - b. Participate in coalitions that advocate comprehensive immigration reform consistent with these principles; and
 - c. Assist immigrants to integrate into local communities, while recognizing and respecting the importance of preserving immigrant culture and heritage.

Appendix D-2: Resolutions Pertaining to Immigration, General Convention of the Episcopal Church

1982-A063

Encourage Relief for Refugees - Concurred as Substituted

The 67th General Convention commends efforts to resettle refugees and encourages Episcopalians to accept refugees in their communities. It urges fair treatment of

Salvadoran and Haitian refugees and permanent status for political and economic refugees.

1982-0051**Urge Immigration and Church Sponsorship of Amerasian Children - *Concurred as Amended***

The 67th General Convention urges that immigration laws be changed to allow Amerasian children into the US. It encourages dioceses, congregations and families to provide for them and urges the Presiding Bishop to encourage sponsorship.

1985-D018**Call on the Government to Grant Immigration Status to Central American War Refugees - *Concurred as Amended***

The 68th General Convention reaffirms the call for the U.S. to offer safe haven to Central Americans seeking temporary refuge in our nation from civil strife in their home countries.

1985-D113**Request Congress to Reform Immigration Legislation - *Concurred as Amended***

The 68th General Convention calls the Congress to enact immigration legislation that recognizes the human realities of undocumented people in this country and that provides asylum for those fleeing political repression.

1988-B032**Request the ACC to Assist With the Settlement of Refugee Bishops and Clergy - *Concurred as Amended***

The 69th General Convention calls for steps to be taken for the employment, support, and maintenance of Anglican bishops, clergy, and lay workers who are forced by political or military circumstances to flee their dioceses in developing countries.

1988-B034**Commend Participation in the Legalization Program for Refugees - *Concurred as Submitted***

The 69th General Convention encourages continuing Church participation in the legalization program established Congress to assist persons to prepare for permanent residency through education and counseling.

1994-D113**On the Topic of California's "Save Our State" Initiative - *Rejected***

The 71st General Convention rejects the resolution declaring opposition to California's "Save Our State" initiative.

1994-D132**Reject Racism Toward Immigrants and Request the Church to Respond -
*Concurred as Substituted and Amended***

The 71st General Convention condemns widespread racist and unjust treatment of immigrants in political discourse and directs provinces and dioceses to develop programs to counteract violations of civil rights.

1997-D081**Develop Advocacy Agenda of Refugee Admissions and Asylum - *Concurred as Submitted***

The 72nd General Convention charges the Episcopal Migration Ministries to develop an advocacy agenda for refugee admissions, asylum and access to essential services.

2000-A053**Adopt Migration Ministries Mission Statement - *Concurred as Amended***

The 73rd General Convention adopts the Migration Ministries mission statement, "The Episcopal Church in Service to Refugees and Immigrants."

2003-C028**Support the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride - *Concurred***

The 74th General Convention calls for support of the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride (IWFR) through the education of Church members about the importance of immigration law reform.

2003-C033**Urge Legislation to Expand Temporary Workers' Programs - *Concurred as Substituted***

The 74th General Convention urges Congress to enact legislation to expand temporary workers' programs.

2006-A017**Adopt the Fundamental Principles Included in "The Alien Among You" as the Policy of the Episcopal Church - *Concurred as Amended***

The 75th General Convention adopts the fundamental principles included in "The Alien Among You" as the policy of the Episcopal Church.

Source: www.episcopalarchives.org/

In addition, a resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1998 states, "On the fiftieth anniversary of its proclamation in December of 1948, this conference: (a) resolves that its members urge compliance with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the nations in which our various member Churches are located, and all others over whom we may exercise any influence; and (b) urges extension of the provisions of the Declaration to refugees, uprooted and displaced persons who may be forced by the circumstances of their lives to live among them" (Resolution 1.1). Since Article 13 of the UNUDHR speaks of "the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country," and Article 14 says, "everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution," the Lambeth Conference of 1998 is urging a discussion of the issues of emigration and immigration in the context of human rights.

Appendix E
Phoenix, Arizona

Mind of the House Resolution on Charles Bennison

“We exhort Charles, our brother In Christ, in the strongest possible terms, to tender his immediate and unconditional resignation as the Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania.”

Grace to you and peace in Jesus Christ our Lord. As the bishops of The Episcopal Church, bound by solemn vows to share in the governance of the whole church, guard its unity, and defend those who have no helper, we are committed to safeguarding the dignity of every person entrusted to our care. We are devoted especially to the care of the young, the weak, and those most vulnerable among us. Because of the depth of these commitments, long held among us, we are profoundly troubled by the outcome of the disciplinary action against the Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, the Right Reverend Charles E. Bennison, Jr.

In a lengthy judicial process Bishop Bennison was found guilty on two counts of conduct unbecoming a member of the clergy during a lengthy judicial process. Subsequently, the Court of Review reversed one count, upheld one count, but vacated the sentence because the statute of limitations had expired. We respect the decision of the Court of Review and we share their disappointment and find the ultimate resolution of this matter unsatisfactory and morally repugnant. The wholly inadequate response of our brother bishop to the sexual assault upon a minor is an inexcusable violation of his ordination vows. We note here two excerpts from the decisions of the ecclesiastical court:

The tragedy of this conduct unbecoming a member of the clergy is exacerbated by the fact that, during the trial of the case, Appellant testified that, upon reflection on his failure to act, he concludes that his actions were “just about right.” They were not just about right. They were totally wrong. Appellant’s testimony on this subject revealed impaired judgment with regard to the conduct that is the subject of the First Offense and that is clearly and unequivocally conduct unbecoming a member of the clergy. (Court of Review, page 25).

.....we find that Appellant committed conduct unbecoming a member of the clergy. Because the statute of limitations has run on that offense, we have no choice under the canons of the Church but to reverse the judgment of the Trial Court finding that Appellant is guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of the clergy... (Court of Review, page 38).

The bishops of this church stand in unequivocal solidarity with anyone who has been sexually abused or mistreated by a member of our clergy or by any member of our church. We apologize, out of the depths of God’s compassion for every human being, to the woman who has been victimized by Bishop Bennison’s lack of responsible action, and to all those who have in any way

been hurt by our church. We are deeply sorry and we are committed to consistent discipline for those who bring shame upon the Body of Christ by sinful, demeaning, and selfish behavior that takes from another human being their God-given dignity.

As the House of Bishops, we have come to the conclusion that Bishop Bennison's capacity to exercise the ministry of pastoral oversight is irretrievably damaged. Therefore, we exhort Charles, our brother in Christ, in the strongest possible terms, to tender his immediate and unconditional resignation as the Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. For the sake of the wholeness and unity of the body of Christ, in the Diocese of Pennsylvania and in the church, we implore our brother to take this action without further delay.

This matter has weighed heavily upon the hearts of every member of the House of Bishops and it has been held in prayer not only among us, but by the good and faithful clergy and people of our church. We will continue to pray for Charles, his family, and every person who has been hurt by the church. We pledge to continue to seek God's guidance and we resolve to lead our church with compassion, justice, and mercy.

Appendix F
Phoenix, Arizona

College for Bishops Nonprofit Incorporation Resolution

Explanation: The College for Bishops was first created in 1993 as a joint project between the Office of Pastoral Development and General Theological Seminary, and in 1998 became a program solely of the Office of Pastoral Development. In 2006 a management agreement between The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society as agent for the Office of Pastoral Development and CREDO was established.

This resolution will provide for structural clarification including ownership by the House of Bishops and an enhanced opportunity for future sustainability.

Appendix G
Phoenix, Arizona

Board of Directors for the College for Bishops

The Most Rev. Dr. Katharine Jefferts Schori, *Chair* - Presiding Bishop
The Rt. Rev. Dr. J. Neil Alexander, *President* - Bishop, Diocese of Atlanta
The Rt. Rev. David Alvarez - Bishop, Diocese of Puerto Rico
The Rt. Rev. J. Jon Bruno - Bishop, Diocese of Los Angeles
The Rev. Canon Patricia M. Coller - Senior Executive Vice President, The Church Pension Fund
Mr. William S. Craddock, Jr. - Managing Director, CREDO Institute, Inc.
The Rt. Rev. Duncan M. Gray III - Bishop, Diocese of Mississippi
The Rt. Rev. Don E. Johnson - Bishop, Diocese of West Tennessee
The Rt. Rev. F. Clayton Matthews - Managing Director, College for Bishops
The Rt. Rev. Henry N. Parsley, Jr. - Bishop, Diocese of Alabama
Mr. Donald V. Romanik - President, Episcopal Church Foundation
Dr. Timothy F. Sedgwick - Professor of Christian Ethics, Virginia Theological Seminary
The Rt. Rev. Dean E. Wolfe - Bishop, Diocese of Kansas

Terms ending October 2010

The Rt. Rev. Ian T. Douglas - Bishop, Diocese of Connecticut
The Rt. Rev. Edwin F. Gulick, Jr. - Bishop, Diocese of Kentucky
The Rt. Rev. Chilton R. Knudsen - Retired Bishop, Diocese of Maine
The Rt. Rev. Victor A. Scantlebury - Assistant Bishop, Diocese of Chicago

Terms beginning October 2010

The Most Rev. Colin Johnson - Archbishop, Diocese of Toronto
The Rt. Rev. Mary Gray-Reeves - Bishop, Diocese of El Camino Real
The Rt. Rev. Jeffrey D. Lee - Bishop, Diocese of Chicago

**House of Bishops Meeting
Kanuga Conference Center
Hendersonville, North Carolina
March 25–30, 2011**

Minutes of the Business Session

Wednesday
March 30, 2011

Call to Order

The business meeting of the House of Bishops was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by the Presiding Bishop, the Most Rev. Katharine Jeffers Schori.

Roll Call

The Secretary moved that the registration list for the conference stand in place of a formal roll call.

Motion passed

The registration list showed 146 bishops registered and eligible to vote. The Secretary declared a quorum was present.

Recognition of the Senior Bishop

The Senior Bishop present was the Rt. Rev. David Reed.

Changes of Status

The following official acts were recorded since the last meeting of the House of Bishops September 21, 2010 in Phoenix:

New Consecrations / Elections

Terry Allen White, Kentucky, 09/25/2010 (attended September meeting)
Michael Vono, Rio Grande, 10/22/2010 (attended September meeting)
Scott B. Hayashi, Utah, 11/06/2010 (attended September meeting)
Michael Milliken, Western Kansas, 02/19/2011
Martin S. Field, West Missouri, 03/05/2011
Daniel H. Martins, Springfield, 03/19/2011
William Franklin, Western New York, 04/30/2011 (consents received)
Rayford Ray, Northern Michigan, 05/21/2011 (consents received)
George D. Young III, East Tennessee, 06/25/2011 (consents received)

Necrology

The Rt. Rev. Leigh A. Wallace
resigned Bishop of Spokane
10/07/2010

The Rt. Rev. Philip A. Smith
resigned Bishop of New Hampshire
10/10/2010

Resignations

Edwin F. Gulick as Bishop Diocesan, Kentucky, effective 9/25/2010
Carolyn Tanner Irish, as Bishop Diocesan, Utah, effective 11/06/2010
John L. Rabb, as Bishop Suffragan, Maryland, effective 01/01/2011
Barry Howe, as Bishop Diocesan, West Missouri, effective 03/05/2011

Communications from the Presiding Bishop

The Presiding Bishop shared the substance of a communication which will be executed regarding Bishop Mark MacDonald. [See Appendix D.]

The Presiding Bishop also shared the following message:

Greetings from Jerusalem in the Name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ!

I bring you my greetings and the greetings of the clergy and people of the Diocese of Jerusalem to my brothers and sisters of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church.

Be assured of my continued prayers for you and the ministry God has given you during these challenging times. May your time together be guided by the Holy Spirit as a source of inspiration and direction for the decisions which are before you.

I want to take this moment to also offer my appreciation for your prayers and support of the ministry of my Diocese here in the land of the Holy One. May God continue to bless us all.

*The Rt. Rev. Subeil S. Dawani,
Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem.
The Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem*

Elections

The following nominations for the Disciplinary Board for Bishops were made by the Presiding Bishop:

The Rt. Rev. Dena Harrison, 2012
The Rt. Rev. Herman Hollerith IV, 2012
The Rt. Rev. J. Scott Mayer, 2012
The Rt. Rev. James Magness, 2012
The Rt. Rev. Prince Singh, 2012
The Rt. Rev. Robert Fitzpatrick, 2015
The Rt. Rev. Dorsey Henderson, 2015
The Rt. Rev. Wayne Smith 2015
The Rt. Rev. James Waggoner, 2015
The Rt. Rev. Catherine Waynick, 2015

Following announcement of the slate, Bishop Wayne Smith withdrew and upon nomination of Bishop Jacobus was replaced by the Rt. Rev. Francisco Duque, for a term to end in 2015. With the one change, the slate as presented was accepted by acclamation.

The following nomination for the Board of Directors for the College for Bishops was made and approved by acclamation:

Allison St. Louis

Resignations of Bishops

The Rt. Rev. Neil Alexander moved that consent be given for the resignation of the following bishops, all under the age provision in the canons:

The Rt. Rev. Roy F. "Bud" Cederholm as Bishop Suffragan in Massachusetts, to be effective January 1, 2012

The Rt. Rev. Catherine Roskam as Bishop Suffragan in New York, to be effective January 1, 2012

The Rt. Rev. Geralyn Wolfe, as Bishop Diocesan in Rhode Island, to be effective at the end of 2012.

Motion passed

Other Matters

Bishops with jurisdiction were reminded to turn in their consent forms regarding the request for the Diocese of Haiti to elect a Bishop Suffragan.

The Rt. Rev. John Chane made a request that the Presiding Bishop write to members of the Episcopal Church regarding the plight of Bishop Dawani and share with them a letter from the

House of Bishops to the Israeli ambassadors of those nations where the Episcopal Church has dioceses or presence. (The text to those communications may be found in the Appendix to this meeting's minutes.)

The Committee on Pastoral Development was requested to bring guidelines regarding tweeting at HOB meetings and during General Convention to the next meeting.

It was moved and seconded that the reading of the minutes of the last meeting be dispensed with. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
(The Rt. Rev.) Kenneth L Price, Jr.
Secretary

Certified by:
(The Rt. Rev.) Catherine Waynick
Assistant Secretary

Appendix A
Hendersonville, North Carolina

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to order by the Presiding Bishop
 2. Roll Call
 3. Acknowledgement of the senior bishop present
 4. Acknowledgement of
 - a. New members of the House since the last meeting
 - b. Resignations since the last meeting
 - c. Necrology since the last meeting
 5. Communications from the Presiding Bishop
 6. Special Business of the meeting
 - a. Nominations for the Disciplinary Board for Bishops – election
 - i. Dena Harrison (2012), Herman Hollerith IV (2012), J. Scott Mayer (2012), James Magness (2012), Prince Singh (2012), Robert Fitzpatrick (2015), Dorsey Henderson (2015), G. Wayne Smith (2015), James Waggoner (2015), and Catherine Waynick (2015)
 - b. Nominations for Board of Directors for the College for Bishops – election
 7. Report from the Committee on Resignation of Bishops
 8. Other matters
 - a. Resolution tabled 9/21/10
 9. Reminder to bishops with jurisdiction to turn in forms regarding election of Bishop Suffragan for Haiti
 10. Reading of the minutes
 11. Adjournment
-

Appendix B
Hendersonville, North Carolina**Bishops Present at the Interim Meeting of Spring 2011**

Gladstone Adams	Michael Garrison	Mark A. Lattime	Edward Salmon
Laura Ahrens	Robert Gepert	Mark Lawrence	Lane Sapp
Neil Alexander	Wendell Gibbs	Jeff Lee	Stacy Sauls
Lloyd Allen	Mary Glasspool	Peter Lee	Victor Scantlebury
David Alvarez	Duncan Gray	Edward Leidel	Gordon Scruton
Marc Andrus	Mary Gray-Reeves	Gary Lillibridge	James Shand
David E. Bailey	William Gregg	Edward Little	Thomas Shaw
John Bauerschmidt	Orlando Guerrero	William Love	Prince Singh
Nathan Baxter	Edwin Gulick	Bruce MacPherson	Mark Sisk
Mark Beckwith	Ambrose Gumbs	James Magness	William Skilton
Barry Beisner	Michael Hanley	Chip Marble	John Sloan
Larry Benfield	Barbara Harris	Santosh Marray	Wayne Smith
Scott Benhase	Gayle Harris	Daniel Martins	Andrew Smith
Charles Bennison	Dena Harrison	James Mathes	Dabney Smith
David Bowman	Scott Hayashi	Clayton Matthews	Michael Smith
Thomas Breidenthal	Frederick Hiltz	J. Scott Mayer	Kirk Smith
Franklin Brookhart	Julio Holguin	Steven Miller	John S. Smylie
Diane Bruce	Herman Hollerith	Michael Milliken	James Stanton
Jon Bruno	Mark Hollingsworth	Alfredo Morante	Eugene Sutton
John Buchanan	Samuel Howard	Wallis Ohl	Chester Talton
Joe Burnett	Barry Howe	Robert O'Neill	John Tarrant
Bud Cederholm	John Howe	Todd Ousley	Porter Taylor
John Chane	James Hughes	Henry Parsley	Cabell Tennis
George Councill	Robert Ihloff	William Persell	Brian Thom
Michael Curry	Henri Isingoma	Neff Powell	Morris Thompson
James Curry	Russell Jacobus	Kenneth Price	Michael Vono
Clifton Daniel	Katharine Jefferts Schori	Brian Prior	Charles vonRosenberg
Herbert Donovan	Don Johnson	Lawrence Provenzano	James Waggoner
C. Andrew Doyle	Robert H. Johnson	Rayford Ray	W. Andrew Waldo
Philip Duncan	Shannon Johnston	David B. Reed	Catherine Waynick
Francisco Duque	David Jones	David M. Reed	Pierre Whalon
Zache Duracin	Charles Keyser	Gregory Rickel	Terry White
Dan Edwards	Paul Kim	Graham Rights	Keith Whitmore
Thomas Ely	Michie Klusmeyer	Nedi Rivera	Arthur Williams
Christopher Epting	Edward Konieczny	Gene Robinson	Don Wimberly
Martin Field	David Lai	Catherine Roskam	Geralyn Wolf
Robert Fitzpatrick	Paul Lambert	Sean Rowe	Dean Wolfe
R. William Franklin	Stephen Lane	Luis Ruiz	Wayne Wright

Appendix C
Hendersonville, North Carolina

Changes in Status

New Members of the House

Terry Allen White, Kentucky, 09/25/2010 (attended September meeting)

Michael Vono, Rio Grande, 10/22/2010 (attended September meeting)

Scott B. Hayashi, Utah, 11/06/2010 (attended September meeting)

Michael Milliken, Western Kansas, 02/19/2011

Martin S. Field, West Missouri, 03/05/2011

Daniel H. Martins, Springfield, 03/19/2011

William Franklin, Western New York, 04/30/2011 (consents received)

Rayford Ray, Northern Michigan, 05/21/2011 (consents received)

George D. Young III, East Tennessee, 06/25/2011

Resignations since the last meeting

Edwin F. Gulick, effective 9/25/2010

Carolyn Tanner Irish, effective 11/06/2010

John L. Rabb, effective 01/01/2011

Barry Howe, effective 03/05/2010

Necrology since the last meeting

The Rt. Rev. Leigh A. Wallace, resigned Bishop of Spokane 10/07/2010

The Rt. Rev. Philip A. Smith, resigned Bishop of New Hampshire 10/10/2010

The Rt. Rev. Richard L. Shimpfky, resigned Bishop of El Camino Real 02/28/2011

Appendix D
Hendersonville, North Carolina

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between:

BISHOP MARK MACDONALD

an ordained Bishop in the Church of God
transferring from The Episcopal Church to The Anglican Church of Canada
-and-

THE MOST REVEREND FRED HILTZ

Primate of The Anglican Church of Canada
-and-

THE MOST REVEREND DR. KATHARINE JEFFERTS SCHORI

Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this Memorandum is to confirm our understanding about the transfer of Bishop Mark MacDonald from The Episcopal Church to The Anglican Church of Canada.

BACKGROUND

2. The Anglican Church of Canada and The Episcopal Church are in full communion one with the other.
 3. Bishop MacDonald was consecrated as a Bishop in The Episcopal Church and held office as Bishop of Alaska and also was an assisting bishop in Navajoland.
 4. In January 2007, in response to a request from the Sacred Circle, the then-Primate (Archbishop Hutchison) appointed Bishop MacDonald to be the first National Indigenous Anglican Bishop in The Anglican Church of Canada working with the General Synod and not attached to any particular diocese as part of the Church's commitment to A New Agape with Indigenous Peoples.
 5. Bishop MacDonald resigned the office as Bishop of Alaska in September 2007 and the office of Bishop of Navajoland in July 2009.
 6. In 2010, the General Synod of The Anglican Church of Canada gave second reading to amendments to the Declaration of Principles and the Constitution to recognize the office of National Indigenous Anglican Bishop and make the National Indigenous Anglican Bishop a member of the General Synod of The Anglican Church of Canada, and also enacted Canon XX with respect to the National Indigenous Ministry.
 7. In order for Bishop MacDonald to become a full member of the national House of Bishops of The Anglican Church of Canada, it is necessary for him to take oaths and subscriptions.
-

8. Although the canon law of both The Episcopal Church and The Anglican Church of Canada contain procedures for the transfer of bishops either internally between dioceses or coming into a diocese from a church with which it is in full communion (through the use of *letters de bene decessit* and *letters dimissory*), neither has provisions which directly deal with the present circumstance, and it is desirable to set out our understanding and commitment about the effect of Bishop MacDonald's transfer from The Episcopal Church to The Anglican Church of Canada.

**THIS MEMORANDUM CONFIRMS OUR UNDERSTANDING AND COMMITMENT
AS FOLLOWS:**

9. Upon taking the required oaths and subscriptions in The Anglican Church of Canada, Bishop MacDonald will cease to be under the authority of The Episcopal Church and a voting member of its House of Bishops, and will come under the authority of The Anglican Church of Canada and be a full member of its national House of Bishops.
10. The Episcopal Church recognizes that Bishop MacDonald's transfer from The Episcopal Church to The Anglican Church of Canada does not affect the catholicity of his ordination, and recognizes him as a duly consecrated bishop in The Anglican Church of Canada which is a church in full communion with The Episcopal Church.
11. In accordance with canon law and custom, and as would be the case with any other bishop of The Anglican Church of Canada, Bishop MacDonald will obtain the consent of the appropriate diocesan bishop in The Episcopal Church prior to exercising any ministerial function therein, as he does when he exercises such functions in the various dioceses in The Anglican Church of Canada.

SIGNED on the _____ day of _____ A.D. 2011 by Bishop Mark MacDonald
The Most Reverend Fred Hiltz, Primate of The Anglican Church of Canada
The Most Reverend Dr. Katharine Jefferts Schori, Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church

Appendix E
Hendersonville, North Carolina

Letter to the Church

To the members of The Episcopal Church

From the House of Bishops

At our meeting in Kanuga, North Carolina, 25-30 March 2011, we considered the plight of our fellow Christians in the land of the Holy One. Bishop Suheil Dawani, of the Diocese of Jerusalem, has for many months been gravely limited in his ability to function as leader of that diocese. We urge your reflection on the following letter, and your response as you deem most appropriate. Change is likeliest when the leaders of our governments know of our urgent concern.

In every part of The Episcopal Church, your response is most likely to be effective when directed to Israel's ambassador to your nation, to your national leader – President and/or Prime Minister, and/or to your legislative representatives in your national government.

In the dioceses of The Episcopal Church within the United States, those contacts are:

Ambassador Oren embsec@washington.mfa.gov.il

President Obama <http://www.whitehouse.gov/contact>

House of Representatives: <https://writerep.house.gov/writerep/welcome.shtml>

Senate: http://senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm

In the dioceses of The Episcopal Church beyond the United States, we urge you to work with your diocesan bishop if you are uncertain about how to contact the Israeli Ambassador, your President or Prime Minister, and your legislators.

May God bless the land of the Holy One with peace. I remain

Your servant in Christ,
The Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori
Presiding Bishop and Primate
The Episcopal Church

Appendix F
Hendersonville, North Carolina**A letter from the House of Bishops of The Episcopal Church to the Israeli ambassadors to the nations where The Episcopal Church has dioceses or presence**

30 March 2011

It is with deep concern that we inform you that the Anglican Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem, the Rt. Rev. Suheil Dawani, has been denied renewal of his "Temporary Residency Status" in Jerusalem. This action was taken when the A-5 permits held by the bishop, his wife, and youngest daughter were revoked by the Government of Israel, effective 24 September 2010.

The Government of Israel claims that the permits were denied because of an accusation by the Ministry of the Interior that Bishop Suheil acted with the Palestinian Authority in transferring land owned by Jewish people to the Palestinians, and also helped to register lands of Jewish people in the name of the Church. There were further allegations that documents were forged by the bishop.

Bishop Dawani has vehemently denied these allegations and responded formally to the Ministry of the Interior. He has never received a response. The bishop also sent a letter challenging the allegations and demanding that any evidence to secure the claim against him be made known to him. To date no information has been forthcoming. The Archbishop of Canterbury received assurances that the situation would be resolved promptly. Other Anglican leaders including Presiding Bishop Katharine Jefferts Schori, the Episcopal Bishop of Washington D.C. (the Rt. Rev. John B. Chane), and the Primates of the Anglican Communion, representing Anglicans throughout the world, have all used their influence individually and collectively with Israeli authorities, without success to date. Diplomatic efforts through the British Foreign Secretary, the British Ambassador to Israel, the British Consul General in Jerusalem, the State Department of the United States, and the American Consul General in Jerusalem, and Christian and Jewish leaders in Jerusalem have all provided support for Bishop Dawani in his ongoing contact with Israeli authorities, but without tangible results. In terms of discovering the source of the allegations against the bishop, or the restoration of the residency rights which are crucial to his ability to provide leadership of his diocese, and residency in Jerusalem for himself and his family, the Israeli Government has failed to respond. Because of the current situation the bishop is unable to conduct any legal business on behalf of the diocese, and is crippled in his ability to run the day to day affairs of his diocese, which comprises schools, churches, and hospitals in Israel, the West Bank and occupied territories, Gaza, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon.

We seek your assistance in resolving this situation as rapidly and completely as possible. The ability of our brother, Bishop Dawani, to lead his diocese is severely compromised. We ask your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

The bishops of The Episcopal Church, in 110 dioceses and two regional areas in Austria, Belgium, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federated States of Micronesia, France, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Switzerland, Taiwan, Venezuela, and the United States of America (including Guam and Puerto Rico), and the British and U.S. Virgin Islands.

**House of Bishops Meeting
Hilton Colon Hotel Quito, Ecuador
September 20, 2011**

Minutes of the Business Meeting

Call to Order

The business meeting of the House of Bishops was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by the Presiding Bishop, the Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori, who led in prayer.

A moment of silent prayer was offered for the Rt. Rev'd Robert Anderson, and the Rt. Rev'd Walter Righter, who have died since the last meeting in March 2011.

Roll Call

The Secretary suggested the registration for the meeting be considered a sufficient record of bishops present.

Motion carried

There were 113 bishops present and eligible to vote.

Recognition of the Senior Bishop

The Senior Bishop present was the Rt. Rev. David Reed.

Changes in Status

The following officially recorded acts since the last Meeting of the House of Bishops were announced:

Consecrations

R. William Franklin, Western New York, 04/30/2011 (attended March meeting)
Rayford J. Ray, Northern Michigan, 05/21/2011 (attended March meeting)
George D. Young, III, East Tennessee, 06/25/2011

Elections/Consecration dates

J. Scott Barker, Nebraska, 10/08/2011
Marianne E. Budde, Washington, 11/12/2011
John McKee Sloan, Alabama, investiture 01/07/2012

Resignations

Joe Burnett, Bishop of Nebraska 04/01/2011
J. Michael Garrison, Bishop of Western New York 04/30/2011
Rayford High, Bishop Suffragan of Texas 04/30/2011
Charles vonRosenberg, Bishop of East Tennessee 06/25/2011

Victor Scantlebury, Assistant Bishop of Chicago 07/01/2011

Stacy Sauls, Bishop of Lexington 09/01/2011

Removals

Mark McDonald

Communications from the Presiding Bishop

The Presiding Bishop announced that Sean Rowe has accepted the appointment to become Assistant Parliamentarian for the House.

In response to comments and evaluations, a task force is being formed to conduct a review of meetings of the House of Bishops. Invited to participate are: the Presiding Bishop, Canon Chuck Robertson, and Bishops Clay Matthews, Tom Shaw, Todd Ousley, Dan Daniel, Terry White, Diane Bruce, Prince Singh, Orlando Guerrero, and Andy Doyle.

Luis Ruiz and Victor Scantlebury were invited to offer information about the situation in the Diocese of Ecuador Central. As a result of ongoing and escalating tension in the relationship between the Bishop, the Standing Committee, and the Legal Representative, it has been agreed that all the persons involved in those particular ministries will resign, in order to provide a time for healing, clarification, formation, and a fresh start for the leadership of the diocese.

Resignations are to be tendered before October 1, 2011.

Bishop Scantlebury will serve as Interim Bishop, and will lead the diocese in reconstruction and reconciliation, revision of diocesan canons to conform to churchwide canons, and the training of clergy who were previously formed in the Roman Catholic Church, along with other transitional tasks. Bishop Clay Matthews will continue to provide resources for the enterprise of “building the new plane while flying it.”

The Presiding Bishop urged the House to hold all persons involved in prayer. The Ruiz family, diocesan leaders and members, and Church Center staff all have been affected by more than a decade of turmoil and stressful disagreement; reconciliation and reconstruction will take a long time. Title IV complaints have been received, and the process of addressing those will move forward.

Diocesan leaders have ceded authority to the Presiding Bishop, who will make the determination about the timing of a diocesan convention.

The House was reassured that Bishop Ruiz will continue to receive his salary, and the family does have health insurance.

Election of Members of the College for Bishops

The Bishop for Pastoral Development offered the names of Dean Wolfe (Bubba Lobo) and Andrew Doyle to be elected as members of the Board of The College for Bishops.

Bishop Bailey offered a resolution to affirm Bp. Ruiz for his strong support and involvement in ministries to refugees, and that the money offerings received during this meeting be designated for refugee ministries in this diocese.

Resignations

Bishop Alexander asked for a vote to consent to the Resignation of David Jones as Bishop Suffragan of the Diocese of Virginia, effective January 31, 2012.

Motion carried

Privilege and Courtesy

Bishop Scantlebury presented the request to admit Santosh Marray as a Collegial member of the House. (Collegial members have seat and voice but no vote.)

Motion carried with acclamation

Theology

Joe Burnett offered a resolution from the committee that we adopt their letter on stewardship of the Earth as a pastoral letter from this House.

With very little grammatical tweaking, a request for a footnote definition of ‘carbon footprint’, and the suggestion that this document be styled a ‘teaching’ rather than a ‘letter’ the House passed the resolution handily.

Reading of the Minutes

The minutes were accepted as submitted by e-mail many weeks ago, and a motion was made to dispense with the reading of the minutes.

Motion carried

Respectfully submitted,

+Cate Waynick

Assistant Secretary to the House of Bishops

Appendix A
Quito, Ecuador

Meeting Agenda

Thursday, September 15

James Chisholm

(MC: +Rivera)

- 9:00 a.m.** Opening (Plenary) Eucharist
10:15 a.m. **Session I**
Check In
Welcome by the Presiding Bishop
Town Hall Meeting
12:30 p.m. Lunch
2:00 p.m. **Session II**
Scriptural Foundation for Prophetic Proclamation to the Least
(with +Naudal Gomes, Bishop of Curitiba, Brazil and Don Compier, Professor at St. Paul School of Theology)
4:45 p.m. Evening Prayer
5:30 p.m. Wine & Beer
Reception / Opening Dinner

Friday, September 16

Ninian

(MC: +Holguín)

- 9:00 a.m.** Morning Prayer and Bible Study
9:45 a.m. **Session III**
Announcements
Scriptural and Theological Foundation for Liberation Theology
(with Silvia Regina, Director of Departamento Ecumenico de Investigaciones {Dep't. of Ecumenical Research})
11:45 a.m. Holy Eucharist (+Morante)
12:30 p.m. Lunch
2:00 p.m. **Session IV**
Panel: Scriptural and Theological Panel: Prophetic Proclamation and Liberation Theology *(with +Gomes, Compier, and Regina)*
3:00 p.m. Preparation for Field Trips by local leaders
4:30 p.m. Evening Prayer
-

Saturday, September 17

Hildegard of Bingen

Field Trips

- 6:30 a.m.** Buses to Tulcán depart hotel
(Arrive at 11:00, buses return at 2:00)
- 7:00 a.m.** Buses to Ibarra and Otavalo depart hotel
(Arrive at 10:30, buses return at 3:00)
- 7:45 a.m.** Trip to visit Missions in Quito
(Morning Prayer at 8:30, go to daycare at 10:00, buses return at 11:00)
- 7:30 p.m.** Provincial Dinners

Sunday, September 18

Worship

- 7:00 a.m.** Bus departs for 8:00 a.m. service at **Misión Cristo Libertador, Sector Comité del Pueblo**
- 7:45 a.m.** Bus departs for Reconcile then to **Misión Emanuel, Sector Guajaló** for 9:00 a.m. service
- 8:15 a.m.** Bus departs for 9:30 a.m service at **Catedral El Señor, Rumiñahui sector, Quito**
- 12:30 p.m.** **Lunch at the hotel**
- 7:00 p.m.** **Session V**
Fireside Chat
- 9:00 p.m.** Compline

Monday, September 19

Theodore of Tarsus

(MC: +Lambert)

- 9:00 a.m.** Morning Prayer and Bible Study
- 9:45 a.m.** **Session VI**
Announcements
***Panel: Migration, Poverty, Indebtedness, and the Environment in Ecuador and Province IX
- 11:30 a.m.** Holy Eucharist (+Bruce)
- 12:30 p.m.** **Boxed lunches provided**
- 2:00 p.m.** **Session VII**
Migration, Poverty, Indebtedness, and the Environment in Ecuador and Province IX *continued*
Town Hall Meeting *continued from Thursday*
- 5:30 p.m.** Evening Prayer
- 6:30 p.m.** Class Dinners
-

Tuesday, September 20

John Coleridge Patteson

(MC: +Rowe)

9:00 a.m.	Morning Prayer and Bible Study
9:45 a.m.	Session VIII
	Announcements
	Follow up with Structure Conversation
12:00 noon	Prayer
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 p.m.	Session IX
	Town Hall Meeting <i>continued from Monday</i>
	Visiting Primates' Reflections
	BUSINESS SESSION (PUBLIC SESSION)
4:30 p.m.	Holy Eucharist (+M. Curry)
6:00 p.m.	Wine & Beer
	Reception / Closing Dinner

Appendix B
Quito, Ecuador**Bishops Present at the Meeting in September 2011**

Gladstone Adams	Orlando Guerrero	Lawrence Provenzano
Laura Ahrens	Edwin Gulick	Rayford Ray
Neil Alexander	Michael Hanley	David B. Reed
Lloyd Allen	Gayle Harris	Gregory Rickel
David Alvarez	Scott Hayashi	Nedi Rivera
Marc Andrus	Julio Holguin	Sean Rowe
David E. Bailey	Herman Hollerith	Luis Ruiz
John Bauerschmidt	Mark Hollingsworth	Edward Salmon
Nathan Baxter	Katharine Jefferts Schori	Stacy Sauls
Mark Beckwith	Don Johnson	Victor Scantlebury
Barry Beisner	Shannon Johnston	Alan Scarfe
Larry Benfield	Michie Klusmeyer	Gordon Scruton
Scott Benhase	Edward Konieczny	James Shand
Charles Bennison	David Lai	Prince Singh
Thomas Breidenthal	Paul Lambert	Mark Sisk
Diane Bruce	Mark A. Lattime	John Sloan
John Buchanan	Jeff Lee	Andrew Smith
Joe Burnett	Edward Little	Kirk Smith
Albert Chama	William Love	Wayne Smith
George Councill	James Magness	John S. Smylie
James Curry	Santosh Marray	Eugene Sutton
Clifton Daniel	Daniel Martins	Chester Talton
Ian Douglas	James Mathes	John Tarrant
C. Andrew Doyle	Clayton Matthews	Porter Taylor
Francisco Duque	J. Scott Mayer	Morris Thompson
Zache Duracin	Rodney Michel	Nathaniel Uematsu
Dan Edwards	Steven Miller	Michael Vono
Thomas Ely	Michael Milliken	James Waggoner
Martin Field	Alfredo Morante	W. Andrew Waldo
Robert Fitzpatrick	Wallis Ohl	Catherine Waynick
Leopold Frade	Robert O'Neill	Pierre Whalon
R. William Franklin	James Ottley	Terry White
Carol Gallagher	Todd Ousley	Keith Whitmore
Michael Garrison	Henry Parsley	Arthur Williams
Robert Gepert	William Persell	Geralyn Wolf
Wendell Gibbs	Neff Powell	Dean Wolfe
Mary Glasspool	Peter Price	George Young
William Gregg	Brian Prior	

House of Bishops Meeting

Camp Allen

March 20, 2012

Call to Order

The business meeting was called to order by the Presiding Bishop, the Most Rev. Katharine Jefferts Schori .

Roll Call

It was moved that the registration list of the conference suffice for the roll call. The Secretary announced that the original attendance consisted of 132 bishops and the number still present more than constituted a quorum.

Recognition of the Senior Bishop

It was announced that although the Rt. Rev. Herbert Donovan had been at the meeting earlier, at the time of the business session the Rt. Rev. Arthur Williams was the senior bishop present.

Communications from the Presiding Bishop

The Presiding Bishop announced that former Episcopal Bishop Jeffrey Steenson, now in the Roman Catholic Church, has been appointed to work with Episcopal clergy coming into the Roman Catholic Church.

The Presiding Bishop announced that the House of Bishops would consider accepting the invitation of the Bishop of Taiwan to meet there in September, 2014.

The Rt. Rev. Mark Hollingsworth and The Rt. Rev. Mark Sisk distributed a copy of a proposed resolution B014 on Pastoral Relationships between a Bishop and Diocese. This matter will come to the General Convention.

Changes of Status of Bishops in the House

Consecrations/elections since the last meeting

Scott Barker, Nebraska, 10/08/2011

Mariann E. Budde, Washington, 11/12/2011

John McKee Sloan, Alabama, 01/07/2012

Andrew M.L. Dietsche, New York, 03/10/2012

Gregory O. Brewer, Central Florida, consecration scheduled for 03/24/2012

Ogé Beauvoir, Haiti, consecration scheduled for 05/22/2012

Necrology

Bertram N. Herlong, resigned Bishop of Tennessee, 10/21/2011
Elliott L. Sorge, resigned Bishop of Easton, 12/06/2011
Arthur A. Vogel, resigned Bishop of West Missouri, 3/06/2012

Resignations

Luis Ruiz, Bishop of Ecuador Central effective 10/01/2011
John Chane, Bishop of Washington effective 11/12/2011
Roy F. Cederholm, Bishop Suffragan of Massachusetts effective 01/01/2012
Catherine Roskam, Bishop Suffragan of New York effective 01/01/2012
Henry Parsley, Bishop of Alabama effective 01/07/2012
David Jones, Bishop Suffragan of Virginia effective 01/31/2012

Notice of Accord

Vincent Warner to not act as a bishop effective February 14, 2012

Special Business of the Convention

The Rt.Rev. Wayne Wright introduced a resolution on behalf of the Committee on Dispatch of Business sending good wishes to the Archbishop of Canterbury after the announcement of his upcoming retirement.

Motion passed
Resolution adopted

The resolution was passed by acclimation followed by applause.

The Rt. Rev. Ed Little offered a revised version of the DEPO document (Caring for all the Churches). Several perfections from the floor took place.

Motion passed
Resolution adopted

The Rt. Rev. Gayle Harris offered a set of Policies for Social Media and Electronic Communications at House of Bishops Meetings and Gatherings. These policies will be part of the norms of the House.

Motion passed
Resolution adopted

The Rt.Rev. Neil Alexander offered, on behalf of the Presiding Bishop, the name to Les Callahan to become member of the Board of the College for Bishops.

Motion passed

Formal Reports

Bishop Alexander then called attention to the Annual Report of the College for Bishops. The Rt. Rev. Dean Wolfe spoke on funding issues with the College for Bishops and requested that bishops support to this endeavor.

Resignations

The Rt. Rev. Neil Alexander, reporting for the House of Bishops Committee on Resignations moved the following resignations:

The Rt. Rev. David Bailey, to resign as Bishop of Navajo land for reason of advanced age, effective March 30, 2012.

The Rt. Rev. Gordon Scruton, to resign as Bishop of Western Mass. for reason of advanced age effective December 1, 2012.

The Rt. Rev. Kenneth L. Price Jr., to resign as Bishop Suffragan of Southern Ohio effective July 31, 2012 and Bishop Provisional of Pittsburgh, effective October 20, 2012.

Motion passed
Resignations accepted

Although no action was needed, it was announced that the Rt. Rev. William Skilton has resigned as assisting bishop in the Dominican Republic.

Informal Reports and Announcements

The Rt. Rev. Tom Breidethal spoke briefly on behalf of the National Association of Episcopal Schools, and distributed a copy of a resolution that will come before General Convention, requesting support.

The Rt. Rev. Jay Magness spoke briefly of his concern that when many of the troops now on active duty return home, many veterans will end up homeless.

The Rt. Rev. Scott Benhase reported that \$81,000 has been raised in support of the Bishop Luis Ruiz fund.

The Rt. Rev. Russell Jacobus distributed a report on Solitaries and reminded the bishops that he needs reports from more dioceses.

The Rt. Rev. Dean Wolfe spoke briefly on Looking Toward General Convention and reminded the bishops that there will be an orientation for all bishops at 3:00 p.m. on July 3, 2012, in Indianapolis.

The Rt. Rev. Cate Waynick spoke briefly on her recent visit to the Sudan, sharing the conditions there.

Reading of Previous Meeting Minutes

It was moved that the reading of the minutes of the last meeting be dispensed with and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

The Rt. Rev. Kenneth L. Price Jr.
Secretary

Attested,

The Rt. Rev. Wayne Wright
Chair, Dispatch of Business

Appendix A
Camp Allen, Texas

Meeting Agenda

Friday, March 16

MC: +Nedi Rivera

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Morning Prayer
9:45 a.m.	Session I
	RETREAT TIME
	Spiritual Discipline (+Tom Shaw)
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 p.m.	Session II
	Check In
	Discussion of B014 Media Recommendations
5:30 p.m.	Opening Eucharist (Presiding Bishop)
6:30 p.m.	Opening Dinner
9:00 p.m.	Hospitality

Saturday, March 17

Patrick, Bishop

(MC: +Ed Little)

7:30 a.m.	Eucharist
8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Morning Prayer
9:45 a.m.	Session III
	RETREAT TIME
	Proclamation of the Gospel (+Michael Curry)
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 p.m.	Session IV
	Discussion of SCLM
5:30 p.m.	Evening Prayer
6:30 p.m.	Dinner

Sabbath Begins

Sunday, March 18

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
- 10:00 a.m. Eucharist
RETREAT MEDITATION
Pastoral Care
(+Porter Taylor / +Geraldyn Wolf)
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch

Sabbath Continues

- 6:00 p.m. Dinner
- 7:00 p.m. Session V
Fireside Chat
- 9:00 p.m. Hospitality

Monday, March 19

Saint Joseph

(MC: +Skip Adams)

- 7:30 a.m. Eucharist
- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast
- 9:00 a.m. Morning Prayer
- 9:45 a.m. Session VI
RETREAT TIME
Faith, Unity and Governance (Presiding Bishop)
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch

Free Afternoon (possibility of presentations)

- 5:30 p.m. Evening Prayer
- 6:30 p.m. Dinner
- 8:00 p.m. Session VII
Covenant
Impact of Decisions at GC
Revised DEPO document
- 9:00 p.m. Hospitality

Tuesday, March 20

Cuthbert, Bishop

(MC: +Victor Scantlebury)

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Morning Prayer
9:45 a.m.	Session VIII
	RETREAT TIME
	Mission (+Julio Holguín)
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 p.m.	Session IX
	<i>Business Session</i>
5:30 p.m.	Closing Eucharist (+Wolfe / +Harrison)
6:00 p.m.	Reception and Closing Dinner

Appendix B
Camp Allen, Texas**Bishops Present at the Spring 2012 Meeting**

Gladstone Adams	Christopher Epting	Paul Lambert	Edward Salmon
Laura Ahrens	Martin Field	Stephen Lane	Stacy Sauls
Neil Alexander	Robert Fitzpatrick	Mark A. Lattime	Victor Scantlebury
Lloyd Allen	R. William Franklin	Mark Lawrence	Alan Scarfe
David Alvarez	Michael Garrison	Jeffrey Lee	Gordon Scruton
Marc Andrus	Robert Gepert	Edward Leidel	James Shand
David E. Bailey	Wendell Gibbs	Gary Lillibridge	Thomas Shaw
J. Scott Barker	Mary Glasspool	Edward Little	Prince Singh
John Bauerschmidt	Duncan Gray	William Love	Mark Sisk
Nathan Baxter	Mary Gray-Reeves	Bruce MacPherson	William Skilton
Mark Beckwith	Orlando Guerrero	James Magness	John Sloan
Barry Beisner	Edwin Gulick	Chip Marble	Andrew Smith
Larry Benfield	Ambrose Gumbs	Santosh Marray	Wayne Smith
Scott Benhase	Michael Hanley	Daniel Martins	Michael Smith
Charles Bennison	Gayle Harris	James Mathes	John S. Smylie
Thomas Breidenthal	Dena Harrison	Clayton Matthews	James Stanton
Gregory Brewer	Scott Hayashi	J. Scott Mayer	Eugene Sutton
Franklin Brookhart	Dan Herzog	Steven Miller	John Tarrant
Diane Bruce	Julio Holguin	Michael Milliken	Porter Taylor
Jon Bruno	Herman Hollerith	Alfredo Morante	Cabell Tennis
John Buchanan	Mark Hollingsworth	Wallis Ohl	Brian Thom
Mariann Budde	Samuel Howard	Robert O'Neill	Morris Thompson
Joe Burnett	John Howe	Todd Ousley	Michael Vono
George Councill	Barry Howe	Claude Payne	James Waggoner
Michael Curry	Robert Ihloff	William Persell	W. Andrew Waldo
James Curry	Russell Jacobus	Neff Powell	Catherine Waynick
Clifton Daniel	Katharine Jefferts	Kenneth Price	Justin Welby
Andrew Dietsche	Schori	Brian Prior	Pierre Whalon
Herbert Donovan	James Jelinek	Lawrence Provenzano	Terry White
Ian Douglas	Shannon Johnston	Rayford Ray	Keith Whitmore
C. Andrew Doyle	Michie Klusmeyer	David M. Reed	Arthur Williams
Philip Duncan	Chilton Knudsen	Gregory Rickel	Geralyn Wolf
Francisco Duque	Edward Konieczny	Nedi Rivera	Dean Wolfe
Zache Duracin	David Lai	Gene Robinson	Wayne Wright
Thomas Ely	Jerry Lamb	Sean Rowe	George Young

Appendix C
Camp Allen, Texas

Changes in Status

Consecrations/elections since the last meeting

Scott Barker, Nebraska, 10/08/2011

Mariann E. Budde, Washington, 11/12/2011

John McKee Sloan, Alabama, 01/07/2012

Andrew M.L. Dietsche, New York, 03/10/2012

Gregory O. Brewer, Central Florida, consecration scheduled for 03/24/2012

Ogé Beauvoir, Haiti, consecration scheduled for 05/22/2012

Necrology

Bertram N. Herlong, resigned Bishop of Tennessee, 10/21/2011

Elliott L. Sorge, resigned Bishop of Easton, 12/06/2011

Arthur A. Vogel, resigned Bishop of West Missouri, 3/06/2012

Resignations

Luis Ruiz, Bishop of Ecuador Central effective 10/01/2011

John Chane, Bishop of Washington effective 11/12/2011

Roy F. Cederholm, Bishop Suffragan of Massachusetts effective 01/01/2012

Catherine Roskam, Bishop Suffragan of New York effective 01/01/2012

Henry Parsley, Bishop of Alabama effective 01/07/2012

David Jones, Bishop Suffragan of Virginia effective 01/31/2012

Notice of Accord

Vincent Warner to not act as a bishop effective February 14, 2012

Appendix D
Camp Allen, Texas

Greetings to the Archbishop of Canterbury

Resolved; We the bishops of the Episcopal Church send our greetings to the Most Rev. Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury as you begin a new season in your ministry. We remember with deep appreciation your pastoral visit with us as we met in New Orleans, Louisiana following the destruction of Hurricane Katrina. At the 2008 Lambeth Conference we were recipients of your personal hospitality, teaching ministry, and leadership. The "indaba" spirit of that gathering continues to influence and shape our common life and ministry. We wish you Godspeed and many blessings in the coming days.

Appendix E
Camp Allen, Texas

CARING FOR ALL THE CHURCHES
A Response of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church
to an expressed need of the Church

The church is the Body of Christ. Our life in this Body is a continuing action of God's grace among us. In Christ's power alone the church *is* "joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. 2:21). Through the church's common life in Christ, God intends to signify to the world the beginning of a new and reconciled creation.

We know that the unity with God that Christ has won for humanity, he won through the victory of his passion. We are mindful of the suffering Jesus who, on the cross and through his resurrection, reaches into every corner of alienated human life, reconciling and restoring to the household of God all who come to him in faith. By God's grace the church is continually called, in repentance and hope, to be a trustworthy sign to the world of this costly reconciling power of God. As we trust in Christ and follow him, we share in his unity with the Father through the Holy Spirit. Communion in the Trinity is the salvation of the world. The church, thus, exists for the sake of the world. Therefore, for the sake of the world, bishops have been called "[to] serve before God day and night in the ministry of reconciliation" (BCP, p. 521) – a ministry which is to be carried out "with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing one another in love, making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:2-3).

We as bishops are not of a common mind about issues concerning human sexuality. Different points of view on these matters also exist within our dioceses and congregations. In some instances there are significant differences between congregation(s) and the bishop, and few of our congregations are themselves of one mind. As we exercise pastoral leadership in our dioceses, we pledge ourselves to work always towards the fullest relationship, seeking, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has said, "the highest degree of communion." We have committed ourselves to living through this time of disagreement in love and charity and with sensitivity to the pastoral needs of all members of our church.

In the circumstances of disagreement regarding the actions of the 74th and subsequent General Conventions on issues of human sexuality, we commit ourselves to providing and to making provision for pastoral care for dissenting congregations, and we recognize that there may be a need for a bishop to delegate some pastoral oversight. Oversight means the episcopal acts performed as part of a diocesan bishop's ministry either by the Bishop Diocesan or by another bishop to whom such responsibility has been delegated by the Diocesan. In other Anglican Provinces, the term "pastoral oversight" signifies what we mean by "pastoral care." In our Episcopal Church polity, "oversight" does not confer "jurisdiction." We are aware of current

examples of the delegation of pastoral oversight in the gracious accommodations which have occurred in some dioceses. As we commit ourselves to a process for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight, we also recognize the constitutional and canonical authority of bishops and the integrity of diocesan boundaries. We are in accord with the statement of the Primates: “Whilst we affirm the teaching of successive Lambeth Conferences that bishops must respect the autonomy and territorial integrity of dioceses and provinces other than their own, we call on the provinces concerned to make adequate provision for episcopal oversight of dissenting minorities within their own area of pastoral care in consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Primates.”

We recognize that we face a complex set of needs. Some Christians of a traditional perspective on matters of human sexuality find themselves in dioceses where the actions of the 74th and subsequent General Conventions are overwhelmingly affirmed and where diocesan policies and practices are in line with those General Convention actions (for example, in the ordination of persons living in same-sex partnerships and in episcopal permission for the blessing of same-sex unions). At the same time, some Christians who affirm the actions of the 74th and subsequent General Conventions find themselves in dioceses where the actions of those conventions are overwhelmingly opposed, and where diocesan policies do not permit the ordination of persons living in same-sex partnerships or the blessings of same-sex unions. In both cases, it is essential to provide a “safe space” for the exercise of conscience. A particular issue surrounds the ordination of persons from a “minority” perspective within a diocese. Often persons whose perspective runs contrary to that of the majority in a diocese feel that they cannot test their vocation to the diaconate or the priesthood; that their vocations will be dismissed out of hand, without a fair hearing. Thus Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight needs to include the possibility that persons from a parish receiving episcopal ministry under the provisions of this document may test their vocation in that bishop’s diocese.

Sensitive pastoral care does not presuppose like-mindedness. Bishops and congregations have frequently disagreed about particular articulations and interpretations of scripture and the Creeds while being able to transcend their differences through common prayer and celebration of the sacraments of the new covenant. Bishops promise to “support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries” (BCP, p. 518), and that pledge must not be limited to the like-minded. Our theology and practice hold that ordination and consecration provide the gifts and grace necessary for the sacramental acts of a bishop to be effectual. (See article XXVI of the Articles of Religion: Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments.) Yet the conflict over human sexuality reminds us that our support and pastoral care may need to take unusual and extraordinary forms for the sake of the unity of the church.

As bishops we are “servants of Christ and stewards of God’s mysteries” (1 Cor. 4:1), a ministry that none of us possesses alone. Together we must be signs of unity. We seek unity for the sake of the world and in fidelity to our Lord, who gave his life to restore all to unity with God. We

acknowledge our failures of charity toward one another in our shared ministry, we repent and ask forgiveness of God and of our brother and sister bishops, and we pledge ourselves to a sacrificial ministry with one another. We will value in each the presence of the Crucified and Risen Christ. While our unity may be strained, we continue to strive for godly union and concord. Our task requires humility, charity, mutual respect and a willingness to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

In March of 2002 the House of Bishops adopted the following covenant:

“We believe that the present Constitution and Canons of The Episcopal Church are sufficient for dealing with questions of episcopal oversight, supplemental episcopal pastoral care, and disputes that may arise between the bishop and a congregation. We encourage that their provisions be used wisely and in the spirit of charity.

The provision of supplemental episcopal pastoral care shall be under the direction of the bishop of the diocese, who shall invite the visitor and remain in pastoral contact with the congregation. This is to be understood as a temporary arrangement, the ultimate goal of which is the full restoration of the relationship between the congregation and their bishop.

We are profoundly grateful that the faith that binds us together – grounded in Jesus Christ, rooted in the historic Creeds and in the Holy Scriptures – is deep, and that the bond created in baptism is indissoluble. Our disagreements are nonetheless real, and touch on issues that cannot be easily or quickly resolved. Convictions are passionately held across the spectrum on matters of human sexuality. We must honor conscience in such a way that persons who find themselves in a theological minority know that they have a permanent place in the Church. Thus the “temporary arrangement” called for in the 2002 covenant must also be seen as being “as long as necessary.” Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight is a way of assuring theological minorities that they are beloved and not merely tolerated, and that their presence is a gift rather than a problem.

Expanding on the agreement of 2002, and working always towards “the highest degree of communion,” we offer the following recommendations in order to provide Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight. We expect that the first priority in a relationship between a Bishop Diocesan and a congregation is a striving for unity. As such, it is incumbent upon both the bishop and the rector/congregation to meet together, with a consultant, if needed, to find ways to work together. If for serious cause in the light of our current disagreements on issues of human sexuality, the bishop and rector/congregation cannot work together, we propose the following process for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight.

- 1) In the spirit of openness, the rector and vestry, or the canonically designated lay leadership shall meet with the bishop to seek reconciliation. After such a
-

meeting, it is our hope that in most instances a mutually agreeable way forward will be found.

2) If reconciliation does not occur, then the rector and two-thirds of the vestry, or in the absence of a rector, two-thirds of the canonically designated lay leadership, after fully engaging the congregation, may seek from their Bishop Diocesan, (or the bishop may suggest) a conference regarding the appropriateness and conditions for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight.

3) After such a conference the Bishop Diocesan may appoint another bishop to provide pastoral oversight.

4) The ministry of a bishop serving under the provisions of Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight may include the following elements:

- a. Episcopal visitations
- b. Administration of confirmation and other initiatory rites
- c. Providing counsel to the rector, vestry, or canonically designated lay leadership
- d. In cooperation with the Bishop Diocesan, collaborating in search processes when the parish seeks a new rector

5) The bishop providing delegated pastoral oversight may also, with the consent of the Bishop Diocesan and his or her own commission on ministry and standing committee, care for persons from the parish receiving delegated oversight in the ordination process. In that case the canonical provision in Canon III.6.2(a) and III.8.2(a) regarding “other community of faith” shall apply to the parish receiving delegated oversight. Thus the person testing his or her vocation seeks ordination through the discernment process of the diocese of the bishop providing delegated oversight, and his or her formation is under the direction of that diocese. In situations in which the bishop providing delegated pastoral oversight is not a Bishop Diocesan, he or she may ask a bishop with jurisdiction to assume this task.

6) If no reconciliation is achieved, there may then be an appeal to the bishop who is president or vice-president of the Episcopal Church province in which the congregation is geographically located, for help in seeking such a resolution. Those making such an appeal must inform the other party of their decision to appeal.

7) When such an appeal is made, the provincial bishop may request two other bishops, representative of the divergent views in this church, to join with the provincial bishop to review the situation, to consider the appeal, and to make recommendations to all parties. If a bishop is invited to provide Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight, that bishop shall be a member in good standing in the House of Bishops.

8) When an agreement is reached with respect to a plan, it shall be for the purpose of reconciliation. The plan shall include expectations of all parties,

especially mutual accountability. The plan shall be for a stated period of time with regular reviews and an opportunity for re-negotiation and renewal.

The provincial bishop shall periodically inform the Presiding Bishop, the Presiding Bishop's Council of Advice, and the House of Bishops at its regular meetings of the progress and results of this process.

This difficult season in the Church's life provides, paradoxically, an opportunity to exercise loving pastoral leadership. We commit ourselves wholeheartedly to the provisions of this document, and to the ministry of reconciliation to which it points. Our Lord's prayer for the unity of the Church includes a promise: "so that the world may believe that you have sent me" (John 17:23). In other words, Jesus invites those beyond the Christian community to look at the Church and make a decision about him on the basis of our relationships with one another. This moment in our lives has eternal significance, not merely for ourselves, but for the world for which Jesus died.

As bishops of this church, we pledge ourselves to pray and work for patience and the generosity of spirit that can enable a pastoral resolution as we live with our differences. As well, we will strive for Godly union and concord as together we seek to be led by the Spirit of truth who, as Jesus tells us, "will guide us into all the truth." (John 16:13)

The House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church

20 March 2012

Appendix F
Camp Allen, Texas

**Draft Policies for Social Media & Electronic Communications at
House Of Bishops Meetings and Gatherings**

Once adopted by the House of Bishops, these policies are to be distributed to all in attendance at House meetings and gatherings in English, Spanish, French, Creole and other languages necessary. Copies of these policies are to be distributed to all bishops' tables, and prominently displayed at the entrance and within the meeting space for visitors, guests, staff, chaplains, and translators.

1. The terms social media and electronic communications include but are not limited to:

photographs, email, blogs, Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, videotaping, live streaming, audio taping and other multimedia, including electronic listening devices.

2. The House will be informed at the beginning of any session when reporters, journalists and/or photographers are present.

3. Each session will begin with a declaration of the status of meeting or gathering by the chair or leader as either an "Open Session" or an "Executive Session".

It is also desirable that the status of each session be displayed prominently at the entrance of the room where House is gathered

4. The status of meetings or gatherings of the House of Bishops are as follows:

Open Session: Members of the House, invited guests, chaplains, translators, visitors, members of media, and staff designated by the Presiding Bishop are present.

In open sessions:

Photographs may be taken only with the permission of those in the photograph; an exception is given to designated staff taking pictures; pictures taken by the staff will be reviewed. Photos may only be released after permission is given at the end of that session, not during the session. Photos by designated staff may only be released at the close of day.

It is assumed that speakers will be quoted at open sessions, but the agenda, topics, events and spoken words at the open session may not be communicated in any form until the close of that session.

Executive Session: Members of the House, guests invited by the Presiding Bishop, chaplains, and translators are present.

Note: Executive Sessions are intended:

To strengthen relationship and communication among members

To allow members to speak freely and explore all aspects and directions of issues and concerns presented

To discuss sensitive issues in private until the House is ready to speak publically

(edited from *boardsource.org*)

In Executive Sessions:

Confidentiality in discussions is assumed and is to be respected in Executive Sessions.

The use of social media and electronic communications and preparing drafts for them are prohibited during Executive Sessions.

Photographs are not permitted.

Videotaping, or audio taping are not permitted.

Specific members of the House of Bishops may not be quoted or referred to in any communication or posting of messages.

Any communications concerning Executive Sessions must wait until after an official report/statement of the House has been publically distributed.

Members of the House sending any messages or communications concerning the content of an Executive Session after the official report has been released are to refer only to their thoughts and reflections and avoid stating another's comments.

5. Robert's Rules of Order allows both discussion and voting during either an Open Session or an Executive Session
