

Discussion of A040, Called To Common Mission
House of Bishops, ECUSA
July 7th, 2000
Denver, Colorado
(Transcribed to the best of my ability by Robert A. Sain, Hickory, NC)

Bishop Edward Lee of Western Michigan (Chair of the Committee on Ecumenical Relations): This recommendation comes to you unanimously from the committee (Ecumenical Relations Committee) of 25-30 members, not only unanimously, but with strong conviction. It arrives at the right time, at the right place and at the right moment in this jubilee year. And if ever there is a jubilee moment of opportunity for this convention, then brothers and sisters, then this is it. We have come through what in history might be called an ecumenical century that precedes us; that small step by step process that started with conversations, key leaders that worked its way through the World Council of Churches and its predecessors.... coming right up into our time and into our own diocese in such a way that much that is called ecumenical business had been going on not only at top levels of deliberation, but in all of our parishes and communities. So at the beginning of a new century and a new millennium, we have I believe, an opportunity to enact a jubilee action of reconciliation. This ecumenical breakthrough at the beginning of a new ecumenical era, as we all know by now, is not a merger, it is not a blending, it is not a dilution, and contrary to what some people heard from NBC News today, we are not joining the ELCA. What we are doing is an ecumenical breakthrough called Full Communion. And I want to remind us that we hear it in a variety of directions from our own participation in ecumenical dialogue, conversations, bilateral, tri-lateral in a kind of covenant that we have often done locally with the Lutheran Church and our Roman Catholic brothers and sisters. But the operative words are no longer simply cooperation or collaboration, they are not even just covenant. Operative words these days even at official levels of deliberation, whatever direction we want to see it go; from the orthodox world, yes even down at the edges of conversations with our Pentecostal brothers and sisters, with the word Full Communion. Simple talk, dialogue and conversation will need to be continued as we continue working in conversation with other Christian bodies with whom we have not had that before. It takes time. And for thirty-some years the Episcopal Church and the ELCA and its predecessor bodies in that time, have taken a step-by-step, almost word by word dialogue on a course that even then wasn't envisioned as Full Communion. But if we believe, guided by the Holy Spirit, with the understanding that the mandate "to be one" is a possible mandate we can not altar, though we have broken it, then the task of reconciliation are ours to..... (unintelligible).... what is that oneness and unity that Christ has already established.

And the ELCA, starting with its predecessors, now since 1988 and the Episcopal Church have moved in the direction of where we are today. With this resolution that we are considering because there have been indeed a revision of that Concordat which we so overwhelmingly approved in Philadelphia three years ago, and now must return to us. It hasn't been replaced; it hasn't been indeed rewritten, but rather revised as Called to Common Mission. And so we must at this time, act in response to what the ELCA did last summer in this very city, probably, maybe even in this very room. In 1997 it was painfully at that point, by the slimmest of margins according to its voting procedures, not able to approve the Concordat. But good friends, lets recognize what the ELCA proceeded to do. At the very moment when their negative decision about the Concordat was made, they would not let it stop there. They could well have gone home. And the path and the pursuit toward Full Communion with these two great bodies would have just stopped. They respected the mind of that very close, but not quite enough two-thirds majority, and they said, "we will not leave our churchwide Assembly without attempting to put back in place the pursuit of Full Communion. And from that has come CCM. I think we need to remind ourselves and respect their generous, gracious, determination. And I would ask at this time in our deliberation, in what we are being called to do, to respond in kind to their graciousness, their generosity, their initiative, and their determination, so as to make sure that this opportunity to enter Full Communion with them will not be put aside. But in the midst of their own rejection, they issued a bold, new attempt to be one.

So, I ask you that as we discuss and vote on this particular resolution, that we will respond I believe as enthusiastically as we did in 1997 with the Concordat. It is our convention. And though the document is a revision, and obviously with different language, all the basics are the same for entering into Full Communion. And in some instances, CCM may even be stronger than the Concordat we approved so overwhelmingly three years ago.

If this moment is a jubilee moment (and one of the Jubilee Year Themes is reconciliation) then may we dare to do something daring and different other than retribution or avoidance? What we are being asked to recognize is that reconciliation is never easy. It always has elements of uncertainty, or non-acceptance and imprecision. But above, it also has elements of pain and sacrifice because it requires a certain letting go, in order that we be consistent with the Gospel and be blessed by our Lord's mandate and desire that we be one with He and the Father, in order to bear his name and by baptism do so under whatever flag or whatever tradition or whatever ethos.

So, in our discussion, if we find a fine tooth, we are probably putting ourselves in a cul de sac that will be inconsistent both with the intent and the spirit of this resolution. And I would again say, if we don't pass this, we might never have this opportunity for another fifty years.

So, I believe that this House and hopefully and prayerfully, the Senior House, will be able to confirm this and other resolutions that will come along to put it in place. This will be a sign to the larger church of that oneness which is already there in Christ, and which we dare to make known at this moment with our Lutheran brothers and sisters. We are giving and gifting of our Anglican treasure and heritage. Your committee does not believe in any way that we are giving up, compromising or abandoning or surrendering that identity. But our identity compels us to share it with Lutherans and receive from them that unique, special identity of theirs. And then together offer this Full Communion to the ecumenical movement in this new century and new millennium. I so move.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Lee. Now you have before you A040 that Called to Common Mission Resolution be adopted.

Bishop Neff Powell of Southwest Virginia: I'm not nearly as eloquent as my colleague Bishop Lee. But our relations with the Lutherans are extremely important in southwest Virginia where we have an ecumenical Episcopal/Lutheran congregation, and an ecumenical Lutheran/Episcopal/Presbyterian congregation. And this would allow us to continue what we are already doing even in more viable and creative ways. And if this is not passed, I will go home utterly mortified. I urge you to vote for this. Thank you.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Powell. Bishop Epting of Iowa.

Bishop Christopher Epting of Iowa: It should surprise no one in this house that I rise to speak in favor of A040, Full Communion with the ELCA. I do so because I agree with the Bishop of Western Michigan that this is an historic ecumenical moment for us, and an historic ecumenical decision in which one church, which has retained its apostolicity over the years at least in part by the sign of the historic episcopate, and one church which has retained its apostolicity in other ways, but is now moving to regain that sign and come together without discouraging one another in the process. This enormous step and is one being observed carefully by our ecumenical partners around the country and around the world. Also this step is part of the worldwide ecumenical response between Anglicans and Lutherans of which we are only a part. Also however, it gladdens the call to hope about the mission of the church because I live and die survival. I live in the upper mid west where there are many Lutherans. There are three synods to our one Diocese in Iowa. I've already been in conversation with all three Bishops about joint work that can be done. We have shared a joint Lutheran/Episcopal College Captaincy at the University of Iowa for many years. We do many things together through the Ecumenical Ministries of Iowa and our State Council of Churches. We've always been stymied in the opportunity of new church starts or for cooperative ministry in many of our tiny congregations. Many of these tiny congregations cannot afford full time clergy. And up to this point, we have not shared clergy. Full Communion will allow that to happen. As I say, I have already been in dialogue with all three Bishops about exact locations where this can happen. And I know there is not enough language in CCM about mission. We did try to punch it up a little bit. We had to deal with the complex realities of the theology of ministry. That's why the document has so much in it. It is about mission. And if this is passed, you can begin to move forward and see the roots of that mission very quickly as of January 1, 2000. I will support A040.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Epting. I believe that Bishop Herlong is next.

Bishop Bertram Herlong from Tennessee: I just have a simple question of Bishop Lee. Since this affects the constitution, is this a first time vote or a second time vote?

Bishop Griswold: We will deal with the constitution in a separate resolution. Right now we are dealing solely with CCM. Bishop White.

Bishop Roger White, of Milwaukee: I rise to support the adoption of this resolution and I hope that our support as Bishops will be a sign of our leadership to the Senior House. I live in the midst of Lutherans. Five synods are in Wisconsin. My brother Bishop in Milwaukee, Bishop Peter Rogness voted no on the Concordat. His brother, who is at the seminary in Minnesota, is a leader in the opposition to CCM. And Bishop Rogness voted yes on CCM. We have worked closely together. I personally prefer the Concordat. There are some things I would like to change in CCM. But I believe the document is like we are. It is imperfect. And if we stop to amend it at this point, I think it will lead us to end this conversation. I was struck this morning by the lesson from Romans, "But you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you...for all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God." I pray that we may as Lutherans and Episcopalians be led by the Spirit of God to be led into this Full Communion. Full Communion, it appears, is the way God is calling the Churches; Anglican, Protestant, and now, Roman Catholic; that we all be led toward Full Communion with each other. Let us endorse this movement of Full Communion as a way to further God's mission that the Spirit work on us.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop White. Bishop Rowley.

Bishop Robert Rowley (Erie, PA): In a recent posting on the internet, Bishop Epting helped me focus very well on whether or not we should support CCM. And he raised a question, "Does CCM meet the requirements of the Lambeth Quadrilateral? And that is the basis, I am told, by everybody, for our Full Communion and our ecumenical relations. And I have looked at the Lambeth Quadrilateral and I think all four points are satisfied by CCM. I would urge support.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Rowley. Bishop Fairfield.

Bishop Andrew Fairfield, North Dakota: The condition in North Dakota is somewhat unique in our relationship with the ELCA. In North Dakota, the Lutheran Church is really the biggest denomination in the state. Within the city of Fargo alone there is probably six Lutheran congregations, each one of which is bigger than the whole Episcopal Diocese. And so they are big in North Dakota. And so, three years ago, I thought this was an obvious choice to vote yes for the Concordat. Since that time, I have been aware of real hostility toward the Concordat and CCM in North Dakota. At issue is the Historic Episcopate, which most Lutherans in North Dakota feel is not a gift but a threat. They feel that this has a hidden agenda, which threatens to change the way they practice their faith. They are very much against it. They also see other Lutherans around the country who are for the CCM now as not being truthful with them about the impact of the Historic Episcopate on their lives. Thus they are suspicious. They also see us Episcopalians as small and inappropriately arrogant and domineering. And, so what I thought was going to be a vote for life in relationships is turning out to be a vote for real strain in my ecumenical relationship in North Dakota. And so I am really conflicted about this. For the sake of my relationships with Lutherans in North Dakota, I will be compelled to vote no.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Fairfield. Bishop Parsons.

Bishop Donald Parsons (Quincy): I don't like saying what honesty compels me I must say. I'd like to make two points. First, there are some things in CCM which I am unable to accept and which I believe as Anglicans we should not accept. In B20, there is a phrase that everybody will agree that in the future, Bishops shall preside and participate in the laying on of hands at the ordination of all clergy. But now in CCM the word "regularly" is stuck in there. "Regularly, Bishops shall be....." What about irregular? This leaves the way open for the ordination of clergy not to be done by those who are Bishops. And I find that I can not accept that similarly later at another place, "lay persons may continue to be licensed in unusual circumstances to administer the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion." What's an unusual circumstance? We can all find those. (unintelligible) We are not the Diocese of Sydney. The second point I'd like to make, that I feel I must make....I'm sorry, I wouldn't like to, but I feel that I must is this provision where the opportunity is made for the

Lutheran friends to draw a list of how they understand the document. Meanwhile we Episcopalians, we draw our list of how we understand the document. Now in the old days, when we were involved in deciding annulments of marriage, one of the basis for annulling a marriage was a pre-nuptial contract. This is contrary to the intent and terms of matrimony. And I wonder if that isn't what we have here. A pre-nuptial declaration of how our bride understands the word and how the groom understands the word. And if that isn't a basis for an annulment, then what else do you need? If we were engaged in serious pre-marital counseling for a couple who acted this way, what would we say to them? I think responsibly we have to say, "why don't you wait a while and talk a little more until you are more certain that your real intentions are the same as the words you've agreed to." Thank you sir.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Parsons.

(An unnamed person rises to a point of order, "can debate be limited to three minutes per person?")

Bishop Griswold: I believe that would be in order. Bishop Jenkins of Louisiana.

Bishop Charles Jenkins (New Orleans, LA): Believe it or not, there are Lutherans in Louisiana and we cooperate with them in the Campus Ministry at Tulane University and in two congregations. I rise with some degree of nervousness. First of all let me say that I am cautious about the idea that we cannot offer amendments. In terms of my understanding of the process, this makes me very wary indeed. And it puts me off. Second, I want to ask Bishop Lee a question. And that is, "what is the status of the Mind of the House Resolution passed by this House at our meeting in Lake Arrowhead? Though we can't procedurally amend CCM, would it include the Mind of the House?"

Bishop Lee: The Ecumenical Relations Committee discussed that and believes (again unanimously) that to amend any thing to this resolution, could in some way, introduce those complications that we want to avoid. We want to be very clear about embracing and accepting the document. However, mindful of that and the work of the Deputies and Senior House approval, as how might this nevertheless get into the process, if this passes, as we have it, and subsequent constitutional resolutions, we have already put in process a resolution that would instruct and commend (the language is really instruct) a resolution based on paragraph 20 in CCM, the implementing committee that it can deal with it there. And that in all of their implementing responsibilities, which they would have to do as a committee appointed by both churches, to monitor and implement the carrying out of CCM. That this would say that we wish that they would be very mindful of the Mind of the House Resolution that we passed. So our desire was to acknowledge that it was there and somehow get it into the ongoing implementation process. If I may read a resolution that we submitted yesterday....."the Ecumenical Relations Committee that instructs the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to formulate guidelines for our members of the Joint Committee constituted under our agreement with the ELCA and CCM. Such guidelines would reflect interpretation of CCM agreement as set forth in the Mind of the House Resolution adopted by the House of Bishops on April 3, 2000. If this is adopted today, this resolution would come before you.

Bishop Griswold: In which case it could be amended. Bishop Friday of the Diocese of Honduras.

Bishop Leopold Frade (Honduras): I rise to support this resolution. You know, being a latin, I have a right to (unintelligible)... Regularly comes from the latin root called regulae... which is rule. Its not something that we do but it is a rule that the Lutherans are asking for. I would ask you to look at page 98 (Blue Book)... for what's going to be the constitution and bylaws of the ELCA. "The Bishop shall exercise solely this church's power to ordain or provide for ordination by another Bishop..." It is the Bishop that would be regular that would be the rule for the ELCA. I would also like to look at it from the point of an overseas Bishop. Having planted many churches and many missions, it is scandalous that the world sees that we are not together. It is time for us to be together. It means that we now turn around and receive the gift of union. The Latin American Church is looking at this vote. It would be a tremendous help to our ecumenical theology. We live with Lutherans, with many types of Lutherans. And we want to be able to say that the prayer of our Lord was somehow answered. We can be one, and this is our chance to respond to our Lord and say, "yes Lord, we can be one."

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Friday. Bishop Bob Ilhoff, Maryland.

Bishop Robert Ilhoff (Baltimore, MD): I speak in favor of the resolution and want to continue the analogy that Bishop Parsons began on marriage. Because it seems to me that the CCM is exactly an invitation to a marriage. It seems to me that the pre-marital counseling has been going on for about thirty years, and we still have some reservations. As Bishop of a Diocese that has very strong vocational diaconate, I'm very concerned about the lack of the document to really address adequately, or at least to my satisfaction, and the satisfaction of my Deacons, that ministry. But I have great faith that as this marriage proceeds, that will fall into place. There may be some learning from me in the process and our Deacons. I think there will be some gifting of the Lutherans about a new sense of what Diaconate might mean. In general, I am optimistic about the sense of this marriage. We talk about the leap of faith. I think this is a leap of faith that we are making. Somehow, we don't want to have to make the leap. We want to have the faith without the leap. I think its absolutely necessary to make the leap. I'm prepared to make that leap. And I hope that you are all prepared to make it as well.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop. Bishop Bob Johnson, North Carolina.

Bishop Johnson: Bob Johnson, retired, NC. I too favor this resolution. I'm not as passionate about it as I was about the Concordat, but I do have one question that maybe Bishop Lee or maybe somebody else could reassure me of now. How realistic is the threat of a schism in the ELCA if this passes? I hear various reports. Some say that it is very likely that our approval of this might help to birth yet one more denomination. And that would be a sad irony if in our effort to be working toward union; we do indeed produce further disunion. How realistic do you think, that threat is?

Bishop Lee: First of all that question should really be addressed to the ELCA or its representatives who have been here with us during the duration of the committees deliberation. We have heard during the course of those discussions at least reports citing percentages and numbers that we ask again the question, "are we going to contribute to division?" The response we have heard from them is, "the Churchwide Assembly has acted." They stand by that action. If there are consequences because we respond positively to that action and proceed into Full Communion on the basis of CCM, then that church will face those consequences. And then, their response to us in committee was, "that will be our problem." We are not going to solve that problem for them. We are here to say, "is what we have before us in the way of the proposal of Full Communion something that is consistent with the Gospel mandate that the Body of Christ be one. We were, I believe certainly assured that they are fully cognizant, of the criticisms and critics that exist painfully within the ELCA, some of it strongly held. They themselves can't explain, and I don't think we wish to bring them and can't anyway into this discussion. If however, after this discussion, particularly if it passes Bob, I'd be happy to introduce you to them. They are in our gallery observing so that they might be able to answer what has been put out there by those who are quite sincerely conscientiously within the ELCA opposed to CCM and its terms of Full Communion. But they feel that they honor the actions of their Churchwide Assembly, and do not want others to somehow have to deal with.... problems of reaction that could well occur within their church if this proceeds and goes ahead. Other than that I can't really speak on their behalf.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop Lee. Bishop Herzog, I think has been on the side anxious to speak for some time.

Bishop Daniel Herzog (Albany, NY): Thank you Bishop Griswold. I'd like to draw our attention to the pre-nuptial agreement and draw our attention to page 103 in the Blue Book, prefaced by on page 102 in bold capitals, Official Text. And on page 103 at the bottom of the second paragraph from the bottom, says that "we declare and that we specifically acknowledge that this agreement has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the ELCA, adopted Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999. The text of the Lutheran statement is omitted. I have copies here that pages could distribute for everyone to look at. The Lutheran statement specifically provides for lay celebration of the Eucharist. It makes references to the fact that Bishops will not always ordain pastors, and that is included on page 98 of our own Blue Book, where there is said to be cases of pastoral discretion. And furthermore, I have in my possession a text of a letter that the Secretary of the Lutheran Church, dated April 11, 2000 (which I have copies that could be distributed) which pertains to the relationship of Full Communion implemented between the ELCA and the Episcopal Church, which includes the question "could the Joint Commission (which Bishop Lee made reference to) altar, the

Tucson Resolution? And the answer is No.” That’s been mailed out to all Lutherans. If we attempt to adopt or to include the statement of the House of Bishops from Lake Arrowhead, we have a resolution, which by its very definition we are not controlling. But we have in fact affirmed and declared that the statement of the Lutheran Bishops is controlling in interpreting this agreement. I worked for a lot of years in labor relations. And I know when an agreement at the top level is vaguely crafted because of all kinds of reverberations down through the organization. And I think our postponement of the approval of this until we have a clear understanding of whose interpretation will control this agreement; will not terminate any existing relationship. (unintelligible) And I think if we we’re going to be really honest we should set the fact that it desperately needs an Anglican balance. The text as it is quoted from the Blue Book, is not complete and does not give proper balance to the agreement we ourselves made at Lake Arrowhead. Thank you very much.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you. Bishop Kimsey.

Bishop Rustin Kimsey (Oregon): But I am concerned about my brother’s comments. I’ve been the Chair of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations the last six years. And this particular issue has come up several times in our deliberations. And we’ve tried to share with the House of Bishops at Lake Arrowhead this dilemma, which was caused by an unfortunate use of language. You need to remember that the Churchwide Assembly did not vote on the Lutheran Bishop’s statement of what they believed about it. That was not important. So that it does not carry (The Lutheran Bishop’s statement) the weight that it would appear to carry. And your accusation of what is in the document is itself is confusing. All I can say is that the resolution that we have prepared before the house at a later point will give balance to the concern of whose interpretation is going to hold sway. That’s now what I intend to say. I just want to say, because this may be my farewell speech, of how proud I am to be a part of this house, and how grateful I am to you in this process. And one of the reasons for that has been that over these past twenty years, while I have been sitting here, there have been moments where I have been broken open to a new revelation that has affected my inner spirituality, and it is also I think more often than not that same “being broken open” has affected this church in so many incredibly unifying ways. And I could cite example after example of that. I believe that this measure before us is one of those kairos moments where we are again being asked to be broken open. And I think what is exciting for me about this that I can see that this church has been pretty much in an ecumenical cocoon. We have not found our way to act beyond the whole issue of orders in ministry. And in our dialogue with Lutherans we have found a way to do that, not finding a way in a machiavellian sense, but finding a way because we have been gifted by our Lutheran brothers and sisters through their witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Griswold: Thank you Bishop Kimsey. Bishop Theuner.

Bishop Douglas Theuner (New Hampshire): I want to say just a couple things in response to first off about the Tucson statement and the House of Bishops statement. I think that the House of Bishops statement does adequately speak to the concerns raised by the Tucson statement. The fact that it was a response to a Lutheran statement perhaps is a moment of kairos for us also. We’ve heard reference to Anglican arrogance on the part of Bishop Fairfield that says that we are perceived as acting arrogant sometimes. Indeed we are. I don’t feel the least bit bad in defining this by reacting to something the Lutherans first said. The second point that I want to make is that the committee has heard numerous testimonies from Lutherans, from Episcopalians, from experts in both churches and others also about the possibility of schism that is raised by Bob Johnson. And we are assured that the concern has been overrated in the press. There is not nearly as much concern about that in the Lutheran Church as we have been led to believe. I simply want to say in response to Bob Johnson’s question, I asked the same question of a Lutheran pastor before we came here. His answer to me was if Dr. Martin Luther had put the threat of schism ahead of the evangelical proclamation of the gospel there wouldn’t be any Lutherans today.

Bishop Griswold, “Thank you Bishop Theuner. Bishop Swing at Table Three.

Bishop William Swing (San Francisco, CA): “Bill Swing, California.” Regarding the Lambeth Quadrilateral: within the four elements is an element of courage that under girds that statement which causes my heart to leap when I read it. We have a chance, in our moment in history to take that courage and do something with it. The Lutherans have come out to meet us half way toward unity. We have been advertising for years and years that we are a bridge church. Well I think we are at a cross roads where this is either a drawbridge or it’s the

Golden Gate Bridge. Being from California, I'm for the Golden Gate Bridge. Griswold, "Thank you Bishop Swing"

Bishop John Howell, Central Florida: I just wanted to ask would it be in order to have that document that Ed Herzog has referenced to be distributed before we take our vote.

Griswold, "That's not in order."

Bishop Stephen Jecko (Jacksonville, FL): Thank you. In the Diocese of Florida right now, if I had the cash I could start seventeen new congregations. Cash is all I'm lacking, and clergy too, that's a shortage too. I would stand in favor of this as a member of the Ecumenical Relations Committee simply because Bishop Bill Trexler of the Florida-Bahamas Synod ELCA has been in conversation for a long time now. And the proclamation of the mission of the Church for both of our churches is paramount in our minds, and as presenting so many times this agreement with the Lutherans is really about mission and I agree with that whole-heartedly. We would like very much to be able to work together in prosecuting the mission of the church in our part of Florida. And I stand in favor of this so that both of us can get to work on it, especially small rural communities that are so interested in working together.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you Bishop. Bishop Irish.

Bishop Carolyn Tanner-Irish (Utah): I am also a member of the Standing Committee on Ecumenical Relations and have worked in this field for quite a long time including being vicar of a Lutheran/Episcopal Church. I have listened well to all of the conversations that have gone on particularly since we have been here, and very often they go over and over talking about adopting and I don't have any disrespect for that because we obviously need a document but I appreciate Steve's reminder to us that we are talking about mission and we are talking about the church and the future of the church. I served in a very large, spacious area. There are only three cities that are above 50,000, and it, it feels to me like there are a number of places where we could work collaboratively as well with the Lutherans, and in light of that I am in conversations with my counterpart in Denver. I just wanted to say a quote of something that Dan Martinson said who I used to work with in Washington, D.C. He says something like, "unless the church in many parts of the world, unless the church is ecumenically present, it runs the risk of not being present at all. That's true.

Griswold. Thank you very much. I was given a note by Bishop Plummer, which informs me that the Tucson Document as it was referred to and requested by Bishop Howell, has in fact been distributed to all of you both at Camp Arrowhead and by mail. Table 21, Bishop Shipp.

Bishop Harry Shipp (Savannah, GA): Harry Shipp, retired, Georgia. I have been on the standing Commission for Ecumenical Relations for twelve years and perhaps I have quite a bit of a reputation for being a nitpicker with these proposals for Full Communion with the Lutheran Church. If I were to do a relationship with the ELCA, I would perhaps do it somewhat differently. I like the Concordat better than the CCM. However, what frightens me would be the failure to pass CCM. I think the consequences of failure to do it overwhelmed my hesitations about going ahead with it. The failure to do it, would set back ecumenical relations for decades. Not that I was there, but in 1946 we had a similar thing with Presbyterians and we were on the verge of a unity arrangement with them but we dropped it, and we haven't been close to unity with Presbyterians since then. It has been said, and I believe that once the Episcopate is gotten right, then everything eventually will fall into place. And I am confident that time, over a period of time, you will see our hesitations set aside and those opposed to the (unintelligible) in the Lutheran Church will hereby yield as time goes by. So I am going to support CCM because I really think that is the way to go.

Bishop Griswold. Thank you Bishop Shipp. Table 23.

Bishop William Wantland (Eau Claire, WI) : Bill Wantland Retired. I rise to say that nothing would please me more than unity with our Lutheran brothers and sisters. At the same time, I hear that the document before us is not at all what was presented three years ago. And I think that we need to be honest with ourselves and our Lutheran Brothers and Sisters. Let me just point out the deep concern that I think we have to keep before us. We say that this document agrees that the three fold ministry of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon in historic

succession will be the future pattern of the one ordained ministry shared corporately with the two churches in full communion. Yet the Lutheran Bishops in that Tucson statement says and I quote "no requirement of the ELCA must eventually adopt the threefold order of ministries. Rather CCM recognizes that the present understanding of one ordained ministry in the ELCA may continue in effect. I think what we are about to do is to sacrifice the three-fold ministry and to lay the foundation for the destruction of the recovery of the permanent diaconate, and to create a union based on a misunderstanding. I would much rather that we come to an honest, clear understanding. And for that reason, I cannot support this resolution.

Bishop Griswold: Thank you. Bishop McKelvey at Table 17.

Bishop Jack McKelvey (Newark, NJ): I would like to call the question.

Debate ended at this point.